THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Former and present members: A. Abel, C. C. Berg, F. Gabrieli, E. García Gómez, the late H. A. R. Gibb, the late J. H. Kramers, the late E. Lévi-Provençal, [the late G. Levi Della Vida], T. Lewicki, B. Lewin, B. Lewis, [the late E. Littmann], the late H. Massé, G. C. Miles, H. S. Nyberg, R. Paret, J. Pedersen, Ch. Pellat, the late N. W. Posthumus, the late J. Schacht, F. C. Wieder

Former and present associated members: the late H. H. Abdul Wahab, the late A. Adnan Adivar, A. S. Bazmee Ansari, the late Husain Djajadiningrat, A. A. A. Fyzee, Halil Inalcik, the late M. Fuad Köprülü, Ibrahim Madkour, the late Khalil Mardam Bey, Naqi al-Asil, the late Muhammad Shafi, the late Mustafa al-Shihabi, the late Hasan Taghizade, E. Tyani

Former and present honorary members: the late G. Levi Della Vida; the late E. Littmann


The articles in this volumes were published in double fascicles of 128 pages from 1965 onwards, the dates of publication being:

1965: fascs. 41-42, pp. 1-128
1966: fascs. 43-46, pp. 129-384
1967: fascs. 47-50, pp. 385-640
1968: fascs. 51-54, pp. 641-896
1969: fascs. 55-56, pp. 897-1024
1970: fascs. 57-58, pp. 1025-1152
1971: fascs. 59-60, pp. 1153-1270

First published 1971
Reprinted 1979

ISBN 90 04 08118 6

Copyright 1971 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands
All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the Editors

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS
AUTHORS OF ARTICLES IN VOLUME III

For the benefit of readers who may wish to follow up an individual contributor’s articles, the Editors have decided to place after each contributor’s name the numbers of the pages on which his signature appears. Academic but not other addresses are given (for a retired scholar, the place of his last known academic appointment).

In this list, names in square brackets are those of authors of articles reprinted or revised from the first edition of this Encyclopaedia or from the Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam. An asterisk after the name of the author in the text denotes an article reprinted from the first edition which has been brought up to date by the Editorial Committee; where an article has been revised by a second author his name appears in the text within square brackets after the name of the original author.

A. ABDOSSELEM, University of Tunis. 684.
A. M. ABU-HAKIMA, Columbia University, New York. 773.
AZIZ AHMAD, University of Toronto. 94, 119, 249, 359, 376, 440.
F. AHMAD, University of Massachusetts, Boston. 554, 595, 624, 994.
M. MUNIR AKTEPE, University of Istanbul. 628, 1003, 1248.
M. BEL, Tlemcen. 832.
A. M. ABU-HAKIMA, Columbia University, New York. 773.
Mme BELDICEANU-STEINHERR, C.N.R.S., Paris. 539.
J. E. BENCHERIK, University of Paris. 291, 1205.
M. BEN CHENEB, Algiers. 673, 674, 731, 733, 734, 753, 762, 667.
H. J. BENDA, Yale University. 568.
Niyazi Berkes, McGill University, Montreal. 998.
Mme M. BERNARD, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris. 1026.
E. BIRNBAUM, University of Toronto. 968.
A. D. H. DIVAK, University of London. 304, 502.
H. BLANG, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. 1260.
S. A. Bonebakker, University of California, Los Angeles. 1006, 1022, 1092, 1246.
J. BOSCH-VILA, University of Granada. 806, 837, 848, 865.
C. E. BOUSWORTH, University of Manchester. 47, 198, 346, 460, 472, 1016, 1060, 1113, 1117, 1120.
the late J. C. BOTTOMS, University of London. 503.
G. H. BOUSQUET, University of Bordeaux. 19, 315, 648.
S. BOUSTANY, Lebanese University, Beirut. 909, 956, 1176, 1178.
CH. BOUSWORTH, University of Tunis. 641, 904.
J. A. BOYLE, University of Manchester. 569, 702, 1198, 1208.
W. C. BRICE, University of Manchester. 1254.
W. M. BRINNER, University of California, Berkeley. 206, 774, 775, 813, 923, 924, 931, 958.
[C. BROCKELMANN, Halle]. 677, 800, 930.
[FR. BULH, Copenhagen]. 245, 435, 510.
H. BUSSE, University of Hamburg. 349, 575.
[A. CABATON, Paris]. 1212.
Cl. CAHEN, University of Paris. 184, 244, 259, 394, 470, 489, 510, 673, 693, 704, 730, 733, 799, 813, 892, 894, 960, 1051, 1091, 1113, 1157, 1198.
J. A. M. C. COWLEW, University of London. 535.
E. E. CALVERLEY, Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Conn. 83.
M. CAHARD, University of Algiers. 82, 131, 246, 620, 759, 841, 868, 900, 1086.
J. CHELHOD, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris. 54, 294, 361, 393, 1051.
A. COHEN, University of London. 150, 647.
Mlle V. CREMONESI, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Naples. 621, 691.
Mme B. CETKROVA, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia. 342.
F. DACIAROUI, University of Tunis. 786.
C. E. DAWN, University of Aix-Marseille. 627.
G. DELANOUE, University of Aix-Marseille. 1071.
J. DESPOIS, University of Paris. 95, 224, 588.
C. E. FARAH, University of Indiana. 897.
R. ETTINGHAUSEN, New York University. 385.
M. Goldstein, Yale University. 808, 924, 970.
H. FLEISCH, University St. Joseph, Beirut, 1, 2, 152.
Mile A. M. GOICHON, University of Paris. 22, 334.
Mme S. GIBERT, University of Madrid. 837.
M. GOKBILGIN, University of Istanbul. 340, 983, 999.
M. GRABAN, University of Michigan. 175.
F. de la GRANJA, University of Saragossa. 677, 713, 730, 747, 923, 853, 855, 856, 891, 935, 971, 973.
G. E. von GRUBER, University of California, Los Angeles. 1020.
MOHIBUL HASAN, University of Kashmir. 317.
YUSUF FAZL HASAN, University of Khartoum. 949.
A. T. HATTO, University of London. 119.
[W. HEFFENING, Bonn]. 104.
[E. HERZFELD, Chicago]. 29, 149, 203.
the late U. HEYD, Hebrew University, Jerusalem. 147, 1134.
M. HISKETT, University of London. 278, 283.
the late M. G. S. HUDSON, University of Chicago. 545, 663, 907.
P. M. HOLT, University of London. 300, 922, 1000, 1258.
J. F. P. HOPKINS, University of Cambridge. 763, 773, 780, 905, 925, 960, 963, 976, 1005, 1039, 1046, 1110.
[M. HIDAT HOSAIN]. 36, 456.
[Cl. HIART, Paris]. 129, 274, 483, 572, 584.
A. Huyi MIRANDA, Valencia. 73, 74, 75, 135, 147, 570, 574, 587, 602, 734, 754, 771, 775, 790, 816, 842.
A. B. M. HUSAIN, University of Rajasthan, Pakistan. 288, 634, 635.
H. R. IDRIS, University of Bordeaux. 69, 139, 324, 387, 684, 955, 712, 713, 754.
HALLI NALCHI, University of Ankara. 45, 218, 285, 318, 1189.
A. K. IRVINE, University of London. 10, 21, 33, 53, 179, 208.
T. ISIKSAL, Basvekalet Arsvi, Istanbul. 11.
M. SHAMOON ISRAELI, Muslim University, Aligarh. 1126.
FAHIR Iz, University of Istanbul. 92, 132, 261, 358, 484, 623, 1200.
S. H. M. JAFRI, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur. 390.
N. A. JAHRAZHOV, University of London. 454.
J. JOMIER, Cairo. 37, 987, 1053, 1246.
D. H. JONES, University of London. 1038.
J. M. B. JONES, American University, Cairo. 572, 811.
RUSSELL JONES, University of London. 986, 1218.
P. E. DE JOSSELIN DE JONG, University of Leiden. 1215.
[Th. W. JUYNBOLL, Utrecht]. 1057.
[P. KAHLE]. 1000.
S. KAHWAJI, Lebanese University, Beirut. 1135.
A. H. KAMAL, Dharara. 362, 578.
MEHMED KAPLAN, University of Istanbul. 269.
ABDULKADIR KARAHAN, University of Istanbul. 132, 134.
KAZEMZADEH, Yale University. 531.
P. DE JOSSELIN DE JONG, University of Leiden. 1215.
[Y. J. JUYNBOLL, Utrecht]. 1057.
[P. KAHLE]. 1000.
S. KAHWAJI, Lebanese University, Beirut. 1135.
A. H. KAMAL, Dharara. 362, 578.
MEHMED KAPLAN, University of Istanbul. 269.
ABDULKADIR KARAHAN, University of Istanbul. 132, 134.
KAZEMZADEH, Yale University. 531.
E. KEDOURIE, University of London. 526.
A. KERDIAN, University of London. 1259.
MAJID KHADDURI, Johns Hopkins University, Washington. 181, 547.
M. J. KISTER, Hebrew University, Jerusalem. 49, 224, 588.
O. F. KOPFOLC, Istanbul. 627.
[P. KRAUS, Cairo]. 906.
R. M. Savory, University of Toronto. 157, 253, 316, 989.
G. Scarca, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Naples. 3, 589.
Mme B. Scarca Amoretti, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Naples. 808, 935, 938, 951, 1152.
Mme A. Schimmel, Harvard University. 1059.
H. J. Schmidt, Staatliche Kunstakademie, Düsseldorf. 221.
L. O. Schuman, University of Amsterdam. 506, 540, 546.
J. B. Segal, University of London. 805.
[C. F. Seybold, Tübingen]. 763.
M. A. Shaban, University of Exeter. 723.
Irfan Shahid, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 94, 222, 463.
A. Shiloah, Hebrew University, Jerusalem. 730, 749.
Miss Margaret Smith, London. 132.
M. Souissi, Tunis. 469.
D. Sourdel, University of Bordeaux. 22, 46, 121, 244, 293, 388, 574, 645, 750, 768, 824, 859, 873, 887, 902, 933, 938, 975, 987, 988, 1256.
A. Spitaler, University of Munich. 825.
B. Spuler, University of Hamburg. 122, 236, 316, 336, 337, 350, 484, 532, 536, 1123.
N. Steensgaard, Copenhagen. 211.
[M. Streck, Jenaj. 510.
G. Strohmaier, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin. 581, 962.
[R. Strothmann, Hamburg]. 255.
[K. Stürmer, Munich]. 1119.
[H. Suter, Zurich]. 731, 931.
the late Fr. Taeschner, University of Münster. 483.
M. Talbi, University of Tunis. 271, 489, 720, 831, 903, 933, 940, 982, 983, 1050.
F. Tauer, University of Prague. 59.
M. C. Şahabeddin Tekindao, University of Istanbul. 993, 1179.
E. Terés, University of Madrid. 12.
H. R. Tinkew, University of London. 566.
R. Traini, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Naples. 689.
J. S. Trimmingham, American University, Beirut. 6.
A. S. Tritton, University of London. 404.
E. Tyan, Université St. Joseph, Beirut. 72, 389, 1017.
E. Ullendorff, University of London. 5, 7, 176.
M. Ullmann, University of Tübingen. 1088.
F. J. Vatikiotis, University of London. 395, 561, 625.
J. Vernet, University of Barcelona. 683, 604, 703, 737, 750, 754, 789, 802, 921, 928, 995, 960.
F. S. Vidal, Dhahran. 238, 366, 549.
F. Viré, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris. 110, 726, 804, 809, 891.
P. Voorhoeve, Leiden. 153.
J. R. Walsh, University of Edinburgh. 45.
J. Wansbrough, University of London. 240, 346, 1179.
W. Montgomery Watt, University of Edinburgh. 8, 94, 123, 166, 167, 169, 260, 286, 367, 452, 539, 578, 767, 801, 1018, 1023, 1270.
P. Wheatley, University of London. 1214.
G. M. Wickens, University of Toronto. 57.
the late R. O. Winstedt, London. 377.
M. E. Yapp, University of London. 392, 460.
E. Yar-Shater, Columbia University, New York. 810.
Tansin Yazici, University of Istanbul. 603.
Z. H. Zaidi, University of London. 365.
S. Zakkar, University of Damascus. 839.
[E. V. Zambah]. 11.
[K. V. Zetterstén, Uppsala]. 351, 730.
ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

VOLUME I

P. 19*, 'ABBASIDS, 1. 3, f<# 344/945 read 334/945.
P. 187*, CADHAB AL-$ABR, add to Bibliography:

P. 277*, AHMAD b. HANBAL, l. 7 of Bibliography, for 343-45 read 342-43.
P. 304*, 'ALI PASHA ORULU, l. 22 of the article, for May 1710 read May 1706.
P. 451*, AMR b. AL-ÂS, l. 1 of Bibliography, for li. 1 read li. 1.
P. 856*, BADA'CN, add to Bibliography: Yahya b. Ahmad Sirhindi, Ta'rikh-i Mubarak-Shahi, Baroda-1932, index under Badaon (Badayun).
P. 1047, BARID SHAHlS, add to Bibliography: Ta'rikh-i Mubarak-Shahi, for 234-43 read 324-43.
P. 277*, BHATTINDA, add to Bibliography: Yahya b. Ahmad Sirhindi, Ta'rikh-i Mubarak-Shahi, Baroda 1932, index under Baddaon (Badayun).
P. 1194*, BHATINDA, add to Bibliography: Yahya b. Ahmad Sirhindi, Ta'rikh-i Mubarak-Shahi, Eng. tr., Baroda 1932, 222 n. 9, and index under Tabarhinda.
P. 1250*, delete BOBASTRO [see BABBASTURU].

VOLUME II

P. 12*, CANDERI, lli. 21-2, read in the Mâlîwa internal struggles by Mahmûd Shâh Khalîlî.
P. 347*, DIYAR MUDAR, l. 43, for (485/1092) read (485/1092); lines 53-4, for In 553/1158 Zangi granted it in fief, read In 553/1158 the Zangi granted it in fief.
P. 372*, Mh DJA'FAR, add to Bibliography: Ra'amân 'All Ta'ayy, Tanavirat-i Dzhâ'â, Arrah 1910, 79-111; Awlâd Haydar Fawk, Tanavirat-i Djaldid Šûbâ Bihâr-o Urisa, Patna 1915, 285-381.
P. 402*, DJA'IÎI, the present members of the Dja'ilî family of Mosul have asked the editors to make known their views on this article, for which the second sentence of this article does not accord with their family tradition, according to which 'Abd al-Djalîl b. 'Abd al-Malik was born a Muslim in Dijâ'âbârî in about 1030/1621 (cf. 'All Amîrî, Ta'rikh-i Shu'aîrâd 'Amîd, Istanbul 1328, l. 258) and had extensive business connections with Mosul and Baghdad; he later settled in Mosul, and died in 1909/1679.
P. 558*, DÎJWAN, add at end of Bibliography: For his views on 'samâ' see Muhammad Dja'far Nadwt, Islâm awr Mu'ayyî (in Urdu), Lucknow 1956, 110-20, 168-75.
P. 778*, after FÂRÂB, insert: al-FÂRÂBî, Anf Isfahân Isfâhân [see Supplement].
P. 809*, FARRUKHÎBÂD, add to Bibliography: Debi Prashad, Tadhkira-i Shu'ârâd 'Amîd, Istanbul 1328, l. 258) and had extensive business connections with Mosul and Baghdad; he later settled in Mosul, and died in 1909/1679.
P. 879*, FEHMÎ, add to Bibliography: see also 'Abd Allah Sirhindi, Ta'rikh-i Mubarak-Shahi, Baroda-1932, 114-5.
P. 1004*, GHÂNÎ, add to Bibliography: Husayn-Dîst Sanbhâlî, Tadhkira-i Hûsâyînî, Lucknow 1875, s.v.; 'Abd Muhammad Mu'ayyî l-Dîn Miskîn, Tadhkira-i Shu'ârâd 'Amîd, Istanbul 1328, l. 258) and had extensive business connections with Mosul and Baghdad; he later settled in Mosul, and died in 1909/1679.
P. 1036*, GHÂZÂL, iv. l. 22, for Gondwana read Gonda.
P. 1130*, GUDÂRÂT, l. 8 of Bibliography, for al-Mirmâni read al-Kirmâni and after Bodl. Elliot 257 add (and further Pertsch 321, now at Tübingen, and King’s College Cambridge MS 67; see the note by Hameed ud Din in History and Culture of the Indian people, ed., Bombay 1960, 752-3, and idem, in Journal of Indian History, xi (1962), 765-777).
P. 1134*, GULBADAN BÈGAM, l. 5, for Zinda-Pil read Zehnda-Pil.

VOLUME III

P. 24*, HADÎTH, li. 38, for al-Bûbya read Ibn Bûbya; li. 41, for al-Îbitar read al-Îbiştar.
ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA


P. 135a, HAMDALA, l. 14, for usually read regularly.

P. 231a, HARTNÂ, Bibliography, delete M. Ould Daddah, in GLECS 26(5/1965).

P. 246a, before AL-HASAN AL-A'SAM insert AL-HASAN 'ALÂ DIKKHIB 'L-SALAM [see Supplement].

P. 285a, HAWûRÎ, l. 3 of art., for Beitrag read Neue Beiträge.

P. 331a, HAYYî B. YAKZAN, lines 21-23. The edition and translation, Oxford 1671, were by the younger Edward Pocock (1648-1727). A fragment of an English translation by his father, the elder Edward Pocock (1604-91), dated 10 July 1645, survives in manuscript in the Bodleian Library (MS. Poc. 429, ff. 1-2, 16-17). Add to the bibliography: G. Vajda, D'u attestazione poco conunne di thme du 'philosopho autodidacte'”, in al-Andalus, xxxi (1966), 379-83.

P. 381a, HILAL, i, add to Bibliography: R. Brunschvig, in Mêlanges Georges Marquis, ii, 1957, 15, 19.

P. 456b, HINDAL, l. 10, for 21 Dhu 'l-Hijjida 932 read 21 Dhu 'l-Ka'âda 958.

P. 497a, HISHAM B. AL-HAKAM, lines 11-12, for descriptive attributes (qifâl), rather than accidents (awâq), read merely descriptive attributes, and l. 17, for accidents read descriptive attributes.

P. 511a, HIYAL, l. 34, add see Mûsûtus. l. 39, for 111, read 111.

P. 512a, l. 44, after valid add (cf. Sha'tibî, Muwafâbdâr, ed. 'Abd Allâh Darrâs, iv, 210 l. [K. al-idîtîhâd, l. §10], l. 51, read confirm.

P. 535a, HIZKIL, l. 11 of the article, for ID HARD read ID JAMA.

P. 570a, Q. SULALI AL-MAWSILIYYA, add to Bibliography: See the article (in Arabic) by al-Abbadî in Tijâris, no. 3 (1960); and especially O. Brunschvig, al-Iflal al-Mawsiliyya, Grenade et le Maroc marinide, in Studes . . . H. A. R. Gibb, Leiden 1965, 147-65, in which the compilation of the Iftal is situated in its historical context so that its true significance is made apparent.

P. 585a, HURMUZ, l. 11 of Bibliography, for Comentarios read Commentarios; l. 19, for perdu read perdus; l. 20, for Scillinger read Schillinger; and add: J. Aubin, Les princes d'Ormus du XIIIe au XVe siècle, in JAR, ccxli (1933), 77-138.


P. 751a, IBN AL-DIASSÂS, add to the Bibliography an important article by G. Wiet, Un homme d'affaires mésopotamien au Xe siècle, in Mêlanges Eugène Tisserant, Città del Vaticano 1964, ill, 475-93.

P. 775a, IBN AL-HADDÂD, l. 3, for Cadix read Guadix.

P. 780a, IBN AL-HADDÂD, l. 20, for AL-BALAFIKI read AL-BALAFIKI.


P. 802a, IBN HUBAYRA, Throughout the article, for Yusuf b. Umar read Yusuf b. Umar.

P. 803a, IBN HUBAYRÎ, l. 15, for Diazrat Shak read Diazrat Shukr.


P. 835a, IBN KHALDUN, l. 2, for (732-84/1332-82) read (723-858/1323-8406).

P. 835a, IBN KHALLIKAN, lines 8-9, for Bahâ al-Dîn Zubayr read Bahâ al-Dîn Zuhayr.

P. 835a, IBN KHASîbî, l. 1, for AHMAD B. AL-KHAZIB read AHMAD B. AL-KHAZIB.

P. 836a, IBN KHAṬIÎB, l. 6, for MIYür al-Ishârî read MIYür al-Ishârî.

P. 835a, before IBN MANDA insert IBN AL-MAMûN [see AL-MATÂJUL].

P. 846a, IBN MARDANISH, l. 32, for Cadix read Guadix.

P. 865a, IBN MARYAM, l. 37, for bi'r read bir; l. 86, IBN MARZOK, l. 12, for Lamtûna read Lamtûna.

P. 898a, IBN NAFIS, add to Bibliography: On Andrea Alpago, see Francesca Lucchetta, Il medico e filosofo bellunese Andrea Alpago, Padua 1964.

P. 939b, IBN SHUHAYD, add, at end of the article: A second attempt has been made by Ya'qûb Zahî (James Dickie), Dasjân 3bn Shuhayd al-Andalusi, Cairo 1969.

P. 946a, IBN SINâ, add to Bibliography: the psychological section of the Kitâb al-Shîja unplanned was edited by F. Rahman, as Aticenna De Animâ, London 1959.

P. 947a, before IBN SULAYM AL-ASWÂINI insert IBN AL-SUKÂLI [see Supplement].


P. 994a, IBRÂHIM HAKKÎ PASHA, add to Bibliography: Feroz Ahmad, The Young Turks, Oxford 1969.


P. 1085a, IKRÎTÎCH, lines 55-6, for circa 241-668/855-860 read circa 241-circa 281/855-95 (according to G. C. Miles); p. 1084a, add to Bibliography: G. C. Miles, The Coinage of the Arab Amirs of Crete (ANS Numismatic Notes and Monographs, no. 160), New York 1970.

P. 1102a, IÎAT, l. 35, for Dânîhpashâh read Dânîhpashâh; p. 1103b, l. 13, for Ousely read Ouseley.

HA', 26th letter of the Arabic alphabet, transcribed h; numerical value: 5, as in the Syriac (and Canaanite) Semitic.

Definition: unvoiced glottal spirant; according to the Arab grammatical tradition: rikhwa mahmuṣa; as regards the makhraj: aṣṣa 'l-balh "the farthest part of the throat" (al-Zamakhshari, Muṣafarāl, § 732). A voiced h can be found after a voiced phoneme but it is not a distinctive characteristic (see J. Cantineau, Cours, 75). Pause can develop a h to support the short final vowel of a word when it is not a vowel of inflexion (i'rab): this is the ḥa' al-sakh or ḥa' al-umūf or ḥa' al-istirība (see H. Fleisch, Traité, § 36 ee to ii). For the phonological oppositions of the phoneme h, see J. Cantineau, Esquisse, 177; for the incompatibilities, ibid., 201.

Modifications: the conditioned modifications of h are limited to its possible assimilation to a b preceding or following, and this between the final letter of one word and the initial of the next; or to reciprocal partial assimilation after an 'ayn, thus: <ḥ > <ḥḥ, as maḥṣum for maḥ'um "with them" (using the ancient dialectal form ma5), a particularly frequent phenomenon among the Banū Tamīm (see H. Fleisch, Traité, § 12 r and 11 e; J. Cantineau, Cours, 75). This latter assimilation is also found in Maghribi and eastern dialects (W. Marcais, Old Brahīm, 17 and n. 1; C. Bergstrasser, Sprachalas, Map 5, in ZDPV, xxviii (1915).

h disappears, in modern dialects, from the 3rd pers. masc. sing. of the pronominal suffix, in those dialects where the suffix is -o, -u and derives from *-ahā with loss of -a. The same is also true of the h of the 3rd person feminine singular and 3rd person plural pronominal suffixes in certain dialects of North African and Oriental sedentary groups (notably Aleppo, Lebanese dialects). For assimilations: to a preceding 'ayn, see Bergstrasser’s Map 5 referred to above; to other preceding consonants, see J. Cantineau, ibid., 76.

h as a demonstrative element appears in three forms: with a short vowel: ha-, the definite article in Hebrew; with a long vowel: kā, which, in Classical Arabic, did not go so far as to constitute a demonstrative in itself but which appears in compounds; with a diphthong: hāy; also in compounds, like hayta (= hāy + ta) of hayta laka in Kurān, XII, 23 [(come) here] (see H. Fleisch, Esquisse, 108-13), but hey "here" (L. Bauer, Palāstīnische A. 4, § 55, 6).

Bibliography: see in text and under ḥurūf al-muḥākāl; for a general discussion of the phonetics of Arabic as seen by the classical grammarians, see ḥurūf al-muḥākāl; for modern studies, see phonetics and linguistics.

(H. Fleisch)

ii. – IRANIAN AND TURKISH LANGUAGES

In addition to its consonantal value (as in Persian ham, pāhm, bīh, Turkish hep, laka, Urdu hem, bahu, vh, etc.) the letter h early acquired in Persian the role of mater lectionis for the final vowel -a. Whether this was due to analogy with the writing of the Arabic ending of the feminine singular, -a(h) or to a phonetic development within Persian, -ag > *-ay (> *-ah?) > -a (NPers. -e), it is impossible to decide. It was plainly from the spelling of final -a with -h, however, that the spelling of the much rarer final -i developed, as in ħh (earlier ħ, ḥy) = ki. In other languages practice differed: in Khārizmian final short vowels were not expressed other than by the Arabic barakād and the same was true of early Pashto spelling, but in the course of the last two centuries writings with -h have increased in Pashto for -a, -e, as in ᪣ pa, ᪣ ta, ta. In certain cases a morphological difference is expressed by a variant spelling, e.g., ፙ ḥa ḥa 'of him'. From final position the letter h later passed into use as mater lectionis for the short vowels -a, -e in medial position in some Turkish usage and is still so used (for -a) in the written Kurdish of Irāk.

In Persian and Turkish there is no visible distinction between final consonantal and 'mute' h, e.g., nh may represent Pers. na, nh, nūh, and Turk. ne. In the North Indian languages, however, the occurrence of aspirated consonants has led to further conventions: see below. (D. N. MACKENZIE)

iii. – INDIAN LANGUAGES

Generally in Indo-Aryan languages h is voiced in all positions (see W. S. Allen, Phonetics in Ancient India, Oxford 1953, 33 ff. with full references), and frequently a contiguous syllable can carry the breathy quality of the h; in some languages (Pandībā, some East Bengali dialects) h is replaced by a syllabic tonal distinction; in others (some dialects of Rājasthāni and East Bengali) there may be a phonetic differentiation between voiced h and voiceless h < s. In Urdu, Hindī and some dialects of Pandībā ah in tonic syllables when followed by short i, e, or a consonant, or in pawa, is fronted to [eh].

Besides this free h, there is also the characteristic aspiration of consonants: hh ḥh ḥh ḥh; gh ḡh ḡh ḡh ḡh bh. In the former series the aspiration is voiceless, in the latter series voiced; there is also the possible juncture of voiceless consonant and voiced...
h arising from morphological processes, distinguished from both serie.5. There is no phonetic distinction in Indian speech between h and k. In Urdu and Hind phonology contiguous final consonants do not occur, except in pedantic educated speech, and are separated by an anaptyctic vowel, usually a; thus falh is usually realized as fatha and pronounced as [fatha].

In the Perso-Arabic script as applied to Indian languages lah is generally called hā (sometimes choli hā 'little h' to distinguish it from baḥā 'big h', i.e., ḫā). The existence of the aspirated consonants -kṣh, -gṣh, -ph, -fath a; by an anaptyctic vowel, usually thus: "to praise" phonology contiguous final consonants do not occur, except in pedantic educated speech, and are separated by an anaptyctic vowel, usually a; thus falh is usually realized as fatha and pronounced as [fatha].

In the Perso-Arabic script as applied to Indian languages -h is generally called hā (sometimes choli hā 'little h' to distinguish it from baḥā 'big h', i.e., ḫā). The existence of the aspirated consonants -kṣh, -gṣh, -ph, -fath a; by an anaptyctic vowel, usually thus: "to praise" phonology contiguous final consonants do not occur, except in pedantic educated speech, and are separated by an anaptyctic vowel, usually a; thus falh is usually realized as fatha and pronounced as [fatha].

For the general discussion of the phonetics of Arabic as seen by the classical grammarians, see harrūf al-ḥarqā; for modern studies, see phonetics and linguistics. See also hā—iii, above.

HABABA, name of a singing slave-girl (ḥayma [q.v.]) of Medina who had learnt music and singing from the great singers of the 1st/7th century: Ibn Suraydij, Malik, Ibn Muhriz, Maḥbūb, Djamila, Ḥumayra [q.v.]. Her talent, beauty and charm conquered Yazid b. ʿAbd al-Mallik, who finally became her owner in circumstances which the sources describe very variably, but at a date after his accession (Shaʿbān 101/February 720); she was originally called al-ʿAyyiya and it is he who is said to have given her the name by which she has remained famous. Hababā is often associated with another ḥayma of Medina, Sallāma [q.v.], but the latter, also purchased by the caliph, seems to have played mainly the part of a singer (though see al-Masʿūdī, whose account is not convincing), while Ḥabbā exerted complete control over Yazid, who was infatuated with her. Neglecting his duties, he shared all his pleasures with her and even granted her authority, which she knew how to exert, to such a degree that he attracted bitter complaints from those about him, particularly his brother Maḥlamā. When the opportunity arose to pursue her policies, she was supplied with the verses she required by the poet al-ʿAbwās [q.v.]. According to tradition, she died of choking on a pomegranate seed, and her decease inspired such violent sorrow in the caliph that he kept her corpse by him for several days and even had it exhumed later in order to see her face one last time; shortly thereafter he died himself, of consumption, on 24 Shaʿbān 105/26 January 724, and was buried beside her. The enemies of the Umayyads did not fail to draw arguments from the dechaubed conduct of Yazid and his absolute subservience to Ḥabbā (see the speech of Abū Ḥamza ṣalīd al-Dāhilī, Bayān, ii, 123).

For the general discussion of the phonetics of Arabic as seen by the classical grammarians, see harrūf al-ḥarqā; for modern studies, see phonetics and linguistics. See also hā—iii, above.

HABBASH, HABASHA, a name said to be of S. Arabian origin [See HABASHAT], applied in Arabic usage to the land and peoples of Ethiopia, and at times to the adjoining areas in the Horn of Africa. Although it has remained a predominantly Christian
country, Ethiopia has an important Muslim population, and has moreover had relations with the world of Islam since the days of the Prophet. These will be examined under the following headings: (1) history, (2) the spread of Islam, (3) Hābash in Muslim geographical writings, (4) Ethiopian languages spoken by Muslims. A final section will deal with the Ḥabish in ancient Arabia. Reference may also be made to Erītra, Ḥabash (on Ethiopian Muslims) and Ḥabash (on the Ottoman province of that name). (Esp.)

1. Historical Background

Though Muslim traditions mention friendly relations between Muhammad and the Negus, the principal expansion of Islam occurred at a time when the Aksumite state was in a period of decline. The Persians had disrupted the sea and trade routes in the Red Sea, and the Muslim conquests soon enveloped the whole of Arabia and North Africa. Ethiopia was, however, at least temporarily, from its spiritual source, the Patriarchate of Alexandria. In fact, Islam had knocked on the very gates of the Christian kingdom: it had occupied the Dāhliak islands [q.v.]. The isolation of Abyssinia, which was to last for many centuries, had now begun. Trade and conquest were a thing of the past, and in the face of the great Islamic expansion there was nothing left to the people but to retire within their impenetrable mountain fastnesses.

While the internal upheavals in the heart of Ethiopia were at their height (towards the close of the first millennium A.D.), Islamic encroachment along the fringes of the kingdom became bolder and more dangerous. The internal troubles were eventually checked, and ground lost, both territorially and in the propagation of Christianity, was regained, but the effects of the disturbances on the periphery could not be mitigated in the same manner. Here the losses along the coastal plains proved irremediable; the Islamization of the lowlands continued at an accelerated pace, and Muslim powers succeeded one another in establishing their sovereignty, with varying degrees of effectiveness, over the African Red Sea littoral. But Islam threatened not only the coastal areas from which the Abyssinian Kingdom had been depopulated, but also among the nomadic groups who lived and moved between the sea and the eastern slopes of the Shoan plateau, where the pagan peoples of East Africa, as conversion was the easiest way of escaping this recruitment. The organization of this lucrative trade was enormous: it set up bridgeheads deep in the interior of the country, and what had begun as a raiding expedition developed into permanent control of entire areas and the establishment of a series of petty states and sultanates. Setting out from the Dānkal and Somali regions and the coastal towns, the slave-traders enveloped the Harar area, Arussi, and the lake district in the south-west.

It is impossible to say with any degree of certainty whether the origin of the Muslim state in eastern Shoa is due to slaving expeditions. Its beginnings are shrouded in impenetrable darkness, but it must have existed for a considerable period and have been under the rule of the Makhzumī sultans, probably since the late 3rd/9th century. The overthrow of this Shoa sultanate, in 1285, and its absorption within that of Ifat, the predominant Muslim state in Ethiopia, is described in a document published by Enrico Cerulli (KSE, 1914, 5-42). The sultanate of Ifat under the Walasma dynasty had become the focus of Islamic expansion in Ethiopia and of all those southern nuclei of resistance to Abyssinian and Christian encroachment who saw in the spread of Islam the lesser evil. Ifat was firmly established on the south-eastern fringes of the Shoa plateau and has impinged on many points and at several stages in the subsequent course of Ethiopian history.

The war of attrition between the central Christian highlands and the Muslim sultanates, entrenched all along the eastern and southern fringes of the Abyssinian plateau, is the principal feature of Ethiopian history during the period from the 8th/14th to the 10th/16th century. Proceeding from east to west we first encounter the sultanate of Adal (Muslim writers such as Maqrīzī refer to it as Zeila, but Adal and Zeila are largely synonymous and their histories closely connected) on the Dānkal and Somali coast. At times Adal formed part of the state of Ifat; its ruler was styled Amlīs or Islam (Negus in the Ethiopian chronicles), and one of them who opposed the Ethiopian King Amda Sion's march against Zeila, in 1332, was defeated and slain. Harar became a Muslim city-state and a great centre of Islamic commerce and cultural propagation. Ifat held the south-eastern part of the Shoa plateau and the slopes of the Awash rift-valley; it was the most important of the sultanates. To the west, the Ifat, in what is now the Arussi region, the Dawaro sultanate [q.v.] was founded by the Dānkal in the early 14th century; it controlled the whole of southern Ethiopia. It bordered upon the Bālī sultanate, while the small principalities of Shārkha and ArābaBī lay between Dawaro and the most westerly Muslim state, Hadya, which comprised the territory of the Sidama and Gurage.

Those were the Muslim sultanates ranged against the Emperor Amda Sion (1314-44). They covered a far greater area than that controlled by the Christian Emperor, but the latter had the advantage of a geographically compact state, while the Islamic peoples were spread in a vast semicircle without proper communications or political cohesion. Amda Sion seized the initiative, attacked Ifat and Hadya, and defeated both. He had thus gained the entire plateau down to the Awash River. And though these Muslim principalities displayed great powers of recovery, for the time being Amda Sion had relieved the pressure of Islamic encroachment. Victory brought mass conversions to Christianity in its wake; many monasteries and churches were founded at that time, and the name of Amda Sion himself was registered among the saints in the senkessar (Synaxarium).

Amda Sion's son and successor, Saīfa Ar'ād (1344-72), is principally renowned for his reigns
against Egyptian merchants in Abyssinia to show his disapproval of the persecutions to which Christians in Egypt had been subjected, culminating in the invasion of the Coptic Patriarch, Saita Ar'ad's son, Dawit I (1382-1411), brought about a temporary reconciliation with the Egyptian ruler, marked by an exchange of gifts. He also received an embassy from the Coptic Church in Egypt. But under his son Yešāḥ (1414-29) relations deteriorated once more, and the Ethiopian Emperor endeavoured to enlist the help of the "Franks" (possibly Aragon) in his war against Egypt. (This episode has been investigated by Hasan Habashi in an unpublished Ph. D. thesis, S.O.A.S., University of London, esp. chapter III). Ethiopian Emperors from time to time threatened to divert the course of the Nile in an attempt to mitigate the lot of their co-religionists in Egypt by so dramatic a gesture.

Meanwhile, the Ethiopians realized that the tense but "peaceful co-existence" with the Muslim strongholds in their immediate neighbourhood, on the Red Sea coast, could not last for ever. They therefore acted upon a suggestion, first advanced by Pedro de Covilha, to enlist the aid of Portuguese naval forces in the dislodgement of Muslims from the Red Sea littoral. The arrival of a Portuguese exploratory mission was, however, much delayed, and it did not, in fact, reach the country till 1520, by which time the general situation had undergone profound changes.

In the meantime the sultanate of Adal was convulsed by internal struggles. The recent defeat had done grave harm to the prestige of the Walasma dynasty, whose authority was now constantly challenged by the amirs and military commanders. The Sultan Abū Bakr had transferred the capital to Harar, possibly to extricate himself from the persistent pressure exerted by the generals who drew their principal support from the Dankali and Somali peoples. Chief among those forceful military commanders was Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm (nicknamed Gra, "the left-handed") [see Aḥmad Gra] who soon became the effective master of the Muslim possessions in Ethiopia and assumed the title of Iḥām. We are fortunate in possessing a detailed eye-witness account of the conduct of the conquests of the 15th/16th century, with the Iḥām Ahmad as the central figure, written by Shīhāb al-Dīn (Fūtāḥ al-Habashā, ed. R. Basset).

Gra had first made sure of the strength of his position in Adal and had then welded the Danakil and Somalis into a formidable striking force, inspired by the old ideal of the gikàd and lust of conquest and plunder. He initially concentrated on limited objectives, raids and incursions into the plains and foothills, before venturing upon the distant and difficult highlands. But in 1529, three years after the departure of the abortive Portuguese Mission, he struck and inflicted a major defeat on Lebna Dengel, the Ethiopian Emperor. He was, however, unable to drive home this advantage, as his armies disintegrated, drunk with victory and booty. It was only two years later that he was finally ready to begin the great conquest and invasion which inundated nearly the entire territory of traditional Abyssinian, burning churches and monasteries and forcibly converting large numbers of Christians. Dawaro and the Shoa province were conquered in 1531, and Amhara and Lasta followed two years later. At the same time Bali and Hadya as well as the Gurage and Siddama regions fell into Gra's hands. The accession to the throne of the Emperor Clau-

HABASH, HABASHA dius (1540-1559) thus occurred at a most critical moment in the history of Ethiopia—yet within less than two years the situation had radically changed, thanks mainly to the help given by the Portuguese. The 400 men under Christopher da Gama had disembarked at Massawa in 1541 and, aided by the Governor of the maritime province, who had held out at Debayoa, set out on their epic march into the interior. When the Portuguese contingent met the Iḥām Ahmad, they were successful in two encounters, but could not press their victory home. Meanwhile, Gra asked for and obtained reinforcements from the Turkish commander Özmēr [q.v.], with which he prevailed over the Portuguese and their leader, who was put to death. But the remaining 200 Europeans had not been demoralized; they managed to join forces with the remnant of Claudius' armies and, near Lake Tana, fought what was probably—at least until recent days—the most decisive battle in the history of Ethiopia. They smote the Muslim troops and slew Gra himself (1543).

Though there still followed some skirmishes, with the death of Gra the serious Muslim threat to Ethio-

piam had been effectively removed. Assisted by the soldiers of a Christian country from Europe, the Ethiopians had finally saved their ancient Christian kingdom and heritage. But the salvation had come at a very late hour: Ethiopia lay prostrate and exhausted; many of its churches and monasteries existed no longer, its clergy was weakened, and its people were either Islamized—however superficially—or terrorized and in urgent need of moral and material succour.

Adal, though greatly enfeebled, continued with harassing operations against the Ethiopians. A nephew of Ahmad Gra moved against the plateau, but he was beaten by Claudius, who subsequently advanced on Adal and wrought much devastation. Harar was now the main Muslim stronghold in Ethiopia, and it was from there that another attack was launched which, in 1559, led to the death of the Emperor Claudius.

But despite such isolated successes the Muslims no longer constituted a serious danger to the Abyssinian Empire. By the middle of the 16th century the prospect of an Islamized Ethiopia had become very remote. The next war between Muslim and Christian Islam did not occur until the last decades of the 19th century, when the reign of the Emperor John (1868-89) was characterized by constant wars against the Muslim powers encroaching upon his dominion.

Egypt, under the Khedive Ismā'īl [q.v.], had conceived plans for the conquest of Abyssinia. In these designs she was encouraged by the quick success of the British Expedition in 1868 and by the hope of Ethiopian disunity. In 1875 Egypt directed a threepronged attack against the Christian Empire; earlier already her agent, the Swiss adventurer Werner Munzing, had placed himself in charge of the Keren area and also assumed the governorship of Massawa. He now led the assault from Tadjura, but was overwhelmed and killed by Dankali forces. The second prong set out from Zeila under the command of Ra'uf Pasha and succeeded in occupying Harar. The Egyptians stayed there until they were dislodged, ten years later, by the Emperor Menlik. The third and largest column proceeded from Massawa, crossed Eritrea, and during their descent into the Mareb Valley, near Gunet, were attacked by John's Tigrean army and virtually annihilated.

The shock of this disaster was immense, and the Egyptians at once prepared another expedition, this
time of nearly 20,000 men under the command of the Khedive's son. The Emperor now organized a veritable crusade, and the whole country down to Menelik's Shoa hills reverberated with excitement and the call to deal a final blow to the Muslim foe. When the two armies met in 1876 near Gura, the Egyptian débâcle was so colossal that it quenched their thirst for Imperial aggrandizement in Ethiopia.

The most notable group of Muslims in Ethiopia are the Afar or Bedja region and from coastal settlements of which Zayla [q.v.]. The northernmost nomads, the Afar or Bedja [q.v.], were influenced both from the Nilotic and Somali in the plains. Islam made its inroads among pagans (mainly Galla), but also among northern nomads of the coastal plains known as 'Afar or Dangall [q.v.]. The northernmost nomads, the Afar [q.v.], were influenced both from the Nilotic region and from coastal settlements of which 'Aydhab [q.v.] was one of the most important. Zayla [q.v.] became an important diffusion centre and through trading relations the ruling classes of the developed southern Sidama kingdoms, as far west as Hadya around the river Gibe, adopted Islam. The religious culture penetrated northwards into Shoa and along the eastern shores of Lake Tana, and in the north (Eritrea and Tigrai) and are indistinguishable from the Bantu Nyika and Somali tribes. Islam spread only among the Somali [q.v.] and its diffusion is bound up with legends of tribal origins.

The central point throughout the history of this north-eastern region of Africa has been the Christian state of Ethiopia against which waves of nomad aggression tended to waste themselves. Muslim trading communities were present on the plateau but these waves also left behind small groups of Muslim agriculturalists. These Ethiopian Muslims living in plateau regions are known as Diabart ([q.v.] and see also ERITREA) and are indistinguishable from the Christians among whom they live except in customs which derive from religion. Those in the north (Eritrea and Tigray) speak Tigrinya and the others Amharic.

Before the 19th century, therefore, the only Muslims in the region apart from immigrant traders were the scattered groups of Diabart and the nomadic tribes of 'Afar and Somali in the plains. Islam made its greatest gains during this century, not merely among pagans (mainly Gallia), but also among northern Christian tribes in what is now called Eritrea. Many of the Gallia [q.v.] tribes which had penetrated into the highlands and were making a great if uncoordinated bid to gain control of the Christian stat-
adopted Islam in contradistinction to Ethiopian Christianity as a means to that end. A people known through them that those Galla who occupied the same region (Yedju and Raya or Azebo) and mingled with the preceding population adopted Islam as well as their hostility to Christian Amhara. Similarly, Islam spread among the Wolde Galla in the heart of the highlands (centre Dessié) to reinforce their attempt to remain distinct from Amhara. Many Wallo changed to Christianity during the reign of the Emperor John.

The 19th century was a period of anarchy in northern Ethiopia and the Christian state had no real control. The Egyptian conquest of the Sudan affected Eritrea (occupation of the Keren highlands 1860-76). Most of the Tigre-speaking tribes became Muslim between 1880 and 1885. These included the ruling classes of the nomadic Bait Asgedé (Habáb, Ád Taklés and Ád Tamúyán), many of whose serfs were already Muslim; the cultivating tribes of the Bilén or Bogós (Christian elements remain among the Bait Tarke section); the Marya living north-west of the Bilén; the Mensa; and Bait Juk. Muslim holy tribes formed themselves, one of the more important being the Ád Sháyyáb. Also the pagan negroid Baria, inhabiting the country around the Talkázé and Gash, became Muslim during the Turko-Egyptian occupation. The Mirgháni family [see Mirghaníyya] gained great influence among Eritrean tribes during this period, deepening the religion of the southernmost Béjja, the Banú Ámír (q.v.), who had been influenced by Islamic diffusion from the fábará of the Nilotic Fundjá (q.v.) state.

The northernmost Áfar tribes, mixing with other groups, gave rise to the Sahó tribes who occupy the eastern mountain slopes of Akèlé-Guzáé, Shimezana and Agame. Long exposed to Islamic influence, a movement into Islam began in the 8th/14th century. They were still predominantly Christian at the beginning of the 19th century, but during this period of change they became predominantly Muslim. They comprise the Asaortá, Hato or Hau, Mini-Fere, and Debrí-Mela, though they contain groups which have remained Christian, e.g. the whole of the Irób tribe and sections of the Mini-Fere and Debrí-Mela.

In the south, it has already been shown (e.g., al-'Umarí's account) that although Islam had entered the Sidama states by the 8th/14th century it had made no lasting mark upon the bulk of the population of these states and what little there was disappeared before the waves of Galá and subsequent upheaval and dislocation. The Galá first invaded the Muslim kingdom of Bálí (q.v.), where was situated the sanctuary of Sháyyáb Húsayn which they assimilated, and the eastern part of Sidama territory became Galá whilst the unmodified Sidama became confined to the valley of the river Omo. Only in the second half of the 19th century did the Galá of the Harar region adopt Islam; since then many of the Arusi have also come to call themselves Muslim.

The Galá who invaded the region beyond the Gibé formed a number of states (Guma, Gomma, Géra, Limmu Enarya, and Djj Sta Abba Djjifar) into which Islam spread in the middle of the 19th century, chiefly through commercial currents from the east, though there was also some Nilotic Sudan influence. It also spread among some Sidama (Gáro or Bosha, Tanbaró, Alaba, Hádiya or Guédéla, and part of the Walamo) and Gurágé groups (Waláné, Akekí-kabe, Gogót and Silté), though it should be pointed out that in many of these southern regions no clear-cut religious classification is possible. From the Nilotic Sudan Islam spread among certain Negro tribes (e.g. the Berta) of the western Ethiopian borderland known to the Amhara as Shánqela.

An aspect which distinguishes the Islam of the region from other parts of Africa is in the number of mágódhás which are recognized, owing to historical circumstances. The Banú (through Turkish or Egyptian influence) is found at Mášawa and elsewhere on the Eritrean coast, in parts of the interior of the Ethiopian state, and in a quarter of Hará city; the Múlíkí (from the Nilotic Sudan) in the extreme west and in the interior of Eritrea; and the Shálfí (from Arabia) in other parts of Eritrea, among the Sidáma, the Galá of Gibé region, and the Sónu. The spread of Islam was nowhere accompanied by Arabization and in consequence the people, especially the nomads, preserved their own social institutions as the basic feature of communal life, modified but not radically changed by Islamic institutions.

For further information the articles on individual peoples or regions should be consulted. (J. S. TRIMINGHAM)

## iii. — AL-HÁBASH IN MUSLIM GEOGRAPHICAL WORKS

Arabic writers often use the word Hábásha as vague by as some classical and mediaeval Europeans use Ethiopia, i.e., as approximately equivalent to the habitable part of sub-Saharan Africa, though the Arabs, unlike some European geographers, do not confuse it with India. Its eastern boundary was considered to be the Bahr Külzum and Bahr al-Zándí, its northern the desert separating it from Egypt; Idrísl extends it to the southern limit of cultivation in Africa. In the west Ibn Khurrádádhíb gives it a common frontier with the Šúrf state of Sídilímá, and al-'Umarí states that it is bounded by the country of the Takrúr; there is no reason to suppose he does not refer to the Sudanese Takrúrs. The Arabs derived their information partly from Pótemy, especially from the works on the Red Sea region, partly from the book of arf, the handbook he wrote to accompany the map compiled by order of al-Má'mún. In time this information became more rather than less confused as names became more corrupt. Muslim penetration was at this time practically confined to the lowlands on the western shore of the Red Sea. This is why so many Arab descriptions emphasize the extreme heat and aridity of Abyssinia. Their acquaintance with the plateau was very slight, though later accounts become more detailed and more accurate. The orders that ensued after the collapse of the Aksúmite kingdom, the prevalence of Christianity in the highlands, and the formidable physical obstacles to communication contributed to this ignorance. In general the early Arab geographers mention only the capital, Djarra, or Djarm, properly Djarma (Hudái, 473), really Garama, capital of the Garamantes of Fazán (q.v.), where Yákút places it. In the Hudái, for example, only three place names in Hábashá are given, Djarma, corrupted to Rásun, and two others, equally corrupt, but tentatively identified by Minorsky as 'Aydháb and Zaylá. Masúdí (Murád, iii, 34) gives the capital as Ku'bar. This cannot be Ankober as stated by the editors, nor can it be the same as Idrísl's Káljún. It is Ya'qúbí's Ká'ban or Ku'bar, capital of the Nadjástí. Its iden-
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tification is problematical; Conti Rossini proposed |
Aksum, but several alternatives are equally plausible; |
and several places on the coast from Sawakin to Moga- |
His capital is Dānbayta, a popu-
le extremely corrupt. His capital is Dj.nbayta, a popu-
a, |
islands. Idrisi's description is hopelessly confused |
not been satisfactorily identified, but the first is |
to the very limited extent to which it has been |
the Eritrean plateau, Ottoman geographical litera-
It appears to owe nothing to written |
the Nile and it seems likely that the latter will slowly displace |
the last century, the influence of Amharic has grown, 
and it seems likely that the latter will slowly displace Harari altogether. The number of those still capable of speaking Harari has been estimated by Cerulli at 35,000.
Harari has generally been written in Arabic, and not Ethiopian, characters. Its literature is limited to some songs and some popular works of Islamic religious law.

Among non-Semitic languages spoken by at least a certain number of Muslims are Galá, Somali, the Sidama languages including Kaffa, as well as Beja and Bilen.

**Bibliography:** E. Cerulli, Studi Etiope: I. La lingua e la storia di Harar, Roma 1956; E. Ullendorff, The Semitic languages of Ethiopia: a comparative phonology, London 1955; W. Leslau, The Arabic loanwords in Gurage (southern Ethiopia), in *Arabica*, iii (1956), 266-84; idem, Arabic loan-

**AHABISH**

Ahábish is a plural form which may mean either (a) "Abyssinians" as derived from Ḥabab, or (b) "companies or bodies of men, not all of one tribe" (Lane), from ḥabūb or ḥabīb; in a poem *Uḫman* is said to have been murdered by "ahábioh from Egypt" (Nöldke, *Delectus*, 79, 7; from Ibn al-ução, i, 152). It is also said that the word is applied to men who formed a confederacy either at a mountain called al-Ḫabab or at a wadi called Ḥabash.

The Ahábish who are mentioned several times in the *sira* of Muhammad were a confederacy of small tribes or clans, at first allied with Banū Bakr b. Abd Manāt b. Khāna against Kuraysh (al-Azraq, *U. Wüstenfeld, Mecka, i, 71, 14), but subsequently allied with Kuraysh, The leading group was Banu 'Hārīb b. 'Abd Manāt b. Khāna, and the others usually named are: al-Muṣṭalik (of Khurās), and al-Ḥūn (of Khuzayma) with its subdivisions 'Aṣāl and al-Ḫāra (for references in Ibn Ḥišam, al- halkın, al-Wākidī and al-Ṭabarī see W. M. Watt, *Arabia Felix*, ii (1943), 259-75.

(C. F. BECKINGHAM)

While the above facts are clearly stated in several passages, there has been much dispute about the identity of the Ḥabāšī who supported Kuraysh since the appearance of the article by H. Lammens, *Les 'Aḥabīs* et l'organisation militaire de la Mecque, au siècle de l'hiḡirè (J.A, 1916, 425-82; reprinted in *L'Arabe occidental avant l'hiḡirè*, Beirut 1928, 237-94). Lammens put forward the view that the Ḥabāšī consisted of Abyssinian and other negro slaves attached to a core of nomadic Arabs; and further held that the power of Mecca in the early 7th century A.D. rested on these mercenaries. Lammens was correct in rejecting the older view that the Ḥabāšī were simply "die politischen Verbündeten" (J. Wellhausen), but his hypothesis as a whole is unjustified for the following reasons: (a) he sets too much weight on the meaning of "Abyssinians" and neglects the second possible meaning; (b) there is nothing in the sources to suggest that the tribes or clans of the Ḥabāšī are not Arab; (c) they are stated to be confederates (*ḥulāfā*) of Kuraysh, not slaves, and at their first mention they were confederates of enemies of Kuraysh; (d) they were organized under a chief (*sayyīd*), usually of Banu Ḥārīth b. ʿAbd Maʿān b. Khānān, who spoke to Kuraysh as an equal (e.g., Ibn Ḥāḳam, 506, 743); (e) in the Meccan campaigns the Ḥabāšī did not have the importance alleged by Lammens. The Meccans certainly had some Abyssinian slaves who fought for them; of the eleven slaves or freedmen who fought for Muhammad among the Emigrants at Badr, two were clearly of Abyssinian origin (Ibn Sa'd, *ii*; Watti, Muhammad al-Medinah, Oxford 1936, 344); but this is a small proportion, and there is nothing to show that such slaves were called Ḥabāšī. The word is used, however, of Abyssinians in the Yemen (S. Smith in *BSOAS*, xvi (1954), 455, 458, 465).

**Bibliography:** (further to that in the text): M. Hamidullah, *Les 'Aḥabīs* de la Mecque, in Studi orientalistici in onore di Giorgio Levi Delia Vida, Rome 1956, i, 434-7; Tabarī, 1, 2495-9; Ibn Durayd, 119; Abd al-Masih al-Kindī, Risāla, 213 foot. (W. Montgomery Watt) ḤABASH AL-ḤASIB AL-MARWAZI, AHMAD b. Abd allah, one of the most important and interesting figures in early Islamic astronomy, hailing from Marw, but living in Baghdad. The sobriquet "Ḥabāšī" ("the Abyssinian") is nowhere explained; it may refer to the dark colour of his skin. While the *Fihrist* (p. 275) mentions that he reached the age of 100, Ibn al-Kīṭīf (Taḥḥāḥ, 170) gives more detailed information on his life and the various stages of his scientific activity. According to him, he lived in the reigns of al-Māʾṣūr and al-Muṭṭaṣım, which is confirmed by Ibn Yūnus (in his *Great Ḥākimītī Tables*, see Kennedy, *Tables*, 126), who reports observations made by Ḥabāš in Baghdad in 214/829 and 230/846. The limits for the year of his death (250/864-260/874) as given in Suter, *No.* 22, p. 13, and Sarton, *Introduction*, i, 505, are pure conjecture. Nallino (al-Balāḏurī, i, p. 181, and *Raccolta*, v, 55) states that Ḥabāš completed the *ṣīdā* and announced it before Ibn Sa'd (Ahwārī, 1750), in 300/912. If this is true, we would have to assume that he made his first observations as a young boy of no more than 15, which is not very probable. For this reason, Nallino (*Bull. du XII* congr. int. d. orientalistes, no. 15, 11-2) excludes the possibility of his having collaborated in the Maʻmīnic observations; see Vernet, 505, note 31. Vernet's surmise that there were two different individuals bearing the name Ḥabāš al-Ḥasib is extremely unlikely. The titles of his works include the *Fihrist* and by Ibn al-Kīṭīf (differing with one exception only slightly) are the following: *The Damascuss tables; The Maʻmīnic tables; On the distances [of the planets] and [their] bodies; On the construction of the astrolabe; On sundials and gnomons; On the three tangent circles and the properties of their functions (kāyfiyyat al-waḍīl); On the construction of horizontal, vertical, inclined *mulūma* (see the first one of the 'main directions') planes. In Ibn al-Kīṭīf the last two titles are combined into one: On the tangent circles and the mode of their application (kāyfiyyat al-latīḍāl [better read istīlmāl] to the construction of . . . planes. If this is correct, the title would refer not to the construction of sundials but to stereographic projection and its practical application, the terms māʿī and munḥarih bearing on the ecliptic and on the horizon with the muḥanfarādī respectively.

Contrary to this list, which contains three *ṣīdā* of Ibn al-Kīṭīf in the *Fihrist* preceding it mentions three *ṣīdā* and under different titles: one according to the methods of the *Sīndhind*, "composed in his early days, when he still relied on the computations of the *Sīndhind*", in which he refrained entirely al-Fazārī's and al-Khārizmī's procedures and their application to the motion of precession according to Theon of Alexandria; another one, called al-ṣīdī al-mumlabān ("verified tables*, tabulas probabiles, for the meaning of the title see Vernet, 506), which was the most famous of his works composed after he had had recourse to his own observations; finally a third one, the "small *ṣīdā" called also the *ṣīdī al-ḥāḏh.*

It is hardly possible to decide whether the two extant *ṣīdā* bearing Ḥabāš's name (Berlin 5750 and Istanbul, Yeni Camī 284, 2°), both described in detail by Kennedy (nos. 13 and 16, and §§ 7 and 8, pp. 151-4) are at least in part identical with one or the other of the two great *ṣīdā* listed (the *ṣīdī al-ḥāḏh* is lost). The former, in which references to the *al-ṣīdā* of Yahyā b. Abl Manṣūr (Ms. Escorial 1927 (formerly 922), Kennedy, no. 51 and § 5, 145 ff., and Vernet, 507 ff.) are found, is obviously modified by some later author. The latter is "much more homogeneous than the other purported copies of early *ṣīdā*" (Kennedy). The latter contains among others a "Table for the correct positions" (*Dīwān al-tabām*) of which Abl Naṣr Manṣūr (Risāla . . . *īl-Biarrī, . . . fi bāḥārī a'māl dīwān al-tabām fi *ṣīdī Ḥabāš al-Ḥāḏh, in Rāsāl Abī Naṣr aīl *īl-Biarrī, Hyderabad-Deccan, 1948) has given an elaborate description. There the following four functions are listed for the argument *λ* (elliptical longitude) = 1, 2, . . . 90°: 1. the latitude *b* (*"al-*māyī al-ḥāḏh") of a point on the equator with longitude *λ*; 2. *cos b* 90-λ 3. ; 4. sin *ε* *t* *λ*.

With the aid of these functions many computations can be considerably abbreviated.

As for the *ṣīdī al-ḥāḏh,* the title seems to indicate that it was composed on the basis of parameters (e.g., longitude of the solar apogee) or even methods employed in the *Pahlavi tables* *Zik-i-gahrooyār*, known and in use already at the time of the astrologers of al-Manṣūr, such as Mā ṣāḥa'ī 'llāh, which in turn, as Nallino (*Raccolta*, v, 233) has shown, must have been based mainly on Hindu models (*Sūrya-stidhānta*).
There is no doubt that Habash possessed a perfect mastery of trigonometrical functions (sine, cosine, versine, tangent, cotangent) and their application to the problems of spherical astronomy. Curiously, however, Abu Nasr in his Risala on Habash’s giyawa al-tab’um (see above) avoids the term zill and consistently replaces it by the ratio of sine and cosine (thus the above fourth function is actually defined as “sin λ · sin ϵ/cos λ”).

Al-Biruni, who cites Habash on many occasions, himself wrote an improvement and correction to the tables of Habash (Tahmil ridg al-yahdāt al-bakhsh al-jābiha min al-zalal, Boilot, no. 4, p. 177). Ibn Yūnus, in his Ḥakimītīc tables, on one occasion at least makes the depreciatory statement that “Habash’s remarks concerning the latitudes of Venus and Mercury sound like those of one who does not understand what he is saying” (Kennedy, 126). Contrary to this, the unanimous opinion of all later writers seems to have been that Habash was one of the greatest astronomers of early Abbasid times.

Habash’s son ʿAbū Dīʿār b. ʿAbīd b. ʿAbd Allāh (Ibn al-Kifṭs, 396) was a renowned astronomer and instrument maker. He wrote a book on the planispheric astrolabe.


**HABASHAT**, a term found in several Sabaean inscriptions with apparent reference to Aksumite Abyssinia. Despite the absence of explicit evidence, it has generally been assumed to apply not only to the territory and people of the Aksumite empire but also to a South Arabian tribe related to the former and in close contact with them. To E. Glaser the term in its widest and most ancient usage signified no more than “incense-collectors” (Arabic ḥababsa “to gather”) and was confined to the peoples of the incense region, that is, of the Mahra and Somali coasts and Abyssinia proper. He equated it with the Greek *Aithiopoi* for which he posited an original *Afya* with the same sense. In Habashat of the inscriptions, however, Glaser preferred to see a region and tribe of South Arabia which he further recognized in the Abasenoi of Uranius (opus Stephanus of Byzantium) who inhabited the territory and people of the Aksumite empire. C. Conti Rossini rightly stressed the improbability of a people from Mahra colonizing across the Red Sea and was raised the linguistic objection that Ge’ez, the language of Aksum, shows closer affinities with Sabaean than with Ḥadrami. Consequently, if the Abasenoi were really Habashat they might more reasonably be seen as refugees from Abyssinia. For his part he took Ḥabashat as a South Arabian tribe, part of which had emigrated to Eritrea at a very early date, and sought their provenance in Western Yemen, which had obvious geographical advantages. A number of middle Sabaean texts attest their presence in the ancient district of Sahartān, roughly the region between Wādī Bayḥa and Wādī Surdū, and they were clearly in close relations with Aksum. This location, which was specified by the vicinity of Luhayya, was felt all the more convincing since many Yemeni place names, ancient and modern, were found to recur in Eritrea, a clear indication of early cultural contacts. However, it is pertinent to observe with A. J. Drewes that such theories on the South Arabian origins of a tribe Ḥabashat have tended to become confused with and to develop on the strength of a series of quite separate, quite different, theories of the origins of Abyssinian civilization generally, and of the latter there is little doubt. In fact there is no known mention of Habashat before the earliest references to Aksum, that is, at least 400 years later than the oldest Abyssinian texts. Even by the traditional chronology of A. Jamme, the Sabaean inscriptions citing the name are not earlier than the first century B.C. and other schemes would up-date them by three centuries. Habashat is attested in only one Aksumite text (*DAE*, 6/1 = 72) where it is the rendering of Aithiopoi in the Greek version (*DAE*, 4/2-3). In the Sabaean texts there is no suggestion that Habashat was anything other than a designation for the region comprising the nucleus of the Aksumite empire. Where the reference is to the people of Ḥabashat, the term employed is Ḥabbāṣi (‘Abbas). Consequently it is probable that in Sabaean and Aksumite Ge’ez the name simply represented the later Arabic al-Ḥabasaḥa, Abyssinia.

Fortunately Abyssinian history may be considered in isolation from the foregoing problem. Although the epigraphic and other evidence from Eritrea is scant compared with that from Arabia, the texts so far published permit certain general conclusions. The earliest date back to the fifth century B.C. and are written in South Arabian characters. They may be subdivided into those in Sabaean and those in a language resembling Sabaean but with divergences in vocabulary, syntax, and proper names. The latter show that a civilization was developing in the Aksum region which closely resembled that of Saba but whose roots, undoubtedly transmitted from Saba, must go much further back in time. Since some of the texts of the first category actually mention Saba and Marīb (mryb), the possibility of a later wave of Sabaean colonists in the fifth century is very likely. Thereafter, till the emergence of Aksum, the only inscriptions consist of a few uninformative graffiti, and it is possible that in this period the development of the local civilization was largely inhibited by the Ptolemaic presence in the Red Sea. The first mention of Aksum itself occurs in roughly contemporary South Arabian and Greek sources. The *Periplus Maris Erythraei* (traditionally about 70 A.D., more recently brought forward to about 230 A.D.) knew it as a flourishing trade centre under a king Zōkalsē and with links with Arabia and Egypt through its port Adulis. Ptolemy (160 A.D.) also mentions the city, and its people, but gives little indication of its status. The ethnographic and economic authors would suggest that, if not of recent foundation, it rose to prominence only after the eclipse of the Ptolemies. As a trading nation the Aksumites inevitably came into sharp conflict with the interests of Saba, and it is probably in this context that we should understand the part played by them in the struggle which developed between the rising state of Himyar and the traditional Hamdādūn dynasty in Saba. One Sabaean text (*CIH*, 308) tells how Gadarat, king of Ḥabashatān, concluded an alliance with ʿAlbān.
Nahfän of Saba. In the reign of his son Sha'ir Awtar, Gadarat appears on the side of the Himy rites in campaigns in Zahar, Sahartän and Nagran (Jambhe, 1965, 34-38). During the co-regency of Ishhār Yahūfū and Ya'zīl Bayyūn, the Nadžāshī 'Adhbah sided with the Himyrite ruler Shammad of Raydān during campaigns in Western Yemen which resulted in the defeat and surrender of the Himyrite faction (CIN, 314 + 954; Jamm, 574-7, 585). Jammf places all these events in a period of about three generations in the first century B.C., a date by no means confirmed by the South Arabian evidence. J. Pirenne however, in identifying Shammar with the famous Shammad Yuharīsh, brings the date of the troubles forward to about 250 A.D. and thereby introduces an attractive degree of cohesion into the early history of Aksum.

The greatest Aksumite ruler was unquestionably Ezānā (mid fourth century), whose inscriptions, composed in Greek, Ge'ez and pseudo-South Arabian, tell of campaigns extending from the confines of Egypt to Somaliland. His titles include king of Hamër (Himyar) and Raydān, and Sabā and Saḥḥān. It is difficult to assess the validity of this claim—the theory of an Aksumite occupation of the Yemen after the reign of Shammad Yuharīsh has been abandoned in the light of new inscriptions—but E. Littmann supposes that a successful campaign in South Arabia may have lain behind it. It is worth observing too that a predecessor, the unknown author of the Monumentum Adulantum, in the course of similarly wide-ranging conquests, had subdued the Arhabitat and Kainādkoplitā, who inhabited the coastal regions of Ḥiḍrāz and 'Āṣir down to the northern borders of Saba. If this operation may be seen as an attempt to curb piracy in the Red Sea, it is possible that Ezānā, too, may have had commercial motives for interfering in South Arabian affairs. Drewes, who attributes the Monumentum Adulantum to one Sembūthē, known from a fragmentary Greek inscription from Daqql Mahārī (DAE, 3), goes so far as to suggest the latter's identity with Shammad Yuharīsh and would thus explain the titulature. Apart from his statecraft, Ezānā's most notable achievement was to make Christianity the state religion. It had been introduced about 525 A.D. when the Emperor Justin called upon the Nadjashi Kāleb to intervene in South Arabia on behalf of the persecuted Christians there [see PHU 3], goes so far as to suggest the

The statements regarding the subdivisions and multiples of the habba also vary; the abba also varies; the

The statements regarding the subdivisions and multiples of the habba also vary; the habba is usually divided into 2 grains of barley (sha'ir) or 4 grains of rice (araw) or about 100 mustard-seeds (khardal); sometimes 3 and sometimes 4 habba on the other hand make a kêrāt [q.v.].


HABAT, South Arabian name for a sacred area which is under the protection of a saint and which is a place of refuge; see hāwta.

HABBA, literally grain or kernel, a fraction in the Troy weight system of the Arabs, of undefined weight. Most Arab authors describe the habba as 1/10 of the unit of weight adopted, as a 1/100 of the dānak (which in Arab metrology is a sixth part of the unit [see šikka]), but there are other estimates which vary from 1/10 to 1/10. The habba thus means something very different according to the unit of weight; there is a habba of the silver measure, a habba of the gold measure, a habba of the mihkāl, later of the dirham etc. On the supposition that the oldest Arab unit of Troy weight was the mīghāl [q.v.] of 4.25 grammes (61/2 grains Troy), we get as the most probable weight of the habba in the early days of Islam about 70-77 milligrammes (1.1 grains), which approximately agrees with the European apothecary's weight of the granum (grain, of the pound) as it was used throughout Europe down to the most recent times (cf. the English grain, the Spanish grano, the modern metric decagramme). The statements regarding the subdivisions and multiples of the habba also vary; the habba is usually divided into 2 grains of barley (sha'ir) or 4 grains of rice (araw) or about 100 mustard-seeds (khardal); sometimes 3 and sometimes 4 habba on the other hand make a kêrāt [q.v.].

Bibliography: S. Bernard, Notice sur les poids arabes (Description de l'Egypte, État Moderne, Vol. xvi of the octavo edition, 73-106); Don Vasquez Queipo, Essai sur les systèmes métriques et monétaires des anciens peuples, Paris 1859; S. Lane-Poole, The Arabian historians on Moham medan numismatics (Num. Chron., Third Series, Vol. iv, 1884); E. W. Lane, Manners and customs of the modern Egyptians3, 1846, iii, 330; H. Sauvage, Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire de la numismatique et de la métrologie musulmanes, Paris 1882; idem, Arabian metrology in JRS, 1879-84; Decordiermanche, Traité pratique des poids et mesures des peuples anciens et des Arabes, Paris 1909; idem, Sur les misqals et dirhems arabes, Paris 1908; C. Mauss, Loi de la numismatique musulmane, etc., Paris 1898; Adolf Grohmann, Einführung und Christomathie zur arabischen Papyrskunde, Prague 1955, 141-2, 146; Walther
HABBAN, a town in the Wahidi Sultanate of the former Aden Protectorate, situated in the wadi region the houses are strongly built like fortresses and a Hakir which stands as early as 400 B.C. in the inscription of the same name. It is very old and may be referred to as a Kasabdt (kasabdt) and numbered about 200 in 1947 and, though subject to the usual taxes and restrictions, were well treated so that relations with the Arab population were good. They were divided into five sections (bašâbbi) and came under the protection of the Sultan. They spoke Hebrew amongst themselves and had their own cemetery outside the town. By trade they were itinerant silversmiths. Habbân is also known as a centre for the cultivation of incense but the chief crops are dhura and barley. The land is very fertile and can support up to four harvests in one year. Indigo provides the Hadârîm with employment as dyers, and rubber has also been noted. The road from Bîl Hâm to Marjha passes through the town and a caravan trade was conducted with Nisâwa under the rule, not of an Ottoman governor, but of a tribal chief entitled nâdh. The kâshîfik in Lower Nubia had become hereditary, and the descendants of the Ottoman garrison, intermarried with the local population, became a hereditary military caste.


HABESH, Ottoman name of a province covering the African coastsland of the Red Sea south of Egypt as far as the Gulf of Aden, and including also the sandghijs of Djidda; the principal sandghijs were Ibrim, Sawâkin, Arkko, Masawwa, Zaylin and Djidda, so that its area corresponded approximately to the coastal districts of the present-day Sudan, Ethiopia, French Somaliland and the Zayli district of the Somali Republic.

The province was founded with the intention of expelling the Portuguese, who, since the last years of the Mamlûk sultanate, had been endeavouring to obstruct the Pilgrimage and the spice trade from their bases along the Red Sea coast. These Portuguese attacks caused a reduction in the customs revenues of such ports as Djidda, Suez and Tör; they also had unfavourable repercussions throughout the Muslim world, since word of them was spread by pilgrims (see H. Inalcik, in Belleten, xxii/83 (1957), 503-5). As protector of the Holy Places [see BARABRA], the Ottoman Sultan was forced to action; but after the failure of five expeditions against the Portuguese (between 930/1524 and 961/1554), it was decided that these regions should be permanently occupied and constituted a province.

In 962/1555, therefore, Özdemir Paşa [q.v.] was appointed beylerbeyi (Istanbul, Basvâkela Sârîvî, Reise nach Südarabisen, Dhiyâr-i Hûmayûn, part no. 213, 212); with an army gathered in Egypt, he launched an offensive up the Nile, but the operation failed, owing to the obstacles which this route entailed (see C. Orhonlu, in Altıncı Türk Tarih Kurumu Kongresi Teâbîleri, Ankara 1961). In a second expedition Özdemir Paşa embarked his forces at Suez and landed at Sawâkin. Using both land and naval forces, he conquered the whole region from Masawwa to Zayli, the province being finally constituted in 964/1557 (C. Orhonlu, XVI. asrin ûlk yarısında Kusânedîn sahillerinde Osmanlılar, in Tarih Dergisi, xii/10, 1-24). In order to consolidate their position, the Ottomans extended their conquests inland until 966/1559, when Özdemir Paşa died. After his death, Ottoman power declined rapidly. The remotest districts were abandoned or separately administered [see BARABRA]. In 1789 Bruce found Masawwa under the rule, not of an Ottoman governor, but of a tribal chief entitled nâdh. The kâshîfik in Lower Nubia had become hereditary, and the descendants of the Ottoman garrison, intermarried with the local population, became a hereditary military caste.

Since one of the primary duties of the beylerbeyi was to maintain order in the Holy Cities and the Yemen, the headquarters of the province was, from the last quarter of the 10th/16th century until the beginning of the 19th century, located in Djidda (Bayvâkela Sârîvî, Mûhimme def., xxi, 311, xxvii, 235, 6, 92). Owing to the disturbances in this region, Medina was temporarily made the headquarters in the 12th/18th century.

By 1814, when Burckhardt visited Sawâkin, Ottoman authority was reduced to the granting by the governor of Djidda of the amir, and the appointment of a customs officer in the port. The Ottoman sultan finally transferred all claims on the African parts of the province to the pasha of Egypt in 1830.


HABIB B. 'ABD AL-MALIK AL-KURASHI AL-MARKANI, great grandson of the Umayyad caliph of Damascus al-Walid I. After the
fall of the Umayyad dynasty, Habib b. 'Abd al-Malik fled from Syria and arrived in Spain in advance of his cousin Habib b. Abd al-Malik al-Dakhil, the future 'Abd al-Rahman I of Cordova; when this Umayyad claimant arrived, Habib gave him his support and encouraged him in his aspirations. On the eve of the battle of al-Muṣrā (138/756), which was to decide the fate of the throne of Cordova, 'Abd al-Rahman appointed Habib commander in chief of the cavalry.

After victory had been achieved, 'Abd al-Rahman I al-Dakhil retained his cousin Habib in his service, and he became his intimate confidant. The ruler entrusted to him the government of Toledo, a key point in the centre of the Iberian peninsula, which until then had been under the domination of the Fihrs, supporters of Yusuf, the willi dismissed by 'Abd al-Rahman. While Habib b. 'Abd al-Malik was at Toledo, this eastern town showed no sign of rebellion; this calm must be attributed to the energetic attitude of its governor, who also made use of this place as a centre of operations against the revolt which was taking place at this time in the adjacent territories—the rebellion of the Berber Shawkī which broke out in 131/748 and which was the most serious of all the many uprisings which took place during 'Abd al-Rahman's reign. The detachments sent by the governor of Toledo succeeded in penetrating into the main stronghold of the chief rebel, the castle of Sopetran, in what is now the province of Guadalajara. In 162/778 Habib was once again in action in his territory, against another rebellion—by the ḥārīd al-Sulami.

In reward for his services, the amīr granted great favours and benefits and many estates to Habib b. 'Abd al-Malik, who in addition did not hesitate to appropriate to himself, with the ruler's connivance, any land which he coveted; on one occasion, confronted by the vigorous support of the judge of Cordova for those who had been dispossessed, 'Abd al-Rahman went so far as to repay from his own money the value of the properties which Habib had seized. On Habib's death (date unknown), the ruler showed profound grief, which is described in graphic terms by the historians.

Habib b. 'Abd al-Malik was the founder of the line of Habibs who held the Andalus with some notable men of learning and of letters, among whom there stands out the branch of the Banū Dāhūn. Among the most noteworthy Ḥabibs may be mentioned: Ḥabib Dāhūn and Bishr b. Habib Dāhūn, both poets of the reign of 'Abd al-Rahman II; the hādi of Cordova, Ibrāhīm al-Kurāshī, also contemporary with 'Abd al-Rahman II; 'Abd Allāh b. Yahyā b. Dāhūn, a venerable fakih who lived to see the fall of the caliphate of Cordova and was the religious counsellor of Ibn Ḥazm (q.v.); Sa'd b. Ḥūqūm b. Dāhūn, a poet who lived at Porcuna and was the contemporary of Ibn Hamdīn (6th/12th century).

**Bibliography:** Khusham, 14, 15, 110-5; Ibn al-Faraḍī, Ta'rif 'ulamā' al-Andalus, ed. Codera, nos. 121 and 123; Ibn Bāqīḫuwalī, Sila, ed. Codera, no. 585; Ibn al-Abbār, Tahmiṣa, ed. Codera, nos. 86 (ed. M. Ben Cheneb, no. 601); Al-Qānūn and González Palencia, nos. 280 and 285; Ibn Sa'd, Maqārib, i, 62, 217-75; Maḳḳārī, Naqsh, Cairo ed., ii, 103, iii, 259, iv, 136 (= Analectes, i, 373, 802, ii, 96); Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Amalī, ed. Lévi-Provençal, Rabat 1934, 62; Asn Pālacin, Abnāhsam al-Cordoba y su Historia de las ideas religiosas, i, 108 and note 138. (E. Terés)

**HABIB B. AWS [see ABU TAMMĀN].**

**HABIB B. MASLAHAMA, a military commander of Mu'awiyah I, took his son Bishr b. Habib in his service. In 133/751, after the battle of al-Musara (138/756), which was to decide the fate of the throne of Cordova, 'Abd al-Rahman b. Mu'awiyah, the future Abd al-Rahman I of Cordova, appointed Habib commander in chief of the cavalry.**

... (ps.-Balkhi), al-Bad wa 'l-tarikh, iii, 130 f., 134 f.; Chronique de Tabari (Balchami), trans. H. Zotenberg, ii, 51 f.; Annales, 45); Ibn al-Athlr, Notices, nos. 121 and 123; Ibn Bashkuwal, Silwa, ed. H. Lammens, Études sur le règne du calife omeyyade Mu'awiyia 1er, in MFOB, i, 42-57.
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HABIB ALLAH (HABIBULLAH) RAHAN (1872-1919), son of the amir 'Abd al-Rahman [q.v.] and of the concubine Guzı̃r, who came from the Wakhjān; ruler of Afghanistan in succession to his father, from 1 October 1902 to 20 February 1919, when he was assassinated at Kalla-gush in the valley of Ailingār not far from the residence of Kal'at al-Sīrāj (Laggān). In foreign affairs he adopted a pro-British policy, reinforced by frequent visits to India (and also with Russia, but without going so far as to establish the regular relations desired by the governor of Turkestān, Ivanov), and with Treasury loans to merchants. He carried out some public works, but it was in the field of education that most progress was made. With a military school supplementing it, there began to function from 1903 the high school called Ḥabibiyya, based on the type of the Anglo-Indian colleges and intended to train an administrative cadre: in its 12 classes, with local and Indian teachers, it taught the usual subjects and allowed for literature and the religious sciences, geography, chemistry, physics, history, mathematics; while among the languages, together with Persian, were English, Hindustani and, more sporadically, Persian. A suitable Dār al-ta'līf attached to the school attended to the preparation of textbooks, most of which were lithographed in India. In Kābul a littégraphique and printing works (the Ināyat press) was set up. For eight consecutive years from 1911, there appeared the 16-page fortnightly scientific, literary and political periodical Sirājāl al-akhbār-i āfgānīyya, with engraved illustrations and edited by the “father of modern prose”, Māhmūd b. Qulām Muhammad Tarzī (b. Kābul, 1285/1868-9, d. Istanbul 1335/1919). Thus schools and periodicals were the first two really modern manifestations of Afghan cultural life. The assassination of the amir, however, brought to an abrupt end this interim period of apparent tranquility and of imposed friendship with Great Britain, and opened the way to new and more definite national claims by the country.

Bibliography: A. Hamilton, Afghanistan, Boston-Tokyo n.d. (Oriental Series, Millet company); Dogovor zaklyulemyeny mel'du Britanskim pravitel'ствom i ěmīro mp Afganistana 21 marta 1905 goda s otnosyuts'shiami k nemu procesnyiyami, in Sbornik materialov po Asii, lxxx (1907), 62-74; A. Le Chatelier, L'amir d'Afghanistan aux Indes, in RMM, ii (1907), 35-49; F. Raskol'nikov, Rossiya i Afghanistan, in Novyi Vostok, iv (1923), 46-8. (G. SCARCIA)

HABIL WA KABIL, names of the two sons of Adam [q.v.] in Muslim tradition: Heşel and Kāsin in the Hebrew Bible (for the distortion and assimilation throughout Islam of the Hebrew and Arabic names of the two sons of Adam, see Table of Names, pairs of words Dālūt - Talūt, Harūt - Marūt, in the Hebrew Bible (for the distortion and assimilation throughout Islam of the Hebrew and Arabic names of the two sons of Adam, see Table of Names, pairs of words Dālūt - Talūt, Harūt - Marūt, Yahyā' - Mākūdjī; Kāsin is, however, attested sporadically). Although the Kurān does not give these names, it tells however (CV, 27-32/30-5, Medinan period) the story of the two sons of Adam, one of whom killed the other because his own sacrifice was refused when his brother's was accepted. Unlike the Bible, the Kurān also tells how the murderer learned from the example of a crow how to dispose of his victim's body. From this episode the Kurān argues for the prohibition of murder, underlined by a consideration inspired, no doubt indirectly, from the Mīghna, Sanhedrin, iv, 5: to take the life of an innocent being is as serious a crime as to cause the death of the whole of humanity; to save the life of a single person is as meritorious as to do so for ten men. If an exegetical tradition is to be believed, the Kurān, XXXIII, 72, is also referring to the first murderer: Kābil, having offered the trust (a'māna) to Adam, broke his word and killed the brother entrusted to his care, but this interpretation, foreign to the context, does not rest on any serious basis. Several later authors certainly know the biblical story: Ibn Ḫutayba, Ma'dīrī, ed. S. ʿŪkhāda, 171,
quotes an abridged form of Genesis, IV, 1-8; al-
Tabari adduces Genesis, IV, 9-16, following Ibn Isbâk; and they lay stress, in accordance with the his
tory of the time, on the subject of the sacrificers, as a reason for the fratricide, this rejection being due
to the poor quality of the fruits of the earth offered
up by Kâbl. In general, however, Muslim sources
show a preference for legendary versions derived from
the Jewish aggada and the "Treasure Cave", rather
than the slightly paraphrased scriptural data. And so
they try to find a motive for the drama in distant antecedents which claim to fill a gap in the biblical
narrative. The question, however, to the extent that Adam had
only daughters after the fratricide and after the birth
of Seth who was to replace Abel (Genesis, V, 4).
The legend readily repeated by Muslim authors
(following Wahb b. Munabbî) has it, in short, that
each of the two brothers had a twin sister (Akllma
and Labuda), each destined to be the bride of the
other brother; displeased with this arrangement,
other brother; displeased with this arrangement,
the motive of consanguineous marriage; the pole-
mical anti-Zoroastrian point is obvious). Tradition
also offers a number of variants as to the means of
murder: Hâbl was beheaded by a carpenter's axe, his
head was crushed by a huge stone while he slept,
zzo. Lastly, the Muslim legend has received the fable
already mentioned by Jerome, Ep. 36 ad Damasium
and attested in more recent midrashim about
Kâbl being killed by his blind descendant (Lemekh).
—As is often the case with similar material, Jewish
texts of a later period show some traces of the Muslim
legend.
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HABITIYYA, followers of Ahmad b. Hâbl (q.v.).

HABOUS [see warf].

HABBISH, term used in India for those African communities whose ancestors originally came to the country as slaves, in most cases from the Horn of Africa, although some doubtless sprang from the slave troops of the neighbouring Muslim countries. The majority, at least in the earlier periods, may well have been Abyssinian, but certainly the name was applied indiscriminately to all Africans, and in the first days of the Portuguese slave-trade with India many such 'Habbish' were in fact of the Nilotic and Bantu races.

There is little detailed information concerning the numbers, the status and the functions of the Habbish in the earliest Muslim period, although the favour shown to the Habbî slave Djamal al-Dîn Yâkûtî by the Khalîfâ qeen Ka'îlyâ (q.v.) in the early 7th/13th
century indicates that even then Habbish were able
to rise to positions of power and eminence (but the
story that Djamal al-Dîn was the qeen's lover has no
support in the contemporary historians). The Habbish
were certainly well distributed over India by the Tugh-
lûk period, for Ibn Battûtîa, who travelled widely in
the sub-continent between 734/1333 and 743/1342,
notices them from north India to Ceylon, employed
especially as guards and men-at-arms by sea as well
as by land (Ibn Battûtîa, iv, 37, 59-60, 93, 185; tr.
Gibb, London 1929, 224, 229, 236, 260). Their
presence in large numbers in Gujûrât is nowhere
mentioned directly, it being noted by Ibn Battûtîa
that the district of Dâmâghi (q.v.) was renowned for
its quality of the fruits of the earth offered up by the Habsh (q.v.) in the early 7th/13th

Towards the end of the 8th/14th century the slave
Malik Sarwar, who was most probably a Habbî
enuch, became prominent under sultan Muhammad
al-Dîn Fath Shah. Fîrûz Shah, who succeeded him,
was appointed wâzir, but the Ilyas Shâh sultan Rukn
al-Dîn Bârbak Shâh, 863-79/1459-74, maintained that of his successors see IBRAHIM SHAH SHARKI and
SHARRIDS.

In Bengal, where Habbî slaves arrived directly by
sea, it is recorded that the Ilyas Shâh sultan Rukn
al-Dîn Bârbak Shâh, 863-79/1459-74, maintained
some 8000 African slaves mainly for military pur-
poses, many of whom were raised to high rank. They
became dangerously powerful under the rule of
Djâlal al-Dîn Fath Shâh (886-91/1481-6), who on
taking power, was deeply concerned about them, and
succeeded Malik Sarwar in the government in 802/
1399 as Mubârak Shâh; his younger brother suc-
cceeded him on his death the following year and, as
Ibrahim Shâh, ruled Dâjpur for nearly forty years,
a great patron of art and literature. For his reign and
that of his successors see IBRAHIM SHAH SHARKI and
SHARRIDS.
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monarchy itself. The wazir was elected king, as 'Ala al-Din Husayn Shah, in 900/1493, and shortly thereafter expelled all Africans from Bengal; most of them eventually made their way to Gujurat and the Deccan.

It was perhaps in the Deccan that the Habshis were most conspicuous over a considerable period. Here again records of their presence in the early period are scanty, although Rafi al-Din Shirazi states in the Tadhkirat al-muluk that the Bahmani sultan Fizr, 800-25/1397-1422, had made him his personal attendant; some of his bodyguards were, he says, subverted by his brother Ahmad, who eventually encompassed Fizr's death at the hands of his Habshi gismad. Foreigners, especially Persians and Turks, had earlier been attracted to the Bahmani court, and Ahmad on his accession increased their number. This led to rivalry between the local Dakhni Muslims and the foreigners, not least on religious grounds since most of the influential foreigners were Shi'i. The Habshis, who were Sunnis, lost favour at the court, and came to support the local Sunni Deccan Muslim faction in their opposition. The Dakhni party managed to regain some favour in the later years of Ahmad Shah Walli's reign and, coming also to some power, commenced a persecution campaign against the foreigners, not excluding the Persian Mahmud Gawan [q.v.] in spite of the Bahmani sultan's efforts to divide and rule between the foreigners and the Dakhni party; in this division two of the four Bahmani provinces, Māhūr and Gulbārga, were governed by Habshis. The persecution culminated in the plot, in which a Habshi leader was the instigator, to discredit Mahmūd Gāwān, whom the sultan put to death. The hill outside Bīljāpur town where the Habshi community had their stronghold is still known as the Habshi Kof; the tombs of many Abyssinian nobles and soldiers are scattered over the hill (see G. Yaqdani, Bīljāpur: its history and monuments, Oxford 1947, 82 ff.). The next sultan, Mahmūd Shah, 887/1482-924/1518, who had succeeded to the throne with the help of an extreme Turkish faction, nevertheless appointed a Habshi divān of finance, Dīlāwār Khān. This officer failed to carry out a plan for the occupation of the Bahmani dominions from Bīljāpur, the king's command, and fled the country. Meanwhile a powerful Dakhni revolt had in 892/1487 attempted an unsuccessful coup to dethrone Mahmūd; he was saved by his foreigners, and gave orders for a general massacre of the Dakhni and Habshi. The differences were settled, but the Sunni Turk Kāsim Barīd [see BUKSHI] as wazir seized much of the government, and Dīlāwār Khān returned from exile to assist the king against him; but Dīlāwār Khān was defeated and the Barīd family gained a greater ascendancy over the Bahmani lands. In 901/1495 the Habshi governor of western Telengānā, Dāstūr Dīnār, rose in revolt on being replaced by Sultān Kuli Kūt al-Mulk, and was defeated by the Barīd minister with the aid of Yūsuf ʿAbdul Khān; he was however restored to the fief of Gulbārga in an attempt by Kāsim Barīd to curb the ambition of Yūsuf in Bīljāpur. On the death of Kāsim Barīd in 910/1504, Yūsuf marched on Dāstūr Dīnār, killed him, and annexed Gulbārga to his dominions. Yūsuf then took vigorous measures to establish the Shi'i faith, which led to renewed hostilities between the foreign and Dakhni factions in which the Habshis again took a leading part.

In 924/1518, who had succeeded to the throne with the help of his Habshi tradition, command of the island continued to be held by a number of influential Habshi officials who restored the foreigner, and gave orders for a general massacre of the Dakhni and Habshi. The differences were settled, but the Sunni Turk Kāsim Barīd [see BUKSHI] as wazir seized much of the government, and Dīlāwār Khān returned from exile to assist the king against him; but Dīlāwār Khān was defeated and the Barīd family gained a greater ascendancy over the Bahmani lands. In 901/1495 the Habshi governor of western Telengānā, Dāstūr Dīnār, rose in revolt on being replaced by Sultān Kuli Kūt al-Mulk, and was defeated by the Barīd minister with the aid of Yūsuf ʿAbdul Khān; he was however restored to the fief of Gulbārga in an attempt by Kāsim Barīd to curb the ambition of Yūsuf in Bīljāpur. On the death of Kāsim Barīd in 910/1504, Yūsuf marched on Dāstūr Dīnār, killed him, and annexed Gulbārga to his dominions. Yūsuf then took vigorous measures to establish the Shi'i faith, which led to renewed hostilities between the foreign and Dakhni factions in which the Habshis again took a leading part.

The Habshi navy at Dīlājīra and Surat. The power of the Habshi naval commanders continued until the end of the 17th century, when, under Ahmad Nizām Shah, the navy became a more effective power against the English forces as well as against the Marathas; but by about 1730 their sea power had
declined as that of the Marathas had risen, and they were no longer able to protect the Surat shipping.

In Gudjarat there seems to have been a continuous supply of Habshis by sea through the ports of Bharan, Surat-Rander and Kambhaya. The sultan Bahadur (933/1526-943/1559) especially welcomed foreign slaves to his service, and there were said to have been as many as 5000 Habshis in Ahmadabad alone (Hadidji al-Dabir, Zafar al-wadll, ed. Ross, i, 97, 407, 447); many of these appear to have been prisoners taken in the Muslim invasion of Abyssinia in 914/1514. The able Habshis rapidly obtained positions of importance: thus Sayf al-Mulk Miftah was governor of the fort of Daman, with a force of 4000 Habshis, at the time of the Portuguese conquest; Saykh Sa'd al-Habshi, a cultured and wealthy soldier, who had performed the Ha'didji and who maintained a fine library and a public kitchen (Hadidji al-Dabir, ii, 640-3), is remembered as the builder of the exquisite 'Sidi Sa'dt's' mosque (980/1572-3) in Ahmadabad; the titles Pudihar Khan and Ulugh Khan were borne by several Habshi nobles, one Ulugh Khan being the patron of the historian Hadidji al-Dabir, in the 10th/16th century, especially after the disorders which began with the accession of Mahmud Shih III in 949/1543. They formed a prominent faction opposed to the local Gudjarati nobility and the dissension of these rival nobles in the sultanate made possible the almost bloodless conquest of Gudjarat by Akbar in 980/1572-3. See further GUDJARAT, also KHAYYAR AL-MULK, ULUGH KHAN.

The Habshis were similarly prominent in the neighbouring sultanate of Khandesh [q.v.]; see also FAROSKIPAS, where the practice of the Habshi Malik Yaqut Sultan, in keeping the male members of the royal house in restraint in the mountain fortress of Asirgarh has led C. F. Beckingham, in Amba Gelein and Asirgarh, in JSS, ii (1957), 182-8, to suppose that this custom was imported from Abyssinia, the Ethiopian royalty having been detained in a similar way on the frontier. However this may be, to a man of Gargantuana appetite.

The Habshis were similarly prominent in the majority of the schools, in addition to the references in the article, see the bibliographies to the articles on the major regions of India. No systematic study of the Indian Habshis has yet been attempted, and much field-work, particularly anthropological and linguistic, is needed. R. Pankhurst, An introduction to the economic history of Ethiopia, London 1961, includes as Appendix E 'The Habshis of India', 409-22, incomplete and with dates unreliable.

HABUS [see ZIRIDA].

HAC OVASI [see MEZO-KERESZTES].

HADANA, (A.), bidana, in the technical language of the Sufahd, is the right to custody of the child, a ramification of guardianship of the person which though exercised as a rule by the mother or a female relative in the maternal line may in certain circumstances devolve upon the father or other male relative. This institution is of very great importance in judicial practice because of the numerous conflicts to which the subject gives rise, particularly where the spouses are “separated” and above all where the cause of separation is repudiation of the wife.

A.—In theory this right of custody begins with the birth of the child, whether boy or girl, the parents living together (al-Zayla'a, Tabyn, iii, 46). However most authors, of whatever school, recognizing that difficulties often arise at this point do not normally arise till dissolution of the marriage, confine their explanations to this hypothesis alone.

When the spouses are not separated there are only two sets of circumstances in which the right of custody sets husband over against wife. The wife has a domicile distinct from that of her husband, either because he permits this to her (Hanafl law), or because she has reserved this right to herself by a clause in the marriage contract (Maliki and Hanball law); or else the husband decides to take his small child on a journey, unaccompanied by his wife.

In these two cases it is only the Hanafls who have drawn the logical conclusions from the principle that hadana is a prerogative conferred upon the mother, even before dissolution of the marriage. Thus the husband is not entitled to travel with his child, still in custody of the mother, against the wishes of the latter (al-Kasani, iv, 44). Authors of the other schools pay less attention to this hadana during the subsistence of the marriage and their doctrine on the subject is very unstable.

B.—In the majority of the schools hadana ends at the age of seven for a boy, who can then “feed and clothe himself without the aid of a third party", and at pre-puberty for a girl (about the age of nine). In
Mālikī law it lasts until puberty for boys and until the consummation of marriage for girls.

In the three schools which terminate very early the privilege of the mother and others entitled to hadāna (Ḥanafi, Shāñī and Hanball), the question arises as to what becomes of the minor when no longer in the care of the mother. We must not forget that this concerns a child who has barely attained the age of reason. In Ḥanafi law he or she is then obligatorily given over (dāmm) to the father, or in default of the father through death or unworthiness, to the male relative on whom devolves the wilāya (of the child) within the same denomination as the child. In the case of a girl, that the wāli must be a relative "within the forbidden degrees". In other words the boy of seven and the girl of nine are not consulted, since the Ḥanafis consider them still too young to be able to make a reasoned decision.

The Shāñī's (Muhadhdhab, ii, 171) and Hanballis (Mughni, vii, 614) allow the boy of seven to choose between continuing to live with his mother and moving to his father's house. The same option is given to the girl who has reached the age of nine, but in Shāñī law only.

At puberty (towards the age of fifteen—see Mālīkī) the boy is accorded the right by all schools, of having a dwelling independent of that of his father, or of that of his mother if he had opted for her at the age of seven as permitted by the Shāñī and Hanball schools. However, he is "recommended" to stay with his parents. As for the girl who has reached puberty, it is surprising to find the Shāñī school the most liberal towards her. For the doctors of this school do not forbid her to have a separate abode, although they hold it to be morally "reprehensible" (mahrūk) (Muhadhdhab, ii, 169). In the other schools puberty does not release a virgin girl from the custody of her parents. We have seen that in Mālikī law she remains under her mother's control until consummation of marriage. Much the same solution is reached in Ḥanafi and Hanball law, where the virgin girl (bihr) cannot leave her father at puberty, "since she is ignorant of men and their wiles". On the other hand, the girl over the age of puberty who is no longer virgin (ghayyib), being widowed or repudiated, has freedom of movement. Even here the Ḥanafis make certain reservations concerning a girl whose consanguine is preferred to the child. Although ghayyib, she must still live with her father.

C.—The devolution of the right of custody follows differing rules in the various schools, which can be split, from this point of view, into two groups. On the one side we have the Ḥanafis and Mālikis, who make the right of custody, if not an exclusively feminine prerogative, at least a function in which women always take precedence, so much so that of two female relatives of equal degree the uterine will be preferred to the consanguine; and on the other side the Shāñī and Hanball schools which, while according an indisputable priority to some women (mother and maternal grandmother, great grandmother, etc.), do not hesitate in certain contingencies to prefer men to women even though the latter be quite closely related to the child.

According to the scholars of the first two schools hadāna belongs in the first instance to the mother; in default of the mother, or if she is unworthy or has forfeited her right, custody passes to the female ascendants of the mother, the nearer excluding the more remote, then to the female ascendants of the father (in Mālikī law maternal aunts come before ascendants of the father); these are followed by the full sister (because of the double link) and the uterine sister, before the consanguine; then nieces (except the consanguine, who is related to the child through the father only); maternal aunts are preferred to paternal uncles.

In these two schools men are invested with hadāna proper only in default of all female relatives within the "forbidden degrees" (for marriage). The two qualities must be united in one and the same woman if she is to bar the deviation of the right of custody upon a man. Thus no account is taken of the female cousin, even if full, since there is no obstacle to marriage between relatives. In the other schools, the presence of a wet-nurse or the daughter of a wet-nurse, despite the existence of a bar to marriage, does not keep men from hadāna since these women are not blood-relatives of the child.

The men in question are, first of all, the taṣabt (males related through males) who come in the same order as in the law of succession: first, therefore, the father; then, in the absence of any father, a male relative of the father (not within the forbidden degrees for marriage); and then those with whom marriage would have been impossible if the child had been a girl. Last of all come relatives, men and women, who are not within the forbidden degrees for marriage (full cousins, their issue, etc.)—men exercising hadāna over boys, women over girls. Only in default of all relatives does the bādī designate a person of trust.

In the other two schools (Shāñī and Hanball), the priority of women is less absolute than in Ḥanafi and Mālikī law, and men may assume hadāna even when there exist fairly close female relatives. Thus in default of the mother and female ascendants of the mother, or if the latter are prevented, or are unworthy or have forfeited their right, hadāna is conferred on the father, then on female ascendants of the father. Another peculiarity of these two schools is that the consanguine sister is preferred to the uterine and the paternal aunt to the maternal (Muhadhdhab, ii, 170 and 171; Mughni, vii, 623), both solutions being directly contrary to those of the Ḥanafi and Mālikī schools.

D.—The Ḥanafi scholars never fail to ponder the nature of hadāna. Is it a "right" (ḥākī) of the custodian or a "right" of the child? They generally conclude by saying that although it is a "right" of the custodian, it is a "duty" of the woman; although ḥākī, she must still live with her father.

The teaching of the other schools on all these points hardly varies from the Ḥanafi doctrine.
concerning capacity to exercise the right of custody: first, where the ḥādīna (especially the mother) remarries; second, where the father is a Muslim but the woman called to assume custody is non-Muslim.

On the first point the schools are unanimous. The remarriage of a repudiated or widowed mother is normally a cause of forfeiture of ḥādīna, unless she marries a man related to the child within the “forbidden degrees”. How do the scholars explain the rule and the exception, reconciling them with the principle that ḥādīna is established in the interest of the child? Their explanation is simple if not per-
tinent. The mother who remarries after widowhood or repudiation (for in practice it is only she who is concerned) must devote all her time to her new hus-
band—law, morality and religion require it; how could she, under these conditions, give to the child in her custody the care its tender years demand? It is another matter if the new husband is a close relative of the child (uncle for example) because it is sup-
posed that his natural affection will prevent him from taking offence at her wife’s attention to the child.

In order of frequency, the second problem con-

nected with the conditions of capacity to exercise ḥādīna is that of disparity of religion. Suppose the mother, widowed or repudiated by a Muslim husband, is not herself a Muslim. Should the ḥādīna be left to her? No, she is entitled to receive it, and the Malikis (Muzāhir, vii, 653), and their ar-

guments on this point are not without good sense. Is not misbelief (ḥifr) more serious than mere mis-
conduct? Now we have seen that this latter causes forfeiture of ḥādīna, in the case of women as well as men. Besides, if it is true that this institution was created in the interest of the child, how can it be maintained that this interest is safeguarded when the child’s most precious possession (its belonging to Islam) is threatened by possible proselytising on the part of the mother, exerting herself in favour of her own religion?

The Mālikis, not without a certain hesitation, and the Ḥanafis much more firmly, decide that the ḡummiyya (Christian woman or Jewess) has the right of ḥādīna. Still, the Ḥanafis add certain qualifications to the rule (al-Zayla’i, Tahāyin, iii, 49). The Malikis consider that a Muslim woman loses the custody of the child if she has tried to turn it from its father’s re-

ligion, provided the child has reached the age when it is able to understand its religious duties. Since this age corresponds more or less to that when ḥādīna

normally finishes, at least for boys, the Hanafis much more firmly, decide that the child if she has tried to turn it from its father’s religion, provided the child has reached the age when it is able to understand its religious duties. Since this age corresponds more or less to that when ḥādīna normally finishes, at least for boys, the Hanafis make it obligatory only when it is impossible to find another

custodian, for the interest of the child overrides the humanity of the mother (and others entitled) and also a measure of protection in respect of the small child, derive, res-
pceptively, from the Mālikis.

The woman entitled to custody of the child is not bound to accept it, except where the mother is con-
cerned, and even in her case the Ḥanafis make it obligatory only when it is impossible to find another

custodian, for the interest of the child overrides the “right” of the mother. This explains why any ḥādīna may normally (Ḥanafi law) claim a wage distinct from the cost of maintaining the child, which naturally falls on the father, unless the child has a personal fortune. This presupposes that the parents are “separated” and that the ḫaḍā (q.v.) period has ex-

pired. Outside the Ḥanafi school, the mother cannot claim a wage distinct from the nafa ḱa due to the child; and the Mālikis go so far as to refuse a wage to all those entitled to ḥādīna; if, in their doctrine, it sometimes happens that a needy mother may draw a nafa ḱa on the goods of the child, or part of the child’s allowance, she does so not in the capacity of custodian but as any mother in need (Dārdir-

Dasākī, ii, 534).

Although a “right” of women, ḥādīna is neverthe-

less established in the interest of children; it is not therefore permissible to modify the imperative rule fixed on this point by ḥifr. These rules belong to the public order, in as much as disregarding them would be injurious to the child. It is on the occasion of a
negotiated divorce (ghul) that the parties may attempt to circumvent this principle. Although it is permissible for the spouses to agree that the mother should undertake the full cost of maintaining the child, as consideration for the repudiation pronounced by her husband, it is not possible, on the other hand, for the husband to make it a condition of the repudiation that his wife should give up the hadâna (except perhaps in Mâlikî law); in such a case the ghul would be valid and the purported condition void. Nor could the wife, by agreeing to the repudiation, her husband's custodianship and payment of half the period of the hadâna, at least where boys are concerned, for such agreement is admitted in the case of girls (Ibn Nufîjâyn, Babr, ii, 98).

G.—Contemporary legislation inspired by Islamic law (codes of personal status and laws relating to the family) has introduced but few changes into the system of classical fiqh.

In countries of Hânaî allegiance, the main preoccupation has been to prolong the duration of hadâna, which the classical law of the school restricts unduly.

The Egyptian law of 10 March 1929 (art. 20) authorizes the judge, when "the interest of the children requires this measure", to extend this period to nine years for the boy, and to eleven years for the girl. This disposition was taken up by the Jordanian code of 1951 (art. 123), and the Syrian code of 1955 (art. 147). The Sudanese circular no. 34 of 1932 (art. 3) squarely adopts the Mâlikî doctrine (Sudanese Muslims are governed by Hânaî law, though ritually Mâlikîs); thus the boy is in the custody of females until puberty, and the girl till consummation of marriage. As for the Iraqi code of 1953 (art. 57, al. 5), it permits the judge to prolong the hadâna without fixing a maximum.

The two North African codes of personal status (Tunisia 1956 and Morocco 1958), while reproducing broadly the principles of Mâlikî law on the question, add a few modifications inspired by Hânaî law, which are not always very felicitous. Thus it is hard to see why the Tunisian code (art. 67) should limit the duration of custody by women to seven years for boys and nine years for girls, when the majority of actual Hânaî countries have abandoned the classical law on this point. The Moroccan code (Tunisia 1956 and Morocco 1958), while reproducing the classical law of the school restricts hadâna,

HADATH. minor, ritual impurity, in fiqh, is distinguished from major impurity (qiyâmaqân); Hâdadh is incurred: 1. — by contact with an unclean substance (fradaih, nadjis), which soils the person or clothing, etc.: sperm, pus, urine, fermented liquor, and some other kinds. There is some controversy about corpses or the bodies of animals. It is only in the view of the Mâlikî school that the pig and dog, when alive, do not soil. Except with the Shî'is, contact with a human being never soils according to Muslim law, unlike the prescriptions of Jewish law; 2. — by certain facts; by the emission of any substance whatever—solid, liquid or gaseous from the anus, urethra or vagina (further to those which bring about major impurity); by loss of consciousness—sleep, syncope, madness; by apostasy, and in certain other circumstances. The Mâlikî majority alone has elaborated a moral theory of hadath (slander, false swearing, perjury, obscene proposals, evil thoughts, etc.).

The muhdât retains its ritual purity, which the hadath has dispelled, by means of the simple ablation (wudu) which can be replaced, if it is impossible to use water, by the tayammum [q.v.]; as for the part of the body soiled by hadath, this must be washed, likewise in water that is ritually pure, to restore its purity. The same applies to the clothing of the man at prayer, and the place in which he intends to make his salât. Anyone who is in a state of hadath cannot therefore: a) perform the prayer; b) make the ritual circumambulation of the Ka'ba (tasâfîf); c) touch a copy of the Qur'an, but he can carry fragments of it (for example, on a medal or a piece of paper), and can also recite from it. For casuistical details, see the works quoted in the bibliography and also the articles gâja, jâbin on hadath. As general, practising Muslims and very familiar with the hadath, suppose the requirement, in case of qîmâmat, to make a ghul, this partially explains the existence of hammâms in urban centres.

Bibliography: The collections of hadâth (cf. the Handbook of Wensinck), and texts of fiqh, all of which start with the study of ritual purity; reference should be made, in particular, to the hadith collections, such as the Bida'ayat al-mudâjâhid of Ibn Rush'd and others. Even a mystic like Qâzâlî (Ihyâî), I, Book III, § 21 ff. (in the Analysis of Bousquet) deals with these questions in a way similar to that of the fidâhab, though in a slightly different spirit. G.-H. Bousquet, La pureté rituelle en Islam, in KHR, xxvi (1959), 53-71.

AL-HADATH, town, which today has disappeared, in the province of the 'Awâṣîm [q.v.], situated in a plain at an altitude of 1000 metres at the foot of the Taurus, near to the three lakes on the upper course of the Ak Su, one of the principal tributaries of the Dîjayân. Known as al-Hâdadh al-Hamrâ' (probably to avoid confusion with Hâdadh al-Zakâk in the Palmyra desert), it owed its importance to its situation on the Arabo-Byzantine frontier, between Marrâsh and Mâlîsîta, at the entry of the saddle
which guarded the route to Albistān. Its protection was assured by a fortress built on a hill called al-Uwaysah, "the Little Umayyad Dynasty. To the north-west of al-Hadath, in the massif of the Nurubak Dagh, was the darb al-Hadath, a narrow pass which was the scene of many battles and whose name the Arabs changed to darb al-salamā in an attempt to exorcise the evil fate which seemed to be attached to it.

Conquered under the caliph ‘Umar by Ḥabbā b. Maslama, who had been sent by the general ʿYād b. Ziyād. The fortress was used by Muʿwiyah as a starting point for incursions into Byzantine territory. The upheavals at the end of the Umayyad dynasty enabled the Byzantines to re-occupy the region, without, however, succeeding in changing very much the course of the frontier. In 961/778, the Byzantine general Michael Lachanodrakon sacked al-Hadath. The caliph al-Mahdi rebuilt it in 963/778 and the town was then called al-Mahdiyya or al-Hamdaniyya. His successor, ʿOmar b. Ḥālid, repopulated it with inhabitants from neighbouring towns. But these buildings of sun-dried brick could not long withstand the severe winter climate. Furthermore, the Byzantines overran it once again and burned it completely, whence its name Gōyuḵ, "burnt", used both in Turkish and Armenian. Hārūn ʿAlīṣ̱ al-Rāshīd rebuilt and fortified it and maintained a large garrison there, as in the other frontier-stations of this region. Thus under the ‘Abbasid caliphs al-Hadath became a strategic point which served as a base for their expeditions into Byzantine territory. But in 369/979, the son of Bardas Phocas, seized al-Hadath and left none of its fortifications standing. The town became Muslim again as the result of a victory by the Ḥamdūnī Sayf al-Daula, who rebuilt the walls in 343/954, but the Byzantine garrison took it in 346/957. After this, al-Hadath no longer played an important part in the military history of the region. However it fell again into Muslim hands in 545/1150 under the Saljuq sultan of ʿOmar Masʿūd b. Khūdā Aṛslān; then the Armenians seized it in their turn and made it a base for expeditions against the Muslims. In 671/1272, the Mamluk sultan Baybars seized al-Hadath from the Armenians. The fortress was burned and all that remained was the town, which the Kurds then called al-Mahdiyya or al-Hamdiyya. In 1356, the Mamluk sultan Barsbay used it as a base for his expedition against the Ḫūrūj al-ʿIṣkād. In 1540 various ruins at Saray-Köy, to the south of the lake of al-Hadath, were described and identified by R. Hartmann as being the remains of al-Hadath. This identification contradicts earlier opinions, which had situated al-Hadath on the site of the present-day Inekköy, in the meaning of limit, boundary, frontier [see ṣawāsim, qurban, ḥumārāt, ṣayyid].

In theology, hadd has become the technical term for the punishments of certain acts which have been forbidden or sanctioned by punishments in the Kurān and have thereby become crimes against religion. There are: unlawful intercourse (hadd [q.v.]; its counterpart, false accusation of unlawful intercourse (hadari [q.v.]); drinking wine [see ḥamār]; theft [see sīriq]; and highway robbery (kaft al-ṭarīq [q.v.]). The punishments are: the death penalty, either by stoning (the more severe punishment for unlawful intercourse) or by crucifixion and burning. But these buildings of sun-dried brick could not long withstand the severe winter climate. Furthermore, the Byzantines overran it once again and burned it completely, whence its name Gōyuḵ, "burnt", used both in Turkish and Armenian. Hārūn ʿAlīṣ̱ al-Rāshīd rebuilt and fortified it and maintained a large garrison there, as in the other frontier-stations of this region. Thus under the ‘Abbasid caliphs al-Hadath became a strategic point which served as a base for their expeditions into Byzantine territory. But in 369/979, the son of Bardas Phocas, seized al-Hadath and left none of its fortifications standing. The town became Muslim again as the result of a victory by the Ḥamdūnī Sayf al-Daula, who rebuilt the walls in 343/954, but the Byzantine garrison took it in 346/957. After this, al-Hadath no longer played an important part in the military history of the region. However it fell again into Muslim hands in 545/1150 under the Saljuq sultan of ʿOmar Masʿūd b. Khūdā Aṛslān; then the Armenians seized it in their turn and made it a base for expeditions against the Muslims. In 671/1272, the Mamluk sultan Baybars seized al-Hadath from the Armenians. The fortress was burned and all that remained was the town, which the Kurds then called al-Mahdiyya or al-Hamdiyya. In 1356, the Mamluk sultan Barsbay used it as a base for his expedition against the Ḫūrūj al-ʿIṣkād. In 1540 various ruins at Saray-Köy, to the south of the lake of al-Hadath, were described and identified by R. Hartmann as being the remains of al-Hadath. This identification contradicts earlier opinions, which had situated al-Hadath on the site of the present-day Inekköy, in the meaning of limit, boundary, frontier [see ṣawāsim, qurban, ḥumārāt, ṣayyid].

HADD

In kaldm and in philosophy, hadd is a technical term for definition of which several kinds are distinguished: hadd hasth which defines the essence of a thing, hadd lāfīn which defines the meaning of a word, etc. Opposed to the definition is the description (rasm), but the distinction is not very sharp, so that it is possible to speak of a hadd rasmī. A perfect or complete definition (hadd khamī) must be ġimmī 'mānī, “universal and proper”; this is achieved by giving the genus proximum and the differentia specifica.

In logic, hadd means the term of a syllogism; the minor term is called hadd aṣghar, the major term hadd akbar, and the middle term hadd awwāt.

In astrology, the degrees of each sign of the zodiac are divided into five unequal portions each of which belongs to one of the five planets; this portion or term of a planet is called hadd.

In the terminology of the Druzes, the main officers of their religious hierarchy are called buddūd; this usage is based on an allegorical interpretation of the Qur'ānic passages.


Before assuming its philosophical meanings, the word hadd follows a semantic evolution comparable to that of the Greek words that it translates, ὁφασμός and ἐφοσ. From its meaning of “limit” it passes to that of “delimitation” or “definition”, and from that of “furthest limit” or “extremity” to that of “extreme” or “term” in logic. In order to avoid any ambiguity between the two meanings, modern Arab authors who study mediaeval philosophy often follow hadd, in the sense of “definition”, with the word ta'rif in parenthesis, since one of the uses of ta'rif is in fact “definition”, although its meaning includes both description and name.

In metaphysics hadd means “definition”, in so far as it is a statement referring to the thing whose essential elements it sets out. It indicates the thing's quiddity, its māhiyya (secondary substance or predicative substance). In its strict sense “definition” can refer only to a substance, but in a wider sense we speak also of definitions of accidents, although these cannot be defined without the mention of an element that is foreign to them, i.e., the substance that receives them. Hadd is used also in a derived sense, to mean a commentary on the name of the thing; it is then a “nominal definition”, which is not composed of direct references to the thing's essence, but explains the name that does refer to the essence. In entities composed of matter and form, “definition” does not refer to form alone, but to everything that goes to make up the entity, i.e., to matter and to form. In entities that have no material element, it obviously refers to form alone; nevertheless, there can be no definition of the entity that is absolutely simple, since different essential elements cannot be distinguished in it. Definition applies to individuals, but there can be no definition of such a compound. The individual can be indicated only by combining various attributes that apply to it alone, for example by pointing out its filiation.

In logic hadd is used with different meanings according to the three mental processes, which are forming the concept, judging and reasoning. In the logic of the concept hadd has the meaning of “definition” as in metaphysics, and has also to give the essential elements of the thing defined, but in this case with reference to the concept, i.e., by uniting the essential meanings so as to produce in the mind an intelligibly equivalent to the essence of the thing. This statement is more explicit than the name, of which it gives an analysis; it is the name that expresses the meaning in one word only.

Perfect definition, hadd lāmm, is a statement of proximum genus and specific difference: “Man is the rational animal”. It cannot be arrived at by demonstration, but only by the methods that make it possible to determine this genus and this difference. The definition is obtained bi-ta'rif al-tarkih, by means of combination, i.e., by taking the essential attribute whose extension is just greater than that of the thing to be defined and combining with it the essential attribute peculiar to the thing. This is obtained by looking for all the attributes that belong to the essence of the genus that has just been defined, by making a kind of division, bīnīm, and finally by selecting that one which is predicable only of the thing to be defined.

In this perfect definition are included, on the one hand, all the *summa genera*, and, on the other, all the consequents of the essence. It is, however, often very difficult to find these two attributes. If they cannot be isolated from each other, the definition is imperfect, i.e., by uniting both attributes, for example: “Man is a rational animal”. It is possible to determine this genus and this difference by stating one or more of the thing's essential characteristics that are peculiar to it. The statement is thus equivalent in extension, but not in comprehension; it is a description, rasm, or an imperfect definition. When the cause of the existence of the thing defined gives the meaning of the thing, a causal definition is obtained, and when cause and effect are united in the same proposition, the definition is complete, hadd tāmīm, and resembles the conclusion of a syllogism. An example is: “Thunder is the noise that is produced in the cloud because of the fire that is quenched there”. (For details of the reasoning, see *Shaf'ā*, *Manāhī*, v, book 4, ch. 4, 290-1). Definition in no way refers to existence.

While hadd means “definition” in the logic of the concept, the same word means “term” in the logic of the proposition and in that of syllogistic reasoning. Hadd is, in that case, the word or statement used as subject or as predicate, major, minor or middle term.

The whole Islamic theory of definition, and that of terms of reasoning, follows Aristotle, sometimes reproducing what he says almost word for word. The brief mention of definitions made by the *Ikhān al-asfāl* is already in conformity with this; they apply the method outlined above to the definition of
species and genera, omitting "Substance", which can be the object only of a "description", rasm; it is the entity that is self-subsistent and receives contrary attributes"—this is in accordance with Aristotelian teaching. Al-Kindi uses the word in its accepted sense. Avicenna is the Hellenizing philosopher who most develops the study of hadd; it is a theme to which he returns again and again in his works. Al-Ghazālī scarcely mentions it in the first part of the Maḥābīd, Averroes comments on the relevant chapters of Aristotle's Metaphysics. Al-Dīnawarī's Tafsīr presents a rather different meaning, the various philosophical meanings, including that of "defective (mabīs) definition", obtained "by nearest (i.e., specific) difference alone, or by that and summum genus". In Sūfism, he adds, hadd, which has then the sense of "limit", "indicates the separation between you and your Lord".

**Bibliography:** Raʿīṣī Ḩabūn al-qāfī, 1957 ed., i, 431-2, definition, 420-1, term; al-Kindī, Risāla fi būdūd al-makhāliqī, ed. Aḥṣāī, Cairo 1356/1950, 165; Avicenna, Shīfā, Cairo ed. 1952 f., 137, i, b, ch. 8, see also 7 and 9, bk IX, ch. 1, 373, lines 2-2; Manṣūḥ, Makhāl, i, 7, 48-9; al-Burhān, i, 52; ii, chap. 8 and 10; iv, ch. 4 and 6 and Index; idem, Naḍīḍ, 1331 ed., 137-40; idem, Dāneq-nāma, Tehran 1331/1371, 25-7, trans. Achen and Massé, Paris 1955, 32-4; idem, Fi l-ḥadīd, in Tafsīr Ṣāfī, no. 4, Cairo 1356/1951; idem, K. al-Hadd, ed. Goichon, Cairo, (IFAO) 1963, 2-12 trans. introductory pages, 3-15 text, with references to the Greek sources; those of al-Burhān are indicated in Dr. A. E. Affifi's analytical preface; idem, K. al-ṭabarān wa l-tanbihā, text ed. Forget, 17-21 (trans. Goichon, Paris 1951, 103-11). The fullest account is that of the Manṣūḥ al-makhālīyān, 1328/1910 ed., 34-46 and 52-3. In the same volume al-Ḳaṣīda al-mudawwīn, on logic, ch. al-hadd, 17-8; Averroes, Tafsīr maʿ bāṭ al-taḥfīz, ed. Bouyges, commentaries on Metaph. 7, 4 and 5, 782-821, texts 10-19, and Z 15, 982-96, texts 53-5; Goichon, Lexique de la langue philosophique d'Ibn Sinā, no. 126. (A.-M. GOICHON)

**Hadendoa** [see BEQA].

**Hadīdī**

Al-ḤADĪD ILA 'L-HAKK, regnal name of the fourth 'Abbāsīd caliph Mūsā, son of al-Mahdī, who had been proclaimed heir in 159/775-6. His accession took place in Muḥarram 160/August 785, but it did not pass smoothly. Al-Mahdī died when he was actually on the way to Dūrjādī intending to force Mūsā, resident in that province, to renounce his rights in favour of his brother Hārūn, who had been appointed second heir in 166/782-3. Although the chamberlain al-Rabī' procured that the oath of allegiance to Mūsā was sworn in Baghdād, a revolt broke out in the capital almost immediately afterwards; it was swiftly put down, before even al-Ḥādīd arrived, but contemporaries saw in it the hand of adversaries of the new ruler.

On returning to Baghdād, al-Ḥādīd first made al-Rabī' his viceroy, but dismissed him soon afterwards and entrusted the central administration to various persons, none of whom seems to have made any mark. Once in power, al-Ḥādīd continued the persecution of the zindībīs which his father had begun, but abandoned the latter's moderate policy towards the Shiʿīs, adopting an attitude of frank hostility to the 'Alīds; hence he was led to repress brutally an 'Alīd revolt which had broken out in Medina and which ended in the massacre of Fakhkhī (q.v.). Other revolts had to be put down, both in Egypt and in 'Irāq. Throughout his reign, the most important question was that of the succession. Al-Ḥādīd wished to annul the right of his brother Hārūn, who then had as his tutor and adviser Yahyā the Barmakīd. Hārūn, vigorously rejecting his brother's proposals, was finally thrown into prison and threatened with a still worse fate. At this juncture, in Rabī' 1 170/ September 786, there occurred the sudden death of al-Ḥādīd, an event in which, according to some chroniclers, Hārūn's mother al-Ḥādīrūzān had some share. This ended the short reign of a caliph who left the reputation of being a ruler energetic to the point of brutality as well as addicted to pleasure; through the massacre of Fakhkhī he widened the gulf between the 'Abbāsīds and the 'Alīds; his only lasting achievement was perhaps an improvement in the financial departments of the central administration.


Al-ḤĀDĪD Ila 'L-HAKK, YAHYĀ, founder of the Zaydi dynasty of the Yemen [see ZAYDĪ].

**Hādīdī sabzawārī** [see sabzawārī].

**Al-ḤADĪD, iron.** According to the Sūrat al-ḤADĪD (LVII, 25) God sent iron down to earth for the detriment and advantage of man, for weapons and tools are alike made from it. According to the belief of the Šābians, it is allotted to Mars. It is the hardest and strongest of metals and the most capable of resisting the effects of fire, but it is the quickest to rust. It is corroded by acids; for example, with the fresh rind of a pomegranate it forms a black fluid, with vinegar a red fluid and with salt a yellow. Collyrium (al-ḥadīd) burns it and arsenic makes it smooth and white. Kazwīnī distinguishes three kinds of iron, natural iron, al-sabūrādhs—which can only mean dark iron ores such as micaceous ore, magnetic ironstone etc.—and that which is made artificially, which is of two kinds, the weak (Pers. narm-tham) or female, i.e., malleable iron, and hard or male, i.e., steel (falāḏīd). According to al-Kindī, however, the kind of iron called sabūrādhs is identical with male iron; both kinds are called natural iron, while steel on the other hand is not natural. These contradictory statements cannot be reconciled here. Chinese and Indian iron are particularly esteemed. The applications of iron and iron-rust in medicine and magic are fairly numerous and varied. See further MARĪN.

**Bibliography:** Kazwīnī, ed. Wustenfeld, i, 207, transl. Ethé, 424; Dimīghī, Cosmographie, ed. Mehren, 54; E. Wiedemann, Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Naturw., xxv and xxxii (Sitzungsber. Physikal. medicin. Sotetät, Erlangen, vols. 43, 45); Ibn al-Bayṭār in Leclerc, Notices et extraits, i, 422; Steinbuch des Aristoteles, ed. Rusa, 180; al-Būrūnī, Dīanāmīr, 247-59. (J. RUSKA)

**ḤADĪD** [see nūḏūm].

**HADDĪDĪ, makhāṣṣ of a minor Ottoman poet who flourished in the first decade of the 17th century, the author of a verse-chronicle.** According to his near-contemporary Sehī, his home was Feṛājīk (near Enos), where he adopted khāfīb; he adopted the makhāṣṣ Ḥaddīdī because he was a blacksmith by trade.

His unpublished history of the Ottoman dynasty, completed in 930/1523-4, consists of some 7000 very pedestrian couplets in the hazadī metre; the last incident recorded is the appointment of Ibrāhīm
Paša as Grand Vizier (in 929/1523). In an introduction Ḥaddīdī states that his account, as far as the first years of the reign of Bāyazīd II, is a verse-p paraphrase of the prose history by the šekh al-ʿĀṣik Paša-ogli, i.e., ʿAshīk-Paša-zade (p.o.); but this section, the first two-thirds of the work, contains also some episodes characteristic of the Uruđī texts, e.g., the passage on Bāyazīd I's suicide, quoted disparagingly by Ṣaʿd al-Dīn (i, 217; cf. Hammer-Purgstall, GOR, i, 647; for another example see A. S. Leveud, Gazasvat-nümeler ..., Ḵanṣāra 1856, 1858). The rest of the work, his claims, original:

According to Ḵaṭṭī, he failed to procure the presentation of his work to the Sultan, Suleyman I. Although Pečewi names it among his sources (i, 3), it is probably of minor importance and only a few manuscripts survive, in Istanbul: Esad Efendi (Şüleymaniye) 2081, much damaged by fire towards the end; All Emiri manzum 1317, modern (for these two, see Istanbul Kültülpenceri ları-köşफey yaşamalar hikayeleri, i, nos. 69; University Library T 1268, a good old copy (see L. Forrer, in Isl., xxvi (1942), no. 17); Veliyiddin (Beyazıt) 152/3443 (see Tansklarlyqe Tarama Sözlük, iv, Ḵanṣāra 1957, p. X). There is a copy in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek (PERTSCH, Katal., 232) and a good, apparently old, manuscript has recently been acquired by the British Museum (Or. 1295).

Poems by a Ḥaddīdī are preserved in some anthologies (see, for example, F. E. Karatay, Topkapı Sarayı ... türkcə yəzəmlər kataloqlu, ii, nos. 2665, 2690).

Bibliography: Sehi, 101-2; Ḵaṭṭī, 127-9; M. F. Köprüzūa, in Mitt. öst. Gesch., i (1921-2), 220-2; Bursaı Mehmed Ṣaḥīr, ʿOmnınlı mücellifleri, ii, 45-6 (inaccurate); Babinger, 59 f. (with further references). (V. L. Mıracıb)

Al-Ḥaadīna, a small independent region of South Arabia, now in the Upper ʿAwašl Sultanate. It is one of the most fertile districts of South Arabia and is irrigated by canals from the Wādī ʿAbadān. The products of the soil, which is of volcanic origin, include indigo, which is exported to al-Ḥaṭwā, Ḥīra and millet. Al-Ḥaadīna is inhabited by the tribe Ahl al-Khālija which claims descent from the Ḥillal [p.e.]. When the Ḥillal emigrated from South Arabia they remained behind, whence their name Khālīja. In the past they ordinarily acknowledged no authority, but in time of war would serve under the banner of the Sultan of the Upper ʿAwašl in Niṣāb. According to Philby, who visited the region in 1936, they numbered about 300 male adults, giving a total population of about 1,000. There were nine clans in possession of some sixteen villages of which the most important was Ḡabīyya, a market and the seat of the ʿAвладr or ruler. Al-Ḥaadīna was famed in Landberg's day as a centre for cotton, which was exported to Baybān al-ʿAṣab and Ḥarīf. It lies on the caravan roads from Bāl Ḥāf to Markha, and Dīrōn to Baybān al-ʿAṣab and Mūhrīb. Bibleography: C. Landberg, Arabia, iv, Leiden 1897; H. von Malzahn, Reise nach Süd-arabien, Brunswick 1873; H. St. J. B. Philby, Sheba's daughters, London 1939; A. Grohmann, Süd arabien als Wirtschaftsgesell, Vienna and Brün 1922-33, 2 vols., index. (J. Schleifer-A. K. Irvine)

Al-Ḥaḍirā (Al-Huwaydī), nickname of the Arabic poet Kuṭba b. Abī. Very little is known of his life; he belongs to the Banu Thaʿlab b. Saʿd b. Dhūbyān, a tribe of the group Ghatafan. He had a quarrel with Zabbān b. Sayyār al-Ṣaḍār and satirized him in his verses. In another poem he boasts of the victory of his kinsmen at al-Kuṭafā. The leader in this battle, Ḥaḍirā b. Ḥusain al-Fazari, later on became Ḥaḍirā, Ṣaḥāba, i, 222, whilst al-Ḥaḍirā is called a pagan poet (dījkīl); so we may infer that he lived into the beginning of the 7th century. His poems, few in number, were collected by Muhammad b. al-ʿAbbās al-Yazīdī (d. 310/921-2). One ḱṣāda is included in the Muḥādīlīyāt (no. viii, ed. Lyall); it is said that this poem was greatly admired by Ḥaḍirā b. Ṣaḥāba. Bibliography: al-Haḍirān al-Yaṣīdi, al-ṣūrā al-ṣalībī (ʿawdī, 1858; Broekelmann I, 26; S. I, 154. (J. W. FÖCK)

Ḥadīth (narrative, talk) with the definite article (al-ḥadīth) is used for Tradition, being an account of what the Prophet said or did, or of his tacit approval of something said or done in his presence. Ḫabar (news, information) is sometimes used of traditions from the Prophet, sometimes from Companions or Successors. ᴠṭḥ, pl. ḥabr (trace, vestige), usually refers to traditions from Companions or Successors, but is sometimes used of traditions from the Prophet. Summa (custom) refers to a normative custom of the Prophet or of the early community.

I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF ḤADĪTH

Tradition came to be considered second in authority to the Kurān, but this was the result of a lengthy process. The Prophet had made a great impression on his contemporaries, and Islam had not only survived his death, but had quickly spread far beyond Arabia. It is therefore only natural that those who had known him should have much to tell about him and that new converts should have been anxious to learn what they could about him. Many of his Companions settled in conquered countries where it is reasonable to assume that they would be questioned about him; but there would be nothing formal about the retailing of stories and little attempt at first to record them. At that time there was no idea that Tradition was second in authority to the Kurān because there was no collected Tradition in the form of traditions. At the Prophet's death, the Kurān remained as the source of guidance and it was only gradually, as new problems arose, that men came to feel the need of a subsidiary authority. Individuals and groups in various regions developed an interest in Tradition, and many traditionists engaged in travels to learn traditions from authorities in different countries. The annual Pilgrimage would also provide an opportunity for people of different regions to meet, and traditions would be spread in this way. The demand for traditions was great, and inevitably the supply grew to meet it.

Gradually the necessity of producing authorities for traditions developed, and there is reason to believe that the practice was to some extent in force before the end of the first century; but it was late in the second century before it seems to have become essential to have a complete chain of authorities back to the source. Ibn Isḥāk (d. 150/767 or 151/768) quotes authorities in his biography of the Prophet, but not always with a complete chain, and the same applies to Mālik b. Anas (d. 797/795) whose law-book al-Muwatta gives many traditions with partial chains of authority, some with complete chains, and some with none. When books of tradition came to be compiled the traditions had two necessary
features: (1) the chain of authorities (isndd, or sanad) going right back to the source of the tradition, and (2) the chain of transmission.

But while traditionalists were collecting traditions and attempting to verify their authority, there were others who were not prepared to lay great emphasis on the importance of tradition. As a result there were disputes between parties; but largely as a result of the genius of al-Shafi'i (d. 204/820) [q.v.] the party of Tradition won the day, and Hadith came to be recognized as a foundation of Islam second only to the Qur'an. Thus Hadith was given a kind of secondary inspiration. Though not the eternal word of God, like the Qur'an it represented divine guidance. II. COLLECTIONS OF HADITH

The theory was held by some that traditions should be conveyed only by word of mouth and not written, and there are even traditions in the books supporting this view. Abū Dā`ūd (‘Ilm, 3) rather curiously gives two traditions, one after the other, the first stating that the Prophet gave command to write traditions and the second stating that he forbade writing them. Whatever justification there may have been for the view that writing was prohibited, there were, even quite early, men who made notes for their own guidance, and these notes formed a basis for larger works produced later. Among them mention may be made of ‘Urwā b. al-Zubayr (d. 94/712 or 99/717) in Medina who is quoted as transmitting many traditions from his aunt ‘A‘ṣa, and Muḥammad b. Muslim Ibn Shihab al-Zuhri (d. 124/741) who settled in Syria and was one of the most widely quoted authorities. Reference is even made to Ṣaḥīḥ (scripts) in which some Companions of the Prophet collected traditions.

When more formal books were first compiled they were of the type called musnad works, the word indicating that each Companion's traditions were collected together. While this arrangement has its interest, it is not very convenient. People would want to consult traditions on particular subjects and would therefore need to read through much irrelevant material before discovering what they were seeking. Such works as those of al-Ṭayālīṣī (d. 203/818) [q.v.] and of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/853) [q.v.] are arranged according to this method. Mālik had arranged his Muwattā’ according to the subject-matter, but the 3rd/9th century was the time when the important muṣannaf (classified) works were compiled. They were said to be arranged al-‘ābāb (according to the sub-sections), and this arrangement of the material proved to be much more convenient. Six of these muṣannaf works eventually took precedence over others. The most authoritative were considered to be the Ṣaḥīḥs of al-Bukhārī [q.v.] and Muslim (d. 261/875), followed in importance by the Sunan works of Abū Dā`ūd [q.v.], al-Tirmidhī (d. 279/892), al-Nasa‘ī (d. 303/913) and Ibn Mādjā (d. 273/886). The Ṣaḥīḥs contain biographical material and Kurān commentary in addition to details of religious observance, law, commerce, and aspects of public and private behaviour which are the main interest of the Sunan works. The corpus of Tradition provides details to regulate all aspects of life in this world and to prepare people for the next. In theory the traditions of al-Bukhārī and Muslim are all considered sound, whereas those in the other books have varying degrees of worth; but criticism has been made even of some of al-Bukhārī's and Muslim's traditions.

There was no official body to commission the books of Tradition, so they had to make their own appeal to the community. By the 4th/10th century the collections of al-Bukhārī and Muslim were fairly generally recognized, and the others gained recognition after longer periods. For example, Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808/1406) did not recognize Ibn Mādjā's Sunan, but spoke of the 'five' books. Nevertheless the six books were eventually recognized, although some people preferred Mālik's Muwattā’ to Ibn Mādjā's Sunan. Other works also were compiled, and while they did not command so much general respect as the six books, they are recognized as important and are quoted. Among these mention may be made of the works of al-Dārinī [q.v.], al-Dārākūṭī [q.v.] and al-Bayhākī [q.v.]. Commentaries were written on the books of Tradition, and there are many works which give selections of one kind or another. A favourite type of work uses the title Ṭabḥān from the practice of collecting forty traditions on some particular subject. Larger works were also compiled giving selections of traditions from various sources. One of the best known of these is Mīḥāk al-sumna by al-Baghawi [q.v.], enlarged into the still more popular Mīḥāk al-maṣāhūb by Wali al-Din.

The works to which reference has been made are those recognized by Sunnis. The Shi`ites have books of their own, accepting only traditions traced through 'All's family, an important purpose being to support the claims of the Shī`a. They are al-Kāfī fi ‘īm al-dīn by Abū Jā`far Muḥammad b. Y`ākūb al-Kulaylī (d. 326/939); Kitāb man la yakhfurū ‘l-fadlāt bī Abī Jā`far Muḥammad b. ‘Ali called al-Bāḥbāyā al-Kummi (d. 581/991); Tahākīb al-akhbām by Abū Jā`far Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Tābt (d. 459/1067 or 460/1068), of which he produced a shorter version entitled al-Ḥabīsārī fīmā bātulis fīkī min al-akhbār. They are muṣannaf works covering subjects similar to those in the Sunni books.

III. CRITICISM OF HADITH

Before the recognized books were compiled the body of Tradition had grown enormously, and serious students recognized that much of it was fabricated. The kūsūdās (storytellers) were men who invented the most extraordinary traditions to which they attached seemingly impeccable isndds, their purpose being to astonish the common people and receive payment for their stories. The spurious nature of such was easily recognized. Others fabricated traditions to spread false doctrines, and this was sometimes so cleverly done that it had a chance of being undetected. For example, one such quotes the Prophet as saying, 'I am the seal of the prophets; there will be no prophet after me unless God wills'. The phrase 'unless God wills' is so common that it was sometimes so cleverly done that it had a chance of being undetected. For example, one such quotes the Prophet as saying, 'I am the seal of the prophets; there will be no prophet after me unless God wills'.
"I have not seen more falsehood in anyone than in those who have a reputation for goodness".Abū Asim al-Nabī (d. 212/827) is credited with the similar statement, "I have not seen the good man lying about anything more than about Hadith". The fact that different types of people invented traditions shows how important Hadith had become. Because of this, ingenious men made use of it to propagate their ideas.

Criticism was made of transmitters for various other reasons. Some were accused of carelessness in transmission, others of being inaccurate in old age, others of pretending to transmit traditions when they had lost their books and were depending on a faulty memory. Al-Ḥākim (d. 405/1014) accuses some of tracing back to the Prophet traditions which went back only to Companions or Successors.

As a result of the effort to investigate the genuineness of traditions biographical works were compiled regarding the people who appeared in īsmāḍ. It was important to know the years of their birth and death, for this shows whether they could have met the people they are said to have quoted. Statements were also recorded regarding the degree of their trustworthiness, but these raised problems for them frequently contradictory. Although it is said that such material was collected from the first century, the books were mainly compiled from the third century onwards. Arabs were notable as genealogists, and therefore one may not unreasonably assume that while the books began to appear comparatively late, materials for the earliest periods were available. Books were also written confined to traditionists in particular districts, madḥabs, or centuries, some including people of other interests. It is important to note that while these are called rīḍīl (men) works, they include many women traditionists (see further al-Djurī wa l-Tarīq). The criticism of traditions soon developed a series of technical terms, a number of which are found in the six books, where comments on traditions are common. Al-Tirmidhī made a notable contribution to the criticism of Tradition, for he not only supplied notes to the large majority of his traditions, but concluded with a chapter in which he discussed some particular aspects for the first time. These include the four types of Semitic Studies, vi (1964), 32 fl. The use of technical terms seems to have been a gradual development, but although a particular term might be used differently at different periods, fairly general agreement about most of them was eventually reached.

Traditions were divided into ʿašūk (sound), hasan (good), and daʿāf (weak) or saḥīm (inform). ʿAšíṣ traditions have seven grades: (1) those given by al-Buḫārā and Muslim; (2) those given by al-Buḫārā alone; (3) those given by Muslim alone; (4) those not given by either, which however fulfil their conditions (ḥuru); (5) those which fulfil al-Buḫārā’s ḥuru; (6) those which fulfil Muslim’s ḥuru; (7) traditions sound in the opinion of other authorities. Hasan traditions are not considered quite so strong, but they are necessary for establishing the text of the tradition. Indeed, most of the legal traditions are of this type. There are varieties of the hasan but authorities are not all agreed on the subject. Al-Tirmidhī has used hasan along with other words, but in his final chapter he has unfortunately not explained what he means by all the terms he uses. Weak traditions also have various degrees. Allowance is made for using weak traditions dealing with exhortations, stories, and good behaviour, but not for those dealing with matters of law or with things which are allowable or forbidden. Abū Dāʾūd has used ʿašīḥ for traditions about which he has made no remark, some being sounder than others. Some have held ʿašīḥ to be a grade inferior to hasan, but this view is not common. Ibn Ḥaḍjar al-ʿAskārīnī (d. 852/1449) distinguishes between ʿašūk al-ḥathīdādī (fit to be used as proof) and ʿašūk al-ḥathīb (fit to be considered), the former being equivalent to hasan and the latter, though weak in itself, deserving consideration to see whether it is corroborated. If that is so it becomes hasan bi-ḥurūr (fit through another tradition) and ʿašūk al-ḥathīdādī. But in classical terminology ṣahīḥ is applied to transmitters rather than to traditions.

Most of the following technical terms, mainly dealing with the īsmāḍ, acquired a stable meaning although all authorities did not agree in their interpretation of some. For convenience they are here arranged in five groups.

(i) With reference to the number of transmitters. Muṣawādī is applied to a tradition with so many transmitters that there could be no collusion, all being known to be reliable and not being under any compulsion to lie. Maṣḥūr is a tradition with more than two transmitters, some such being ṣahīḥ and others not. Muṣawādī is treated by some as equivalent to maṣḥūr, by some as equivalent to muṣawāṣur, but by most as an intermediate class. ʿĀṣī is used of a tradition coming from one man of sufficient authority to have his traditions collected when two or three people share in transmitting them. ʿGarb is a tradition from only one Companion, or from a single man at a later stage. It may apply to īsmāḍ, or maṭn, or both. It is to be distinguished from ṣarī ʿadb the ḥadīth which applies to uncommon words in the ʿadb. Facts can be used of an īsmāḍ with one one transmitter at each stage, or of a tradition transmitted only by people of one district. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245) says every ʿard is not reckoned ṣarī; al-Nawawī (d. 676/1278) considers those from one district to be ʿard and those from individuals ʿgarb. ʿĀḥād is a tradition from a single authority which differs from what others report. If it differs from what others report, the latter are said to have quoted from the former. Some have held ṣahīḥ to be of insufficient reliability to have his unsupported traditions accepted, it is rejected. ʿĀḥād is used of traditions from a relatively small number of transmitters, not enough to make them muṣawāṣur. Ḥabar al-ṣaḥād, or al-ḥadīth al-ṣaḥābī is to be distinguished from Ḥabar al-waṣīḥ, a tradition from a single man.

(ii) With reference to the nature of the īsmāḍ. Muṣawāṣur is used of an unbroken īsmāḍ traced back to the source. If it goes back to the Prophet it is muṣawāṣur marfūʿ, i.e., to a Companion it is muṣawāṣur muṣawāṣur. Īsmāḍ is generally applied to a tradition with a fully connected īsmāḍ traced to the Prophet, i.e., both muṣawāṣur and marfūʿ, though it has been applied by some to connected traditions going back to a Companion or a Successor. Marfūʿ is a tradition traced to the Prophet whether or not the īsmāḍ is complete; but some would treat it as equivalent to muṣnad. Muṣnad is a tradition going back only to a Companion. Muṣīṣ is a tradition going back to a Successor regarding words or deeds of his. Al-Ṣaḥāf and al-Ṭabarānī used it in the sense of munṣaṣur, which has been used of an īsmāḍ including unspecified people, or one later than a Successor who claims to have heard someone he did not hear. It is also used of one later than a Successor quoting
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directly from a Companion; but commonly it is applied when there is a break in the isnād at any stage later. (At all subsequent division, but separated and divided) may be found applying to a tradition with several breaks in the isnād, to distinguish it from munbatāt. Mu'allak (suspended) is used when there is an omission of one or more names at the beginning of the isnād, or when the whole isnād is omitted. Mursal is a tradition in which a Successor quotes the Prophet directly. Mu'allal or ma'sil applies to a tradition with some weakness in isnād or main. Al-Hāfiẓ declares that it is a tradition mixed with another, or containing some false notion of the transmitter, or given as muttaṣil when it is mursal.

(iii) With reference to special features of main or isnād. Ziyādād al-ğibāl means additions by authorities in main or isnād which are not found in other transmissions. Views differ regarding the extent to which such information is acceptable. Mu'an'an is used of an isnād where 'an (on the authority of) is used with no clear indication of how the tradition was received. It is held that when those who use it are known to be genuine, and to have heard the person they quote, the tradition is muttaṣil. Musalsal is applied when the transmitters in an isnād use the same words, or are of the same type, or come from the same place. Musalsal al-ḥalif is a type in which each transmitter swears an oath, and musalsal al-yad is the type in which each transmitter gives his hand to the one to whom he transmits the tradition. Mudallās is used of a tradition with a concealed defect in the isnād. The defect of tadlis (concealing defects) may consist in pretending to have heard a tradition from a contemporary when that is not so (tadlis al-insād), or in calling one's authority by an unfamiliar ism, kunya, or nasba (tadlis al-ğiyūṣ), or in omitting a weak transmitter who comes between two sound ones (tadlis al-masāya). Mudhams (obscure) is used when a transmitter is named vaguely, e.g., rażīl (a man), or tān ḥulīn (son of so and so) without giving the man's ism. Maklub (transposed) is applied when a tradition is attributed to someone other than the real authority to make it an acceptable ḡhālib tradition, or when two traditions have the isnād of the one with the main of the other. Some use Ǧubayr 'aṣ wins later than the Successor. Musalsal confused. Tadlis (inserted) is used of a gloss in the main, or of giving with one isnād texts which differ with different isnāds, or of mentioning a number of transmitters who differ in their isnād without indicating this. Generally it is used of inserting something in the isnād or the main of one tradition from another to make this appear part of it. Muḍjarīb (incongruous) is used when two people or more disagree with one another in their version of a tradition, they being people of similar standing. The difference may affect isnād or main. Iđīṣrāb makes a tradition weak. When a man is called muḍjarīb al-ḥadīth it means his traditions are confused. Isnād ʿaṣīl (a high isnād), which is used when there are very few links between the transmitter and the Prophet, or between him and a certain authority, is considered it a tradition with good ground that the fewer the links the fewer are the possible chances of error. Isnād nūṣīl (a low isnād) means that there are many links. The quality of the former is called ʿawwaw and of the latter mutāl. Muḥarrf (altered) is used of a change occurring in the letters of a word. Musṣāḥaf (mistaken) is used of a slight error in isnād or main, commonly confined to an error in the dots. Musabbabāl (variegated, embellished) is used when two contemporaries transmit traditions from one another. Iṭībār (taking into consideration) means consideration of whether a transmitter who is alone in transmitting a tradition is well known, or whether, if the tradition is transmitted by one authority, someone in the chain has another authority, or whether another Companion transmits it.

(iv) With reference to acceptable traditions. Ma'rūf (acknowledged) is applied to a weak tradition confirmed by another weak one, or it is a tradition superior in main or isnād to one called munkar. Munkar (see below) is also applied to a traditionist when two or more transmit from him. Otherwise he is maṣḥūl, i.e., unknown either as regards his person, or his reliability. Mabbāl (accepted) is a tradition which fulfils requirements and is either ṣāḥib or baṣan. Makūfás (committed to memory) applies to a tradition which, when compared with one which is ʃahādāt, is considered of greater weight.

(v) With reference to rejected traditions. Munkar (ignored) is used of a tradition whose transmitter is alone in transmitting it and differs from one who is reliable, or is one who has not the standing to be accepted when alone. Some equate munkar with ʃahādāt, but munkar is normally considered inferior. When one says of a transmitter yarūs 'l-munṣārā (be transmits munṣārā traditions) this does not involve the rejection of all his traditions; but if he is called munkar al-ḥadīth they are all to be rejected. Mardūd (rejected) is the opposite of mabbāl. More particularly it is a tradition from a weak transmitter which contradicts what authorities transmit. Maaṛūf (abandoned) is a tradition from a single transmitter who is suspected of falsehood in Tradition, or is openly wicked in deed or word, or is guilty of much carelessness or frequent wrong notions. Mārib (cast out) is held by some to be synonymous with maṣṭūk, by others to be a separate class less acceptable than da'īf, but not so bad as maqādīs (fictitious), the worst type of all. Some other technical terms are given below. [See also al-Dījkār wa l-τα'ḍīl].

The criticism of traditions was very detailed, showing how seriously the work was undertaken, and one can appreciate the situation in the early days when the criticism was so thorough that the one who used it seems to have been saying that this does not involve the rejection of all his traditions; but if he is called munkar al-ḥadīth they are all to be rejected. Mardūd (rejected) is the opposite of mabbāl. More particularly it is a tradition from a weak transmitter which contradicts what authorities transmit. Maaṛūf (abandoned) is a tradition from a single transmitter who is suspected of falsehood in Tradition, or is openly wicked in deed or word, or is guilty of much carelessness or frequent wrong notions. Maaṛūf (cast out) is held by some to be synonymous with maṣṭūk, by others to be a separate class less acceptable than da'īf, but not so bad as maqādīs (fictitious), the worst type of all. Some other technical terms are given below. [See also al-Dījkār wa l-τα'ḍīl].
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traced back to the Prophet. While one does not feel justified in explaining away the whole body of Tradition on these lines, it is quite clear that much material coming from a later date has been attributed to the Prophet, and this makes it very difficult to find a satisfactory criterion by which one may recognize what is genuine. Material which accumulated within a certain circle may often have seemed to a later generation to have come from a Companion who settled in the area, and by a natural process to have been attributed to him with the assumption that he had the Prophet as his authority. One result of Western criticism is that we must be chary of accusing men like Abu Hurayra of inventing many traditions, for they probably heard and transmitted very little of what they are reputed to have told.

IV. THE STUDY AND TRANSMISSION OF TRADITION

The study of Tradition is called ʿUlam al-hadith (the sciences of Tradition). Various works have been written on branches of Tradition, but the first to attempt a comprehensive work was Abu Muḥammad al-ʿRāmahurmuzī (d. 360/971) whose lengthy work in seven parts is called al-ʿUmmāl al-fṣālī bayna l-rāʿūt wa l-wuʿūt. Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī wrote a more systematic work entitled Maṣāʾiful ʿulam al-hadīth, divided into 52 nāw (categories), a method followed by later writers. The work of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, ʿUlam al-hadīth, which may be considered the classical work on the subject, has 65 nāw. The study covers minutely a wide range of subjects, dealing with classes of traditions and transmitters (emphasizing being specially laid on knowledge of the Companions—ṣaḥḥīth, and the Successors—tābiʿūn), with methods of learning and transmitting traditions, with rules about details of writing traditions and methods of making necessary corrections in one's manuscript, even with the ages at which it is appropriate to begin and to stop transmitting. To give one illustration of the rules for writing, when the phrase salta lākhu ʾalayhi wa-sallam comes after rasūl Allāh, one must not end a line with rasūl, for to do so would mean that someone happening to glance at the next line might think God was being invaded of His majesty. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ gives the following: (1) Hearing (samā). Hearing directly from the shaykh's mouth is considered superior to other methods. (2) Reciting to the shaykh (al-baḍʿa ʿala l-shaykh), commonly called ʿard (submitting the material to him). One may recite to him his material from memory or from a book, and he may listen with or without his book for reference according to the quality of his memory. The important matter is that he should be able to guarantee the correctness of what is attributed to him. This method is equally valid if one hears someone else reciting. (3) Licence (iǧāsa). Licence to transmit a shaykh's traditions is of various kinds, some more precise than others as to the material and the person or persons to whom it is given. (4) Handing over (mudawala). This applies to a copy of the shaykh's traditions being handed to a student with or without iǧāsa. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ held that iǧāsa must be received to make it valid, but said that a number of traditions held that mudawala alone was sufficient. (5) Correspondence (mukāṭabāt). Some held that material received thus may be transmitted though licence has not been given, but others disagreed. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ holds that if the man who receives the traditions is familiar with the šaykh's handwriting he may transmit the traditions, making clear how he received them. If licence is given, this is equivalent to mudawala with iǧāsa. (6) Bequest (wasiyya). Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ says that receiving a book of traditions in a bequest does not give one the right to transmit them, but some consider that it does. Wasiyya is also used of a book entrusted to someone by one going on a journey. (7) A find (ašādīda). One who finds a book in a šaykh's handwriting may transmit the traditions if he finds how he got them, this giving a suggestion of a connected ismād. If the book contains the šaykh's traditions copied by someone else, one may say merely that he said such and such, this not suggesting a connected ismād. Some at least of these methods were used in the 3rd/9th century, and possibly earlier. Al-Bukhārī has chapters on reading over traditions to a šaykh and on mudawala and mukāṭabāt, and al-Tirmidhī speaks of reading over material to a šaykh.

Different words used in the transmission of traditions are discussed, such as haddathānī (he told me), hadāthānī (he told us), akhbarānī (he informed me), akhbarānī (he informed us), samīʿū (I heard), anbaʿānī (he announced to me), anbaʿānī (he announced to us), ʿān (on the authority of). Various views mentioned by people of the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries suggest that in their day there was no general agreement about the relative importance of these terms. Al-Ḥākim is more precise. He says haddathānī should be used when one hears a šaykh with no others present and haddathānī when others are present; akhbarānī when one reads over traditions to a šaykh with no others present, and akhbarānī when one hears someone else reading to the šaykh; anbaʿānī when one submits traditions to a šaykh and is given iǧāsa by word of mouth. ʿān, which is generally agreed to be allowable when the transmitter is reliable, often appears in al-Bukhārī's traditions. Al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071) justifies it especially when the ismād is long, as it avoids tedious details. An ismād which begins with one or more of the other words often uses only ʿān towards the end; or it may begin with one of the recognized words, and continue with ʿān. It is not sufficient, according to the strictest rules, to give merely the contents of a collection of traditions for which one has received iǧāsa; one must inscribe on one's manuscript the name of the šaykh from whom one received the traditions, telling how and when this took place, along with the line of authorities through whom he heard it. So not only the separate traditions but also the whole collection must have an ismād. This practice has continued in certain quarters, but the invention of printing has largely made it unnecessary. The text of some important scholar is printed, his authority suffering without any attempt to trace the transmission of his version down to the present day. But manuscripts always give details of the transmission of their contents.

In discussing the age at which people may begin to hear and transmit traditions and the age at which they should stop Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ holds that no hard and fast rules can be laid down. Some say the youngest age is five and that people should stop in their eigtieths, but he argues that some are not too young before five and some have not become senile in their eigtieths, although there are others who should stop earlier.

Inconsistency in traditions (mukhtasīf al-hadīth)
has caused difficulty, recognizing the existence of traditions which seem contradictory. Ibn Kutayba's Tahwìl (4 vols., Cairo 1313/1896; Fr. ed., C. G. Lecomte, Damascus 1962) is a standard work on the subject. By an exercise of ingenuity it may be possible to reconcile the traditions, or one may be given preference because of the superiority of its transmitters; or by a knowledge of when the traditions were promulgated one may conclude that the later one has abrogated the earlier. This subject has the title of al-nàfisà wa 'l-mansùbih (the abrogating which the abrogated). A tradition cannot be abrogated by iǧmāʿ; only a tradition can abrogate a tradition.

It is often said that the validity of a tradition depends not on the text but on the isnàd. While this is generally true, it is not the whole story. For example, al-Ḥakìm (Maʿruf ʿulàm al-hadîth, 59 ff.) mentions some traditions with very reliable men in the isnàd which he holds to be faulty and weak. He argues that one requires considerable knowledge to detect this, and can arrive at a conclusion only after discussion with people learned in the subject.


Wensinck, Handbook; Wensick and others, Concordance et indices de la tradition musulmane (in progress), Leiden 1936; Muhammad Fuʾād Ab al-Ḵâlî, Taṣâyṣ al-manṣa′a bi-šûbây Mîṣrî hünkuz al-sumna wa l-Muṣālah al-musâfishâr al-alâfîs al-hadîth al-nabawi, 8 parts, Leiden 1939 (detailed list of the bás in six books, and in the works of al-Dârîmî and al-Ḵâlî); al-Bukhârî, ʿAbî, ed. Kreht and Juybînlî, 4 vols., Leiden 1862-1908; Muslim, Ṣâbhî, 9 vols. (18 parts), Cairo 1349/1930; ʿAbî Dâʾūd, Sunan, 2 parts in 1 vol., Cairo 1348/1930; al-Tirmîdhî, Sunan, 7 vols. (13 parts), Cairo 1350-2/1931-4; al-Nâṣîbî, Sunan, 8 vols., Cairo 1348/1930; Ibn Mâḏâ, Sunan, 2 vols., Cairo 1313/1896. (J. Robson) ḤADĪTH KUDSI (sacred, or holy traditions) also called hadîth šâkhî, or râbbânî (divine tradition), is a class of traditions which give words spoken by God, as distinguished from hadîth nabawi (prophetic tradition) which gives the words of the Prophet. Although hadîth kusdi is said to contain God’s words, it differs from the Kurʾân which was revealed through the medium of Gabriel, is inimitable, is recited in the ṣalâh, and may not be touched or recalled by the ceremonially unclean. Hadîth kusdi does not necessarily come through Gabriel, but may have come through inspiration (iḥkâm), or in a dream. One statement, not generally accepted, says God revealed these traditions to the Prophet on the night of the Miʿrāj. The words are not God’s exact words, but express their meaning. They may not be used in ēid, and there is no harm if one touches them when ceremonially unclean. Disbelief in the Kurʾân is infidelity, but this does not apply to hadîth kusdi. When quoting a hadîth kusdi one must not say simply, “God said” as when quoting the Kurʾân he which was revealed through the medium of Gabriel, is inimitable, is recited in the ṣalâh, and may not be touched or recalled by the ceremonially unclean. Hadîth kusdi does not necessarily come through Gabriel, but may have come through inspiration (iḥkâm), or in a dream. One statement, not generally accepted, says God revealed these traditions to the Prophet on the night of the Miʿrâj. The words are not God’s exact words, but express their meaning. They may not be used in ēid, and there is no harm if one touches them when ceremonially unclean. Disbelief in the Kurʾân is infidelity, but this does not apply to hadîth kusdi. When quoting a hadîth kusdi one must not say simply, “God said” as when quoting the Kurʾân he
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Those who desire can find its isndd there. A collection of 101 fyudsi traditions entitled... texts, or at least some of them, do not maintain it. In the Book of Stones ascribed to Aristotle all the substances.

It would appear that al-Munawi, whose order. It is divided into two parts (cf. Hadidii Khalifa, ed. Flügel, I, 150 f.), the first with traditions beginning in the first, sometimes in the second, and usually in the third. ‘All al-Kārī’ merely mentions the Companion reputed to have heard the tradition from the Prophet. Another collection, also published, is by Ibn al-Ra‘īš as-Salman, originally Muḥammad b. Tādı al-Din al-Munawwī (d. 1031/1621). It was published in Aleppo (1346/1927) along with a... the explanation of the name would be that of Baladhuri. That this story is authentic (it is also given in Yakut, ii, 223), following the history of the town, Yakūţ (ii, 223), following Nābīya b. Yābib, who dis... 571 f., S II, 791 (Ibn al-Arabī), S II, 151 (al-Madāni), S II, 417 (al-Munawwī), S II, 530 (‘All al-Kārī).

Haditha, “New town”, the name of several cities.

I. Hadīthat al-Mawṣil, a town on the east bank of the Tigris, one farsakh below the mouth of the upper (Great) Zāb. Its ruins are to be recognized in the mound of Tell al-Shā‘ir. Various accounts of its origin are given. According to one tradition (Ibn al-Arabī, al-Madāni, al-Munawwī, Bālaik, ed. 340) Harthama b. ‘Arabī, after making Mawsil the capital, came to Haditha in the reign of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, where he found a village with two churches in which he settled Arabs.

II. Hadīthat al-Furāt, called also Hadīthat al-Nūra (Lime-Newtown) on the Euphrates, south of ‘Ānā (34° 8’ N. and 42° 26’ E.), a nābīya of the hadīt of ‘Ānā. The town itself is built on an island, only the caravan stations being on the western river bank. It has very much declined since 1910, when the reefs and dams in the river were blown up in order to make way for packet-boats which never came into service; it had formerly 400 houses, 2 dījānīs and 3 masjīdūs, 2 corn-mills, gardens with 1500 date palms (about 6000 in the whole nābīya). It was irrigated by great waterwheels called nābīra, which were erected at the rapids of the river. There are limestone quarries on the western side of the Euphrates valley. There are three saints’ tombs of the 5th/11th-13th centuries there, from N. to S.: 1. Shaykh al-Hadd (a certain Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Kāzīm); 2. The Awhāl Sayyid Aḥmad al-Kīfā; 3. a certain Nadīm al-Din, said to have been one of the occupants of Noah’s Ark. As to the history of the town, Yakūţ (ii, 223), following Aḥmad b. Yābib b. Ḟīrifūr, observes that it was taken before ‘Umar’s time in the governorship of ‘Ammār b. Yābir. It had a strong castle on the island which was of some importance as late as the time of the Caliph al-Kā’īm (Marāṣid, 292). According to Abū Sa‘īd al-Sa‘mānī the inhabitants were Christians. III. Ḥādithat al-Balālī, a village in the Ghūṭah of Damascus (Yakūţ, ii, 225; Marāṣid, 292).

Bibliography: Le Strange, index.

Hadiyya [see hiba].

Hadjar (locally pronounced hajar) is a cognate of the Ethiopic hager “town”, and was the normal word for “town” in the epigraphic dialects of pre-Islamic South Arabia. It is still in use today as an element in the place-names given to ruins of pre-Islamic town sites in South Arabia. See Azimuddin Ahmad, Die auf Südarabien bezüglichen Angaben Nāwān’s in Sams al-ulām, Leyden 1916, 108. (A. F. L. BEESTON)

Hadjar [see al-masāl].

Hadjar (A.), stone. The word is applied in Arabic as indiscriminately as in European languages to any solid inorganic bodies occurring anywhere in Nature; sometimes indeed it is used in a still broader sense, as in Sāra II, 60/57 and VII, 160, where the rock from which Mūsā procures water is called also ‘stone’. Although Sāra XVIII, 50/53 says: Be ye stones, or iron” may indicate a certain discrimination between stones and minerals, later texts, or at least some of them, do not maintain this. In the Book of Stones ascribed to Aristotle all the substances...
HADJAR — HADJAR AL-NASR

A survey of stones analogous to the surveys of animals and stars by Aristotle and Ptolemy respectively is not known in classical literature. There are a few objective descriptions in Theophrastus and Pliny, but their influence, if any, on Islamic literature has not yet been studied. Aristotle's treatises on the origin of minerals in general became known through the Arabic translation of the Meteorologica (see AL-TAHIR AL-ULWIYYA; the text contained in MS Yeni Cami 1779 has meanwhile been edited by 'Abd al-Rahmân Badawi, together with De coelo, 1961). It is to be noted that in the editions of the Greek text Book 3 ends (176b 5-6) with the announcement of a detailed discussion of the different kinds of bodies; in the Arabic translation, Book 4 begins (ed. Badawi, 90) with this same announcement, which was therefore judged to be the introduction to this spurious book. However, the promised detailed discussion does not appear there either. This was probably the reason for compiling the spurious Book of Stones mentioned above. In Latin translations of the Meteorologica, Ibn Sînâ's treatise on the origin of stones and mountains sometimes appears as an appendix, occasionally under Aristotle's name; the Arabic and Latin texts, with an English translation, were published separately by E. J. Holmyard and D. C. Mandeville: Avicennae de Congelatione et Conglutinatione lapidum, 1927 (see OLZ, 1929, cols. 374-6). Fragments of the Meteorologica of Theophrastus in Syriac have recently been edited and translated by E. Wagner and F. Steinmetz, Ein syrisches Kapitel derMeteorologica, 1960 (Ak. d. Wiss. u. d. Lit., Abh. d. Geistes- und Sozialwiss. Kl. 1964, i); see also P. Steinmetz, Die Physik des Theophrastos von Eresos, 1964.

Islamic books on the origin of stones etc. are listed in AL-TAHIR AL-ULWIYYA, and also in E. Wiedemann, Zur Mineralogie im Islam (Beitr. z. Gesch. d. Naturw., xxx, Sitz. d. phys.-med. Soz. in Erlangen, 1919, xxv, 1920). A comprehensive review of Islamic treatises on the subject, dealing with the origin of stones in general, and enumerating a great many of them in detail, is contained in al-Kazwînî's Cosmography, 203-45. Here ma'dîniyyât are divided into metals (the "seven bodies", al-adâjîm al-sab'a), stones and oily substances. Ethê's translation (Die Wunder der Schöpfung, Leipzig 1868, not mentioned in G.A.L) breaks off after the chapter on metals; the chapters on stones and oily substances were translated by J. Ruska (Das Steinbuch . . . des Kaiserîns überw. und mit Anm. versehen, Beil. zum Jahresbericht 1895/96 der provisor. Oberrealschule Heidelberg, Kirchhain 1896). The relation between 'Aristotle' and al-Kazwînî has been fully discussed by J. Ruska in the introductory chapter of his Das Steinbuch des Aristoteles, 1912.

Interest in descriptions of specific "stones" is very many-sided. Apart from the descriptions of substances in medical, commercial, technical and chemical literature, for which, inter alia, pharmacological and chemico-alchemical works may be consulted, there exists a special type of stone-books in which genuine information may be found but whose main purpose is magical. The Pseudo-Aristotle mentioned above is one; another, also ascribed to Aristotle, in which chapters on stones are incorporated, is the famous Sirr al-asrâr or al-Siyâsa fi lâbîr al-

riyâda, published by 'A. Badawi, Fontes Graccae doctrinarum politicarum Islamicarum, i, 1954. A bibliography of such literature was compiled by M. Steinschneider, Arabeische Lapidarien, in ZDMG, xvli (1895), 244-78, to be supplemented by H. Ritter, Orientalische Steinbücher, in Istanbuler Mitteilungen, iii (1935), 1-15. For the Lapidariûn of Alfonso the Wise, see BALINOS; for the use of stones for magical purposes, see H. Ritter and M. Plessner's translation of Ficatius (Ps.-Magrî, Zihyât al-kâmî, 1962); a chapter on this subject will be included in the forthcoming volume of studies on this book.

Since no attention has been drawn to the unique place in the mineralogical literature of Islam occupied by the al-Djumâhir fi mawrîf al-djauwîr of al-Bîrûnî [q.v.], a few remarks on it may be added here. The djauwîr proper, i.e., pearls and precious stones, occupy only part of the book; it deals also with many metals and other minerals, always giving exact descriptions, indications of the location of mines, specific weights, prices, uses, and tales concerning them, the last often aptly criticized (see AMâs). The book deserves a full translation with careful textual criticism. M. J. Haschmi's doctoral thesis Die Quellen des Steinbuches des Berûnî (Bonn 1935) was prepared simultaneously with the edition of F. Krenkow (Haydarâbâd 1935) and relies only on manuscript sources. It should be pointed out that al-Bîrûnî's questions on the genuineness of Aristotle's book of stones (Haschmi, 35; ed. Krenkow, 41). Only two chapters have so far been made accessible to non-Arabists: P. Kahle, Bergkristall, Glas und Glasflüse nach dem Steinbuch des Birûnî, in ZDMG, xc (1936), 321 ff.; F. Krenkow, The chapter on pearls in the Book of Precious Stones by al-Berruni, in JC, xv (1941), 399-421 and xvi (1942), 21-36. In the Bibliography of such literature cited in the article: M. Steinschneider, Lapidarien, ein culturgeschichtlicher Versuch, in Semitische studies in memory of Alexander Kohut, 1897, 42-72; art. Gemmen in Pauly-Wissowa, by O. Roebach, esp. 1097 ff.; art. Lithika, ibid., by Th. Hopfen; H. Ritter, Ein arabisches Handbuch der Handelswissenschaft, in Isl., vii (1917), 9-91 (passim); J. Ruska, Die Mineralogie in der arabischen Literatur, in Isis, i (1923), 341-50.

M. Plessner

AL-HADJAR AL-ASWAD [see al-KÂBA']

HADJAR AL-NASR ("the rock of the vulture"), a fortress founded by the last Idrîsids [q.v.] in a natural mountainous retreat, placed by Ibn Khaldûn among the dependencies of the town of al-BAṣra [q.v.]. Its site has now been identified in the territory occupied by the small tribe of the Sumatra, east-north-east of the Moroccan town of al-Kaṣr al-Kabîr (Alcazarquivir). It is reported to have been known also by the name of Hadjar al-Shurafa. In 317/929-30 the Banû Muḥammad, expelled from Fâs after the assassination of their prince, the famous al-Ḥâdjîdm, settled at al-BAṣra. These descendants of Idrîs would not, however, have escaped the blockade and the Fâtimid persecutions had it not been for the regard in which the Berbers held the descendants of the Prophet. It is without doubt these sentiments which enabled al-Ḥasan b. Gannûn (Diânûn), the local ruler, to manoeuvre skilfully between the Umayyads of Spain and the Fâtimids and to carve out for himself a principality which in about 361/972 comprised not only al-BAṣra but also Tangiers and Tetuan. Al-Ḫaḳam II, the amir of Cordova, was finally routed by the activities of Ibn Gannûn into sending a fleet and an army to subdue him. The
Idrissid then took refuge in his fortress with his harem and his treasure and, after several reverses, he finally inflicted a bloody defeat on the Umayyad troops on 21 Rabi' II 1362/30 December 797; their leader, Ibn Tumlus, was killed and they had to seek refuge within the walls of Ceuta. In order to avenge this cruel defeat, al-Ḫakam II sent to Morocco his best general, the renowned mawali Gḥilib [q.v.], who gathered together his army as soon as he disembarked and set off to besiege Ḥaǧjar al-Nasr. Ibn Gannūn resisted so effectively that fresh reinforcements were sent from Spain, with a large supply of gold to buy over the allies of the Idrissid. The latter realized that he was lost and was obliged to surrender on 21 Dujūmād II 1363/19 March 798. A week later Gḥilib inflicted on him the bitterest defeat, the turning point in the history and the assassination of Ibn Gannūn (see 982510). With this exile the decay of the fortress presumably began; the texts make no mention of it after this date.

Bibliography: Ibn Khaldūn, ʿIbar (tr. de Slane, Histoire des Berbères, index); ʿAḫmad al- недел. Kīlāb al-ʿIsākhād, i, new edition, Casablanca 1954, which summarizes all the Arabic texts (tr. A. Graule, in AM, xxxi (1953)); Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., ii, where further bibliography can be found. (G. Deverdun)

Hadjrāyān, a town in Ḥaḍramawt on the ʿIbīl of the same name, about five miles south of Maḥbūb ʿAll [q.v.] on the Wādī ʿAftān. Situated amid extensive palm-groves, it is built against the slopes of the Jībāl. The surrounding land is very fertile and produces ḡhura. Irrigation is provided through channels from the sayl and from very deep wells. The town is of importance as a centre on the motor road between Mukallā and Shībām. Its houses are built of brick and are large but the streets are narrow and steep. It belongs to the Kuʿaytīs of Shībām and was represented by a member of their family, who bears the title naṣib and lives in a palace on the summit of the hill. Hadjrāyān has about 3,000 inhabitants, many of whom have connections with Java and speak Malay. In the vicinity of the town there are relics of the pre-Islamic period, when the incense trade still flourished in the district.

The ruins of an ancient town, Raydūn, with incisions of Assyrian form, are found. (G. Deverdun)

Hajjarayn, some of its mysteries unveiled, Leiden 1933; A. Grohmann, Südarabien als Wirtschaftsgesch., Vienna and Berlin 1923-33, v, index.

(J. Schlieffer, A. K. Irvine)

Hajḍidj (a.), pilgrimage to Mecca, ʿArafāt and Minā, the fifth of the five “pillars” (arkān) of Islam. It is also called the Great Pilgrimage in contrast to the ṣumra (q.v.) or Little Pilgrimage. Its annual observance has had, and continues to have, a profound influence on the Muslim world. Those not taking part follow the same rules as the religious teachers, and nowadays the press, radio and television help them in this by providing doctrine and news bulletins. For the Muslim community itself this event is the occasion for a review of its extent and its strength. To the religious, social and even political significance which such a gathering has today, was added, until the 18th century, an economic aspect: then, at this time of the year, Mecca was the site of one of the greatest commercial fairs of the world in which were found the products of Europe, Arabia and the Indies. Moreover, in those times, when travelling was still difficult, the pilgrimage helped to produce a mingling among the elite of the Muslim world: scholars on the way to Mecca would stay temporarily at places in the way, forming friendships with colleagues or themselves teaching in the local mosques.

1. The pre-Islamic Hajḍidj.

The investigation of the original meaning of the root ḭid does no further than hypotheses, some however probable. The Arabic lexicographers give the meaning “to betake oneself to”; this would agree with our “go on pilgrimage”. But this meaning is as clearly denominative as that of the Hebrew verb. Probably the root ḥd, which in North as well as South Semitic languages means “to go around, to go in a circle”, is connected with it. With this we are not much farther forward however; for we do not even know whether religious circumambulations formed part of the original ḥadidj. We do know that in the pre-Islamic period two annual markets were held in the month of Dhu ʿl-Ḵaḍa, at Ḫukay and Maḥdiyān. These were followed in the early days of Dhu ʿl-Ḥijja by that of Dhu ʿl-Maḡzā and thence the people would go in direct to Mecca. The Muslim practice of going out from Mecca to ʿArafāt is therefore probably an innovation; and Islam knows nothing of religious circumambulations in ʿArafāt.

This ḥadidj to ʿArafāt was not a local peculiarity; pilgrimage to a sanctuary is an old Semitic custom, which is prescribed even in the older parts of the Pentateuch as an indispensable duty. “Three times a year shall ye celebrate for me a ḥaq” is written in Exodus (xxiii, 14), and “three times a year all thy males shall appear before the Lord Yahweh” (ibid., 17 and xxxiv, 22). But in Arabia also there were probably several places of pilgrimage where festivals like that of the ḥadidj of ʿArafāt were celebrated. The month of Aggathalbaeith mentioned by Eiphanius seems to presuppose a sanctuary in the north. The ḥadidj of ʿArafāt took place on 9 Dhu ʿl-Ḥijja; the most diverse Arab tribes took part in it, but this was only possible when peace reigned in the land. The consecutive months Dhu ʿl-Ḵaḍa, Dhu ʿl-Ḥijja and Maḥarram thus formed a sacred period during which tribal feuds were at rest; weapons were laid aside in the holy territory.

It may be regarded as certain that in Muhammad’s time the sacred festival fell in the spring. Wellhausen has, however, made it appear probable that the
original time of the **hadīdi** was the autumn. If, as is probable, the above mentioned intercalary month had its object to maintain this time of the year, the intercalation did not effect its purpose, but from what cause we do not know. If the **hadīdi** originally fell in the autumn, it is natural, when inquiring into its original significance, to compare it with the North Semitic autumnal festival, the "Feast of Tabernacles" (or Day of Atonement), a proceeding which finds further support in the fact that the Feast of Tabernacles in the Old Testament is often called briefly the **ḥag** (e.g., Judges, xxii, 19; I Kings, viii, 2, 65). We will indeed find several features in agreement (see below).

Great fears were from early times associated with the **hadīdi**, which was calculated on the conclusion of the date-harvest. These fears were probably the main thing to Muhammad's contemporaries, as they are still to many Muslims. For the ceremonies had already then lost their religious significance for the people. The following may be stated: a main part of the ceremony was the **wubāšī** "the halt", in the plain of 'Arafa; in Islam the **hadīdi** without **wubāšī** is invalid. This can only be explained as the survival of a pre-Muslim notion. Houtsma has compared the **wubāšī** with the stay of the Israelites on Mount Sinai. The latter had to prepare themselves for this by refraining from sexual intercourse (Exodus, xix, 15) and the washing of their garments (Exodus, xix, 10, 14). Thus they waited upon their God (God's **wukuf**, 11, 15). In the same way the Muslims refrain from sexual intercourse, wear heavy clothing and stand before the deity (**wukafa** = **wukuf** = stand) at the foot of a holy mountain.

On Sinai, the deity appeared as a thunder- and lightning-god. We know nothing of the god of 'Arafa; but he probably existed. Muhammad is related to have said at the Farewell Pilgrimage: "The whole of 'Arafa is a place for standing (**mašī'), the whole of Muzdalifa is a place of standing, the whole of Minā a place of sacrifice". Snouck Hurgronje has explained these words to mean that the particular places there, where heathen ceremonies were performed, were to lose their importance through these words. A little is known of these heathen places in Muzdalifa and Minā.

It is uncertain whether the day of 'Arafa was a fast-day or not. In Tradition it is several times expressly stated that Muhammad's companions did not know what was his view on this question: he was therefore invited to drink and he drank. The ascetic character of the **hadīdi** days is clear from the **ṣūrah** prohibitions. That these were once extended to eating, drinking and sensual pleasure. In early Islam ascetically disposed persons therefore chose the **hadīdi** as the special time for their self-denials (see Goldzirher in *RHR*, xxxvii, 318, 320 f.).

The **wubāšī** lasts in Islam from the month after mid-day till sunset. Tradition records that Muhammad ordered that 'Arafa should not be left till after sunset, which corresponds to 30 Dhu 'l-Hijjah, the **ṣīfāda** even before sunset. But the Prophet is said not only to have shifted the time, but even to have suppressed the whole rite by forbidding the running to Muzdalifa and to have ordered that it should be slowly approached. But how tenacious the old custom is, is clear from modern discursions of the **ṣīfāda**. Snouck Hurgronje thought he saw a solar rite in the latter, a view which was more definitely formulated by Houtsma in connexion with the character of the **hadīdi** (see below), viz. that it was originally considered a persecution of the dying sun. The god of **hadīdi** was **Kuzāb**, the thunder-god. A fire was kindled on the sacred hill, also called **Kuzāb**. Here a halt was made and this **wubāšī** has a still greater similarity to that on Sinai, as in both cases the thunder-god is revealed in fire. It may further be presumed that the traditional custom of making as much noise as possible and of shooting was originally a sympathetic charm to call forth the thunder.

In pre-Islamic times, the **ṣīfāda** to Minā used to begin as soon as the sun was visible. Muhammad therefore ordained that this should begin before sunrise; here again we have the attempt to destroy a solar rite. In ancient times they are said to have sung during the **ṣīfāda**: **ṣakīb** **thābir** **kaymā** **nughir**. The explanation of these words is uncertain; it is sometimes translated: "Enter into the light of morning, **Thābir**, so that we may hasten".

When they arrived in Minā, it seems that the first thing they did was to sacrifice; 10 Dhu 'l-Hijjah is still called **yaum al-ādātī** "day of the morning sacrifices". In ancient times the camels to be sacrificed were distinguished by special marks (**tābita**) even on the journey to the **haram**; for example two sandals were hung around their necks. Mention is also made of the **ṣīgdr**, the custom of making an incision in the side of the hump and letting blood flow from it; or wounds were made in the animal's skin. It is frequently mentioned also that a special covering was laid on the animals.

According to a statement in Ibn Highām (ed. Wüstenfeld, 76 f. = tr. Guillaume, 50), the stone-throwing began only after the sun had crossed the meridian. Houtsma has made it probable that the stoning was originally directed at the sun-demon; strong support is found for this view in the fact that the **ḥaddīdi** originally coincided with the autumnal equinox; similar customs are found all over the world at the beginning of the four seasons. With the expulsion of the sun-demon, whose harsh rule comes to an end with summer, worship of the thunder-god who brings fertility and his invocation may easily be connected, as we have seen above at the festival in Muzdalifa. The name **tarwiya**, "moistening", may be explained in this connexion as a sympathetic raincharm, traces of which survive in the libation of **zemzem** water. These are again parallels to the Feast of Tabernacles (or Day of Atonement): the goat, which was thrown from a cliff for 'Azazel, is not difficult to identify as the type of the sun-demon; and the libation of water from the holy well of **Siloom** was also a rain-charm, for the connexion between the Feast of Tabernacles and rain is expressly emphasized (Zach., xiv, 17). Further we may call attention to the illumination of the Temple on the Feast of Tabernacles, which has its counterpart in the illumination of the mosques in 'Arafa and Muzdalifa, as well as the important part which music plays at both feasts.

Quite other explanations of the stone throwing are given by van Vloten (*Feestbundel*. . . . *aan Prof. M. J. de G.), Revue d'Archeologie (Annales de l'Acad. Royale d'Arch. de Belgique, 5th Ser., Vol. iv, 272 f.). The former connects the stoning of Satan and the Kur'ānic expression **al-shayṭān al-rajīm** with a snake, which was indigenous to **'Akaba**. The latter finds in it an example of scopelism: the object of covering the **ḥaddīdi** ground with stones thrown on it was to prevent the cultivation of it by the Meccans. Both these theories have been satisfactorily refuted by Houtsma. Cf.
also Douet, Magie et religion, 430 ff.—On the significance of shaving in connexion with the history of religions, see the article IHRAM.

flesh of the sacrificed animals in the sun to take it i.e.,/Zeitschr.

Tradition has much to tell on the subject of this so-called farewell-pilgrimage (hadjdj al-maddi). These accounts of the ceremonies performed by Muhammad agree essentially with the later practice. The arrangements which he made on this occasion are of importance, however, for the history of the hadjdj, notably the abolition of the “intercalation” (nasi) and the introduction of the purely lunar year, which is mentioned in the Kur’ân with the words: “Verily the number of months with God is twelve months in all, of which four are sacred; that is the true religion. In these shall ye do no injustice to one another. But fight the unbelievers, as they fight you, one and all, and know that God is with the righteouss. The intercalation is but an increase of the unbelief, in which the unbelievers err, for they make it [i.e., the time in which it falls or should fall] lawful one year and unlawful the next” (Kur’ân, IX, 36 ff.). On other ordinances promulgated on this occasion see below.

A. The journey to Mecca. It is a duty obligatory on every Muslim man or woman who has reached the age of puberty and is of sound mind to perform the hadjdj once in his or her life provided that they have the means to do so (cf. Kur’ân, III, 97). The following are exempt for as long as their incapacity lasts: the insane, slaves, those who have not been able to obtain mounts or save the sums of money (procured honestly, kalil) necessary for the journey and for the sustenance of their families during their absence. The obligation is lifted also during periods when the route is unsafe by reason of war, abnormal brigandage, epidemics, etc. For certain categories of Muslims who are unable to go, the law provides the possibility of accepting or hiring the services of other Muslims who will take their place on the pilgrimage. Each substitute may represent only one person and must already have made the pilgrimage on his own behalf. In this way invalids and elderly people can delegate someone to replace them. Provision is even made for a substitute to be sent posthumously.

The pilgrimage of a child (with his family) or of a slave (with his master) is considered a meritorious act but does not fulfil the obligation and must be made again when the one has reached puberty and the other become free. Some ‘ulama insist that every woman must be accompanied by her husband or a close male relative (brother, son, etc.) who has the right to enter her harem; others say that a woman is obliged to go even if she has no such protector.

In practice, statistics show that only a small number of Muslims, especially in the case of those in countries far from Mecca, is able to perform the pilgrimage. It is beyond the reach of many people of limited means. And it is established that a fair number of those who could have afforded it die without having been to Mecca.

The hadjdj always takes place on the same dates of the lunar calendar, during the first two weeks of the month to which it gives its name Dhul ‘Hijjada. Ever since Islam suppressed the intercalary month [see nasi?] which every three years corrected the discrepancy between the solar and the lunar year (Kur’ân, IX, 36-7) the Muslim festivals, and consequently the pilgrimage, fall each year ten or eleven days earlier than the preceding year, and thus
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run through the whole cycle of the seasons in 32-3 years. The journey is of course much harder when the hajj takes place in high summer, although the cold of winter, especially at night, can also be painful for the pilgrims, insufficiently protected by their ritual garments. Only Muslims may be present at the pilgrimage, though very rarely Christian travellers have been able to mingle with them, protected by a disguise. In the 11th/12th and 12th/13th centuries Muslims sometimes took with them Christian slaves, who thus penetrated into the forbidden territories.

Until the 18th century, the methods of travel available to pilgrims were either sailing ships as far as Djidda, or caravans. The latter were in effect convoys organized by the authorities of the great Muslim countries. The dangers of the journey (the risk of losing their way in the desert, of being caught in a sandstorm or in the torrent of a river-bed filled with water by sudden rain, the danger of attack by Bedouins, of epidemics, etc.) rendered it a serious undertaking, and the pilgrimage knew that he might die on the way. For this reason there have long been more men than women pilgrims. The authorities, for their part, had built at the most important points of the route forts, some of them quite small, which were manned by small garrisons and served also as stations for supplies of water and food. A military escort accompanied the convoy, supplying as it passed the annual relief of the garrisons. The nomad tribes whose territory was crossed were won over by the distribution of money (called *sura, "purse" [*q.v.*]) and of robes of honour. Each section was directed by a pilgrim leader [see AMIR AL-HADJ]. In addition to whom there were the leaders of secondary caravans in case the main caravan became divided. From the 7th/8th century onwards, a famous palanquin, the mahmal [q.v.], was carried to symbolize the political authority of certain Muslim countries, especially Egypt, and then the Ottoman Empire. Other displays of prestige consisted of taking musicians as part of the caravan and of letting off fireworks at certain points; [for details of the material organization of a caravan, see J. Jomier, *Mahmal*].

An important caravan was mustered at Damascus and then hajj by road, as far as Medina, the direction later taken by the Hidżaz railway through Ma‘ān and Ma‘ān-Shālīb. It was accompanied by a Syrian mahmal and the journey from Damascus to Medina took about thirty days (see R. Tresse, *Pelerinage syrien*).

A caravan from the Magrib, sometimes with a parallel group proceeding by sea as far as Alexandria, made its way first to Cairo, and was sometimes joined en route by groups of pilgrims from Senegal and Timbuktu. Then groups of Egyptians and Maghrabis set off again for the Hidżaz at twenty-four hour intervals. Their route led through ʿAdjerūd, ʿAkhaba, the country of Madyan and the eastern shore of the Red Sea. The Egyptian caravan travelled with its mahmal, while the new exterior hangings (kiswa [*q.v.*]) for the Kaʿbah were carried on other camels. The journey from Cairo to Mecca took about 35 days. However some pilgrims preferred the sea route; indeed at the time of the Crusades there was no choice, and to avoid passing too close to Frankish territory pilgrims coming from Egypt travelled up the Nile and then across the desert to the port of ʿAyyāḥab, where they took ship for Djidda. In spite of the resumption of the overland caravan under Baybars, the sea traffic continued. Towards the end of the 8th/9th century ʿAyyāḥab was replaced by the port of ʿĀrāb (in Sinai), and later it was Suez which, in the 19th century, monopolized the steamship traffic. The last official Egyptian caravan to go by the overland route was in 1300/1883 and it consisted of only 1,170 persons. But once in the Hidżaz, the Egyptian pilgrims continued to group themselves into official caravans around their mahmal, which had been brought there by ship, until 1926 when the palanquin was seen in the Holy Places for the last time.

There was also a caravan from ʿIrāq, across Arabia, and another from the Yemen [see Burckhardt, *Travels*, appendices i and ii]. The pilgrims from central Africa made their way to Port Sudan, where they embarked for Djudda. The arrival at Mecca of the principal caravans, especially those from Syria and Egypt, was a great event for the inhabitants of the city. They camped in places specially allotted to them (see the plan of Mecca in C. Snouck Huzongo, *Mecca I* or in Rifʿat Pasha, *Masāʾīl aṭ-Ṭaraμayn*), and they generally did not appear until a few days before the hajj.

During the last century the journey to the Hidżaz has been greatly changed, first by the advent of steam navigation, then by the building of the short-lived Hidżaz railway [q.v.] (opened in 1908) and finally by the introduction of motor vehicles into Arabia and the spread of air travel. It has been altered also by public health measures, by the introduction of quarantine, and above all by the use of vaccination, so that the terrible epidemics of earlier centuries are now a thing of the past. Nowadays the death rate is relatively low and the main causes of death are the advanced age of some of the pilgrims, and sunstroke. The annual reports of the Muslim quarantine doctors who have accompanied the pilgrimage to the Hidżaz form a collection of extremely valuable documents; they consist mainly of technicalities, but often contain much that is of human interest and are often vividly written and sometimes very moving (texts printed practically every year since the beginning of the 20th century by the Quarantine Office at Alexandria, not for sale).

Up to the present only a rough annual figure has been available for the number of pilgrims. For one thing it is difficult to estimate how many Muslims from Arabia itself take part in the hajj, and then the rather fragmentary information provided by the quarantine services or the pilgrimage offices in the different countries, which alone could provide the numbers of non-Arabian pilgrims, would need to be brought together systematically. Dr. Buez, in *Une mission au Hidjaz*, Paris 1873, 84, gives the approximate total of pilgrims for 23 years between 1807 and 1873. The minimum was 50,000 in 1853 and 1859, the maxima 150,000 in 1873 and 160,000 in 1858. In 1926, a very exceptional year for this period, 250,000 pilgrims are reported.

According to the Meccan press during the last few years (but always excluding the pilgrims who come from the Arabian peninsula itself), from 1957 to 1962 there was an annual total of between 140,000 and 180,000. During this period the chief annual contingents varied within the following limits, reckoning in thousands: Egypt 30-40 (with only 10 in 1962 because of tension between Egypt and Saudi Arabia), Iran 10-28, Pakistan 9-23, India 13-20, Indonesia 7-13, Syria 5-13, Sudan 5-7, Nigeria 3-15, Iraq 3-11.

Pilgrims have always been able to make financial arrangements with agents (mahāwīm), or nowadays with organizations, who undertake mainly to provide for them in advance all the material needs of the journey.
Some pilgrims take advantage of the journey to pay long visits to places on the way and to spend some time on the pilgrimage, but their aim may be devotion, study, commerce, or even simply to work to earn enough to continue their journey. In the Middle Ages many used to arrive at Mecca in Ramadan, the month in which the performance of the 'umra is held to be especially meritorious. A special caravan, the Razgalabyiya, which set off from Cairo in Razjab, is mentioned from time to time in the 8th/14th century chronicles, and was one of the decisions of the pilgrims. The year in which the station at 'Arafat fell on a Friday was held to be particularly blessed, and to die near to the Holy Places was considered to bring especial grace. Until the 19th century many, by carrying on commercial activities during the pilgrimage, were enabled to cover, in part or entirely, the expenses of the journey, and some big merchants were even able to make a considerable profit. Finally it should be mentioned that there exist at the present time in the most important Muslim cities associations whose aim is to encourage the pilgrimage. (For some aspects of a pilgrimage made by a Shafi'i at the beginning of the 20th century, see Kazem Zadeh, Relation d’un pèlerinage à la Mecque, in RMM, xix (1922), 144 ff.) The word hadidi so often added to Muslim names is an honorific title meaning "one who has made the pilgrimage".

E. Arrival at Mecca. The pilgrim will already have put on the sacred garment or shirām (q.v.) when he passed through (or was on a level with) one of the places prescribed for this by tradition, or before he boarded the plane for Djidda. He is then muhirm, in a state of holiness, observing the prohibitions laid on those who are in this state and repeating frequently the invocation known as talbiya (q.v.). The rites on arrival at Mecca are the same for all, for the hadidi is in fact an 'umra, that is a rite of visiting the Ka'bah, which is completed by the rites of visiting the Holy Places in the neighbourhood of Mecca. The 'umra consists of walking seven times round the Ka'bah (tawaf (q.v.)), praying two rak'as facing the Makâm Ibrahim and the Ka'bah (this prayer, according to the various juridical schools, is either only sunna or hadidi), and finally traversing seven times (four times going and three returning) the distance between Safa and Marwa (sa'y (q.v.)). What follows these observances depends on the intention which the pilgrim formed at the time of assuming the shirām. He intended to perform either the hadidi alone (ifrād) or the 'umra and the hadidi together (kiyām); in either of these two cases he does not relinquish the state of shirām after having performed the rites of arrival. But if he wanted to perform the 'umra first and then to enjoy (tamattu') the freedom of a normal life, not resuming the shirām again until the last minute for the hadidi, he deconsecrates himself by having a few locks of hair cut off and coming out of the shirām. But in this case he will have to offer a sacrifice, which can be made wherever he chooses in the sacred territories and within a period upon the duration of which the jurists differ.

In general, the pilgrim joins a group led by a guide (shaykh, dalâl, mutawwif). In this town, where the pilgrimage is the sole source of revenue for the inhabitants, who naturally try to gain as much as possible from it, it is useful to have the protection of a guide, no matter what this costs. Some guides visit the various Muslim countries from time to time to recruit their clients in advance.

C. The collective ceremonies of the hadidi. Unlike the preceding observances, which each pilgrim carries out individually and at any date he chooses within the months set aside for them, the visits to the Holy Places in the vicinity of Mecca are made collectively in a traditional order, between 8 and 12 Dhu 'l-Hijjah. We can give here only the broad outlines of the question, which has provoked an abundant literature among the casuists, each juridical school having its own requirements regarding details. These will be found in a table given by al-Batānî, al-Riḥâla al-Ifidjaziyya, 176.

On 7 Dhu 'l-Hijjah, there is preached in the mosque of Mecca a sermon or khutba in the course of which the pilgrims are reminded of the duties which will fall on them.

It is generally on 8 Dhu 'l-Hijjah that the pilgrims who have relinquished shirām for tamattu' assume it again. This day is called "day of watering", yaum al-tarniya; for, say the Arabic writers, on this day the pilgrims water their animals and provide themselves with water for the following days. This explanation is not accepted by Wensinck and Gaudefroy-Demombynes, among others, who prefer to see in this name traces of an ancient rain rite.

The pilgrimage then becomes part of an immense crowd moving towards the east. Tens or hundreds of thousands of men and women in their white ritual garments enter a desert valley overhung with mountains and rocks. Formerly this was a mass of people on foot, and of camels, in which the pilgrims were accompanied by merchants who were there in order to offer them whatever could be sold in such circumstances. Today, cars and lorries proceed along the metalled road, while a string of first aid posts is set up for some days.

The night from 8 to 9 is spent at Minā (merely from custom) or already at 'Arafat (25 km/15 miles from Mecca), where in the 10th/16th century a fire-work display was held.

The central event of the hadidi is the station (wudud), on 9 Dhu 'l-Hijjah, in front of the Diabal al-Rahma, a small rocky eminence in the valley of 'Arafat itself. All the juridical schools consider this to be an indispensable ruhn. The station begins at noon (when the sun has passed its apogee) with the joint recital of the prayers of suhr and of 'asr brought forward, and it lasts until sunset. A sermon is preached to commemorate that which was given by Ibrahim (this prayer, according to the

Diabal al-Rahma is not prescribed by the Law and can be dangerous with such a crowd of people. Finally he said that it is not necessary to remain there until night, so that one adds to the jostling crush as the crowd leaves 'Arafat.

The doctors of the law admit that those who have
been delayed can still perform individually a brief but valid station at Arafat during the following night and until, but not beyond, the dawn, before hastily overtaking the main mass of pilgrims; but once this permitted period is over they will have to perform the whole pilgrimage again. In the Middle Ages it was sometimes known for pilgrims to remain twenty-four hours at Arafat in order to be quite sure of the validity of their pilgrimage when there was doubt about when exactly the lunar month began and thus of which day was in fact 9 Dhu ’l-Hijjah.

The mass of pilgrims leaves Arafat on the evening of the 9th, when the sun has set. Then there begins the running (called ifâda), in which the pilgrims retrace the road by which they have come from Mecca. They pass the ‘Alamayn, or boundary marks, which show that they are entering again the Haram which surrounds Mecca. It is said that there is sometimes great confusion among the rushing crowd. The Maqgrib and ’Idhâ? prayers are recited together at Muzdalifa, the second of the Holy Places outside Mecca which the pilgrims are to visit. The Kur'ân speaks of this place under the name of al-Maqâ'ar al-Haram. The mosque here is illuminated. The night is passed here by all except the women and the frail and sick, who may omit this and go ahead of the others toward Aqâba, to proceed calmly during (but not before) the second part of the night to the ritual stoning of Aqâba.

On the morning of the 10th, the day called yawm al-nahr, after the recital of the first prayer (al-fajr), the crowd proceeds from Muzdalifa to Minâ, which for three days will be the place where the pilgrims gather. The pilgrims first proceed to throw seven small stones at a construction called diqamal al-Akabâ (see al-qimam) which stands against the mountain at the western exit from the valley of Minâ. This is the only stoning which takes place on the 10th. Around this place, which now in the thoughts of the pilgrims symbolizes the Devil, the crush is indescribable and all that can be seen is a mass of outstretched arms.

Next follow the sacrifices which have given this day the name of ’Idhâ? of Sacrifice. Ten of thousands of sacrificial victims, mainly sheep and goats, are offered for sale by the Bedouins and the merchants of Minâ; only dignitaries of high rank sacrifice camels. A rock near Aqâba is held to be the most auspicious site for the sacrifice (Burckhardt, Travels, ii, 59; Burton, A Pilgrimage, ii, 240); but in fact the doctors of law insist that sacrifice can be made anywhere in Minâ. The pilgrims themselves consume a part—of the meat from the slaughtered animals, then the poor take what they want and the rest is abandoned. For the last fifty years, the local authorities have regulated the slaughter and especially the burial of the remains, so as to put an end to the smell which in former times very soon arose from this huge charnel-house. This offering of a victim in memory of that of Abraham springs from a private devotional act, rules for which are sometimes laid down by the doctors; it is not absolutely obligatory. Many offer at this time the sacrifice which is due for their tamattû (or their kirân, as certain doctors stipulate). It should be noted that this is a simultaneous offering of many individual sacrifices and not a collective ceremony.

It is usual after the sacrifice to have the head ritually shaved (or the hair cut short). Then the pilgrim returns to Mecca to perform a fawâd around the Kâ’ba, which is now seen for the first time adorned with its new exterior hangings (kiswa). This is the fawâd of the ifâda, which forms an indispensable part (ruku) of the pilgrimage. It is best if it is done on the 10th, but it can be transferred to the following days under certain conditions laid down by the jurists. The pilgrims who are making only the hadidî or the hadidî and ‘umra combined (kirân) have now finished the main part of their observances. Only those pilgrims who have chosen tamattû have still to perform the ritual running of the sa’î.

After the ritual shaving (or the trimming of the hair of the head or the body) the prohibitions end and the pilgrims can leave the state of ihram. Conjugal relations (diqâma), however, are permitted only after the fawâd of the ifâda (or the sa’î for pilgrims who have chosen the tamattû). According to certain doctors the order of performing the stoning, sacrifice, shaving and fawâd may be reversed. As an act of devotion also the water of Zamzam is drunk and a further visit is made to Minâ.

The 11–13 Dhu ’l-Hijjah are called ayyûm al-ta’alû (see below). These are days of social relations, and of visits in company to Minâ. Witnesses speak of the striking contrast between this motley crowd, clad in the greatest possible variety of local dress, and the sight of it on the previous day in the uniformity of the ritual garments. In the 1oth/11th century a firework display was given on the first night. Each day normally between mid-day and sunset, every pilgrim has to throw seven stones at each of the three diqmar of Minâ, ending with that of Aqâba (the only one which had been stoned on the 10th). This order of stoning follows a tradition of the Prophet who is said to have acted thus [see al-Qimam]. It is also the custom to sacrifice near a granite block on the slope of Mount ‘Ibâr (cf. Burckhardt, Travels, ii, 65; al-Hatamuni, Rida, 196, map 184); Abraham is said to have prepared his son for sacrifice here. It is permitted to leave Minâ on the 12th and thus to omit the three ritual stonings still prescribed for this day. It appears that the pilgrims usually take advantage of this permission and so return to Mecca. When they are about to leave the town for good, it is the custom for them to perform at a point called Tan’îm (or their tawdîf) a sort of farewell sacrifice.

The pilgrims take advantage of their presence at Mecca to visit the places which are connected with memories of the Prophet and his family. Those who have performed only the hadidî (ifâda) and who now wish to perform an ‘umra will again assume the ihram at a place called Tan’îm. But it was above all during these days that, until the 17th/18th century, the commercial fair of Mecca reached its height. Finally, a large proportion of the pilgrims make arrangements to go to Medina, either on the way to Mecca or on the return journey, in order to visit the tomb of the Prophet.

The ceremonies briefly described above are the normal ceremonies of the hadidî. There is laid down a series of acts which are to be performed in preparation for the omission of one or another of the secondary rites or for any negligence in performing them. They range from the offering of a sacrificial victim to fasting and the giving of food as alms to the poor. But nobody must fast during the feast days at Minâ, unless for very special reasons which have been examined by the doctors of law.

D. The spiritual significance of the hadidî.

The sermons and discourses given in recent years on Cairo Radio have made it possible to trace in outline the spiritual significance of the pilgrimage as it is regarded today. The primary obligation of the pilgrims is to perform
a monotheistic act of worship; obeying the order of the One God, they come as “guests of God” to visit the “house of God”, towards which Muslims throughout the world turn at each of their five daily prayers. Firstly, the pilgrims are exhorted to make this journey for God alone, to purify themselves of all that could estrange them from God, and to avoid all quarrelling. They are to ask of God pardon for their sins and beseech Him to grant them His mercies. Secondly, the traditional formula of the prayers making the pilgrims especially report that God is One and has no associates. It is thus expressed in the formula of the talbiya [q.v.], and in this invocation which is often repeated at ‘Arafat: “There is no god but the One God, Who has no associates; to Him belongs power, to Him belongs glory. He holds all good in His hands and has power over everything”.

There are many invocations of the same type.

Furthermore, the pilgrim frequently hears preachers telling of the deeds and actions of the Prophet during his last pilgrimage (hajj al-wadd) in the year 10/632. The “descent” of Qur’ān, 5/53 at ‘Arafat and the hajj of the Prophet at this same place are especially emphasized. Moreover, everything reminds the pilgrims of the existence of the Ummah (the Muslim community) and its extent. Sermons and articles are fond of repeating that the pilgrimage is the last important event of the Muslim world. The equality of all Muslims before God, and its symbolization by the uniformity of the ritual garments, are firmly emphasized. Many pilgrims buy for one of the parts of their ihram a piece of cloth large enough to serve later as a shroud—the thought of death and judgement is never far off. The pilgrims are counselled to exercise the social virtues of patience and calmness in the face of the thousand and one little incidents which may arise. Finally, in the town of Mecca itself, which saw formerly the defeat of the polytheists at the hands of the Muslims, there are many reminders of the duty of the Holy War (jihād), in all the forms of hot or cold war which this struggle can assume in our time. The sacrifice at Mina is used nowadays to demonstrate the necessity of sacrifice in the fight for the cause of Islam.

The mercy of God of Abraham is sometimes evoked concerning the sacrifice, but it is more often linked with the Ka’ba and with the pilgrimage in general, for the Qur’ān attributes to Abraham both the building of the sanctuary and the call to the pilgrimage. If the properly performed pilgrimage is rewarded by complete forgiveness of sins (as is taught by Abu Ḥārām b. Muslim), this forgiveness is not linked to any particular rite and certainly not to the slaughter of an animal offered as a sacrifice. The pilgrimage does not include a sacrifice for sin.

As always, the preachers present the ideal state of things; the reality is very much more prosaic. There are all types among the pilgrims, the fervent and the lukewarm, those who are truly pious and those who come out of self-interest or to conform socially. Immediately the period of prohibitions is over, most of them waste no time in returning to the pleasures of life. Until the last century, many of the wealthy pilgrims would buy a concubine slave-girl to take back with them to their country. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that many of the present-day pilgrims who return from the Ḥijāz, and are welcomed home with great celebrations, have a powerful desire to return again to these places which have made an unforgettable impression on them. It is much more difficult to know the exact kind of spiritual influence which is exerted by the pilgrimage. Does it consist primarily of a development of the sense of belonging to a community? Or is it a loftier attachment to other and strictly Muslim values? This is known only to God.

(A. J. Wensinck–J. Jomier)

The social, cultural and economic effects of the Pilgrimage in medieval Islam are of immense importance. Every year, great numbers of Muslims, from all parts of the Islamic world, from many races and from different social strata, left their homes and travelled, often over vast distances, to take part in a common act of worship. These journeys, unlike the mindless collective migrations familiar in ancient and medieval times, are voluntary and individual. Each is a personal act, following a personal decision, and resulting in a wide range of significant personal experience. This degree of physical mobility, without parallel in pre-modern societies, involves important social, intellectual and economic consequences. The pilgrim, if wealthy, may be accompanied by a number of slaves, some of whom he sells on the way—as a kind of traveller’s cheques—to pay the expenses of his journey. If he is a merchant, he may combine his pilgrimage with a business trip, buying and selling commodities in the places through which he travels, and thus learning to know the products, markets, merchants, customs and practices of many lands. If he is a scholar, he may take the opportunity to attend lectures, meet colleagues, and acquire books, thus participating in the diffusion and exchange of knowledge and ideas. The needs of the pilgrimage—the commands of the faith reinforcing the requirements of government and commerce—help to maintain an adequate network of communications between the far-flung Muslim lands; the experience of the pilgrimage gives rise to a rich literature of travel, bringing information about distant places, and a heightened awareness of belonging to a larger whole. This awareness is reinforced by participation in the common ritual and ceremonies of the pilgrimage in Mecca and Medina, and the communion with fellow-Muslims of other lands and peoples. The physical mobility of important groups of people entails a corresponding social, cultural mobility, and a corresponding evolution of institutions. It is instructive to compare the stratified, rigidly hierarchic society and intense local traditions within the comparatively small area of Western Christendom, with the situation in medieval Islam. The Islamic world has its local traditions, often very vigorous; but there is a degree of unity in the civilization of the cities—in values, standards and social customs—that is without parallel in the mediaeval west. 'The Franks' says Rashid al-Dīn 'speak twenty-five languages, and no people understands the language of any other' (Històire des Franses, ed. and trans. R. K. Jahn, Leiden 1951, text 11, trans. 24). It was a natural comment for a Muslim, accustomed to the linguistic unity of the Muslim world, with two or three major languages serving not only as the media of a narrow clerical class, like Latin in Western Europe, but as the effective means of universal communication, supplanting local languages and dialects at all but the lowest levels. The pilgrimage was not the only factor making for cultural unity and social mobility in the Islamic world—but it was certainly an important one, perhaps the most important.

Islamic scholarship provides many examples of the impact of the pilgrimage; the biographies of learned and holy men are full of accounts of formative
meetings and studies in the Holy Cities, on the way there, and on the way back. The wandering scholar is a familiar feature of medieval societies: the pilgrimage ensured that the wanderers met, at a determined time and place. It provided the Islamic world as a whole with a centre and a forum, which contributed greatly to the formation and maintenance of an Islamic consensus—almost, one might say, an Islamic public opinion. The Almoravid and Almohad revolutions in the Maghrib were started by returning pilgrims, made aware through travel of the religious backwardness of their own peoples. Indian pilgrims brought the revived Nakshbandi movement to the Middle East; other Indian pilgrims brought back the stimulus of Wahhabism.

The Almoravids and Almohads of the 12th and 13th centuries established a pattern which was to have a lasting effect on all the communities from which the pilgrims came, through which they travelled, and to which they returned. (B. Lewis)
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asked him to leave his territories; he settled in Dinguiaye, which he fortified and where he pushed forward his preparations for conquest and the holy war by recruiting supporters—whom he called ansār—and by laying in stocks of arms and ammunition; his military commander was Alfa 'Umar, son of the tyerño Baila, whose army was eager to fight for the faith.

He came to blows with the minor chieftian of Yimba who was demanding some small-arms from him, defeated him and seized his territory. Between 1848 and 1854 he conquered the Manding, Tamba Ounde and Bandioungou Kelta chiefs and overran Bourre and Bambouk. At Kolon he defeated a Bambara army from Nioro, and captured Koniaikari, Yeljmane and Nioro in 1854. He overcame Kandia Koulibilah, the last Massassi king of Kaarta, and had him beheaded. His authority at that time extended through the entire territory between Futa Djallon and Hôdh.

Meanwhile, on 21 Dhū 'l-Ka‘da 1268/6 September 1852, after the prayer of the 'Īsha, he heard three times a voice authorizing him to wage holy war. From that moment, “he strove to sweep the country clean and impose Islam”.

His conquests, though rapid, were precarious. As early as 1854 he was obliged to leave Dinguiaye and resume the struggle against the Bambara of Kaarta: the latter were constantly defeated, but continued to revolt. He also fought against the Diawara of Kingi, suffering heavy losses; the kings of Segou and Macina refused to be his allies. In 1855 he made his headquarters at Nioro, and beat off a siege. Under these threats, he launched an attack against Ahmadou Ahmadou, the king of Macina; the Fulani being Muslim, he forced them in order to impose on them the practice of the Tidiani, and won a victory at Kassakeri on 12 August 1856. It was during that period that he established cordial relations with the Moorish shaikh Sī Ahmad al-Bakkāy, the enemy of the Fulani; he warred against the Kassonke and attacked the chiefs of the Bondou and the Futa.

Al-Hadidj 'Umar was an excellent military leader and his campaigns were swift and victorious; pagan prisoners and wounded were put to death and the women and children enslaved; on the other hand, any Muslim enemies who were wounded were bandaged and sent home.

In 1857 the people of Kaarta, fleeing from the war, took refuge in Khasso; the shaikh laid siege to the French fort of Médine which had received the refugees; the town, defended by the half-caste Paul Holl, resisted for three months and finally Faidherbe relieved it.

In 1858 the shaikh fortified Koundián, then invaded the Bondou and the Futa and attacked Matam in 1859; he was repulsed and returned to Nioro; the French took Guéou and relieved the outskirts of Bakel. In 1859 he lost Dimar and Dama, both occupied by the French, while the Futa Toro was slipping away from his domination.

He then tried to move the populations of Futa Toro and Bondou in order to repopulate Kaarta, which had been cleared of its inhabitants; his aim was to bring the loyal populations nearer to Nioro. Despite his great religious prestige, the Toucouleur were reluctant to emigrate; he had villages burnt down to force the people to leave, thereby causing a terrible famine. In 1860 he reconquered the Bambara empire of Segou, which was decimated. At Tio, in January 1861, he defeated the armies of "Ali Diara king of Segou and Ahmadou Ahmadou king of Macina. He took Nyamina, Sansanding and Segou on 10 May 1861; this date marks the Islamization of the Bambara country, whose population henceforth took the five obligations of Islam. Segou was fortified and the Tidiani practice enforced on all.

He conquered Macina in 1861 after a renewed offensive by "Ali Diara and Ahmadou Ahmadou, who were defeated. He suggested to the latter that they should both submit to the judgement of God, on the occasion of a great battle, and on 8 April 1862, when with an army of 50,000 men, he defeated the Fulani who were commanded by Ba Lobbo, after which he crushed a second Fulani army of 50,000 men; Ahmadou Ahmadou was wounded.

In 1862 he seized Hamdallah and had the king beheaded. Macina surrendered; he solemnly designated his son Ahmadou as his successor, and himself took the title of sultan of Macina. The shaikh then took and sacked Timbuctu, but the Kouma Moors of the Bakkâyya allied themselves with the Fulani, who plotted together and besieged him in Hamdallah. The siege lasted for eight months and eventually the town was reduced owing to famine; al-Hadidj 'Umar had it burnt and took refuge among the cliffs of Bandiagara, deserted by his followers, he died mysteriously, probably by blowing up a keg of gunpowder. The date of his death is taken to be 4 Ramadan 1280/12 February 1864. As his heir he left his son Ahmadou al-Kabir al-Madani.

His empire stretched from Macina to Faleme and from Tinkiasso to Sahel, but it fell to pieces sixteen years after his death. His body never having been found, some believed that he would return.

He was regarded as a saint and man of letters; he knew by heart the two Saḥiks, of Muslim and al-Bukhārī, and spent long hours in meditation and prayer before taking his decisions. He had, it is said, received five privileges from God:—he had the power to see God's Messenger, either in dreams or when awake; he knew the unknown "great name" of God; he could read men's hearts; he had God's authorization to direct men spiritually along the right path; he had received God's sanction to wage holy war. In Alhass, he had various visions of the Prophet; he saw another and greater appearance of the shaikh asleep and then awake; he knew the unknown "great name" of God; he could read men's hearts; he had God's authorization to direct men spiritually along the right path; he had received God's sanction to wage holy war. In Alhass, he had various visions of the Prophet; he saw another and greater appearance of the shaikh asleep and then awake; he knew the unknown "great name" of God; he could read men's hearts; he had God's authorization to direct men spiritually along the right path; he had received God's sanction to wage holy war.


[1] J. C. Froelich

AL-HADİDJ B. YUSUF, AL-ḤAKAM B. 'AŠR AL-INJĀDI, ŻΩU, the most famous and most able governor of the Umayyads, of the Ablâf clan of the Banū Thâlîf, born
in Ta'if about 41/661. His forebears, poor and of lowly origin, are said to have earned their living as stone carriers and builders (Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, 'Ikhād, v, 38; Ibn al-Āthīr, Chronicon, iv, 313); his mother, al-‘Ārīfa, also from the tribe of the Banū Thākīf, was the divorced wife of al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ab, a man as capable as he was unscrupulous, who was appointed by Mu’tawwiyah as governor of Kūfah. Already as a child al-Ḥadīdjadī had been given the nickname Kulaayb (‘little dog’), under which he often appears in the satires of the poets (Mubarrad, Kāmil, 290 l.); as a young man he was nicknamed al-‘Ajība (‘a stranger’), a name which was finally settled on him by the poets. Apart from this nothing is known of his youth, and little of the early years of his public life: he does not seem to have distinguished himself in the battles in the Harra of Medina in 63/682 (Ağdānī, xvi, 42) and al-Rabadhah in 65/684 (Tabarî, ii, 579) or as governor of Tabālā in the Tihama (Ibn Kutayba, Ma‘īdī, ed. 'Ukashā, 596).

The change began when al-Ḥadīdjadī, in the first years of the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik, set out from Ta'if to Damascus to serve in the police force (shurta) under ʿAbdū Zūrā Rawb b. Zinbā al-Djūdāmī, the vizier of the caliph. He attracted the attention of ʿAbd al-Malik because he succeeded in a short time in restoring discipline among the mutinous troops with whom the caliph was about to set out for ʿIrāq against Muṣāb b. al-Zubayr. In the drastic means with which he discharged this task there could already be recognized the method which was later to make him famous, indeed notorious. On the campaign against Muṣāb, al-Ḥadīdjadī seems to have led the rearguard and to have distinguished himself by some feats of valour. After the victory over Muṣāb at Masʿīlin on the Dūdayl in 72/691, on the caliph's orders he set out from Kūfah in the same month at the head of about 2000 Syrians against ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, the anti-caliph of Mecca. He advanced unopposed as far as his native Ta'if, which he took without any fighting and used as a base. The caliph had charged him first to negotiate with Ibn al-Zubayr and to assure him of freedom from punishment if he capitulated, but, if the opposition continued, to starve him out by siege, but on no account to let the affair result in bloodshed in the Holy City. Since the negotiations proved unsuccessful, al-Ḥadīdjadī and the anti-caliph began to make the city presentable and to persuade the residents to join them. A sudden thunderstorm, in which the uneasy soldiers detected a warning of Divine punishment, he was able to interpret to them as a promise of victory. After the siege had lasted for seven months and 10,000 men, among them two of Ibn al-Zubayr's sons, had gone over to al-Ḥadīdjadī, the anti-caliph with a few loyal followers, including his youngest son, was killed in the fighting around the Ka'ba, together with the pilgrims there assembled. A sudden thunderstorm, in which the uneasy soldiers detected a warning of Divine punishment, he was able to interpret to them as a promise of victory. After the siege had lasted for seven months and 10,000 men, among them two of Ibn al-Zubayr's sons, had gone over to al-Ḥadīdjadī, the anti-caliph with a few loyal followers, including his youngest son, was killed in the fighting around the Ka'ba (Djumādā 1 i 73/October 692).

Thus the unity of the state was restored, and the year 73 is sometimes called the “Year of Unity” (dām al-qiwmāt, 'Ikhād, v, 33). ʿAbd al-Malik showed himself grateful and conferred on al-Ḥadīdjadī the governorship of the Ḥijāz, the Yemen and the Yamāma. The governor himself led the Pilgrimage in the years 73 and 74 and provided for the re-build-
Al-Hadjjadj B. Yusuf

ing to orders; he pacified each territory as it was conquered, ensured supplies and accustomed his troops gradually to the different climatic conditions. Al-Hadjjadj, with his usual impatience, ordered Ibn al-Ashtath in several offensive letters to advance without delay, and threatened if he did not do so to transfer the command to his brother Ishak. Ibn al-Ashtath left the decision to his chief officers, whom he knew to be opposed to Al-Hadjjadj and to this endless war in distant lands. They gave their allegiance to him, and, with an army which soon grew to 100,000 men, Ibn al-Ashtath marched against Al-Hadjjadj, occupied Kufa and Basra, and, in the suburbs of Basra, besieged the governor, who was again obliged to call Syrian troops to his aid. The Syrian army, under the leadership of two sons of 'Abd al-Malik, was instructed first to negotiate with Ibn al-Ashtath and to hold out to him the prospect of the recall of the hated governor. As he would agree to none of the proposals, the Syrians attacked and defeated him decisively in 82/701 at Dayr al-Djamadijm and at Maskin on the Djudjat; three years later he died by his own hand (Baladhi, Futat, 400; Tabarti, ii, 1155; the chronology of these events is not quite certain).

This was the last revolt of the Arabs of 'Irak. After Al-Hadjjadj had suppressed them and had also pacified the Kurdish and Daylamic brigands (Baladhi, Futat, 133 f.), he was the master of the Syrian East rule over the country. In 83/702 he built midway between Kufa and Basra the fortified town of Wasi, made it his own residence and transferred there the majority of the Syrian troops, ostensibly to protect the inhabitants from encroachments by the Syrians, but in reality to isolate them from the 'Iraki and to bring them firmly under his authority. Al-Hadjjadj was now master of the whole of the Islamic East, with the exception of Kurraisan, where the reigning governor, Yazid b. Muhallab, the son of the famous conqueror, was only very slowly applying himself to the extirpation of the last followers of Ibn al-Ashtath. When he did not obey repeated summonses to Wasi, Al-Hadjjadj finally procured from 'Abd al-Malik his dismissal (83/702; Tabarti, ii, 1140 f.) and imprisoned him.

Although 'Abd al-Malik had now and then restrained the activities of his governor, Al-Walid (86-96/705-15) gave him a free hand in everything and relied on him all the more in that he was indebted to Al-Hadjjadj for his succession to the throne, which Al-Hadjjadj had urged to 'Abd al-Malik against the claims of 'Abd al-Asid b. Marwan (Tabarti, ii, 1156 f.; Alghani, xvi, 60). Also Al-Walid's great victories in the East were the result of Al-Hadjjadj's efforts: Transoxania was conquered by Kutaibah b. Muslim, 'Umar b. Mudjdija b. Sif (cf. H. Klein, Kapitel xxxiii der anonymen arabischen Chronik Kagh al-ghumma al-aclims al-akhir al-umma . . ., thesis, Hamburg 1938, 28), India by Muhammad b. al-Kasim al-Thakafi—three outstanding generals whom Al-Hadjjadj had wisely appointed in view of their abilities. He did not himself take part in the campaigns, but personally, sparing no expense, since he calculated that with victory he would recover his expenses many times over. In domestic affairs also Al-Walid conformed to the wishes of his governor, appointing and dismissing officials at his prompting.

Al-Hadjjadj was now anxious to improve the prosperity of the country, which had suffered terribly from the twenty years of war. This too was his ultimate aim in concerning himself with the production of a uniform tradition of the text of the Kur'an; he wanted on the one hand to put an end to the quarrels of the theologians over the different readings and to produce a single text which the Islamic community should be obliged to use, and on the other hand to pururge this text of any kind of anti-Umayyad allusions. The division of the Kur'an into separate ajzat seems to go back to him (Noldke, Geschichte des Qur'an, iii, 260), and it may have been on his orders that new vowel points were introduced (op. cit., 262). In any case he himself shared the conviction that he had been sponsored to be henceforth the only valid one and forbade most strictly the kirda of Ibn Mas'ud. In connexion with the monetary reform by 'Abd al-Malik in 76/695, Al-Hadjjadj began to strike purely Arabic coins, which gradually superseded the Byzantine and Sasaniid currencies, until then in general commercial use. For this purpose he founded his own mints, first in Kufa and then in Wasi, putting them under the management of a Jew named Sumayr (whence these coins were called al-sumayriyya) and punished most strictly the making of counterfeit coins or even the most trivial faults in production (Ibn al-Athir, iv, 337 f.). Many theologians disapproved of the striking of these coins with the name of God upon them (and hence at first called also al-durrakh al-musthna) for they might fall into the hands of infidels (Baladhi, Futat, 468; Ibn al-Athir, iv, 337).

Yet the new coins strengthened themselves in circulation as legal currency and helped to promote the circulation of money and the stabilization of economic conditions. Al-Hadjjadj caused to be translated into Arabic the tax-djizd which had hitherto been kept in Persian (Baladhi, Futat, 300 f.; cf. also Djahshshiyar, Wasara, Cairo 1357/1938, 38), in order to be able to study the tax registers himself. One of his reforms, however, sat with Al-Hadjjadj's efforts to improve agriculture. Like the Sasaniid kings before him, he was anxious to drain the marshes on the lower Euphrates and Tigris by a system of canals, and thus to obtain fertile land; when embankments broke he spared no cost in repairing them (Baladhi, Futat, 274 and 294). He gave to notorious Arabs, such as Bashshar b. Muslim, a brother of Kutaibah, uncultivated lands as fiefs (Baladhi, Futat, 362). He took further new steps against the migration of countrypeople into the towns which had led to a disastrous reduction in the kharjadi, and forced the newly converted Muslims to return to the fields which they had left and to continue paying the kharjadi. When the farmers of the Sawad complained to Al-Hadjjadj about the depopulation of the land—a result of the many wars—he is said to have forbidden them to slaughter cattle in order to preserve the animals for ploughing (on this see the two satirical verses in Alghani, xv, 98).

Al-Hadjjadj was the most loyal servant that a dynasty could wish for. His obedience towards the Umayyads and his willingness to serve them were unbounded, and the caliphs repaid him for this with their unstinted favour. 'Abd al-Malik, it is true, often urged him to practice restraint, for instance when he was charged with the too liberal in the raising of taxes, was too liberal with public resources, or was shedding more blood than was necessary. But in his answers, often pointed by verses composed by himself or others, Al-Hadjjadj was always able to give practical reasons for his actions, so that no mistrust on the part of the caliph ever resulted. The books of adab provide a large number of examples of this correspondence. The caliph and the governor were dependent on each other.
The latter's occasional journeys to Damascus strengthened the relationship, which was a personal as well as an official one: one of al-Hadjijdjād's nieces—the daughter of his brother Muhammad, who under 'Abd al-Malik was governor in the Yemen—was married to a son of 'Abd al-Malik, the later caliph Yazld II; the first son of this marriage was named al-Hadjijdjād in honour of the governor ('Tabi, iv, 452; Ibn Kutayba, Maṭrīf, 390). The governor for his part named his first three sons after members of the Umayyad house, while his daughter named al-Hadjjdjadj in honour of the governor. His relations with al-Walid seem on the other hand to have been of a more formally correct nature; the relevant correspondence is limited to purely administrative affairs. Al-Hadjijdjād feared nothing so much as the death of al-Walid and the accession of Sulaymān, whom he had made his implacable enemy because of his interference in the question of the succession to the throne; add to this his measures against Yazld b. al-Muawahih, who was Sulaymān's especial protegé. It was thus his anxious wish not to outlive al-Walid (Tabari, ii, 1272). This wish was fulfilled: he died one year before al-Walid in Ramadan 95/June 714, only 52 years old, prematurely aged and worn out by the load of strain, danger and disappointment which he had had to bear, and was buried in Wāsiṭ. The cause of death is said to have been cancer of the stomach (wakā'it fi ḥamāshī 'l-nikla: Mas'ūdī, Prairies, v, 377; Ibn Kathir, i, 347, according to Barhebraeus, Ta'rifk muḥtasaṣ al-dawdaw, ed. Šāhāni, Beirut 1890, 395, he died of consumption). The traces of his grave were obliterated in order to preserve it from profanation. His death was mourned by only a few, chief among whom were al-Walid, the poet Djarīr (Nakabīd Djarīr wa'l-Farazdāda, ed. Bevan, 486 f., cf. 496), and also Khālid al-Kasri, the governor of Mecca ('Tabi, v, 30 f.); above all Yazld b. Abi Muslim, al-Hadjjdjād's mansūd, and later governor of Ifríqiyah, dared to call Sulaymān's attention to the merits of the deceased (Mas'ūdī, Prairies, v, 404-6).

Scarcely any figure of the early period of Islam has become the subject of Arabic literature to such an extent as al-Hadjjdjād. He was a man of many stories and verses in which are reflected the arguments for and against him are innumerable. Most of them are pungent anecdotes and allow us to understand exceptionally clearly the traits of his character. The 'Abbasids remembered him with hatred, but in reality envied the Umayyads this governor. There is no doubt that in the interests of the state al-Hadjjdjād could be stern and pitiless; every kind of obstinacy was in his eyes a crime against the State. But the mass executions and other atrocities which were attributed to him are the inventions of his enemies. He is often, and justly, compared with Ziyād b. Abihi, Muṣawwira's governor: "They both considered themselves not as holders of a lucrative sinecure, but as representatives of public order and of the Sultan, and repaid the trust of their sovereigns, who granted them great authority and left them in office until the end of their lives, by faithfully fulfilling their duties, unconcerned whether or not they found favour with public opinion" (Wellinghausen, Reich, 159; cf. English tr. The Arab Kingdom, 254).

That al-Hadjjdjād did in fact have such a conception of his position can be gathered from his own words which are recorded by al-Muqaddasi b. Zakariyyā al-Nahrawānī (d. 390/1000) in Kitāb al-Djālīs al-sālik al-hāfī wa'l-anis al-nāṣih al-maṣīh, Ms Istanbul, Topkapsarayi, Ahmed III 3231, fol. 44a. When, after the death of Ibn al-Aswād, there was peace in Ifrīk and al-Hadjjdjād rewarded the Kaysis richly for their support, 'Abd al-Malik wrote to him that he must be less generous with public funds. Al-Hadjjdjād replied to the caliph with the following verses:

"By my life! The messenger has brought the pages written by you which, after dictation, were folded and sealed.

It is a letter which contains both gentle and harsh things and in which I have been admonished—admonishments are always useful to men of understanding.

Many misfortunes betell me, for this I shall now supply explanations and also reasons and thus justify myself.

When I was a punishing scourge for the people without seeking personal advantage thereby,

—whether they were pleased or angry about this, whether I was praised or blamed or even abused by them—

(and when) in a country into which I came, on my arrival the fires of enmity blazed everywhere,

then I have endured of all that is known to you and fought unceasingly, until death had almost overcome me!

You have heard how many tumults there have been there, and if another than I had been (there), he would have perished from terror.

Always when they wished to commit one of their unhappy deeds, I have proffered my head without disguising myself,

and if brave men (i.e. the Kaysis) had not defended me against them, jackals and hyenas would have shared out my limbs!"

On the strength of this justification—which tersely outlines the whole of al-Hadjjdjād's achievement—the caliph could only write: "Act as you think proper!"

Al-Hadjjdjād's assurance and precision in administration, his firmness and knowledge of men, and his quick instinctive grasp in critical moments must have seemed somewhat sinister to his contemporaries. The fact that he did not tolerate bribery and punished the unlawful acquisition of riches, must have made him thoroughly hated by a civil service in which both were traditional. His chief faults were impatience and lack of self-control; he lacked the balance (ḥilm) which had earlier distinguished Muṣawwira. Thus he sometimes demanded the impossible from those under his command, and had fits of rage if his orders were not carried out quickly enough. Nevertheless al-Hadjjdjād was a highly cultivated man: his eloquence was well known, and if brave men (i.e. the Kaysis) had not defended me against them, jackals and hyenas would have shared out my limbs!"

The unprejudiced judge sees in al-Hadjjdjād one of the greatest statesmen, not only of the Umayyads, but of the whole Islamic world.
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AL-HADJDJADJ, b. YUSUF b. MATAR AL-HASIB, a translator who lived in Baghdad in the late 2nd/8th and early 3rd/9th centuries. His translations include the Elements of Euclid (revised by Thabit b. Kura and commented by al-Nayrî [qq.v.]) and a version, from a Syracusan text, of the Astronomy of Ptolemy. The latter, called K. al-Madjisiti, was completed in 521/1128-9.
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HADJDJI BAYRAM WALI (? 753/1352-833/1429-30), patron saint of Ankara and founder of the order of the Bayrâmiyya [q.v.], was born at the

village of Sosfallas, 7 km. north-east of Ankara, the son of a certain Koyunlûcû Ahmed; his personal name was Nu'mân. After studying at Ankara and Bursa, he taught at the Kara Medrese at Ankara, but abandoned teaching to become a follower of Shaykh Hâmid (on whom see Shâbîl, tr. Medjdî, 77 f. = tr. Rescher, 29 f.) to join him at Kayseri (they are said to have met on Kûrbân bayramî, whence he was given the name Bayrâm); as his mûrid he accompanied him to Syria, thence on the Pilgrimage, and back to Akseray. After his master’s death (in 805/1402, according to Mustâkimzâde, see A. Gûlbahârî, Mandik-i HasBayram Çeşmesi ... , Istanbul 1938, 120) he returned to his native Ankara, where he gathered a following: among his disciples are counted Âk Shams al-Din (q.v. and Dede ‘Umar Sikkini (heads of the two branches into which, after his death, his order split), the poet Shaykhî [q.v.], the brothers Yazîdî-oghlu Muhammed and Ahmed Bîdîn [q.v.], and Ashraf-oghlu Rûmi, author of the Musasikî al-nuwasî, who became his son-in-law. In spite of the extremist tendencies of some of his followers, his own teachings did not exceed the bounds permitted by orthodoxy; he seems to have lived a humble life, supporting himself by manual labour, and practising and encouraging works of charity. His activities are said to have aroused the suspicions of Murdî II, which were, however, allayed when he was brought before the Sultan at Edirne; a tradition that he had preached in the Eski Djami there is reported by Ewliyâ (ii, 437; iii, 430 f.). He was buried in a türbe beside the mosque, abutting on the Temple of Augustus, which he founded. Assigned to Hâdjidî Bayram are five poems (fullest text given by Okhan, see Bibl.), much commented on by his followers, in the style of the ilahîs of Yûnus Emre.

The current attribution of the mosque to Mi'mâr Sinân (presumably based on Ewliyâ, ii, 430) is unjustified (see F. Taeschner’s brief description in ZDMG, lxxii, 1928, 108); the only inscriptions (Ger. tr. by P. Wittek in M. Schede and H. St. Schultz, Ankara und Augustus, Berlin 1937, 45-6, and cf. 36-41) record a repair in 1126/1714 (the inscription published by Mübârek Ghalib, Ankara, ii, 1928, p. 41, no. 82, has no connexion with the mosque). In the Ankara Etnografya Müzesi are preserved clothes allegedly worn by Hadidji Bayram, and the wooden doors (photograph in Yıldız Anıtmaar Dergisi [Ank. Ünl. Ihatiyat Fak.], i, 1956, 231) and shutters of the türbe (restored in 1947).

Bibliography: No critical study of the life of Hâdjidî Bayram has been published. The available sources (many in MS) are listed by M. F. Körprüli, Ikc mualasazvîlar, Istanbul 1918, 577, n. 2; some of these have been used for the monographs of Bursall Mehmed Tahir (Hâdjidî Bayram Welî, Istanbul 1329, reprinted 1331), Mebmed Ali ‘Aynî (same title, Istanbul 1343) and Mehmet Ali Okhan (Haci Bâyram Veli, Istanbul 1950). See also Tâşköprüzade, Şakâtî, tr. Medjdî, 77 = tr. Rescher, 31; B. M. Tâhi, ‘Olm, i, 56-7; Abdubakî [Golpinarî], Melâditik ve Melâdimler, Istanbul 1931, 33-9; D. Krencker and M. Schede, Der Tempel in Ankara, Berlin and Leipzig 1936, 60-1 (P. Wittek); for the political and social context of Hâdjidî Bayram’s movement see P. Wittek, De la défense d’Ankara ..., in REI, xii (1938), 3-34. (V. L. MÂNEGE)
the Giray dynasty of Khan of the Crimea. On his coins he calls himself 'al-Sultan Hadidji Kerey b. Ghiyath al-Din Khan' (see O. Retovsky, Die Münzen der Giray, Moscow 1905, nos. 1-44); according to Abu 'l-Hasan Baha-oddin (see K. Nüüs, Türkler ve Şairler, Trabzon 1967, 226 ed. Solgağ Nür, Istanbul 1925, 184) his father and grandfather were Ghiyath al-Din and Tash-timur respectively (cf. M. Rıûja, al-Sab'i al-sayıyar, 69-71). The identification of him with Dewlet-berdi (V. D. Smirnov, Krımşo khanıstw...), St. Petersburg 1887, 221-34) seems incorrect. Dewlet-berdi (for a coin of his see Lane-Poole, Cat., vi, no. 568) appears in one source (C. L. R. W. Heyd, ii, 399, 400;) as the brother of Ghiyath al-Din; he was still ruling as khan at Solgağh (Eski-Kırımln in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 832/August 1249 (N. Iorga, Notes et extraits...), i, 25; see further Spuler, Horde, 157). According to Polish sources (Spuler, loc. cit.), Hadidji Giray was born near Troki in Lithuania and was assisted in assuming the khanate by Vitovt (Witold, 1430); it is known that the Grand Dukes of Lithuania gave sanctuary to Toktamish and to Hadidji Giray and his successors, and assisted them against the khans dwelling at Saray and supported by the powerful amir Edidij (M. Khrushevskiy, Istoriya Ukrainy-Rossii, iv, Lvow 1907), and this same policy was to assist Hadidji Giray in occupying the Crimea and maintaining himself there. One of the main factors facilitating the rise of an independent khanate in the Crimea under Hadidji Giray was, according to the native sources (al-Sab'i al-sayıyar, 69-71; 'Umdat al-tawdrikh, 94-6), the movement westward, over the northern coasts of the Black Sea and into the Crimean peninsula, of the principal tribes—the Shirin, Konghurat and Barın—upon whose support the rulers of the Golden Horde relied. With their help, Dewlet-berdi and Ulugh-Muhammed attempted to seize control of the whole territory of the Golden Horde; but Hadidji Giray was at attempt to centralize his authority in the Crimea and its immediate neighbourhood, being greatly assisted by Tekine Mırza, the leader of the Shirin and the rival of Edidij's descendants. This much is definite, that in 836/1433 and 837/1434 Hadidji Giray, as Khan, was fighting with the Genoese of Kefe (Spuler, op. cit., 136) shows that the town held out; Hadidji Giray withdrew, agreeing to accept in future the annual tribute of 1200 gold pieces which the Genoese had earlier taken to pay. Later, it seems, the Genoese succeeded in turning the tribal leaders of the Crimea against Hadidji Giray; they deposed him and made his son Haydar khan in his place (600/1456). After a few months Haydar was obliged to flee and Hadidji Giray resumed power; from thenceforward he had good relations with the Genoese (Colli, op. cit., 120-1; W. Heyd, Hist. du commerce du Levant, ii, 398). Confronted by the efforts of Seyyid Ahmed Khan to restore the former power and unity of the Golden Horde, Hadidji Giray maintained the old alliance with Lithuania and Poland, who were faced by the same threat, and also acted in concert with the grand prince of Moscov (Spuler, 170-2). He thus played an important part in the fragmentation of the Golden Horde. When Sayyid Ahmed marched on Moscov in Muharram 870/July-August 1465, Hadidji Giray attacked him near the Don and obliged him to withdraw. The attempt of the Papacy to use him against the Ottomans (H. H. Howorth, History of the Mongols, ii, 451) failed that he at this time one of the most formidable figures in Eastern Europe. His yarlıg of 26 Safar 857/8 March 1453 gives important details about the extent of his territories: his capital (Ordu-i muazzam, Saray) was at that time Kırımlı, Kefe, Kerê, Taman, Kabadâ, and Kickaç. The tribal forces of the Crimea, the Kırımlı tarmâ (6000-7000 men), were under the command of the khan of the Shirin, Mırza; the tribes folk of the Daş-tî Kickaç were not to be relied on. Coins of his, struck at Kırımlı in 845, 847, 857, and 871, and at Kırk-yır in 847, 858 and 867, are known (see Retovsky, Markov, Lane-Poole, op. cit.). Pero Tafur's description, of 841/1437, of the Ordu-basar near Solgağh (Travels and adventures, ed. M. Leets, New York and London 1926, 136) shows that he maintained the traditions of nomadic life; but Kickaç was a powerful fortress. Hadidji Giray died towards the end of the summer of 871/1466 (Heyd, ii, 398; al-Sab'i al-sàyyar, 73), and was buried in the tomb of his ancestors at Saladjik near Baghcesaray (Simferopol). He had eight sons: Dewlet-yär, Nûr-dewlet Kân, Haydar Kân, Kuthuk-zamân, Kildîsh, Mingî Giray Kân [q.v.],
HADJDJI GIRAY — HADJIB

Bibliography: In the article. See also giray.

HADJDJI KHALIFA [see KATTIB ELLEMI].

HADJDJI NASIM OGHLU [see AL-NSARJ].

HADJDJI PASHA, Djalal Al-Din Khidr B. 'Ati, eminent 8th/14th century Turkish physician and author of several important medical texts, including the famous Shifd* al-asfidi wa dawd* al-daldm (Brockelmann, II, 233; Haddji Khalifa, ii, 1949). He was also an outstanding minister of the 8th/14th century in Konya (and not Aydin, as stated by Tsag'skopr-bud, Shakhd* al-nu'mdniyya, stated by Tashkoprii-zade, dldm including the famous Shifd* al-asfidi wa dawd* al-daldm al-fifd* al-ma'mdniyya, in marg. of Ibn Khallikân, Cairo 1310, 114; Turkish trans. by Medjili, Istanbul 1269, 74), whence he went to Cairo to study under Mubârak Shâh al-Mantshed and Akmal Al-Din Bârbart. As the result of an illness, he changed his studies from fifch to medicine, and his abilities were great enough to secure for him later the position of chief physician in the Manşurîyya hospital. Early in the last quarter of the 8th/14th century he returned to Anatolia, where he served both as physician and as haddiib, and it was to 'Asâ b. Muhammad b. Aydân that he dedicated his Shifd* (783/1381). His death occurred in the 20's of the 9th/15th century, and he is buried in Birgi.

His works, most of which are in Arabic, include philosophy, mysticism and Kur'anic exegesis, but it is his medical writings which have assured his fame. However, even the scholars who would most insist on his importance in the history of Turkish medicine can claim little originality for his work, and it is probably his Turkish abridgments and simplifications of the Shifd*—known as the Muniahd* and the Tashîl—which most command interest today, being amongst the earliest specimens of Ottoman didactic prose. Both have been used and quoted extensively in Vol. ii of the historical dictionary (Tansklariyle Tarama Sozlug) published by the Turkish Linguistic Society.

Bibliography: A. Süheyl Ünver, Hekim Konyalı Haci Paşa, hayat ve eserleri, Istanbul 1953; Abdülhak Adnan-Adivar, Osmanlî Türklerinde Ilim, Istanbul 1943, index; 1A, fasc. 59, 290 (Istanbul 1961); A. Shopov, Hâdmâ, term which may be translated approximately as chamberlain, used in Muslim countries for the person responsible for guarding the door of access to the ruler, so that only approved visitors may approach him. The term quickly became a title corresponding to a position in the court and to an office the exact nature of which varied considerably in different regions and in different periods. Basically the Master of Ceremonies, the haddiib often appears as being in fact a superintendent of the Palace, a chief of the guard or a righter of wrongs, sometimes even as a chief minister or a head of government. The word haddiib itself is derived from the verb haddaba “to prevent”, and should be considered in conjunction with the term haddiib which, together with sitr, is used about the period of the Mawardi, who sometimes managed to procure the haddiib, as he found himself occupying the highest position when the caliph decided to dispense with a vizier.

During the reign of this caliph the authority of the chamberlain had diminished somewhat compared with that of the wazir who, with a staff of highly specialized kutdab, had become in fact a head of government. He was rivalled also by the amir who, at this period, was the commander in chief of the army. Yet his influence was not negligible, becoming apparent particularly when there were palace revolutions, for he had directly under his orders certain lâhâmets of the guard, notably the Masâfîyya. Thus the attitude of the chamberlain was determined by the unsuccessful coup d'état against al-Mukhtadâr in 296/908.

During the reign of this caliph another chamberlain, Nasr Al-Kushuri, who held office continuously from 296/908 until 317/929, was regarded with particular esteem, having been appointed vizier by al-Mukhtadâr, and then by al-Mustasîf, who governed the empire between the caliphs al-Hadi and al-Mustasîf. Thus the attitude of the chamberlain was determined by the unsuccessful coup d'état against al-Mukhtadâr in 296/908.

The regime of this caliph another chamberlain, Nasr Al-Kushuri, who held office continuously from 296/908 until 317/929, was regarded with particular esteem, having been appointed vizier by al-Mukhtadâr, and then by al-Mustasîf, who governed the empire between the caliphs al-Hadi and al-Mustasîf. Thus the attitude of the chamberlain was determined by the unsuccessful coup d'état against al-Mukhtadâr in 296/908.

Beginning of the Umayyad period. Certain chroniclers list carefully the names of the persons, nearly all of them who were chamberlains to the first caliphs, from the reign of Mu'âwiya onwards; various texts prove that even at that time palace ceremonial was already developed, so the importance of the haddiib can readily be understood. The chamberlain not only introduced into the sovereign's presence friends and visitors; his duty was also to supervise the organization of the solemn audiences, at which these persons formed three groups: on either side of the hall, leaving the centre of the floor vacant for those who were admitted to address the caliph. At this period the haddiib figures in the caliph's entourage on a level with the secretaries (kutdab), with no pretension to equality in dignity.
From 317/929 onwards, however, the year of another unsuccessful coup d'état against al-Muktadir, the Ḥādījīb’s post assumed more of a military aspect and the chamberlains became rivals of the amīrs who by now had succeeded in gradually supplanting the viziers and in imposing their authority on the caliph. The new chamberlain, an officer and former governor named Ẓākūt, was for some time able to hold his own with the all-powerful Muʿnis and to have his own son appointed Prefect of the Police. But both father and son were dismissed soon afterwards at the demand of Muʿnis and his associates; thus the office of Ḥādījīb passed from the Samanids to the Umayyad empire in Spain the princelings of the Buyids to the same extent as in the more central- and the bureaucrats of the Samanids were modelled on those of the Abbasid Caliphate. The new chamberlain of al-Irāq, Ibn Ẓākūt, who was at the same time amīr, took over the government and controlled the viziers. The chamberlains were on the point of becoming the real masters of the State, at this period when the authority of the caliph was becoming daily weaker; but they did not enjoy so great financial resources as the provincial governors, to whom they were obliged to yield place. It is for this reason that the caliph finally selected, as the person entrusted with the task of government, the amīr Ibn Ṣūr’s, who received the title amīr al-umarā in 324/936. As a compensation, the chamberlain’s title was made more exalted: in 326/938 he became Ḥādījīb al-Hudjīdā, a more impressive title, although the number of Ḥudjīdā under him was decreased.

At this period, as appears from the statements of Ḥillāl al-Ṣāḥībī, the official duties of the chamberlain were still to supervise all the persons concerned with the service or the guard of the sovereign, to control all that went on within the palace, and to organize the audiences, determining precisely the positions of the various dignitaries and courtiers (lābīr al-bawāṣīq).

ii.—SPAIN.

In Muslim Spain the position of the Ḥādījīb was very different from what it was in the East. In the amīrat, and later the caliphate, of Cordova, the title of Ḥādījīb was always superior to that of wasir, the latter belonging to mere counsellors of divers origins, whose the ruler gathered around him and from among whom, almost invariably, he chose the Ḥādījīb. The Ḥādījīb assisted the prince in the tasks of administration and government and acted as chief minister, controlling the three services of the civil administration, namely the royal residence, the chancellery and the financial department. The Ḥudjīdā did indeed remain vacant for some thirty years in the reign of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III, but it was filled again, on his death in 333/946, by his son al-Ḥakam II; a few years later it served as a spring-board for the ambitions of Ibn Abī ʿAmīr, the Arab-born secretary who in 352/967 procured for himself appointment to the Ḥudjīdā and managed to gather all power in his hands, becoming, in the reign of the young Hīṣām II, in effect “Mayor of the Palace”; in 371/981 he adopted a royal lābīr, al-Manṣūr ibn ʿIlāḥ, caused his name to be mentioned in the khutba immediately after that of the caliph, and then in 386/996 had himself called al-sayyid and al-malik al-khārim. The prestige thus attached to the title of Ḥudjīdā did not disappear, for with the break-up of the Mayyad empire in Spain the princelings of the Ḥudjīdā adopted the title of Ḥudjīdā in preference to that of malik, in order to indicate that they regarded themselves as representatives of the caliph.
the Ghaznavids, their successors in Khurasan, and Bayhaqī's 
Tārīkh-i Mas'ūdī shows the wide extent of its usage in 
Ghaznavid military life. As with the Sāmānids, the Commander-in-Chief of the army 
under the Sultan held the title of Ḥādjīb-i Buzurg, 
and there were ḥāджībīs, generals, directly beneath 
him. These top commanders had the special desig-
nation of a black cloak, a distinctive type of belt and a 
two-pointed cap (kulāh-i dādshākh). The majority 
of them were Turks. It seems that the Ghaznavid 
Ḥādjīb-i Buzurg, compared with the Sāmānī one, 
was one step further away from possessing direct 
control over the palace organization, for the day-to-
day running of this was in the hands of a Wākhī-
i ḥāфесс and the palace guard was responsible to a 
special general officer, the Sālārī-i Ghuldāmīn-i Sarāy (see Bosworth, The Ghaznavids: their empire in 
Afghanistan and eastern Iran 994-1040, 68, 101, 138). 
He was nevertheless a most powerful and influential 
figure. In the succession dispute of 421/1030 after 
Mahmūd's death, the Ḥādjīb-i Buzurg was 'All 
Kālsī or 'All Khāṣḥawī, a kinsman of the dead 
Sultan, and it was the transfer of his support from 
Mahmūd to Mas'ūd that gave the latter a bloodless 
victory over his brother (Gardīzlī, ed. Nāẓim, 92-3; 
Bayhaqī, ed. Ghani and Fayyād, 1, 12 ff., 50 ff.). 
When the Sultan did not act personally as war-
leader, the Ḥādjīb-i Buzurg had supreme responsi-
ability in the field; thus until just before the final 
disaster at Dandānḵān in 431/1040, Mas'ūd left the 
fighting in Khurāsān against the incoming Saljuqs 
to his Commander-in-Chief, Sībāṣhī Tīgin.

In the Sāḷḏūq period, there appears to have 
been a general tendency for the importance of the 
office of Ḥādjīb to decline, relative to Ghaznavid 
times. He was no longer specifically the commander 
of the army but rather a court official. The various 
army commanders tended to be referred to by the 
title ṣafāḥsār or ṣipāšārān. The ḥāʤīb, however, 
was the senior commander of the military expeditions and in some cases commanded 
a section of the army of one of the Sāḷḏūq sultans 
or maḥk. Thus, for example, 'All b. 'Umar, the ḥāʤīb 
of Mahmūd b. Mahmūd, led the advance guard against 
Ṣangīr ( Ibn al-ʿĀbīr, x, 386); he eventually became paymaster of the army ( ibid., x, 391).

Rāwandi, quoting the alleged practice of the 
Sāmānīan Ardashīr b. Bābāk, states (p. 97) that a 
king needed a waṣīr for the maintenance of the 
stability of his kingdom, a ḥāʤīb who would ad-
minister punishment (ṣiyāsāt ʿafāyād), a courtier 
(nadīm) and a secretary (dābīr). Nīẓām al-Mulk 
describes the functions of the ḥāʤīb as those of a 
court official. But since the court was a military 
court, the ḥāʤīb was, in practice, normally 
a Turkmen and the men under him were usually 
ṣūlāms (military slaves, see ṣūlām; cf. ʿSiyāsā-
nāma, 94-5, and the description of Sāmānī practice 
cited above). He was concerned with military 
discipline as well as court ceremonial; he was the 
most important official at the court, ranking above 
the amīr ḫaras (chief of the guard and chief execu-
tioner, ibid., 121). Under Mahmūd b. Malikshāh 
the amīr ḥāʤīb acted as intermediary between the 
sultan and the waṣīr; he received the orders of the 
sultan and passed them on to the waṣīr (Bundārī, 
117). Nīẓām al-Mulk also mentions an official 
whom he calls the ḥāʤīb-i dārgah, who was in 
charge of ceremony and procedure at the royal court 
(ibid., 111). It is not clear whether his office was 
different from that of the amīr ḥāʤīb; but it is 
probable that the two were the same.

Rāwandi mentions at the beginning of each reign 
the waṣīrs and ḥāʤībīs of the sultan. Some of these 
were comparatively unknown persons; others, 
however, like the amīr Komaḵ, ḥāʤīb to Malikshāh 
and Barkyārūk (pp. 125, 139), Khāḥ Beg, the ḥāʤīb 
of Mas'ūd b. Mahmūd (p. 225) and Malikshāh b. 
Mahmūd (p. 249), 'Abd al-Rāmahī b. Ṭogḥān-
yūrēk(?) , also ḥāʤīb to Mas'ūd (p. 225), the atābāq 
Ayyāz b. ḥāʤīb to Mahmūd b. Mahmūd (p. 259) and 
Arlān b. Ṭoghrīl (p. 252), the atābāq Pahlavān, 
ḥāʤīb to Arslān b. Ṭoghrīl (p. 282), and the atābāq 
Ay Ḫāṣaḥ b. Ṭoghrīl b. Arslān (p. 332) were 
among the powerful of the day. There does not 
appear to have been any hereditary tendency in 
the office, and Rāwandi records only one case of a father 
and son both holding the office of ḥāʤīb, namely 
ʿAll Bār, who was ḥāʤīb to Muhammad b. Malikshāh, 
and his son Muhammad, who was ḥāʤīb to Mahmūd 
b. Mahmūd (pp. 153, 203). In addition to the 
amīr ḥāʤīb, there were a number of lesser chamber-
lains (ḥāʤībīs) at the court (cf. H. Horst, Die 
Staatsverwaltung der Gross-Seljuqs und Ixoramsahs 
(1000-1122), Wiesbaden 1964, 103, 105).

The great amīrs and provincial governors had 
their own courts and they, too, had their ḥāʤībīs. 
Ibn al-ʿĀbīr mentions Ṣaiḥāl b. Din Mahmūd al-
Yaghṣīyān(?) , who was amīr ḥāʤīb to al-Bursukī 
and subsequently to ʿĪmād al-Dīn Zanī (x, 453, 454). 
Many prominent men also had their ḥāʤībīs or 
chamberlains (ḥāʤībīs) at the court (cf. K. K. 
Rhoads, Iran, Ghazna, Pahlavan, Ayyaz, Hacib, 
39i). Under the Ilkans the ḥāʤīb was a chamber-
lain, and so far as the royal court or the provincial 
courts were concerned tended to be a member of the 
military class; this was also the case in Timurid 
times (cf. H. F. Roemer, Staatsgeschichte der Timu-
ridenzeit, Wiesbaden 1952, 42, 55).

Under the Ikhwāns the ḥāʤīb was a chamber-
lain, and so far as the royal court or the provincial 
courts were concerned tended to be a member of the 
military classes. Under the Timurids the 
ḥūḍībīs are mentioned among the officials of 
the court and the provincial administrations 
and he himself is occasionally referred to as the 
ḥūḍīb al-diwan, the chief of ceremonies (Tādī 
al-Salāmān, Sams al-ḥusn, ed. Roemer, Wies-
baden 1956, 29). There was a change of terminology 
der the Safawīs, the chief ḥāʤīb becoming known as the ḥūḍīb al-diwan (q.v.), whose 
functions were similar to those of the ḥāʤīb-i ḥud[db discussed above. Under the 
Ṣafawīs, the chief ḥāʤīb became known as the ḥūḍīb al-diwan (q.v.), whose 
functions were similar to those of the ḥāʤīb-i ḥud[db discussed above. Under the 
Ṣafawīs, the chief ḥāʤīb became known as the ḥūḍīb al-diwan (q.v.), whose 
functions were similar to those of the ḥāʤīb-i ḥud[db discussed above. Under the
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IV. — EGYPT AND SYRIA.

The chief chamberlain of the Fāṭimid court was an 
exalted functionary known as the Ṣāḥib al-bāb 
(q.v.); his subordinates, however, were called ḥāʤībīs, 
and he himself is occasionally referred to as the 
ḥāʤīb al-hud[db, in place of his more usual title. 
In describing the officers required for the Fāṭimid 
chancery, Ibn al-Ṣaṣṣrāf (Kūmān dīwān al-rashīdī, 
117) speaks of a ḥāʤīb al-diwan, whose duty was to 
keep unauthorized visitors and thus safeguard 
the secrets of the state. The Seldjūk rulers of Syria 
introduced the military ḥāʤīb familiar in the East; 
Zangī and Ayyūbīd institutions, in this as in other 
respects, show strong signs of Ṣeldjūk influence. 
The ḥāʤīb is now a military officer, with military func-
tions—as for example to command a citadel (Abū
In the Mamluk Sultanate, the ḥādjīb still retains some of the functions of a chamberlain. The chief ḥādjīb—ḥādjīb al-faddiḥīb—presents envoys, guests, petitioners and other callers at the Sultan's court; he is also responsible for the organization of military parades. The primary functions of the ḥādjībūn under the Mamluks, however, were not ceremonial but judicial—the administration of justice among members of the Mamluk military class, in accordance with the laws of the Mongol Yasa [q.v.]. According to some Egyptian sources, this separate jurisdiction was set up in the time of Baybars, when the Mamluks and their allies—mainly the Syro-Egyptian state and, though Islamized, insisted on following Mongol custom in personal matters. "They therefore set up the ḥādjībūn," says Makrizī, "to adjudicate disputes between them, to restrain the strong among them and give justice to the weak, in accordance with the rules of the yasa. They also assigned to him . . . disputes concerning ḥādjīb's [q.v.] . . ." (Ḳhitāf, ii, 221; cf. Ibn Ṭabgḥībīrī, Cairo, vii, 182 ff.). The ḥādjībūn thus maintained a form of feudal privilege, whereby the Mamluks had immunity from the courts and laws to which the natives were subject—that is, the ḥādjīb's courts administering the Şarīʿa, and were answerable only to special military courts, with Mamluk not native judges, administering the yasa—the laws of the most powerful and most respected of the steppe peoples, among which most of the Mamluks were recruited. These special courts dealt with matters concerning members of the Mamluk class, including lawsuits about their fiefs.

In time, the scope and scale of the chief ṣamāʾū's judicial actions were considerably increased. At first, he was subordinate to the Sultan's viceroy in Egypt, the Nayīb al-saltāna [q.v.], but gained greatly in power when this office was left vacant or, later, allowed to his Mamluk called ḫālib al-saltāna. Islamic judicial authority by the ṣamāʾūn from the mid 8th/14th century. Sultan Shāh Ḫūn (746-7/1345-6) transferred the judicial power previously exercised by the Nayīb al-saltāna to the chief ṣamāʾū, who thus became head of an independent court dispensing administrative (ṣiyāṭ) justice. During the reign of Ḥādjīb Šama, Rawdatayn, ii, 69), to act as Shīfiynā (Ibn al-Kalanisi, 208, 224, 234) or, sometimes, as envoy (Ibn al-Kalanisi, 232; Makrizī, Suluk, i, 4). The term ṣamāʾū was still, however, used in Egypt in the 7th/13th century in the sense of chamberlain (as for example in a verse of Ibn al-Nabī, d. 686/1287, who links it with the Persian term pārdaḏār [q.v.]; cited in Eos, ed. A. T. Hatto, The Hague 1965, 271).

The Muslim sources complain of the encroachments of the ṣamāʾū, who dealt with cases involving native civilians, and even presume to give rulings according to Muslim law. Many litigants preferred the more expeditious and better enforced decisions of the ṣamāʾū to those of the ḥādjīb, while the ṣamāʾū for his part had a financial interest in dealing with more cases. Makrizī speaks of Mamluk āmīrs who held no fief but lived entirely on fees and fines which they collected as judges. "Today the ṣamāʾū has come to be the judge of the mighty and the humble alike, whether the case be one of ḍharti or of what they call administrative (ṣiyāṭ) justice" (Ḳhitāf, ii, 219-20).

At first there were three senior officers at the centre: the ṣamāʾū al-faddiḥīb, the Ṣamāʾū, and the ṣamāʾū ḥāmi; Barʿūk increased the number to five. The position of the chief ṣamāʾū in the table of precedence varies, at different times and in different sources, from the 3rd to the 12th place after the Sultan. The chief ṣamāʾū (amīr ṣamāʾū) of a prescribed city, third, and sometimes second, after the governor, whom he could replace in an emergency. Subordinate ṣamāʾūn served under him, in varying numbers. In Damascus, Aleppo and sometimes Tripoli the chief ṣamāʾū was an amīr of the first class, in Ṣafad, Ḥaḏm and Qaḥāza of the second class. In Barʾūk's time there were six lesser ṣamāʾūn in Damascus, three in Aleppo, two or one in other towns. Kāʾit Bay introduced a new functionary, with the Persian title pārdaḏār, to discharge the duties of court chamberlain. This office, held by an amīr of the second class, continued to the end of the Mamluk Sultanate.


--North Africa.

In North Africa, the office of ḥādjīb, which had existed under the Fatimids, disappeared shortly afterwards—certainly under the Zirids—to be of importance again under the Hafsids. The institution of the ḥādjībūn seems to have been introduced from Spain into Ifrīkiya, where at first, in the reign of Ābū Išāk (678-82/1279-83), the ḥādjībūn was merely a kind of superintendent of the palace, acting at the same time as the intermediary "between the sovereign and persons of all classes"; after the reign of Ābū
HADJIB — BANU HADJIR

Hafs (683-94/1284-95), the fyididba proper was separated from the control of the palace, and the hadjib acquired increased importance, to the degree that Abû Bakr (718-47/1318-46) used his hadjib as his chief minister, introducing in Tunis the practice of the amirs of Constantine and Bougie to make the local hadjib their right-hand man; the most influential "chamberlain" was Ibn Tafrağûn, who, in the second half of the reign of Abû Bakr, made the hadjibâ, already an influential office, a post of great responsibility, "by the extent of its powers almost a dictatorship, and, soon, under a young sultan, the means to hold him in tutelage and to make all the machinery of the state work as he wished"; for more than twenty years it was he who controlled the whole administration of the realm and directed its policy as he pleased. After the Hafsid restoration in the last third of the 8th/14th century, the title of hadjib was maintained but the powers attached to the office were suppressed, the chamberlain becoming once more a kind of chef du protocole. See H. R. Idris, Zbrides; R. Brunschvigt, Hafsides, ii, 54 ff. and index; Ibn Khaldûn, Muhaddidma, Cairo ed., ii, 210, tr de Siane, ii, 15, tr Rosenthal, ii, 18.

Further west, the hadjibî of the Marinids was at Fas an intamate of the ruler, while at Timcen, under the "Abd al-Wâdihs [q.v.], he became the major-domo of the palace and minister of finance, but disappeared almost completely after the Marinid interregnum.

See further Kâfiq, Mabyyind, ed. Adârîn, Sâhib al-bâb, Teshribat, (Ed.)

HADJIB B. ZURĀRA B. 'UĐUS B. ZAYD B. 'abd Allâh B. Dârim B. Mâlik B. Hânâiza B. Mâlik B. Zayd Manât B. Tamîm, an eminent sayyid of the Dârim of Tamim in the period of the Djâhilîyya. His name was, according to Abu Yâkânâ, Zayd, and his kunya Abû 'Ikrîgâ.

Hadjib, a member of one of the noblest families of Bedouin society, was known for his mildness. A particular incident in connexion with Kurâd b. Hanifa later caused Hâdjiib to kill Kurâd, which led to clashes between some families of Dârim.

The first battle attended by Hâdjiib was the battle of Djaâbala [q.v.]. He was captured and freed himself of Djaâlala, after he had successfully carried out his mission he was "crowned" by the Persian ruler.

Some traditions claim that Hâdjiib embraced the religion of the Magians. Whether Hâdjiib met the Prophet is rather doubtful, since traditions claiming this seem not to be trustworthy. He died in the twenties of the 7th century.

Bibliography: Bibîr b. Abî Khazîm, Diwan, ed. Board of Research in Arabic Manuscripts, 1960, index; Tha Diwânân of 'Abd b. al-Âbrâs and 'Amîr b. al-Tufayl, 98 (ed. Lyall); Ibn al-Kalbi, Dîhmarra, Ms. Br. Mus., ff. 65a, 134a, 178b; al-Baladhuri, Ansâb, Ms. ff. 35a, 909b, 960a, 964b, 967b, 983b, 989b, 992a; Nâbi'dî Dirâs wa'-!-Farazdâk (ed. Bevan), index; al-Farazdak, Diwan, ed. al-Sâwî, 44, 116, 139; Schultehs, Dîvan, ed. al-Masâkim, 1956, 199. (M. J. Kister)

Aghdîn, According to this report Hâdjiib gave his bow as pledge when he was entrusted by the Persian ruler to become a caravan to 'Ukâh. After he had successfully carried out his mission he was "crowned" by the ruler of Persia.

Some traditions claim that Hâdjiib embraced the religion of the Magians. Whether Hâdjiib met the Prophet is rather doubtful, since traditions claiming this seem not to be trustworthy. He died in the twenties of the 7th century.
herding, occupied central al-Hasa Province (now Eastern Province). Always loyal to Ibn Sā'ūd in his wars against al-‘Uqlīmān, Mūtabār, and other tribes, Banū Ḥādirj established colonies in al-Djāwft at Yākrūb, Shuḥaylāt, Ṣalālīj, Fūdā, and ‘Ayn Dār. With the decline of the Ḥādirj colonies after 1930, these villages were abandoned. The Saudi Arabian Government in 1932–1933 encouraged resettlement of these sites; and a few Banū Ḥādirj groups, particularly Āl Ḥamāma, were cultivating small agricultural plots.


ḤADIRJ (A.), literally prevention, inhibition, is the technical term for the interdiction, the restriction of the capacity to dispose. The term expresses both the act of imposing this restriction and the resulting status; a person who is in this status is called mahḍir (abbreviated from mahḍar ṣalāyah). Subject to ḥadirj are (a) the minor, (b) the insane, (c) the irresponsible, and in particular the spendthrift, (d) the bankrupt, (e) a person during his mortal illness, and (f) the slave. Whether ḥadirj comes into being or needs to be imposed by the ḥādirj, is a subject of controversy between the several schools in the cases (b), (c), and (d), and so are numerous questions of detail. Abū Ḥanīfa, for instance, denied that the irresponsible person who was of age was subject to ḥadirj; Abū Yūsuf and Schaybānī held that he was, and, in addition to the spendthrift, they regarded as liable to ḥadirj a debtor who refused to sell his property in order to pay his debt, a debtor of whom it was feared that he would spirit away his property by fictitious transactions (these two rulings obviously link up with the ḥadirj of the bankrupt), and a person who by the use of his own property caused prejudice to his neighbours. The extent of the ḥadirj or, conversely, the kind of transactions which the mahḍar is entitled to conclude on his own, varies according to the type of case; the ḥadirj covers all transactions of the insane, so much so that he cannot even validly adopt Islam if he is a non-Muslim, and of the minor; the others are, generally speaking, entitled to make certain transactions of a personal nature, such as a marriage (supposing they are married), although these may create pecuniary obligations; the bankrupt is, in principle, prevented only from diminishing his assets, and a person during his mortal illness only from concluding unilaterally disadvantageous transactions if, taken together with any legacies he may have made, they amount to more than one third of the estate. The ḥadirj imposed on recalcitrant debtors and on persons who cause prejudice to their neighbours applies only to the transactions and dispositions which are directly relevant. Some texts list many more classes of persons under ḥadirj, and sometimes even the dead are included. The curator of the mahḍar (his guardian in the case of a minor) is called wa’il, and his power to represent his ward, wīdīya [q.v.]. It is, as a rule, either the father or the grandfather, or the ḥādirj or his representative, and the master in the case of a slave. He may confer on the minor the capacity to dispose, but not with regard to purely disadvantageous transactions. In particular, the master may confer the capacity to dispose upon his slave, whether for a single transaction, such as getting married, or in general, for trade; a slave who has received this last permission is called mad‘īdan. This permission, too, does not include unilaterally disadvantageous transactions. The revocation of this permission is also called ḥadirj.

This concept of ḥadirj has formed the subject of a number of legislative measures in Algeria and in British India.


AL-ḤADR, Arabic name of the ancient Hatra (Atra, "A’ra"). situated in the desert to the west of the Tharthar, three short days’ march to the southwest of al-Mawṣil. The Arab geographers, who no longer knew the exact site of this former caravan and commercial centre, provide certain legendary details regarding its ancient greatness. According to Yaḥūb (ii. 282), it was built entirely of hewn stone and possessed 60 large towers, each of which was separated from the next by nine smaller towers and linked to a palace and baths. Ibn Ḥawqal and al-Muqaddāsī do not mention it, however, and the historians, principal among whom was particularly Pazdawī (d. 482/1092), Kasāf al-azrār, and Saraḥkī (d. 483), Kīwāb al-‘Usal. (J. Schacht)

The account of the Sasanid victory is accompanied by a legend that is very widely disseminated among the Arab authors of the first centuries of Islam and derived from two sources: the first is the Kābulīdāna translated by Ibn al-Muqaddāsī [q.v.] under the title Kišāth Siyār mutakāl ‘alā Şā‘īb; the second is an Arab translation transmitted by Ibn al-Kalbī and founded mainly on the verses of ‘Aḍī b. Zayd [q.v.], Abū Dū‘ūd al-Iyādī [q.v.], and others of greater or lesser authenticity (see F. Gabrieli, L’opera di Ibn al-Muqadda’s, in RSO, xi/3 (1932), 209; G. E. von Grunebaum, Abū Dū‘ūd al-Iyādī: Collection
of fragments, in WZKM, li/4 (1950), 277 and references cited, with the addition of al-Djāhīz, Ḥayyān, vi, 149). The versions that we possess contain considerable divergencies, but they are all arranged according to a single plan, which is presented in the following way: an ancestor of al-Nuṣmān b. al-Mundhir [q.v.], named al-Dayzan (see LA for the meanings of this word in Arabic) b. Muʿāwiya (usually, b. Djāhīz), from his mother’s name), who was himself descended from Tanbūk b. Mālikī [q.v.], reigned over al-Ḥadr with the title of Sāṭīrūn (= Sanatrakes, according to Noldeke; this title, signifying “king” in Assyrian, is sometimes regarded by the name of the founder of the town, al-Sāṭīrūn b. Usayyīrūn in al-Masʿūdī); as he had plundered the territory of the Sāṣānīd king, the latter came and laid siege to Ḥatra; after two (or four) years he had still failed to capture it, and it was then that al-Ḍayyan’s daughter, al-Nadīra, saw Shāpur, became enamoured of him, and offered to deliver the town to him if he would consent to marry her and give her his firstborn son. The capture of Ḥatra is related in various ways: al-Nadīra made her father and the garrison intoxicated and gave the key of the town to Shāpur, or else she showed him how to render ineffective the talisman that protected the town. Shāpur, now master of the place, massacred al-Ḍayyan and his troops, took away al-Nadīra and married her. During the wedding night she was unable to sleep, and for hours turned restlessly on her couch, soft though it was; in the morning, Shāpur discovered in a fold of her belly the cause of her sleeplessness, a myrtle-leaf which had lodged there (according to another version, the leaf was found under the cushions). On discovering to what extent she had been tampered with by her father, Shāpur, indignant at such ingratitude and fearing a similar act of treachery towards himself, brought about al-Nadīra’s death by tying her by the hair to a horse’s tail.

The holy legend is repeated in a fairy story by Hans Andersen (see A. Christensen, La princesse sur la feuille de myrte et la princesse sur le pois, in AO, xiv, 241-57).


For the legend of al-Nadīra, see Ibn Khūṣūṣ, Sīra, ed. Sabāqī, etc., i, 71-2; Ibn Khūsūṣ, Uṣūl, i, 189; Ibn Tayhārī, ii, 159; Tabārī, i, 827 ff.; Masʿūdī, Murādī, iv, 81-6; Aḥḍārī, i, 140 (Beirut ed., ii, 116-8); Tāḏīlībī, ed. Zotenberg, 492; Eutychius, ed. Cheikho, i, 106-7; Yākūṭ, s.v. Tīzānābādh; A. Christensen, L'Irān sous les Sassanides, 218-9. (CH. PELLAT)

ḤADRÁ, “presence”, is used broadly by mystics as a synonym of ḥadār, “being in the presence of Allah”. Its correlative is ḡayyāb (♀, with references there given), “absence” from all except Allah. On the controversy as to whether in expressing this relation to Allah ḥadār or ḡayyāb is to be preferred—this is, which is the more perfect, final element—see especially R. A. Nicholson’s trans. of the Ḫaṣṣīj al-maḥāḏīb, GMS xvii, 1911, 248 ff. The term was later extended by Ibn ‘Arabī, in working out his monistic scheme, to the “Five Divine Ḥaḍārāt”, stages or orders of Being in the Neoplatonic chain [see Άλαμ and ‘abd al-‘Azāz al-qāṣāḥi]. There is a short statement of these in the ‘Arūfī of Djurdjund (‘Abbasī, 1321, 5), which has been translated by A. Christensen, Die Dynastie des philosophischen Systeme des spekulativen Theologen im Islam, Bonn 1928, 294 ff., where, and at p. 153, he gives also some minor uses of the term. See also L. Massingue’s edition of the Kithā al-Ṭawāsín, Paris 1913, 183, with a reference to Ibn ‘Arabī’s Fuṣūs al-ḥikm, and Hughes, Dict. of Islam, 169. In consequence, the Plotinian scheme of dynamic emanations laid down in Islam madkhāl ḥaḍārāt (Ibn Khuldūn, Muḥaddath, 106; tr. de Selincourt, 100; tr. Rosenthal, iii, 89). Dervishes call their regular Friday service ḥadāra [see qhikr]. For the use of ḥadāra (ḥadrāt, ḥadād) as a title of respect, see Ḥasan al-Bāshī, al-ʿĀlībī al-islāmīyya, Cairo 1957, 260-4, and Ḳākāb. (D. B. MacDONALD)

ḤADRAMAWT. The name Ḥadrāmawt is applicable in its strictest sense to the deep valley running parallel to the southern coast of Arabia from roughly 48° E. to 50° E., between precipitous walls rising to a high plateau (the Djol), which on the south separates it from the narrow coastal plain and on the north from an arid tract merging into the sand desert of the Empty Quarter of Arabia. The eastern end of this valley, where it turns southward into the sea, has the special name of Ṣāḏīb Masāʾila, and is not properly speaking part of the Ḥadrāmawt. In a more extended sense, however, the name Ḥadrāmawt has always been applied to a much larger area, comprising the districts to the north and south of the Ḥadrāmawt proper, together with an area on the west which includes not only the highlands providing the head-waters of the Ṣāḏīb Wādī Ḥadrāmawt but also a number of wādī-systems draining off those highlands north-westward into the Ramlat Sab‘yān (an outlier of sand desert isolated from the main part of the Empty Quarter) and southwards into the sea. The western limit of Ḥadrāmī territory can be said to lie approximately at longitude 47° E. [see map to AL-‘ARAB, DJAZIRAT].

The Hebrew form of the name, Ḥażārāmawwet, is partly modelled on the classical Arabic form, but no doubt partly influenced by a folk-etymology assuming a connexion with the idea of “presence of death” (which may also have operated to some extent on the classical Arabic form). The native Ḥadrāmī inscriptions use the spelling hārmī, which contrasts with the Sabaean spelling hārmīt; and this is in all likelihood based on the root ṣrām (cf. Arabic ṣarām “burning heat”), enlarged by a feminine termination -t and a prefix comparable (as C. D. Matthews has suggested) with the definite article encountered in the present-day dialects of southeast Arabia, which fluctuates between -a-, ha- and -h-.

I.—PRE-ISLAMIC PERIOD

Evidence for the early history of this area is extremely scanty. One possible reason for this may be that some of the main urban centres have not undergone those population shifts which have, further west, left centres like Mārib, Sirwāh, Tumma,
etc. as deserted ruins capable of furnishing a rich archaeological and epigraphic booty. The two main centres of the Ḫadramawt, Ṣhibām and Tarfīn, are millennium-old foundations still in full occupation; and such archaeological evidence as may have been there has either been destroyed by subsequent occupation or is irretrievably buried under the present towns. The same may well apply to other sites in the Wāfd. The only site in the whole area which has been scientifically excavated is Madhāb, an ancient village settlement on the opposite side of the Wāfd (Amran) from the modern Ḥuraydā, excavated by Caton-Thompson in 1937-8. Some superficial investigations have been made at Ṣhabwā, the ancient metropolis of Ḫadramawt. Other important sites which have been recorded are an impressive wall at Ṣayfā'at (about 15 km. north of the present-day administrative centre of Ṣayfā'at in the Wāḥidī sultanate); the traceable ground-plan of a large settlement at the ancient haven of Cane (Juz-Ṣūq) about 50 km. north of present Bīr Ṭālī (showing the site beneath a covering of sand and rocks); an area of adobe brick at Gassy (about 15 km. north of the portant sites which have been recorded are an im-

The situation of the “metropolis” of Ḫadramawt (as Eratothenes terms it) at Ṣhabwā is remarkable, for it lies right on the north-west perimeter of Ḫadramī territory in a small wadi draining into the Ramlat Sab’atayn. Evidently it owes its importance to commercial factors, since it was the principal entrepôt for the incense trade. Frankincense, produced in the Mahra country north of Ḫadramawt, was at this point handed over to the caravans which assured its transport up the west coast of Arabia to the markets of the Mediterranean and Mesopotamia. The salt workings in the neighbourhood may also have contributed to its commercial importance; according to Philby (Sheba’s daughters, 91) they are today “the chief or only economic asset of the locality”.

Closely connected with the trade factor was the significance of Ṣhabwā as a pilgrimage centre. Pliny’s descriptions of the methods of handling the incense at Ṣhabwā indicate strong religious sanctions governing the process; and it remained a shrine and pilgrimage centre down to the latest days of the pre-Islamic South Arabian civilization, as is attested by a fifth century A.D. graffito there associated with the monotheistic cult of Raḥmān. In the earlier polytheistic period, the Ḫadramī pantheon shows a close similarity to those of other South Arabian areas, dominated by the astral triad of moon, sun and Venus-star; except that the moon god in Ḫadramawt bore the distinctive name Sin, borrowed from Babylonian religion. He is commonly referred to as “Sin of ʾɪm”, and it has been conjectured that the latter term is the name of the principal shrine of this deity.

Muslim sources are agreed that Ḫadramawt was the original homeland of the tribe of Kinda, an offshoot of which founded the central Arabian kingdom of Kinda (g.v.); but it has to be appreciated that these were nomads, and down to about the beginning of the Christian era the nomadic populations of South Arabia were culturally totally distinct from the settled folk whose culture is the one to which our main epigraphic evidence bears witness; and this is the early period about which it would be pointless to say anything about the nomads. Only in the few centuries before Islam do we begin to see a fusion and intermingling of the two cultures. The early Islamic writer Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb still speaks of Kinda and Ḫadramawt as if they are regarded as independent ethnic entities (“Ḫadramawt” representing the ancient settled culture), though both inhabiting the geographical Ḫadramī area.

The language of the pre-Islamic Ḫadramī inscriptions is close enough to Sabean, Minaean and Qatabanian to rank with them as all dialects of a single “Epigraphic South Arabian” language. With Minaean and Qatabanian it constitutes a group using a sibilant for the causative verbal prefix and pronominal affixes, against Sabean ʾa in these functions. Its own main distinctive peculiarities are the use of a preposition ʾa, “to, for” (Sabean and Qatabanian ʾa; Minaean k-); the fact that t and s have coalesced into a single phoneme spelt indifferently with either letter; and a differentiation between the masculine and feminine forms of the pronominal affix, not found in the other dialects, though paralleled in the modern Sahori dialect (see Beeston, Descriptive Grammar of Epigraphic South Arabian, § 37: 6).
HADRAMAWT — HADY


II. — ISLAMIC PERIOD

The editors regret that, for reasons beyond their control, they are obliged to abridge this section of the article to the Supplement.

HADUR (ḤADŪR NABI SHU’AYB), a mountain massif in the Yemen on the eastern edge of the Sarāt Allān, some twelve miles west of Ṣan’ā’. (q.v.), lying between the wādis Shāhm and Sūrdūd. It is separated from the Harās range to the west by the Ḥaymat al-Khāridiyā (q.v.), known in Hamdān’s time as the Balad al-Aḥkrūdī and inhabited by the Sulayh, a branch of Hamdān. The massif is named after Ḥadūr b. ‘Adī b. Mālik, an ancestor of the Prophet Shu’ayb b. Mahdām, who is mentioned in the Kur’ān (cf. Ṣūra VII, 83 f. and XI, 85 f.). He had been sent to preach to and to warn his people on Diabal Ḥadūr and was slain by them there. According to Arab tradition, Ḥadūr Nabi Shu’ayb was the highest of the three mountains which remained above the waters during the Deluge. The other two were Diabal Shayhār and Diabal Kanīn (3,400 metres) in Khwālān. The main ridge of Ḥadūr is about three miles long and has seven peaks, the highest being Diabal Kāhrī (Diabal Bayt Khwālān) which is 3,720 metres high and is often covered with thick snow in winter for days at a time. On it is the celebrated tomb (with mosque) of the Prophet Shu’ayb, which is much visited (particularly by women), in which to be buried is considered a great blessing (there); on the last day of Ramādān and on the festival of ‘Arafa great festivities are held there.

On the range itself there are several villages. It is traversed by numerous wādis, among them Wādī Dāwūd and Wādī Yāsīl, which disperse their sayl-waters in all directions. In these valleys excellent vines are found in addition to various fruit-trees. In the deeper parts of Ḥadūr the cereals particularly grown are barley and wheat. To the east lies the fertile plain of Khwālān. The main ridge of Hadur is said to have been built by Sinan Pasha. It is about 3,310 metres high. Both were explored by Eduard Glaser in 1885.

HADY, oblation, from the Arabic root h d y which has the meanings “to guide”, “to put on the right path”, “to make a present”. The word is used to denote the sacrificial offerings destined for the lord of the Meccan sanctuary (Ibn Sa’d, Tabābā, i, 92). The ritual of the taḥlīl and the ighār, to which we shall return, suggests that the hady had to be some kind of humped animal, especially selected. It appears that the slaughtered beast was left by the man making the sacrifice for the poor and for animals (Ibn Ḥighām, Sīra, i, 146). The term and the consecration ritual survived in Islam, which, however, tended to replace hady by dakhīyya.

Occurring rarely in the Kur’ān (only seven times and that in Medinese sūras: II, 196, V, 2, 95, 96, XLVIII, 25), hady there denotes the oblations intended for the Ka’ba (XXII, 33), without further definition. But hādith and Kur’ānic exegesis are generally agreed in restricting the word to victims chosen from the anṣām (VI, 143) or animals in flocks or herds. It is the normal offering of the pilgrim, which he must for preference choose from the camel family, or failing that from the bovines, or else the sheep, or finally the goat family (Ibn Ṭuṣ, Bidda, i, 222; al-Taḥlīl, Ḥāfiyya, i, 555). The sacrifice must take place on the completion of the Pilgrimage, preferably by the sacrificer himself, so marking his return to secular life.

Although the offering of a hady is in theory optional, the prescriptions of the ĥadīth and also possible transgressions of the strict taboos of the šūrām in practice render it obligatory. In the first place, we should recollect that the pilgrimage can be performed outside the month of the pilgrimage, but that is to say if he accomplishes the ḫummah alone, at the prescribed time, the umrah and tamattu’. The first consists of making the hādith alone, at the prescribed time, the umrah being performed and the pilgimage, but not the travel back, being left to the pilgrim himself. The second consists of the hādith and the umrah, the pilgrim performing the whole pilgrimage, but not the travel back, being left to the pilgrim himself. In this case, the believer is not bound to offer a hady. But he must make compensation if he chooses the tamattu’ (Kur’ān, II, 196), that is to say if he accomplishes the umrah at the same time as the pilgrimage, resumes secular life and dedicates himself once again for the hādith. Similarly, a kind of penalty is envisaged with regard to the ḥarām, one who takes the šūrām at the same time for an umrah and for a hādith, and who releases himself from the vow only when the pilgrimage is accomplished. In these last two methods, which are regarded by jurists as indulgences, one can redeem oneself by the sacrifice of a hady. An obligation is similarly owed by the pilgrim who, having taken his šūrām, finds it impossible to reach the holy city on account of an illness or on account of an illness or a certain transgressions of the strict laws of pilgrimage (violation of the prohibition on hunting [V, 95] and the sexual taboo; cutting of the hair or shaving before desecralization [II, 196]) can similarly be redeemed by the sacrifice of a victim. It is important, however, to make clear that although highly commendable, the offering of a hady is not obligatory, and one can also secure redemption by fasting or alms-giving (II, 196, V, 95).
From this it emerges that hady is sometimes propitiatory, at other times expiatory. But in no case is it meant to be corrupt, since in any event it is considered earned by the sacrificer, his family and the poor (Kur'ân, XXII, 28, 36), or by the last-named only (this is the case, for example, with the hady owed by the pilgrim when besieged, muhsyar [al-Shâfi'i, Umm, ii, 144 and 184] and in general with every expiatory hady).

The animal offered as hady must meet certain requirements in regard to age and appearance defined by fiqh. The legal age varies according to the species; it is 5 years for camels, 3 for cattle, 1 for goats, and 6 months for sheep (Ibn 'Udâma, Sharb, ii, 534, 537; Ibn Rushd, Bidâ'iyah, i, 255). Moreover, the victim must be fat and free from blemish; in particular, it must not be lame, blind or one-eyed, scabby or puny, nor must it reveal certain brand-marks which recall the pre-Islamic wasm. Once it is chosen, the pilgrim will proceed to its consecration to the taklîd and the ishdâr. For the purpose, he hangs a sandal (naâm) or a piece of leather from its neck, and with a spear-head cuts a piece of its skin (wasm). It is a case of an animal without a hump.

Having been thus consecrated, the hady thereafter belongs to the deity. Except for certain circumstances specified by fiqh, it is then no longer possible to exchange, sell or replace it or to inherit it. It is also forbidden to make any profit whatever from it. However, in contradistinction to pre-Islamic practice, it can be ridden by the sacrificer, on condition that no harm comes to it. It is in fact regarded as a valuable object entrusted to the man, who must do everything possible to restore it to its lawful owner, Allâh.

What essentially characterizes the hady and distinguishes it from other blood sacrifices is that this is a question of a sacrifice in a fixed place, in that the sacrifice, except when performed under compulsion, must necessarily take place in Mecca. Moreover, and particularly with the hady offered for a pilgrimage completed by the dahiyya was thus substituted, especially in current speech, for the term hady. But in the books of religious jurisprudence the former denotes sacrifices on the day of 'Arafât and Muzdalîfah, this period being regarded as especially propitious for an expiation.

It appears that among the ancient Arabs of the Hûdâz the sacrifices of Minâ took place before sunrise. The institution of the dahiyya, which is the Islamic equivalent of the hady, reveals the reformer's desire to break away from sun worship by transferring the time of sacrifice to the hour known as jumâ, after the morning prayer. The word dahiyya was thus substituted, especially in current speech, for the term hady. But in the books of religious jurisprudence the former denotes sacrifices on the day of nahr (slaughter), sacrificed at places other than Minâ, reserving the latter for those at Mecca.

**Bibliography:** Buğhârî, Saḥîh, with the commentaries of Kaṣâllânî and Ansârî, iv, Cairo 1326; Ibn Hishân, Sîra, Cairo 1329; L.A., s.v. h d y; Ibn 'Udâma, al-Mughnî wa-'l-Shârî al-kabir, Cairo 1318; Ibn Rushd, Bidâ'iyah al-mudžir al-muhsyar al-muhsîr, Cairo 1335; Ibn Sa'd, Tabâbî; al-Shâfi'i, Kitâb al-Umm, Bâlûk 1321; Tahtâwî, al-Hasanîyya 'ala 'l-Durr al-mukhtâr, Bâlûk 1282; Tabârî, Tafsîr, ii, 126 (on Kur'ân, ii, 196); J. Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums, Berlin 1927; W. Robertson Smith, Lectures on the religion of the Semites, ed. S. A. Cook, London 1927; M. Gaudefoy-Demobynbes, Le Pilierâge à la Mehke, Paris 1923; J. Chelhod, Le sacrifice chez les Arabes, Paris 1925. (J. Chelhod)

**HAFAR AL-BAṬIN** [see BAṬIN].

**HÂFIZ** [see KÂRÎ and KUR'ÂN].

**AL-HÂFIZ**, the regnal name of the seventh Fatimid caliph of Egypt, whose real name was Abu 'l-Maymûn ʻAbd al-Majîd, born at Ascalon (date of birth uncertain: 466, 467 or 468/1073-6) while famine raged in Egypt (Ibn Khallîkîn, i, 389).

Little is known of his life before he took his place in the person of his father Abû al-Mudîbs and then overthrew Hâzârzâm and ʻAbd al-Majîd, threw the latter into prison, seized the treasures of the palace, and declared himself the representative and lieutenant of the expected imâm of the Twelver Shî'â (Lavoix, iii, p. 163, n. 439). Though he did not suppress the Ismâ'îlî faith, he aroused the hostility of its followers, who no doubt resented its replacement by Twelver Shî'ism as the official doctrine of the state (Suyûtî, Hûsîn, ii, 177-8).

A year later, on 16 Muharram 526/9 December 1131, the supporters of the Fatimid state made a successful counter coup, with the help of the young followers of al-Mîr, the "'Amîriyyâ", led by the chamberlain Yânîs [q.v.], who was of Armenian origin. They killed Kutayfât, and freed ʻAbd al-Majîd from prison. At first he was restored as regent, but a few months later a decree (sidjîll) was read, proclaiming ʻAbd al-Majîd this time as caliph with the title al-Hâfiz li-dîn Allâh (Kalkashandl, vi, 237 ff.). It was perhaps at this time that he formed his own pretorian guard, called "Hâfiziyâ" in his honour (Kâlûshandjî, iii, 452, 508).
This time the caliph ruled alone, with the help of his sons. He nominated Sulaymān heir-presumptive and gave him all the duties of vizier (tābi'a). When, after two months, Sulaymān died, he appointed another son, Ḥaydara (Kalkashandi, ix, 377–9). But a third son, al-Ḥasan, jealous because of this nomination, plotted against his father and brother. He seized power, killed several army leaders and formed a private corps, Sibyān al-sarād, the young cuirassiers. But the army, offended by the massacre, gathered in front of the palace and demanded al-Ḥāfiz, then had his son poisoned by the agency of his Jewish doctor (Kalkashandi, iii, 27–9).

This time he appointed to the vizierate Bahram, a Christian Armenian. But this choice provoked a revolt among the Muslims, for once Bahram came to power he formed an Armenian army of 20,000 men, infantry and cavalry. The Egyptians are said to have feared that he would change the religion of Islam (Ibn Muysassar, 79 ff.).

The Muslim troops being discontented, the caliph incited against Bahram the governor of Ascalon, Ṣiwān b. Wandalhashi, who had beenbanished by Bahram, but Bahram sent him away again to the prefecture of al-Gharbiyya. The people of Egypt were grateful to Ṣiwān for having prevented the Armenians from entering Egypt when he was at Ascalon. He later gathered troops and Bedouins and drove Bahram out of Cairo into Upper Egypt. The caliph, however, gave Bahram a safe-conduct (amanāt) (Kalkashandi, Subh, xiii, 325) because of the intervention of the king of Sicily, Roger II (Subh, vi, 458–63).

But once Ṣiwān became vizier (Subh, viii, 342–6), he seized all power and took the title of king (mašūk) (Kalkashandi, ii, 305). He was also a Sunnī and when he attempted to depose the caliph he was assassinated in 540/1147 (Kalkashandi, ii, 173).

After this al-Ḥāfiz appointed no more viziers, but the troubles and the disturbance continued. He died of a violent intestinal colic (kawland) in Dihmādā II 544/October 1146.


ḤĀFIZ, (Khwāja) shams al-dīn muhammad Shīrāzī, Persian lyric poet and panegyrist, commonly considered the pre-eminent master of the ghazal form. He was born in Shīrāz, probably in 726/1325–6, though Kāsim Ghānī argues for 717/1317 and others favour 720/1320. With a few marked absences, he seems to have spent the greater part of his life in Shīrāz, for long moving in or near the court-circle of the Muẓaffarid dynasty. He is believed to have died in Shīrāz, in 792/1390 (or 791/1389), and his tomb is perhaps that city's best known monument. Though credited with learned works in prose, his fame rests entirely on his Divān. There are few aspects of the life and writing of Ḥāfiz that have not given rise, and especially from about 1930 to 1955, a vigorous scholarly dispute over matters of both interpretation and fact. The reverence in which he is held, not only in Persia but widely throughout East and West, as the undoubted composer of some of the world's most sublime and technically exquisite poetry, will doubtless ensure continued concern with these problems, however intractable and ultimately insignificant some of their ramifications may seem to be.

Apart from its general historical framework, the presumed facts of Ḥāfiz's life were for long largely drawn from biographical prefaces, from the usual anecdotal taḥkīra sources like Dawlāṭgāh, or from casual references by writers like Muḥammad b. Ḥanīf and his grandson. Such material has of course frequently been viewed sceptically; but most of it is of its nature difficult to disprove conclusively, and in line with many of these sources, a biography was prepared in the reign of Sultan Ibrāhīm Khān b. Ṣafar (r. 789/1387), research has only tended to strengthen, if not fully to confirm, the legend. Informative biographies of Persian poets are a notorious rarity, and it seems unlikely at this late date that any significant new material of an explicitly biographical nature will be discovered relating to Ḥāfiz. Though not a new technique, it has recently become fashionable to analyse the poems themselves for new biographical evidence or for some bearing on the material already at hand. The latest, and the most comprehensive and ingenious work of this kind, has been done by Kāsim Ghānī and by R. Lescot; but the net result so far is somewhat disproportionate to the formidable effort involved. At best, it has now been convincingly demonstrated that the Divān bears a much more direct relationship to the milieu of its composition than was suspected in the traditional view. Such methods always have their dangers, particularly where the basic biographical material is itself so slight; in the case of Ḥāfiz, the problem is exacerbated by the continued lack of a reasonably authentic text. All this being so, it still seems proper to give here the main outlines of the life in more or less traditional form.

Ḥāfiz's father, Bahāʾ al-dīn or Kamāl al-dīn (some sources refer to his grandfather), is said to have migrated from Isfahān to Shīrāz, where he died in the poet's infancy, leaving the family in poor circumstances. In a close-knit, flourishing centre of Islamic civilization such as Shīrāz at that time, humble beginnings were only a relative handicap; and it is plausibly suggested that Ḥāfiz received a thorough education on the usual classical lines. It was no doubt in youth alone that he earned the right to use the title kāfīz (Kur'ān-memorizer), which became his pen-name; his verse bears ample evidence of familiarity with Arabic, with the Islamic sciences and with Persian literature generally. He is reputed to have been among other things a baker's apprentice and a manuscript-copyist during these years of adolescence and early manhood; but, to judge in particular by the dedication of a number of poems to Kiyām al-dīn Ḥasan (d. 754/1353), sometime vizier to Shāh Aḥmad Ishākhīndī, he was into his poetic stride as a panegyrist before the age of thirty. An oft-cited poem (Broekhuis, no. 579; Kavvāli-Ghānī, 365) mentions nostalgically other Shīrāz notables of this period, including the ruler himself. Already by his twenties, in the wake of the disintegration of the Il-Khānīd order, Ḥāfiz had
lived through dynastic upheavals in and around Shiraz.

A second phase in the poet's life begins in 754/1353 with the capture of Shirâz, after a protracted struggle between the Indû and Muʿaffarid dynasties, by Mubârîz al-Dîn Mûhammad. The latter ruled for five years, before being deposed and blinded by his son Djalâl al-Dîn Shâh Shudjâ. These years were apparently a period of rigid Sunnî observance, hard on Hâfîz and his fellow-citizens alike; but the poet seems to have recommended himself with some success to Mubârîz al-Dîn's chief minister, Burânî al-Dîn Shâh Shudjâ, and to have been appointed by him to the madrasa, in 759/1358-84, while at no time settled politically, and though far from being a period of continuous prosperity and success for Hâfîz, coincides with his phase of maturest composition. It was during these years that his fame spread throughout Persia, as well as westwards into Arabic-speaking lands and eastwards to India; it seems, nevertheless, that he recedes in his original condition to somewhat commentator. The Muʿaffarid dynasty effectively came to an end at the hand of Timûr, in 789/1387, during the last few years of Hâfîz's life, though random representatives of it, like Shâh Shudjâ al-Dîn Mânûrûr, seem to have shown the poet sporadic favour to the end.

It is generally believed that Hâfîz was more or less out of favour with Shâh Shudjâ for a period of some ten years (768-78/1366-76), during which time he is said to have spent a year or two in Isfahân and Yazd. The reason for such a fall has never been fully explained, though it is traditionally related to the poet's allegedly libertine views and behaviour. Though thereafter he enjoyed favour, from time to time, from the throne and from ministers like Djalâl al-Dîn Tûrânshâh, he seems never fully to have regained his former standing. Yet it should be remembered that there is still no real certainty as to what standing actually signified: certainly there is frequent reference to poverty throughout the poet's life (whether it be regarded as a complaint, a hint or a literary device), and there is no serious suggestion that he held a regular, richly rewarded office as "court poet". At one time he is said to have been a professor of Qur'ânic exegesis at a madrasa, but there is doubt as to which of his patrons might have obtained him this preferment and no record of his period of tenure.

Legend credits Hâfîz with editing his Diwân in 770/1368, i.e., over twenty years before his death, but no manuscript of this version is known. Less speculative, perhaps, but still unattested by real evidence, is the edition (with a preface of doubtful biographical value) compiled after the poet's death by a disciple, a certain Mûhammad Gulandâm. From this tradition version are assumed to derive the thousands of manuscripts now extant and over 100 printed editions: many of these versions differ widely in the order and number of poems, in the order and number of verses within a given poem, and in their detailed readings. The bibliography is very extensive, and, while some of the principal editions or translations can be mentioned here. (In general, it may be said that serious interest in Hâfîz seems to have passed, after his death, to the Persian world and to India, whence it came by the late 18th century to Europe, returning in strength to Persia only in the 20s and 30s of the present century). First, it should be mentioned that several manuscripts are known in Persia, in Europe and elsewhere, which date from about the second and third quarters of the 15th century, i.e., from thirty to sixty years after the poet's death; the most reliable of these contain just under 500 poems, while later versions rise to 900 and beyond. (In 1958, P. N. Râhânlî published a manuscript dated around 818/1414 that contains 152 poems in good textual condition). Derivative manuscripts, sometimes with commentaries in Persian, Turkish or Urdu, continued to circulate throughout the next four centuries.

The earliest historic recension, for long accepted as authoritative, and as a source of Hâfîz's life, was that of the Ottoman Südt (d. 1000/1591); he was at one time charged with having suppressed one or two poems of Hâfîz's and rejected much modern scholarship when it had justifified him by failing to find these poems in early manuscripts, and by casting at least some doubt on Hâfîz's Shî'ism. This recension was taken as the basis for another long-dominant edition, the three volumes (692 poems) of H. Brockhaus, Leipzig 1854-61. The late 18th and early 19th centuries saw much fragmentary and dilettante preoccupation with Hâfîz among Europeans (chiefly British and French), but a landmark in printed texts was the Calcutta edition of 1791 (275 poems), associated with the name of Upjohn; this edition was still based on late manuscripts and largely on the Südt recension; its introduction provided much of the material for the traditional life. J. von Hammer-Purgstall produced in 1812-3 a massive German prose-translation of the Diwân, which was known to Goethe at the time he was writing the West-d{"u}nker Diwan. Between 1858 and 1864, i.e., roughly at the same time as the Brockhaus edition mentioned above, and using substantially the same sources, V. von Rosenweig-Schwannau brought out another three-volume edition of the text, accompanied by a remarkably skillful verse-translation in German. The English renderings, partial or complete, of the late 19th century (those, for example, of H. Bicknell, H. Wilberforce Clarke, Gertrude Bell and W. Leaf) deserve only passing mention, despite interesting merits of their own. By 1900 a largely spurious, second-growth Hâfîz stood beside the several approximations to the real figure. The 20th century saw the rebirth of serious Hâfîz scholarship in Persia. Special mention has already been made of the fundamental research of Kasîm Ghânî, but there are few eminent Persian scholars of the present day who have not contributed important articles in this field. In particular, three editions merit notice: that of Abd al-Rahîm Khâkhâl, Tehran 1927 (495 poems, based on a manuscript of 828/1424, but marred by errors); that of Huseyn Pizhmân, Tehran 1936 (994 poems, marked as doubtful); and that of Muhammad Kâzîm Kâzîm Ghânî, Tehran 1941 (576 poems; the most scientific and reliable edition so far, based on some very old manuscripts; contains a good introduction, but lacks a critical apparatus). A new edition, also based on very early manuscripts, is reportedly in preparation by H. Ritter.

It will be seen that the two basic tasks of all research on Persian poetry, the establishment of a significant biography and the edition of an authoritative text, have assumed added and special dimensions in the case of Hâfîz. In briefest sum, one may state the dilemma thus: no text of Hâfîz, however good in itself, can be fully intelligible at any level without a marked amplification in our knowledge of his life and times; yet much of such knowledge must come from an analysis of the text, and one can have little confidence in the results of analyses, however scrupulously conducted, that are
based on texts of doubtful reliability. It may well prove that neither task is fully susceptible of solution, even within limited terms of reference: while solidification of the biography must largely wait on the text, the creation of an inventory of the worth of a rich yield; any acceptable text will inevitably be based on virtually the sole criterion of seniority of manuscript, and the oldest Oriental manuscripts, particularly if falling outside the author's lifetime, are not necessarily the fullest or the most accurate in any absolute sense. This is especially true of poetry, and indications so far suggest that it is even more so the case of the poetry of Hafiz.

There is, too, the fundamental question of the poet's own intent: should everything he ever wrote (or perhaps merely countersigned) be included, even if he might himself have chosen to omit certain items from the supposed canon of 770/1368? Did he have second (or later) thoughts about the inclusion, the order, or the actual text of whole poems or individual verses? If we cannot now hope to answer questions of the classical Western sense, we may hope to do more in effect than publishing early manuscripts and observing their differences from later ones. Certain generally useful conclusions may be drawn, but we may well never be sure what such differences signify in any particular case.

Failure hitherto to solve these basic problems has never quenched interest in several secondary problems related to them. Scholars living in an age of non-representational art and literature are perhaps less concerned than most of their forebears (E. G. Browne was in advance of his age here) to discover positively "whether Hafiz meant what he said", whether he was a mystic or a libertine, a good Muslim or a sceptic, or all of these by turns. It is now generally claimed (without prejudice) merely that he spoke through the standard themes and terminology of hedonism, the lament for mortality, human and mystical love, and so on; that he was a superbly linguistic and literary craftsman, who took these forms so far beyond the work of his predecessors that he practically cut off all succession; and that he revolutionized the ghased and the panegyric both, by making the one the vehicle for the other in the place of the kasida. Nevertheless, useful new work has been done (particularly by R. Lescoat) in establishing the nature of certain poems so as to suggest a development in Hafiz's attitude, style and methods. The secondary problem most hotly debated in recent years concerns the "artistic unity" of the poems: even supposing that the present varying order of verses were reduced to an original unity, is there any genuine unity in these poems? Even supposing that the present varying order of verses were reduced to an original unity, is there any genuine unity in these poems? The result of this endeavour was the Madjam, which contains: A. Introduction and Contents. — B. The Chronicle of al-Tabari translated by Bal'amal. — C. Conclusion of this work to 865/1458 by Hafiz-i Abrü. — D. Introduction to the Di'imi al-tawarih, which contains an extract from the al-Mamlik wa-suwar al-afyldim, probably one of the redactions of the al-Balkhi. In this unfinished and untitled work he could not repress his interests as a historian and included in it extensive historical passages especially on the history of Fars, Kirmân and Khurâsan.

While occupied with this geographical work Hafiz-i Abrü was in 820/1417 charged by Shâhrukh to compile a voluminous historical enterprise consisting of three famous older historical books, with supplements and a continuation written by himself. The result of this work was the Muttamâ, which contains: A. Introduction and Contents. — B. The Chronicle of al-Tabari translated by Bal'amal. — C. Conclusion of this work to 856/1452 by Hafiz-i Abrü. — D. Introduction to the Di'imi al-tawarih, which contains an extract from the al-Mamlik wa-suwar al-afyldim, probably one of the redactions of the al-Balkhi. In this unfinished and untitled work he could not repress his interests as a historian and included in it extensive historical passages especially on the history of Fars, Kirmân and Khurâsan.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the text, see: Kâsim Ghanî, Bahdr dar 'akhâr wa aâhâr wa abhdî-i Hâfiz, Tehrân 1321-2/1942-3 (2 vols. only appeared before the author's death); J. Ryhka, Iranische Literaturgeschichte, Leipzig 1959, 256-68 and bibliographical references (the best and fullest summary to date); H. R. Roemer, Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand derer Lösung, Wiesbaden 1951; A. Göpplari, Hafiz Divans, Istanbul 1944 (useful Preface); R. Lescoat, Chronologie de 'l'œuvre de Hafiz, in B. E. Or., 1944, 57-100; A. J. Arberry, Hafiz: fifty poems, Cambridge 1947 and reprinted, 1-34; idem, Classical Persian literature, London 1958, 329-63; Browne, iii, 271-319; IA, s.v. Hâfiz, by H. Ritter.
The further great historical enterprise of Hafiz-i Abrü is the Madimâ al-tawdrikh, a universal chronicle divided into four voluminous parts. The first part, dedicated to the life of Timur (736-807/1336-1405), is subdivided into two parts, the first dealing with the life of Timur to 772/1370 and the second with the reign of Shahrukh to 782/1380. The second part is the third enlarged redaction of his history of Shâhârkh. The date of his birth is uncertain. Hafiz Ahmed was ordered to restore Ottoman control over Bagdad, where the subâbi Bekir was in rebellion, but he failed in this mission, the forces of the Safawid Shah Abbâs I seizing the town in the winter of 1033/1623-4. Hafiz Ahmed became Grand Vizier in 1034/February 1625. The main event of his Grand Vizierate was his negotiations against the Druze chieftain of Lebanon, Fakhri al-Din. Hafiz Ahmed was an interesting example of the manner of working which relate to these years. The second part is the third enlarged redaction of his history of Shâhârkh.

As this survey shows, the works of Hafiz-i Abrü are an interesting example of the manner of working of a Persian historian of the Middle Ages in what concerns the use of works of other authors and his own former books. For the first 22 years of the reign of Shâhârkh his work is the best source. The fourth part of the Madimâ al-tawdrikh was practically the sole source of the Mâtla‘ al-salâ’în by ‘Abd al-Razzâk Samarkandî and hence of the later Persian chroniclers.
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**Signoria of Venice, states that he was then about forty years of age (Barozzi and Berchet, i, 146: ‘... Câbîl bassa già capitan del Mare che regge ora D. Matteo da Darmasco sarà di 40 anni ...’). He rose in the enderûn-i humdân to the status of muṣâkh, i.e., confidant of the sultan, and to the office of doghândi baghî. On leaving the enderûn-i humdân he became a vizier and also Kapûdân Pâshâ, i.e., High Admiral of the Ottoman fleet—an appointment that he filled (22 Shawwâl 1036/February 1626 until 16 February 1630: cf. Na‘îmî, ii, 23 and Salingar, 259, note i) with little distinction, since he failed, in contrast, in 1037/1627 to stop the ship of the Sultan of Egypt from Alexandria to Istanbul, a number of vessels being lost to a Florentine squadron near Rhodes as a result, in no small measure, of his negligence. Hafiz Ahmed, deposed from the office of Kapûdân, was now made Beglerbeg of Sham (Damasco). During his tenure of this appointment (April 1609-January 1615: cf. Laoust, 199-201) he was engaged in operations against the Druze chieftain of Lebanon, Fakhîr al-Dîn. Two years later, being then Beglerbeg of Diyarbekir, Hafiz Ahmed was ordered to restore Ottoman control over Bagdad, where the subâbi Bekir was in rebellion, but he failed in this mission, the forces of the Safawîd Shâh Abbâs I seizing the town in the winter of 1033/1623-4. Hafiz Ahmed became Grand Vizier in Rabi‘ II 1034/February 1625. The main event of his Grand Vizierate was his negotiations against the Druze chieftain of Lebanon, Fakhîr al-Dîn. Hafiz Ahmed was an interesting example of the manner of working which relate to these years. The second part is the third enlarged redaction of his history of Shâhârkh.

As this survey shows, the works of Hafiz-i Abrü are an interesting example of the manner of working of a Persian historian of the Middle Ages in what concerns the use of works of other authors and his own former books. For the first 22 years of the reign of Shâhârkh his work is the best source. The fourth part of the Madimâ al-tawdrikh was practically the sole source of the Mâtla‘ al-salâ’în by ‘Abd al-Razzâk Samarkandi and hence of the later Persian chroniclers.
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Hafiz Ahmed Pasha — Hafiz Rahmat Khan

Hafiz Ibrihim, Muhammad, Egyptian poet and writer, was born between 1869 and 1872 on the banks of the Nile near Dayrūt (madīrīyya of Asyūt). On the death of his father, when he was four years old, he was given a home by his maternal uncle, first in Cairo and then at Tantâ, where he had the opportunity of attending, albeit irregularly, the few courses given in the al-Ahmed mosque, and of familiarizing himself with Arabic classical poetry, especially that of the Abbasid period, while serving his apprenticeship in the offices of several lawyers. Continually seeking anxiously for the vocation which he had not yet discovered, and weary of living at his uncle’s expense, he left Tantâ to enrol in the military college at Cairo; after graduating, he entered Government service first in the War Ministry and then in the Interior. As an officer, he served for a long time in the Eastern Sudan, at the time of Lord Kitchener’s campaign, but after a riot in which he had been involved he asked to be retired. Returning to Cairo in 1906 he had the opportunity of attaching himself to Muhammad ‘Abd al-Muwaylihi (q.v.), whose disciple he was, and of devoting himself more freely to poetry. He was also at this period in contact with such political leaders as Sa‘d Zaghlul (q.v.), Musâfaš Kâmil (q.v.) and Kâsim Amin (q.v.), as well as with the intellectuals gathered round Khâli‘l Mu‘trân (q.v.) and others. It was only in 1911 that he succeeded in becoming a member of the civil service and in being nominated head of the literary section of the Khedivial Library (now the Dâr al-Kutub) at Cairo, a post which he retained almost until his death on 21 July 1932.

Hafiz Ibrâhim must be counted among the representatives of the innovating Egyptian poetical school, whose leader was Sâmî al-Bârûdî (q.v.) and who followed in his footsteps at the end of the 19th/18th century. Some of his ancestors (memorizer) of the Qur’ân, was the Afghan, a tribe of highlanders aiming to detach themselves from tradition. But he set himself apart from other spokesmen of the new generation by his more spontaneous adherence to the cause of the people and the cause of the Arab community in general, whose legitimate emotions and ambitions he succeeded in reproducing. In fact, the pieces in his DISRA (Cairo 1937, 2 vols.) reveal a mass of details and direct observations which on the one hand throw light on several aspects of Egyptian political and social life during the first decades of this century, and on the other allow us to glimpse the frequently polemical standpoint of the poet. Particularly in those verses which are immediately recognized as poetic, he demonstrates his perfect grasp of the reality of the situation, that is, that the three authorities struggling for the good opinion of the public (British, the Sultan, and the Khedive) must be flattered and that he must above all smother his anger and despair and conceal his thoughts. Thus his occasional poems, in which the poet of the imagination. Suffering, complaints, anxiety and melancholy are the basis for the best verses of Hafiz Ibrâhim, who reserved for such themes his most delicate choice of images and his most effective vocabulary, in a structure that is far from ignoring the classical tradition. In this article, his poetry, which cannot be subjected to exhaustive criticism in this article, became known fairly rapidly in the learned circles of al-Azhâr and received a flattering welcome among the cultured élite and the political leaders of Egypt. Hafiz Ibrâhim, in his sympathy with the wretched, became above all the echo of the sufferings and hopes of his people; it was perhaps this predisposition which led him to translate certain episodes from Victor Hugo’s Les Miserables (al-Bu‘asîd) (Cairo 1903, and reprints), remarkable especially for the splendour of his Arabic prose; another aspect of his narrative style is represented by Layâli Sa‘îf (1st ed.: Cairo 1906, 2nd ed.: n.d.) in which there appear more strongly the moral objectives which the imitators of the mahâmât (q.v.) cherished at the end of the 19th century; this long mahâmâh contains a critical survey of Egyptian moralists and a parodic attempt (al-Bârûdî 1913, 5 vols.).

Bibliography: To the references in Brockelmann, S III, 57-71, the following should be added: Hasan Kâmil al-Sayyâfî, Hafiz wa-Shawâbî; Ahmad al-Tâhir, Mu‘hâdârât al Hafiz Ibrâhim, Cairo 1954; Shawâk Hilî‘, al-Adâb al-arabî al-mu‘âsir (I) fi Misr, Cairo 1957, 82-92. (U. Rizzitano) Hafiz Rahmat Khan, b. Shâh ‘Alâm Khân b. Mâhmmûd Khân b. Shâhâb al-Dîn known as Rôtâ Bâbâ . . . B. Bharêf Shân . . . b. ‘Abd al-Râghîd, the legendary ancestor of the Pathâns or Afghans, a hafiz (memorizer) of the Qur’ân, was the head of an important ruling family of Rohilkhand during the 12th/18th century. Some of his ancestors had migrated from Shôrabak in the Pishin district of West Pakistan to Târ Hazâra where the family ultimately settled. He was born in 1120/1708 at Târ Shâhâmâtâpur, a small little-known village in râb (i.e., a hilly country, a term loosely applied to the tribal areas of present-day West Pakistan and the adjoining regions). The story of his first visit to India where, in the territory then known as Kaftîr (modern Rohilkhand) one of his slaves, Dàwûd Khân, had been able to gain wealth and influence with the local râjâs and zamindârs, whom he served as a mercenary. Gradually Dàwûd Khân was able to carve out a separate principality for himself. His almost meteoric rise to power attracted many of his fellow-countrymen to India including Shâh ‘Alâm Khân, father of Rahmat Khân. On arrival in India he was warmly received by Dàwûd Khân, in the manner befitting a master. But Shâh ‘Alâm Khân apparently became jealous of the success of his former bondsman, who had him murdered. Soon afterwards Dàwûd Khân was himself killed, and succeeded by his adopted son ‘Alî Muhammad Khân. A brave and daring soldier, he was awarded a standard and kettle-drums along with the title of Nawwâb by the reigning Mughal emperor, and won the favour of the Grand Vizier Kâmar al-Dîn Khân. Emboldened by this patronage the Rohillas, under ‘Alî Muhammad Khân, began their depredations in and around the parganas of Bareilly (q.v.). Complaints reached the emperor Muhammad Shâh (reg. 1731-1779/1165/1748) who ordered punitive
measures against them. An unexpected victory over an imperial force encouraged the Rohilla adventurer to further annexations. These alarmed Sa'd-Allah Khan, who had his own plans of expansion. Himself a Shi'i, he disliked the orthodox Rohillas, and instigated the Mughal emperor against 'Ali Muhammad Khan. An expedition, led by the emperor himself, was mounted against the Rohilla chief, who submitted and, on the intercession of the wazir, was forgiven but carried as a prisoner to Delhi. Hafiz Rahmat Khan, the right-hand man of the emperor, was allowed to withdraw, left free. The detention of 'Ali Muhammad Khan was taken as a national insult and Rahmat Khan misused the liberty granted to him by raising a large force and marching to the capital in order to coerce the emperor into releasing his patron 'Ali Muhammad. He succeeded in brow-beating the wazir and other councillors into accepting his demands. Consequently 'Ali Muhammad Khan was released from captivity, and the government of the pargana of Sirhind, at that time disturbed by roving bands of Sikhs and Diâjs, was conferred on him. Rahmat Khan again distinguished himself by breaking the resistance of the refractory zamindârs and dispersing the marauders. 'Ali Muhammad Khan had not been at his post for long when news of Ahmad Shah Abdâli's invasion of India (1161/1748) reached Delhi. As a precaution against the defeat of the Rohillas, 'Ali Muhammad Khan was removed from Sirhind and reappointed to his old post in Katehr.

On the death of the emperor Muhammad Shah in 1168/1748 and that of the wazir Kamar al-Dîn Khan, there was a keen contest for this key-post in the empire. Sa'dar-Djiang, an aspirant to the office, was able to enlist the support of 'Ali Muhammad Khan, who deputed Rahmat Khan to help him achieve his ambition. Rahmat Khan marched to Delhi with 1,000 choice troops and by a bold stroke compelled the emperor Ahmad Shah (reg. 1161/1748-1169/1754) to confer the office of wazir on Sa'dar-Djiang. Soon thereafter 'Ali Muhammad Khan died, on 3 Shawwâl 1162/14 September 1749, having, according to Gulistân-i Rahmat (see Bibliography), nominated Rahmat Khan as his successor only two days before his death. Rahmat Khan, however, willingly withdrew in favour of his elder brother 'Abd Allah Khan, who had been retained as deputy of Safdar-Djiang, to whom he devoted all his energies. 'Abd Allah Khan virtually adopted the rôle of regent during the minority of Sa'd-Allah. This situation tempted the rapacious Sa'dar-Djiang to try and gain the Rohilla acquisitions for himself. He succeeded in pitting Ka'im Khan, the Bangash Nawâb of Farukhabad [q.v.], against the Rohillas. A pitched battle was fought at a place three miles from Badaun [q.v.], in which Ka'im Khan was slain and his large force of 60,000 horse routed. As fruit of the victory Rahmat Khan annexed many parganas belonging to the vanquished Bangash chief. Sa'dar-Djiang turned the defeat of his own instrument to advantage and captured Farrukhabad, maltreating his fallen ally's family. Ahmad Khan, younger brother of Ka'im Khan, however, soon recovered his lost patrimony by defeating and killing Nawal Rây, the deputy of Sa'dar-Djiang. This incensed Sa'dar-Djiang, who assembled a huge force and marched against the Afghans. On an appeal for help from Ahmad Khan, Hafiz Rahmat Khan joined in the battle and their combined troops inflicted a heavy defeat on the Awadh army. Smashing the army, Sa'dar-Djiang called in the Marathás under Malhar Râo Holkar and Djay Appâ Sindhiyâ. Hafiz Rahmat Khan, finding himself unequal to the Marathás, did not respond to Ahmad Khan's appeals for help, but joined the forces of Sa'd-Allah Khan, acting independently of the regent, and a pitched battle was fought at a place three miles from Badaun, in a fierce battle near Fateghar on 28 April 1751. By imprudently refusing help to a brother Afghan ruler in trouble, Rahmat Khan brought misfortune not only to the Afghans but also darkened his own prospects as an independent ruler of Rohilkhand. Desirous of wielding more power, he then strengthened his position and sided with Safdar-Djiang, who, after his dismissal from the office of wazir, was trying to make trouble. In the armed conflict that followed between the Marathás and the ruler of Farrukhabad, Rahmat Khan enigmatically remained neutral. Elated by their victory, the Marathás and their ally Sa'dar-Djiang now thought of invading Ka'têr and annexing it. Sensing their designs, Rahmat Khan and other Rohilla chiefs fled to the difficult reaches of the Terai, where they entrenched themselves. Sa'dar-Djiang and the Marathás laid siege to their camp, but the difficulties of the terrain and the news of Abdâli's impending invasion of India discouraged them. Considering it prudent to retreat, they agreed, at the instance of the emperor Ahmad Shah, to open peace negotiations with the Rohillas. The peace treaty was finally signed at Lucknow in February 1752. By it the Rohillas were required to pay an indemnity of fifty lakhs of rupees to the Marathás, the price of their participation in the conflict in aid of Awadh and Ka'têr. To establish his superiority further, Sa'dar-Djiang compelled Rahmat Khan to accompany him to Awadh. However, after reaching Môhâân, 15 miles from Lucknow, Rahmat Khan was allowed to return to his own country. With a view to further reducing the position and influence of Rahmat Khan, the two elder sons of 'Ali Muhammad Khan, who had been kept as hostages at Kandahâr, were released by Ahmad Shah Abdâli in 1166/1752 on the occasion of his making yet another invasion of India, and were sent back to Ka'têr "with a letter strongly recommending their guardians to carry out Ali Muhammad's will." Willy-nilly Rahmat Khan had to part with his father's acquisitions of 1,000 miles, divided equally, each to the three major sons of 'Ali Muhammad, i.e., 'Abd Allah Khan, Fayd al-allah Khan and Sa'd-Allah Khan (the ruling prince, but the younger son). The presence of Rahmat Khan as a virtual 'regent' was resented by 'Abd Allah, an ambitious and headstrong young man, who attempted to poison him, but the attempt was foiled; it led to the banishment of 'Abd Allah Khan from Katehr. This division of the country and his subsequent loss of revenue and prestige compelled Rahmat Khan to seek new possessions, and he consequently extended his rule to Pillîbhit which he renamed Hafîzabâd (a name which never became popular) and which now became the principal seat of his government; Bareilly [q.v.], which had all along been the major centre of his activity, was relegated to a secondary position. At Pillîbhit he constructed a huge palace, a Diwan-i 'Amm and a Diwan-i 'Amîn to complete the appurtenances of rulership. In the meantime, Sa'dar-Djiang was preparing to fight the emperor's party and summoned Rahmat Khan to his assistance. He at first refused, but on second thoughts considered it prudent to remain neutral. This was construed as an open act of rebellion against the emperor, for as a loyal subject Rahmat Khan was expected to side...
with the emperor's party against a refractory subject. Hafiz Rahmat Khan had to pay dearly for this political blunder which led to the ruin of the short-lived Rohilla kingdom and dimmed the prospects of Afghan rule in India. In this internal conflict, which may rightly be termed the rebellion of Sa’dar-Djang, the only Afghan chief who responded to the call of the emperor was Nagib al-Dawla. It was the very next year Ahmad Shah Abdali invaded India for the third time, and ordered Rahmat Khan to help him. He marched against Durrani with his troops. For the help rendered by Hafiz Rahmat Khan, the Durrani chief conferred the pargana of Etawah on him. Rahmat Khan expelled the Marathas, who still held it. Soon afterwards Shudja\(^{1}\) al-Dawla thought of settling old scores with the Bangash ruler of Farrukhabad and in alliance with his former foe, Nagib al-Dawla, who had now become waiz\(^{2}\) and amir ul-umara\(^{3}\), commenced operations against Farrukhabad. Hafiz Rahmat Khan sided with the weaker side and was able to avert the fall of the small Afghan kingdom. The next notable event in which Rahmat Khan was involved was the attack on Patna, then held by the British, in 1127/1765, and the battle of Buxar fought in 1128/1764 between the British and Mir Qasim 4All, the deposed nizam of Bengal and Rahmat Khan's ally Shudja\(^{4}\) al-Dawla, who greatly feared the growing power of the British in India. Shudja\(^{5}\) al-Dawla was defeated and sought refuge with Rahmat Khan, who was then encamped at Hasanpur (district Muradabad). Finding him unwilling to render active help, Shudja\(^{6}\) al-Dawla turned to the Marathas and they both fell on the British at Kofa Di\(\text{a}\)hanabad in 1129/1765. However, their troops could not withstand the destructive fire of the English batteries and were completely routed. Shudja\(^{7}\) al-Dawla was captured and retired to Shudja\(^{8}\) al-Dawla, who gloated over it. The corpse was later recovered from the battlefield and the severed head was sewn to it. It was despatched to Bareilly, where it was buried. In 1129/1775 Rao Pah\(\text{a}\) Singh, who had received a number of villages in d\(\text{d}\)gov from Rahmat Khan, erected a mausoleum over his grave, which was completed by Dhu 'l-Fa\(\text{r}\)\(\text{i}\) 4All Khan, a son of Rahmat Khan, in 1194/1780. It was repaired from time to time but is now in a sad state of neglect.

After the death of Hafiz Rahmat Khan, the victorious armies fell to depredation and spoliation of the helpless population. Thousands of villages which refused to surrender were burnt down and the inhabitants driven out. Hundreds of buildings which had been erected by the Rohilla chiefs or which were an eye-sore to Shudja\(^{4}\) al-Dawla as an extreme example of show and display, were razed to the ground. Close relations of the fallen hero were not spared and were subjected to all sorts of indignities. They were reduced to great straits and even the women-folk were forced to march on foot from Pilibhit, where they had taken refuge, to Basawli. For days together during the fatiguing march via Aonla and Bareilly several members of the ex-ruling family died of hunger and other privations. The prisoners were eventually transferred to the fort at Allahabad, where they remained for only a few months since the concentration of Rohilla forces under Fayd Allah Khan at Laldh\(\text{a}\)ng and the serious illness of Shudja\(^{4}\) al-Dawla compelled the latter, who had earlier refused to listen to the entreaties of his own mother, to relent and set free some of the prisoners. Mahabbat Khan, another son of Rahmat Khan, however, preferred to remain in detention along with his mother, the widow of Rahmat Khan, and other ladies of his household rather than to win his own personal freedom.

The regime of Rahmat Khan, a just and humane ruler, was marked by all-round peace and prosperity. "Under his . . . rule the peasants were protected; the artisans and craftsmen were encouraged to pursue their vocations in peace and without let or hindrance; trade and commerce flourished; and vexatious taxes . . ."

\(1\) Shudja\(^{4}\)al-Dawla with the provision to pay Rs. 1,000,000 in cash and the balance in three equal instalments of Rs. 1,000,000 to be spread over three years. To this agreement Sir Robert Barker, the British commander-in-chief, was a witness (cf. C. E. Aitchison, Treaties, Sanads and Engagements, i, 5).

As Hafiz Rahmat Khan felt that the conditions binding him to pay forty lakhs of rupees for warding off the menace of the Marathas had not been fulfilled, he declined to pay. This was construed as a breach of agreement solemnly entered into by the Rohilla chief. The British commander-in-chief, the notorious Durrani with their troops. The court of the fallen hero were not spared and were subjected to all sorts of indignities. They were reduced to great straits and even the women-folk were forced to march on foot from Pilibhit, where they had taken refuge, to Basawli. For days together during the fatiguing march via Aonla and Bareilly several members of the ex-ruling family died of hunger and other privations. The prisoners were eventually transferred to the fort at Allahabad, where they remained for only a few months since the concentration of Rohilla forces under Fayd Allah Khan at Laldhang and the serious illness of Shudja\(^{4}\) al-Dawla compelled the latter, who had earlier refused to listen to the entreaties of his own mother, to relent and set free some of the prisoners. Mahabbat Khan, another son of Rahmat Khan, however, preferred to remain in detention along with his mother, the widow of Rahmat Khan, and other ladies of his household rather than to win his own personal freedom.

The regime of Rahmat Khan, a just and humane ruler, was marked by all-round peace and prosperity. "Under his . . . rule the peasants were protected; the artisans and craftsmen were encouraged to pursue their vocations in peace and without let or hindrance; trade and commerce flourished and vexatious taxes . . ."
upon trade were abolished". A patron of learning and literature, he supported five... of Afghan poets preserved in the British Museum are... by C. Elliot, London 1831 (a rather partisan account, but not entirely unhistorical); Muh. Sadr-Dat Yar Khan, Gulam Rafrmat (still in MS), an enlarged version of Gulamst-Rahmat, Agra 1836 (under the Persian title Dikh-i Hafiz Rafrmat Khan); J. Strachey, Hastings and the Rohilla War, Oxford 1892 (gives a one-sided picture of the war which led to the ruin of the Rohillas); Kamal al-Din Haydar, Ta'rikh-i Awadh (Kaysar-tawahir), Lucknow 1597-1597, 1, 57 ff; Nadim al-Ghanî Râmphâ, Ta'rikh-i Awadh, Lucknow 1795, i, 117 ff, ii, 289-295 (quotes several authorities, not seen by me); idem, Akhbar al-samadâd, Bada'un 1918, Attal 'All Barâ'î, Hayât Hafiz Rafrmat Khan, Karachi 1963 (a fairly well-balanced account); Ghulam Husayn Khan, Siyar al-muta'aabkhdirin, Lucknow 1238/1886, vols. ii and iii passim; Nûr al-Din Husayn Khan, Sargudhad-i Nawâd Nadîg al-Dawla, Urdu tr., Aligarh 1924; Ghulâm 'All Khan Nakawi, 'Imdâd al-sa'adât, Lucknow 1857; Mill and Wilson, History of India, London 1958, ii; H. R. Nevill, Gazetteer of Bareilly, Allahabad 1911; Imperial Gazetteer of India (Provincial Series, United Provinces and Oudh, vol. i), Calcutta 1908; Hamilton, History of the Rohilla Afghans, London 1797; Cambridge History of India, iv, 422, 429, 445; A History of the Freedom Movement, The Rohillas, Karachi 1957, i, 393-393 (not very critical place of the Rohilla).

A. S. Bazmee Ansari

HAFEZ AL-DIN [see AL-NASAFI]

HAFEZ ('ABD AL-), 'Alawi Sultan of Morocco, commonly known both in Europe and Morocco by the name of Moulay Hafid. He was born in 1880 to the Sultan Moulay Hasan [q.v.] and his legal wife al-'Aliyya, who belonged to the Arab confederacy of Shâwiyya. On the death of his father, his younger brother 'Abd al-'Aziz [q.v.], who had become Sultan, appointed him khâlifa at Marrûkûsh. After a long underhand struggle and with the aid of the great khâdî Madâni Glâwi [see GLÀWA] he was proclaimed sultan at Marrûkûsh on 16 August 1907. But at Fâs in January 1908 he was recognized as Sultan only on the strength of his promises to follow a xenophone policy imposed by the powerful Moroccan élite. (An attempt to lure the Sultan to take place at this time but without result). In spite of the support which Moulay Hafid found in Germany, the foreign powers did not recognize him until 1909, and then only after he had defeated the troops of his deposed brother and promised to respect the undertakings given by the latter to the European nations at the Conference of Algiers (1906). Very well-read, a jurist and a theologian, he did not possess his father's moral qualities and was ill-prepared for the insurmountable difficulties he had to face. During his reign France and Germany reached the agreement of 1909 which recognized the "special interests" of the former in Moroccan affairs and made possible the signing of the Franco-Moroccan protocol of 4 March 1910. This act of diplomacy established "the understanding between the two countries" and enabled an international loan to be launched, which was greatly needed by Morocco. In November of the same year, the settlement of the disorders in Melilia resulted in the signing of an agreement between the Sultan and Spain. Serious incidents occurred in the beginning of 1911 and, faced by increasing disorder, Moulay Hafid officially requested the help of the French troops who had been stationed at Casa-blanca since 1907. They were soon able to relieve Fâs and facilitated the arrest and execution of the agitator (rogu) Bû ْحمارة [q.v.] who had been at large in the countryside since 1902. The Spaniards, in order to counterbalance the French operations, occupied Larache (al-Azîq) and then Arzila (Asîlî). This interference provoked the disapproval of Germany, who sent a gunboat to Agadir and created for herself a zone of influence in the Sûs. The Agadir incident was settled by the Franco-German agreement of November 1911, which gave France a free hand in Morocco in return for considerable territorial compensations in Equatorial Africa. On 30 March 1912 at Fâs the sultan signed with M. Regnault, representing the French government, the Protetectorate Treaty. Immediately afterwards an insurrection broke out around the capital and, on 17 April, serious riots took place in Fâs. They cost the lives of scores of French soldiers and civilians and of a large number of Moroccan Jews whose ghetto (mahlîq) had been plundered. General Lyautey was then appointed Resident Commissioner General of the French Republic alongside H.M. the Sultan of Morocco. The position of Moulay Hafid became impossible, both in the eyes of France and of the Moroccan people, and he decided to abdicate. After he had very skilfully settled his own position and that of his family, the decision was officially announced on 13 July 1912. The Sultan then paid a visit to France, returning thereafter to Tangier, along with H.M. the Sultan of Morocco, who was again at his disposal. During the 1914-18 War he lived in Spain. He died at Enghien (France) on 4 April 1937. His body was taken back to Fâs with the honours appropriate to his rank.

HAFIZABAD — IJAFSA

Pakistan, lying between 31° 45' and 32° 20' N. and 73° 10' and 73° 50' E. on the east bank of the river Cenab, with an area of 894 sq. miles. It is 33 miles by road from Gudiranwala, which lies on the main rail-road to Lahore. It is now a small town mainly known as a wholesale market for agricultural produce, chiefly rice, wheat, and oil-seeds. Founded by one Hafiz, said to have been a favourite of the emperor Akbar, it is of little historical importance. During the Sikh supremacy, it suffered along with other parts of Gudiranwala district. Its two leading tribes—the Bhattas and the Taraafs—resolutely resisted the Sikhs and consequently suffered heavily. During the disturbances after the first World War, Hafizabad was also badly affected, with the result that martial law was imposed.


(A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

HAIFRAK, a district in the seventh 'Ustân (Fars), situated in the plain where the Pulvar Rud joins the Peşâwar and Lahore. It is now a small town mainly known as a wholesale market for agricultural produce, chiefly rice, wheat, and oil-seeds. Founded by one Hafiz, said to have been a favourite of the emperor Akbar, it is of little historical importance. During the Sikh supremacy, it suffered along with other parts of Gudiranwala district. Its two leading tribes—the Bhattas and the Taraafs—resolutely resisted the Sikhs and consequently suffered heavily. During the disturbances after the first World War, Hafizabad was also badly affected, with the result that martial law was imposed.


(A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

HAIFSA, daughter of 'Umar b. Al-Kha'itab and wife of the Prophet, is said to have been born five years before Muhammad's mission, while the Kuraysh were rebuilding the Ka'ba. Her mother was Zaynab bint Maz'un, the sister of the famous Ummân b. Maz'un [q.v.]. Married first to the Kuraysh al-Khuways b. Hudhâfa al-Salm and widow-
ed while still childless (her husband, a Badri, died at Medina on the return from Badr), she was offered by her father in marriage to Abū Bakr and to ʿUmmān b. ʿAffān; the latter refused, explaining that he did not want to marry at that time; the former said nothing and later made his excuses to ʿUmar, saying that he had understood that Muḥammad himself intended to marry Ḥafṣa. Muḥammad did indeed propose marriage and ʿUmar accepted, naturally with enthusiasm. It is very likely that the Prophet was led to contract this marriage for reasons of policy, wishing to strengthen his bonds with such a valuable supporter as ʿUmar, all the more so because shortly before this he had asked in marriage Ḥafṣa, her father in marriage to Abu Bakr and to ʿUmmān b. ʿAffān.

The name of Ḥafṣa is mentioned in the sources in connexion with the following events. Ḥiğraː she emigrated to Medina with her father. Marriage: According to the majority of the sources, Muḥammad married her in the month of Ẓubayr 3/February 625, after his marriage with ʿAisha, and before the Battle of his wives, generally given as his fourth wife. Episodes concerning Muḥammad's harem: At the beginning of Sūrā LXVI are verses alluding to an event or events which are certainly of a domestic nature: God reproaches the Prophet concerning his wives and reminds him that one of them has divulged a secret which he had entrusted to her; an allusion is then made to the alliance of two wives against the Prophet and the passage ends with a threat of general repudiation. The commentators, the authors of books of asbūb al-nusul, the biographers and the muḥaddithūn explain these verses thus: Muḥammad, during a temporary absence of Ḥafṣa, had invited into her room Mary the Cop[te][see māriya] and had relations with her there. Ḥafṣa, returning, surprised them and created a scene. Muḥammad then placated her, swearing that he would have no more relations with his slave, but at the same time insisted that she should not breathe a word of the affair. Ḥafṣa was unable to refrain from telling her friend ʿAisha and the news of the incident spread. The Prophet was annoyed and divorced Ḥafṣa, but soon retracted his decision because Dhiḥrī came down from Heaven and charged him to take back his wife because she was very devout and was to be his wife in Paradise (Ibn Saʿd, vii, 58); moreover, ʿUmar was so grieved by the treatment inflicted on his daughter that he was to be pitied (it was probably ʿUmar's resentment which caused the Prophet to reverse his decision). He freed himself from the oath which he swore concerning Mary by means of a kaffāra, and for twenty-nine days avoided his wives. Nödeke dates this episode to 7/628-9, Caetani to 9/630-1. Some reporters of ṣaḥiḥ are obviously not very happy about this story, which they consider as dishonourable to the Prophet: they assert that the secret confided to Ḥafṣa, and by her to ʿAisha, was the fact that Abū Bakr would succeed to power after Muḥammad and that ʿUmar would follow Abū Bakr (al-Baladhuri, Anṣāb, 1, 424, etc.). For verse 9 of the same Sūrā LXVI the sources supply another sabab al-nusul, while keeping for the verses which follow the explanation given above: Muḥammad visited one of his wives given as Umūm Salama, but sometimes as Ḥafṣa (Ibn Saʿd, viii, 59, etc.; in this case the names change in what follows) and stayed with her longer than usual because she offered her a honey drink of which he was very fond. ʿAisha then agreed with Ḥafṣa and some of the other wives of the harem on a way of preventing this from becoming a habit: one after the other said to Muḥammad when he visited her that a disagreeable smell came from him and that he must have eaten some maghāfīr (a sweet of the date palm tree). But Muḥammad had not eaten this; the smell could only have come from the drink which he had tasted earlier when visiting Umūm Salama; the cause must therefore be the bees which frequented the ʿursift trees. Consequently Muḥammad denied himself the use of honey. But God had allowed it and Muḥammad abrogated the prohibition. According to one hadīth (al-Buhārī, iii, 358, iv, 273 f.), the secret which the Prophet confided to ʿUmar because he was trying to make the latter more generous towards the ʿAisha refers to be connected with this prohibition of honey (and not with the episode of Mary the Cop).

Thus already very early some relaters of traditions, conforming to a different ethical system from that which prevailed in the Prophet's milieu, endeavoured to modify as much as possible the accounts transmitted by the others. This tendency to draw a discreet veil over Muḥammad's domestic life is confirmed in the modern saḥiḥs and notably in Muḥammad ʿAli's notes to his edition and translation of the Kur'ān published under the auspices of the Ahmadiyya. Another episode, which has no connexion with the Kur'ān, shows us once again ʿAisha and Ḥafṣa conspiring to play a trick on a woman of noble family, Asmaʾ bint al-Nuʿmān al-Diāwīnya, whom Muḥammad had sent for from her tribe with the intention of marrying her. After having adored her for her modesty with the Prophet, they advised her to say when he approached her for the first time "I take refuge with God against you," for, they told her, he pleased him when a woman uttered this sentence on such an occasion. The result of this advice was that Muḥammad threw the sleeve of his mantle over his face and cried out three times "It is I who take refuge" and went away. Immediately after this she sent the new bride back to her tribe with gifts to assuage her sorrow; the poor girl did not marry again and died in grief. Ḥafṣa as one of the four privileged wives of Muḥammad: According to Kur'ān, XXXIII, 35, the Prophet was authorized by God to invite to him whichever of his wives he chose without observing any order. The wives to whom he gave preference were ʿAisha, Zaynab and Umūm Salama, but al-Baladhuri (Anṣāb, ii, 448 and his version of the oath (s.w.q) and Ḥafṣa. During the final illness of the Prophet: Some hadīths mention attempts made by ʿAisha and Ḥafṣa to arrange for the Prophet to have private conversations before his death with their fathers, to the exclusion of the other Companions, and especially of ʿAli. This is certainly possible, though these hadīths are contradicted by others in the matter of the persons who were summoned by Muḥammad to his bedside, and it is impossible to tell which are nearer to the truth. Some hadīths mention Ḥafṣa even in connexion with Muḥammad's delegating to Abū Bakr the leading of the public prayer. On the advice of ʿAisha (or of Abū Bakr through ʿAisha as an intermediary), she is said to have suggested to the Prophet that he should entrust this task to ʿUmar instead of to Abū Bakr, asserting that the latter was too weak and that his voice would be strangled by tears. It seems strange that this advice should come from ʿAisha; it has, however, been pointed out that the person chosen to lead the prayer might have suffered harm instead of gaining advantage by taking the Prophet's place at a time when there was not yet any political significance attached to this duty. But in this case also there are some hadīths which are completely different. After the
death of the Prophet: Hafsa, like the other wives of Muhammed, received an annual endowment and enjoyed the respect of the Muslims, but she did not play any political role and spent her time in caliphate duties of her father; all that is reported of her during this period concerns matters which are of minor importance: some of the Companions asked her to persuade Umar to allocate to himself from the public treasury a more liberal allowance, but Umar would not be persuaded to do this, being inspired by the Prophet's example to live very soberly and simply; as he ate frugality and dressed in too mean a fashion, she exhorted him to spend more on himself. Overcome with anger by Abū Lu'lu'a's assassination of her father, she was among those who incited 'Ubayd Allah b. 'Umar [q.v.] to take vengeance on al-Hurmuzaün, and it was because of this interference that her brother 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar exclaimed "God have pity on Hafsa!" ( Ibn Sa'd, ii/1, 259). When Hafsa revolted with Talhah and Zayd after her father (cf. Ibn Hanbal, vi, 141, 237 f.), this campaign, but her brother 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar persuaded her not to become involved. During the conference at Alqurah, she urged 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar to participate in order to prevent a split in the Muslim community. These are the only two active actions she took in any part in the events during the period of the civil wars. Death of Hafsa: According to the majority of the sources, Hafsa died at Medina in the month of Safar 13/662-3, immediately after his accession, and Ibn al-Ash'ir (ii, 73) gives it as 27/647-8 (1). When Muhammad at one time was threatening to return them to their owner when the work of destruction had been finished, she took after her father (e.g., Ibn Hanbal, vii, 180, 1810, 2241, 2242, 2732, 3100, 3101, 3105, ii, 2244 f.; Ibn Hanbal, Tusnad, Cairo 1313, i, 236, ii, 27, ii, 478, vi, 75, 141, 237 f., 267, 283-8; Bu'dhārī, ed. Krell, i, 176, ii, 132 f., iii, 96, 266 ff., 359, 360, f, 393, 425, 428, 431 f., 442; Muslim, Saḥīḥ, Bulāk 1290, i, 426; Nasā'ī, Sūfān, Cairo 1312, ii, 75, 77; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Isdāb, Haydarābād, 1316-9, 734 (no. 3468); Ibn 'Abd al-Haṣīb, Usd, v, 425 f.; ed. Kämí, ii, 114, 234, 303, iii, 73, 168; Ibn Ḥadījār, Isbā'a, Calcutta 1856-93, iv, 520-3 (no. 294), 547, 760 f., 888; Ibn Taghribirdi, Leiden 1851-7, i, 138, 146 f.; Diyarbakrī, Tārīkh al-khamis, [Cairo] 1302, i, 325, 405; Ḥalabī, al-Sirā al-Halabiyya, Alexandria 1280, ii, 405, iii, 537-42 (with details on the divorce of Hafsa). Western authors: L. Caetani, Annali, 1 A.H. § 15 no. 38, 3 A.H. § 10, 7 A.H. § 42, 9 A.H. § 23, 21 A.H. § 26, 12, 221 n. 1, 229 no. 14, 231, 232, 233 A.H. § 110 and indexes, 36 A.H. § 30, 38 A.H. § 37; H. Lamens, Le "Triomvirat" d'AboB Bahr, 'Omar et Abū Bahr 'Obaida, in MFOB, iv, 120, 121 f.; idem, Fātimma et les filles de Mahomet, Rome 1912, 15, 43, 56, 86; N. Abbott, Aṣḥāḥ the beloved of Muḥammad*, Chicago 1944, 9-12, 41 f., 44, 50-54, 63, 77, 96, 138, 205; G. Stern, Marriage in early Islam, London 1963, 159-62 (the divorce of Hafsa mention is in the very last page); Copt and the divorce of Hafsa: Ibn Sa'd, viii, 59, 133 f.; Baladurī, i, 423, 426, 427; Diyarbakrī, ii, 135; Episod of the honey: Ibn Sa'd, viii, 76, 122 f.; Baladurī, i, 424 f.; Ibn Hanbal, vii, 95, 221; Buḥkārī, iii, 356, 402 ff., iv, 273 f.; Nasā'ī, i, 141 ff. References to some tafsīrs and to a book of asbāb an-nuṣail in which 'Usāna, LXV, 5-5 are explained by the episodes discussed: Ṭabarī, Ṭafsīr, Cairo 1321, xxvii, 90-5; Zamakhshārī,CASTA,1856-9, ii, 1499-501; Baydāwī, ed. Fleischer, ii, 340 f.; Maulvi Muḥammad Ali, The Holy Qur'ān... 4, Lahore 1920, 1089-92; Wāḥīdī, A. asbāb an-nuṣail, Cairo 1315, 325-7. Trick played on Asmā' bint al-Nu'mān: Ibn Sa'd, vii, 104; Baladurī, ii, 457; Tabari, iii, 2458; Ibn Ḥadījār, iv, 445, 446. Ṣufuḥ of the Kurgan belonging to Hafsa: Buḥkārī, iii, 393; Ibn al-Ash'ir, iii, 86; Su'ūfī, Ḫubān, Calcutta 1857, 133 ff.; Nūdeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qur'āns, ii, 15, 19, 21, 23, 27, 43, 48, 67 and index; on the verses of Qur'ān, LXVI, 1-5, and the commentators' explanations: ibid., i, 217; R. Bell, Introduction to the Qur'ān, Edinburgh 1954, 40, 42-4, 97.

(L. Veccia Vagliani)
Hafsa Bint al-Hajdaj — Hafsids


Of her poetical production, strongly tinged with touches and genuine sentiments often expressed in a style quite free from rhetorical artificiality may be perceived.


(Ch. Fellay)}

Hafsa Bint al-Hajdaj, a dynastic line of Eastern Barbary (662/1262-1254), whose eponymous ancestor was the celebrated Companion of the Mahdi Ibn Tumart [q.v.], the shaykh Abû Hafs 'Umar b. Yahyâ al-Hintâf [q.v.], one of the chief architects of Almohad greatness. His son, the shaykh Abû Muhammad Abû al-Wâhid b. Abû Hafs, handed over his caliphate to his two brothers (Abû Zakariyya, Abû al-Mu'min, and Shadhili when they died) and was succeeded by them. Under the pretence of defending the purity of Almohad tradition, which he claimed was being undermined by the Hâfsids, the latter finally succeeded his father without difficulty. He gave free rein to his love of ostentation, and from 650/1253 he adopted the caliphal title of al-Mustansir bi'llah. His self-confident policy was rewarded by important diplomatic triumphs in Morocco, Spain and even in the Hijaz and Egypt. His rule was never jeopardised by a few plots and rebellions, often started or supported by the Arabs. In 658/1260 he executed the chief of his chancellery, the Andalusian writer Ibn al-Abbar [q.v.]. On the whole, relations with Christian merchant communities (Spanish, Provençal and Italian) settled in the ports, particularly in Tunis and Alarach, and the Hafsids had consuls. At the beginning of the 7th/13th century many Spanish Muslims, craftsmen, men of letters and so on, emigrated to Hâfsid Ifrikiyya, and before long constituted a powerful Andalusian body along-side the Almohad caste in the capital (see Andalus, vi, appendix).

II. The caliph al-Mustansir (647/1249-77). As heir presumptive, Abû Abû Allâh Muhammad succeeded his father without difficulty. He gave free rein to his love of ostentation, and from 650/1253 he adopted the caliphal title of al-Mustansir bi'llah. His self-confident policy was rewarded by important diplomatic triumphs in Morocco, Spain and even in the Hijaz and Egypt. His rule was never jeopardised by a few plots and rebellions, often started or supported by the Arabs. In 658/1260 he executed the chief of his chancellery, the Andalusian writer Ibn al-Abbar [q.v.]. On the whole, relations with Christian merchant communities (Spanish, Provençal and Italian) settled in the ports, particularly in Tunis and Alarach, and the Hafsids had consuls. At the beginning of the 7th/13th century many Spanish Muslims, craftsmen, men of letters and so on, emigrated to Hâfsid Ifrikiyya, and before long constituted a powerful Andalusian body along-side the Almohad caste in the capital (see Andalus, vi, appendix).

I. The amîr Abû Zakariyya? Yahyâ (625-47/1225-49). Having achieved independence, he gathered together what was to be henceforth the Hâfsid territory, i.e., the whole of Ifrikiyya, by seizing the surrounding provinces of Constantine, Tripolitania and the country south of Constantine of the persistent rebel Ibn Ghâniyâ (631/1234). The following year he annexed Algiers, and then subdued the Chelif valley. He encouraged the expansion of the Banû Sulaym (Ku'ûb and Mirdâs) when they pushed back the Banû Riyâd (Dawâwida) in the Constantine region and the Zâb. In 636/1238, he subdued the Hawwara of the Algerian-Tunisian Powers. He then turned to his former territory (639/1242), and launched an attack against Tlemcen, which he took early in 640/July 1242, handing it back to the 'Abîd al-Wâhid in return for his submission to the Hâfsid rule. On his way back, he conceded to the chiefs of the tribes of the Banû Tûdjin their rule over their respective territories, thus setting up in the Central Maghrib a number of small vassal states capable of ensuring his security. From 635/1238 onwards, the power of Abu Zakariyya spread as far as Morocco and Spain, whence tokens of submission flowed in. When he died, he was in control of the whole of northern Morocco, and Nasrids and Marinids acknowledged his overlordship.

He upheld Almohad tradition in his civil and military administration, and in his capital Tunis, on which he conferred many benefits: misraj, sâb, hâshâb and madrasas (the oldest of the public madrasas of Barbary). Malikism was not interfered with by official Almohadism, nor was the mysticism associated with Al-Dâmiyâni (b. 621/1224), 'Abî al-Afzî and al-Maldaîwi, Sîdi Abû Sa'id (d. 628/1231), al-Shadhili (d. 656/1258 [q.v.]), and 'A'nîsha al-Mannûbiyya (d. 665/1267 [q.v.]).

Rapid economic growth followed peace and security, and exchanges became more frequent with Provence, Languedoc and the Italian republics, with whom treaties were signed. From 636/1239, relations with Sicily became closer when the Hâfsid ruler began to pay yearly tribute in return for the right to maritime trade and freedom to import Sicilian wheat. About the same time, bonds of friendship were forged between the crowns of Tunis and Aragon. Christian merchant communities (Spanish, Provençal and Italian) settled in the ports, particularly in Tunis and Alarach, and the Hafsids had consuls. At the beginning of the 7th/13th century many Spanish Muslims, craftsmen, men of letters and so on, emigrated to Hafsids Ifrikiyya, and before long constituted a powerful Andalusian body along-side the Almohad caste in the capital (see Andalus, vi, appendix).
HAFSIDS

lengthy period of disturbance and secession (675-718/1277-1318).

III. The reign of his son al-Wathik (675-77/1277-79) began well, but was marked by the scheming of his Andalusian favourite Ibn al-Habbabar and the rising in Bougie (end of 677/April 1279) in favour of a brother of al-Mustansir, Abū Ishāk. As early as 651/1253 he had led a revolt of Dawāwida Arabs, and, after taking shelter at the Naṣrid court of Granada, had been well received by the 'Abd al-Wādīd of Tiemcen when al-Mustansir died. Al-Wathik was at last forced to abdicate in favour of the other one of his sons, who was dead at Tunis as its master (Rabi‘ II 678/August 1279); he had been helped to some extent by military aid forwarded by Peter II of Aragon, who was anxious to secure the allegiance of the Hafsid state in his struggle with Charles of Anjou. 

IV. Abū Ishāk (678-83/1279-85) executed al-Wathik, Ibn al-Habbabar and several other notables, and entrusted the governorship of Bougie to his son Abū Bakr, who, with the support of the Sicilians, for whom the Hafsid had been well received by the Almohad shaykhs, gained control, and set up a pretender to the throne of Ifrīfīya, and set up a pretender to the throne of Tunis, who rejected by the Almohad shaykhs, who was anxious to secure the allegiance of the Hafsid state in his struggle with Charles of Anjou. 

V. Abū Hafs (683-94/1284-95) succeeded in the task of restoring Hafsid authority. Pious and peace-loving, he initiated much religious building. He attempted to reduce the disaffected Kingdom of Bougie (695/1296), soon to be threatened also on the west; for Algiers had submitted to the Marinids, and when these had mastered the Mitidja they laid siege to Bougie (699/1299). Abū Zakariyyāʾ died in 700/1301, and his son and successor Abū 'l-Bākāʾ set once again to work about a reconciliation with Abū 'l-Āṣida; eventually they signed a treaty (707/1307-8) which had as object to reunite the two Hafsid branches, and which provided that on the death of one of the two monarchs the survivor should inherit the vacant throne. 

Particularly during the last three years of his reign, the realms of Abū 'l-Āṣida were seriously disturbed by the Kuṭūb Arabs. We know of certain treaties he concluded with Christendom, but the levying of the "tribute" of Tunis and the occupation of Djarba kept him opposed to Frederic of Sicily.

VII. Abū Yahyā Abū Bakr al-Shahīd (709/1309). A second cousin of Abū 'l-Āṣida, he was proclaimed by the Almohad shaykhs of Tunis, who rejected the arrangement whereby all Hafsid territory was to pass to Abū 'l-Bākāʾ; but the latter took only seventeen days to get rid of him, and forced the reunion of the two Hafsid states.

VIII. Abū 'l-Bākāʾ (709-11/1309-11) was unable, however, to prevent a new defection of the Constantine region under his brother Abū Yahyā Abū Bakr, who also made himself master of Bougie in 712/1312. Meanwhile, the old Almohad shaykh Ibn al-Lihyānī had seized the throne of Tunis, which Abū 'l-Bākāʾ was forced to give up.

IX. Ibn al-Lihyānī (711-7/1311-7). To begin with, relations between the two Hafsid monarchies were cordial. But, after resisting the onslaughts of the 'Abd al-Wādīd of Tiemcen (713-15/1313-15), the ruler of Bougie, Abū Yahyā Abū Bakr, attacked Tunisia (715-16/1315-16), and Ibn al-Lihyānī had to give it up.

X. Abū Darba (717-8/1317-8). The Tunisians made this son of Ibn al-Lihyānī their ruler, but he resisted for only nine months the attacks of Abū Yahyā Abū Bakr, and Hafsid unity was again restored. 

XI. Abū Yahyā Abū Bakr (718-9/1318-19). After 684/1285, Abū Zakariyyāʾ, a son of the amīr Abū Ishāk and nephew of Abū Hafs, gained control, with the help of the Arabs, of all the western part of Hafsid territory, including Bougie and Constantine. Next year he marched against Tunis. Thrown back, he seized Gabēs and advanced towards Tripolitania, but was forced to draw back to defend his capital Bougie, threatened by an 'Abd al-Wādīd incursion instigated by Abū Yaḥṣar, who still exercised suzerainty over the sultan of Tripolitania. Simultaneously, local independent states developed in the Djarid, at Tozeur, and at Gabēs, while the Arabs of the south and of Tripolitania began to show hostility.

On the other hand, the allegiance of the Central and Eastern Arabs won for them, for the first time in Hafsid history, grants of land and of revenues. During the last years of the reign, Bougie annexed the Zāb, to whose governor, from 653/1254 onwards, Abū Zakariyyāʾ conceded the control of all southern Constantine. In the same year, the lord of Gabēs also recognized the suzerainty of Abū Zakariyyāʾ. Here begins the decline of Hafsid influence, and from now on the opposition of Bougie to Tunis recalls that of the Hammādids to the Zirids.

VI. Abū 'l-Āṣida (694-708/1299-1309). A posthumous descendant of the clan of 'Abd al-Wādīd, Abū 'l-Āṣida succeeded to the succession, which had devolved on his brother Abū Hafs, in the person of Ibn Abi Dabbūs (1287-8), who was the heir-apparent of Tlemcen. He attempted to reduce the disaffected Kingdom of Bougie (695/1296), soon to be threatened also on the west; for Algiers had submitted to the Marinids, and when these had mastered the Mitidja they laid siege to Bougie (699/1299). He attempted to reduce the disaffected Kingdom of Bougie (695/1296), soon to be threatened also on the west; for Algiers had submitted to the Marinids, and when these had mastered the Mitidja they laid siege to Bougie (699/1299). But, after resisting the onslaughts of the 'Abd al-Wādīd of Tiemcen (707/1307-8) which had as object to reunite the two Hafsid branches, and which provided that on the death of one of the two monarchs the survivor should inherit the vacant throne.

Particularly during the last three years of his reign, the realms of Abū 'l-Āṣida were seriously disturbed by the Kuṭūb Arabs. We know of certain treaties he concluded with Christendom, but the levying of the "tribute" of Tunis and the occupation of Djarba kept him opposed to Frederic of Sicily.

VII. Abū Yahyā Abū Bakr al-Shahīd (709/1309). A second cousin of Abū 'l-Āṣida, he was proclaimed by the Almohad shaykhs of Tunis, who rejected the arrangement whereby all Hafsid territory was to pass to Abū 'l-Bākāʾ; but the latter took only seventeen days to get rid of him, and forced the reunion of the two Hafsid states.

VIII. Abū 'l-Bākāʾ (709-11/1309-11) was unable, however, to prevent a new defection of the Constantine region under his brother Abū Yahyā Abū Bakr, who also made himself master of Bougie in 712/1312. Meanwhile, the old Almohad shaykh Ibn al-Lihyānī had seized the throne of Tunis, which Abū 'l-Bākāʾ was forced to give up.

IX. Ibn al-Lihyānī (711-7/1311-7). To begin with, relations between the two Hafsid monarchies were cordial. But, after resisting the onslaughts of the 'Abd al-Wādīd of Tiemcen (713-15/1313-15), the ruler of Bougie, Abū Yahyā Abū Bakr, attacked Tunisia (715-16/1315-16), and Ibn al-Lihyānī had to give it up.

X. Abū Darba (717-8/1317-8). The Tunisians made this son of Ibn al-Lihyānī their ruler, but he resisted for only nine months the attacks of Abū Yahyā Abū Bakr, and Hafsid unity was again restored.
to preserve the unity of his territories by entrusting
the administration of the provinces more and more
to his sons, advised by chamberlains. The second
half of Abu Yahyā Abū Bakr's caliphate (733-47/ 1333-46) is notable for the rise of the Almohad
Ibn Tafrağn to a all-powerful position as chamberlain (744/1343), the stern quelling of Bedouin
turbulence, some diminution of disaffection, the
immediate neighbour now that the latter had
annexed Tlemcen and the 'Abd al-Wādīd kingdom.

XII. Abu 'l-Abbās Ahmad. His father, the late
amir, had secured the Marinid Abu 'l-Hasan's
support for his accession to the throne, but Abu
'l-Abbās Ahmad soon met his death at the hands
of one of his brothers, Abū Ḥafs, and this murder
was Abu 'l-Hasan's excuse for an easy conquest of
Irfīkiya.

The Marinid occupation (748-50/1348-50) received
little support, and the abolition of the revenues
which the Bedouins had been collecting from the
settled populations set off an Arab revolt, which
resulted in such a resounding defeat for Abu 'l-Hasan
(749/1349) that his reputation never recovered from
it. The loss of the greater part of Barbary and the
growing hostility of Irfīkiya forced him to escape
by sea to the west (Shawwāl 750/late December 1349).

XIII. Al-Fadl. This son of Abū Yahyā Abū Bakr,
governor of Bōne, was proclaimed in Tunis, but was
soon (751/1350) put down by Ibn Tafrağn, who
replaced him by a brother of al-Fadl, Abū Ishākh.

XIV. Abū Ishākh (750-70/1350-60). The new prince
was so young that the wily Ibn Tafraghn himself
was for fourteen years the real power behind the
throne. Disturbances and movements towards
autonomy multiplied on all sides; the Banū Makki
held the south-east and the Ḥafsids the Constantine
region, whereas Abū Ishākh had to endure many
attacks, some of them severe (752-7/1351-6).

The Marinid of Fez, Abū 'Inān Fāris, fired with
the idea of imitating his father's heroic exploits, took
Tlemcen, Algiers, and Mēdēa. The mutual hostility
of the two factions of Abū Yahyā Abū Bakr and
Abū Ishākh lightened the task of the invader; who
in addition had the support of the Banū Muzni of the
Zāb and the Banū Makki of Gabēs.

The second Marinid conquest of Irfīkiya (753-9/ 1352-6) began brilliantly with the capture of Bougie (753/1352), slowed down for a while, and then
(757-8/1356-7) achieved its objective with the
capture of Constantine, Bōne and Tunis and the sub-
mision of the Djarid and Gabēs. Yet the collapse
came even more swiftly than it had for Abu 'l-Hasan,
and for a similar tactless act—the refusal to permit
the Dawāwīda to collect certain taxes from the settled
population. His forces routed, Abū 'Inān Fāris had
to fall back on Fez (758-1357). Abū Ishākh and Ibn
Tafrağn returned to Tunis only a few months after
they had been turned out. The Marinid died in 759/ 1358 without having succeeded in re-establishing
his authority in eastern Barbary.

While an 'Abd al-Wādīd restoration was taking
place in Tlemcen, matters in the East returned to
the conditions ruling when Abū Ishākh began his reign:
Bougie, Constantine and Tunis governed by three
different and independent Ḥafsids, and the whole
of the south, the south-east and a part of the Sahel
maintaining their independence of the Ḥafsids of
Tunis. When Ibn Tafraghn died (766/1364), Abū
Ishākh was able to rule in person; but to do no great
effect. On the contrary, the policy of the Ḥafsids of Constantine, Abu 'l-Abbās, seized Bougie from his cousin Abu 'l-Allāh and succeeded in uniting the whole of the Constantine region (767/1366).

XV. Abu 'l-Bakrā Khlālid (770-2/1369-70). The situation rapidly worsened under this prince, who
was too young when he succeeded his father, so that
for the third time Irfīkiya was united by a Ḥafsīd of
Constantine and Bougie, Abu 'l-Abbās.

XVI. Abū'1-Hasan (772/1371-73). By his qualities
of mind and heart and his gentle firmness he
restored the prestige of the dynasty, of which he
was one of the most notable members. From him
descended all the succeeding Ḥafsīd sovereigns.

Once he had checked the Bedouins (773/1371) and
foesened their hold on the sedentary population,
he regained piecemeal the lands his forefathers had
lost to the south and south-west (773-83/1371-81)
and even recovered the Zāb. From 783/1381 onwards
Abū 'l-Abbās was occupied in consolidating his
achievements and curbing any attempt to revive the
suppressed local independencies of the south.

Thanks to internal 'Abd al-Wādīd quarrels and the
intense rivalry between 'Abd al-Wādīds and Marinids,
he had nothing to fear from the west. Relations
between Barbary and Christendom were soured by
the Franco-Genoese expedition against Mahdīa
(792/1390) was halted. Later, a reconciliation with
the Italian republics was brought about.

XVII. Abū Fāris (796-827/1394-1434) carried his father's task to a brilliant completion. In Constantine
and Bougie (798/1396), as well as in Tripoli, Gafsā,
Tozeur and Biskra, whose local dynasties he had
uprooted (800-4/1397-1402), he appointed officials
chosen from among his freedmen. He led daring expe-
ditions to the Aurās (800/1398) and the Saharan
borders of Tripolitania (809/1406-7). He cleared up
a serious crisis which agitated the Constantine region
and the south-east in 810-11/1407-8, and rounded it off
by taking Algiers (813/1410-1). There followed a long
period of calm, broken by the launching of several
attacks in the west whereby Abū Fāris attained
control over the 'Abd al-Wādīs of Tlemcen (827-34/ 1424-31). He intervened in Morocco as well, and even
in Andalusia. His relations with Christendom were
sometimes friendly, sometimes strained, but at
times close, and much diplomatic activity went on
all through the reign.

The propitious state in which Abū Fāris's father
had left the realm, and his own military prowess
account only in part for his unusual success; he
benefited in addition from the popularity which he
enjoyed for his care for justice and his policies of
religious orthodoxy, which was manifest in many
ways: favours bestowed on the pious, the 'ulamā',
the shāris, the celebration of the masīḏ, his efforts
to foster Sunnism in Djarba, religious and civil
building, the suppression of taxes not authorized
by the Sharī'a, the expansion of the voluntary
privateering regarded as dhīhad. Mālikī formalism
prevailed, owing to the influence of the famous
jurist Ibn 'Arafā (860-906/1450), who was
mainly responsible for banishing Ibn Khaldūn to
Cairo, where he died in 808/1406. The palace of the
Bardo, first mentioned in 823/1420, illustrates how
far Andalusian influence had penetrated into Ḥafsīd
Barbary. Besides being the ruler of a prosperous
state and a generous patron, Abū Fāris won a great
reputation in the Muslim world by his far-reaching
and discerning liberality. The septuagenarian who had defeated Alphonso V of Aragon at Djarba two years before ended his days in the Ouarsenis at the head of an expedition marching to subdue Tlemcen (837/1434).

XVIII. Al-Muntaṣār (837-9/1434-5). This grandson of Abū Fāris had to contend with rebellious relatives and their Arab allies. He erected a fountain and the madrasa al-Muntaṣāriyya which was to perpetuate his name.

XIX. Uṯmān (839-93/1435-88). Brother of the foregoing, he carried on the work of his illustrious grandfather Abū Fāris. Pious and just, he initiated many hydraulic works, and constructed numerous zāwiyas. He took the Tunisian miracle-worker Sīdī Ben ʿArūūs (d. 868/1463) under his protection. He too had to contend with his relatives, especially, for the space of seventeen years (839-56/1435-52), his uncle Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlī. This son of Abū Fāris was expelled from the governorship of Bougie in 843/1439, but for long afterwards held out against the troops of the sultan in the Constantinois. Uṯmān also undertook military operations in the south (845-55/1441-51). But in fact, once the first phase of Abu ʿl-Ḥasan’s venture was over (towards 843/1439), the greater part of the country was at peace. The provinces were governed, as they had been in Abū Fāris’s day, by the prince’s freedmen, with the title of ʿābd. One of them, Nābīl, affronted Uṯmān by the assumption of too great authority at the court, and was imprisoned (857/1453). The second part of the reign was clouded by outbreaks of famine and plague, and by the revival of tribal unrest, which was particularly troublesome in 867/1463; it was checked with severity, but not entirely suppressed. On many occasions Uṯmān marched against the south and south-west (864/1463, 870/1465). An ʿAbd al-Wādīd had taken Tlemcen and though brought once to heel (866/1462), he had again to be reduced to obedience (871/1466). The last years of the reign (875-93/1470-88), as indeed those of the dynasty, are obscure. Uṯmān tended more and more to appoint his own relatives to provincial governorships. It seems that he retained his hold on Tlemcen and in 877/1472 the new lord of Fez, the founder of the dynasty of the Banū Wāṭāt, recognised his suzerainty.

XX. Abū Zakariyyāʾ ʿAbd Yaḥyā (893-4/1488-9). This grandson of Uṯmān succeeded him. He dealt pitilessly with those of his relatives who challenged his rule, and was in the end himself killed by his first cousin ʿAbd al-Muʿāmin b. Ibtāḥīm.

XXI. ʿAbd al-Muʿāmin b. Ibtāḥīm (894-5/1489-90) was soon dethroned by a son of his predecessor and enemy.

XXII. Abū Yahyā Zakariyyāʾ ʿAbd Yaḥyā (895-900). The Hāfṣid state might conceivably have recovered its strength under this ruler, had he not died of the plague while still young.

XXIII. Abū ʿAbd Allāḥ Muḥammad (899-932/1494-1526). A first cousin of the preceding, he was given over to pleasure, and the decline of the dynasty went on apace. He restrained the rebellious Arab tribes only with difficulty, and the Spaniards took from him Bougie and Tripoli in 1510.

XXIV. Al-Ḥasan (932-50/1526-43). Son of the former ruler, he was driven from Tunis in 941/August 1534 by the Pasha of Algiers, Khayr al-Dīn Barbarossa, but after Charles V had occupied La Goulette he restored him to his capital (Muḥarram 942/July 1535). He fought against the Turks of Kayrawān (1535-36) and then against Sīdī ʿArafa (1540), the chief of the peculiar marabout state founded at Kayrawān by the Shāhībiyya tribe. His eldest son Ahmad deposed him.

XXV. Ahmad (950-76/1543-69). He too continued the struggle with the Shāhībiyya, whose new chief, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Taḥyīb, had allied himself with the Spaniards and with Muḥammad, the legitimate heir of the late Hāfṣid ruler. Meanwhile, the pirate Dragut (see ʿUrūḥiyya), in alliance with the Turks and Ahmad, was trying to establish himself in the Sahel. In 959/1552 the Shāhībiyya were defeated by Ahmad. The latter rewarded his own subjects with kindness and Dragut, returning from Istanbul with the title of Pāgha of Tripoli, took Gafsa (December 1556) and Kayrawān (December 1557). In 967/1569, the Pasha of Algiers seized Tunis, and Ahmad went to join his brother Muḥammad at La Goulette. Finally, in 982/1574, Don John of Austria lost Tunis which he had taken the year before, and the city was reduced to the rank of chief-town of an Ottoman province.


HĀHĀ, Moroccan confederation of Berber tribes (ibāhana) belonging to the sedentary Masmūda [g.v.], inhabiting the plateaux of the western High Atlas as far as the sea. In the 1939 census they numbered 84,000, among whom were 20 Jews, despite the traditional prohibition upon any Jew travelling about in this territory. It is a country on the ancient route (prehistoric remains) between North and South, between the plains of Marrākush and Tarūdant, either by the mountain passes or by the coast road. The Hāhā are a good example of Berbers that are islamized (perhaps by ʿUkba b. Nāfi’i) but almost devoid of Arab blood. They speak the tashelhit dialect (chleuh) and for the most part understand colloquial Arabic. Their territory includes almost the whole steppe- and forest-covered region of the argan-tree [see ARGAN] but, for lack of rain, they have to resort to extensive agriculture and goat-rearing. The houses are not grouped together in villages but are scattered, and each section lives separately. The confederation first appeared in history in the 5th/11th century (al-Bakrī does not know of it) as a supporter of the Almoravid movement, and later of the empire of the Almohads, either voluntarily or under compulsion. After the collapse of that dynasty, their geographical situation, though not giving them complete independence vis-à-vis the Marinid sultan, allowed them to show their regard for the nomadic Arabs deported by the Almohads, particularly the Ḥātīth and the Kalabiyya. Ibn Khaldūn praised their intellectual standing at that time and their long presence in the region. Over a century later Leo Africanus, followed by Ibn Khaldūn praised their intellectual standing at that time and their long presence in the region. Over a century later Leo Africanus, followed by Marmol, confirmed their juridical singularities and attributed to them a territory more extensive than that which they occupy at the present time; it apparently extended as far as the Asif al-Māl, a tributary on the left bank of the Wādī Tansift. Leo also noted that although some of their elements, no doubt near the plain or the coast road, still paid tribute to the last Arab nomads on the occasion of
their annual migration with their flocks, it was not without resistance. The same author records the
struggle against the Christians lasted for a long time, at the cost of much bloodshed and misery among the
confederation (see R. Ricard, Sources inédites, 1st series, Portugal, v, Paris 1953). It was
among the Haha; the surviving remains and the defunct series, Portugal, v, Paris 1953). It was
established a section of their cane-sugar industry among the Haha; the surviving remains and the
defore station of the region still testify to the economic significance of each song notes concerning the
(rhythm and
or decorate them in his manuscripts—a further indication that al-
Hâ'ik did not come from Tetuan. In spite of the detailed character of his collection, al-Hâ'ik did not collect all the Andalusian music which was sung in his time, for several verses of vanished
naubas which are still sung at Tetuan are not found in his manuscripts—a further indication that al-
Hâ'ik did not come from Tetuan.

In the absence of a system of musical notation, al-Hâ'ik had no instrument with which to indicate the melody from memory, adds in the margin of each song notes concerning the mlsân (rhythm and time) and separates the asâghûl songs with the number of their adwar.

The work begins without an introduction and then sets out the 722 songs which comprise the 24 modes, grouped into 11 naubas. At the beginning of each nauba there is a short explanation on the modes, including their origin and their qualities, and illustrated by examples of songs which actually belong to them. Next, arranged by rhythm, are found the various songs which form the nauba and whose number is not the same in all cases.

Above the song is given its title of tawwûh, sâdjûl or ghwîl, and almost all of them have in the margin a variant which is sung to the same melody. In the margin to the right of the number given in the margin are the nauba and whose number is not the same in all cases.

The work begins with an introduction and then sets out the 722 songs which comprise the 24 modes, grouped into 11 naubas. At the beginning of each nauba there is a short explanation on the modes, including their origin and their qualities, and illustrated by examples of songs which actually belong to them. Next, arranged by rhythm, are found the various songs which form the nauba and whose number is not the same in all cases.

The majority of the musicians of present-day Morocco, who continue the mediæval tradition, have
no knowledge of musical theory, so that the melodies and the texts of songs have undergone alterations; this gives al-Hâ'ik's work an especial importance in that it has rescued from oblivion all that remained of them in his time. The original manuscript does not survive, or at least it has not been known where it is, but a number of copies of it exist in various Moroccan towns; not all of them give the naubas in the same order or contain the same songs, the copyists having given preference to those which were most commonly sung in a given locality.

In 1333/1934-5, there was published at Rabat a book of 182 pages entitled Madjma'at al-a^shûn
al-mâshlikya al-andalusija al-marâifa bi 'l-Hâ'ik. Its author, al-Makki Ambrikâh, has collected the songs of the naubas Ramal al-mâya, al-^Ushshâk, al-Isbahdn, Gharbat al-Husayn, al-Râsad and Râdad al-dhayl after having, he claims, compared several MSS. This work, of unequal value, is incomplete, for, in addition to the fact that it contains only six naubas out of eleven, its author has not collected all the songs, nor included those which are found in the margins of the good manuscripts.

In the absence of a system of musical notation, al-Hâ'ik had no instrument with which to indicate the melody from memory, adds in the margin of each song notes concerning the mlsân (rhythm and time) and separates the asâghûl songs with the number of their adwar.

The work begins with an introduction and then sets out the 722 songs which comprise the 24 modes, grouped into 11 naubas. At the beginning of each nauba there is a short explanation on the modes, including their origin and their qualities, and illustrated by examples of songs which actually belong to them. Next, arranged by rhythm, are found the various songs which form the nauba and whose number is not the same in all cases.

HāʿIL [see ḥāyil].

HāʿIR (أ.), term [proved by various lexicographical investigations to be identical with hayr, see H. Pères, La poésie andalouse en arabe classique, Paris 1937, 129] whose meaning is clarified by the study of the remains of hayr still surviving around ancient princely residences of the Islamic Middle Ages. The frequent references by Arab authors, which lead to the conclusion that they were either parks or pleasure-gardens, provided sometimes with a summptuous pavilion, or more exactly zoological gardens like those which are recorded at Sāmarrā or at Madinat al-Zahra (cf. H. Pères, op. cit., index s.vv., ḥār and ḥayr), are supplemented by the data provided by the ruins of Umayyad or ʿAbbāsid castles, and by the ruins of the Ghaznawid castle of Lashk̸ār-i Bāzār in Afghanistan.

The numerous enclosures which surrounded the palaces of Baḥداد and Sāmarrā in Ṭrāk, enclosures filled with rare plants and stocked with animals, to make them hunting-reserves, have, it is true, now vanished without leaving any appreciable traces; but on the other hand, at Umayyad sites with the significant names Kaṣr al-Hayr al-Ḥarbil and Kaṣr al-Hayr al-Sharīkī (q.v. and architecture) and at Khirbat al-Mafaḥir (q.v.), various types of outer walling have survived to a degree sufficient to provide valuable information on the appearance and the dimensions of the gardens which they enclosed. In each case are found walls of stone and brick, now fallen into ruin but formerly of considerable height, which were supported by semi-circular buttresses built alternately against the inner and the outer face; these walls enclosed vast areas of arable land irrigated by aqueducts and with other elaborate installations for bringing and holding water; sluice-gates made it possible to drain off superfluous water brought by torrential rain-storms. The areas enclosed may have been pleasure-parks, continuing the tradition of the elaborately planned gardens of ancient Orient. More probably, however, the land was under very productive cultivation, planted particularly with bushes and trees (fruit-orchards and olives in the steppe-country around Palmyra, orange-trees in the Jordan valley); this would explain the presence of edifices built by members of the aristocracy, and sometimes by caliphs, in places which assured the owners substantial revenues from the products of the soil.


HĀṬ al-Ḥaḍūz “the wall of the Old Woman” (the form ḥāṭ al-Ḥaḍūz is sometimes found, notably in al-Harawi) the name given by Arabic writers to a wall said to have been built by the mythical queen of Egypt, Dalūkā [= al-ʿAdjūz], who is said to have mounted the throne after the army of al-Walīd b. Muṣṭafā [sic = the Khazars of Moses], in pursuit of the Israelites, had been engulfed by the Red Sea. In order to protect the surviving women, children and slaves from the attacks of the peoples of the East and of the West, Dalūkā is said to have surrounded the Nile Valley, from al-ʿArīsh to Aswan, by a rampart flanked by military posts each within call of the next; according to another tradition, this wall, which remains of which still existed in the 19th century. This wall was mentioned by many Arabic writers, but whereas al-Masʿūdī (332/943) for example saw only ruins of it, al-Harawi (d. 611/1215) had followed along it “on the tops of mountains and in the depths of valleys” from Bīl̸īys to the Nubian frontier “for a distance of about one month’s walking”, and Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmari (d. 749/1349), while admitting that the greater part of it had disappeared, stated that he had followed it from farthest Upper Egypt to Dandara.

Bibliography: The principal sources are listed by G. Wiet, L’Égypte de Muradī, Paris 1953, 97-8; here we mention only: Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb, 60; Masʿūdī, Murādī, ii, 398-9 (tr. Pellat, ii, § 809); Dimaḡki, 33-4; Iṣḥāḥī, Mustaṭraf, ii, 171 (tr. R. Basset, 1001 Contes, i, 176 and bibl.); Nuwayrī, Ḥiḥaṣ, i, 392-3; Harawi, Ziyārvī, 45-6; ʿUmari, Masālik, Cairo 1924, i, 239; Makrīzi-Wiet, i, 134, 166-7, iii, 288, 325; Yākūr, s.v.; Maspéro-Wiet, Matières, 72-3. (Ch. Pellat)

ḤAḴĀṬ, plural of ḥāṭha = truth, as a technical term denotes the gnostic system of the Ismāʿīliyya (q.v.) and related groups. In this technical sense the term is used particularly by the Taḥyūṣīs. During the 9th century, the term was part of the law—the time of concealment (sāṭr)—the ḥāṭha are hidden in the bāṭin (see bāṭiniyya), the interior truth behind the exterior (zāhir) of the scriptures and the law. While the law changes with every new prophetic era the truth of the ḥāṭha is eternal. This truth is the exclusive property of the divinely guided Imam and the hierarchy of teachers installed by him. It cannot be revealed to anyone except on formal initiation. The Kāʿim will abrogate all prophetic law and make the hidden truth public. In his era the ḥāṭha are fully known free from all symbolism. The teaching hierarchy is no longer needed and discarded.

The two main components of the ḥāṭha system are an interpretation of history as the permanent struggle and eventual victory of the hierarchy in the progress of the esoteric truth over the exoteric, and a cosmology dividing the world into a spiritual, an astral, and a physical realm. History is viewed as a progression of cycles with recurrent types and situations leading to its consummation in the appearance of the Kāʿim, who will rule and judge the world. The roots of this interpretation of history are Shiʿi, and it appears in its main features already in Ismāʿīli texts of the 3rd/9th century. The basis
texts as “a branch of the judicial power” (although, on the other hand, an arbitrator’s decision is regarded as a transaction). Indeed the hakam is obliged to give judgement in conformity with the rules of the Law; arbitration in simple equity, by friendly agreement, seems therefore to be impossible. But this disadvantage is offset by the fact that the parties may empower their respective arbitrators to agree, in their name, upon a compromise solution.

Scope. — Tahkim is possible only for the settlement of private conflicts of interest concerning property.

There may be only a single arbitrator, or the parties may nominate two or more arbitrators. In the last case the arbitrators must, in principle, give a unanimous decision. Nevertheless the question is discussed whether, if the parties agree, a majority decision may be given.

The necessary qualities of an arbitrator are the same as those demanded of a judge; and the same impediments and grounds of objection apply.

Effects. — The agreement to submit to arbitration is not binding, inasmuch as the appointment of the arbitrator is regarded as the nomination of a proxy, so that either party may revoke it ad nutum, even when it is the case of a single arbitrator appointed with the agreement of the two parties. This rule admits of only one modification: when the appointment of the arbitrator has been submitted to the judge for his approval, revocation is no longer possible. Nevertheless in the Hanbali madhhab one opinion teaches that revocation is no longer possible after the arbitrator has commenced proceedings. The Mālikī madhhab rejects these distinctions and recognizes the agreement to submit to arbitration as obligatory in all circumstances.

As for the arbitrator’s decision, it is binding in all the madhhab, except for one contrary opinion in the Shāfi‘i madhhab. It has therefore full legal force, and does not need to be confirmed by the ratification of a judge. Nevertheless an arbitrator’s decision carries less authority than a judge’s. On the one hand, it is generally agreed that an appeal against it may be made before the judge, who may annul it if it seems to him to be contrary to the teaching of the madhhab which he follows. (Yet it should be remembered that such an appeal may be made also against judicial decisions. In this case the party profiting by the arbitrator’s decision is free to submit it to a judge, who will confirm it, certifying that it is in conformity with his madhhab; in this case the decision will have the validity of a judgement proper. On the other hand, the effects of the decision are strictly limited to the persons who are directly involved. Thus whereas judgements may affect persons not involved in the proceedings but regarded legally as involved, the arbitrator’s decision is limited to the parties who are directly involved. Thus whereas judgements may affect persons not involved in the proceedings but regarded legally as involved, the arbitrator’s decision is limited to the parties who are directly involved.)

Bibliography: — The works of fikḥ, under the heading Takhīm; the Ottoman Medelle, art. 1841-51; E. Tyan, Histoire de l’organisation judiciaire en pays d’Islam, Leiden 1930, 29 ff.

AL-HAKAM B. ‘ABDAL B. DIJABALA AL-ASAD B. ABU ASAD AL-ASHAD, satirical Arab poet of the 1st/7th century. Physically deformed, for he was hunch-backed and lame, he possessed some spitefulness, which shows in his diatribes, but he had a lively wit, prompt repartee, humour, and the subtlety of the Ghādira clan to which he belonged (cf. Al-Ghādirī). He was born
at Kufa and lived there till 'Abd Allâh b. al-Zubayr drove out the Umayyad authorities (64/684) whom he followed to Damascus where he was admitted to the intimacy of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân. He then went back to Kufa and was closely connected with Bishr b. Marwân [q.v.] whom he accompanied to Baṣra when the latter was appointed governor there (74/693-4), and whose death he was to lament at the end of that same year. He was also on excellent terms with 'Abd al-Malik b. Bishr, and frequented the salon of al-Ḥâdîqâdî, who on one occasion rewarded him richly. While poetry was certainly his means of livelihood, he is recorded to have used his literary gifts in more practical and pompous eulogies that poets used to address to the great; he contented himself with merely sending short letters in verse to his benefactors, appealing to their generosity, and the fear of his satires was generally enough to assure him success; al-Ḍâhibî (Bayûn, iii, 74) and other authors after him even describe how, once his reputation for redoubtable satire was established, he limited himself to sending his written satires to his spiritual sons and relations with Ruḍûdi [q.v.] (d. in about 796) and, in particular, Muslim b. al-Walîd. The two men were enemies, to the point that they sometimes came to blows, and it is related that Muslim took a long time to get the better of his adversary. The epigrams that they exchanged do not appear to have been scurrilous, and it is interesting to see in them the revival of the old tribal disputes and rivalries between the Muḥājjirûn and the Ansâr, Ibn Kanbâr acting as defender of the former against Muslim who never gave him too little of his poetry to draw conclusions of any value.

Bibliography:  
Aghdni, xiii, 9-12 (Beirut ed., xiv, 153-60, xxii, 228-71 passim); Ibn Sallâm, Ṭabarî, 579 (although the Aghdni relates several details on the authority of Ibn Sallâm [139-231/756-845], the latter does not give any account of Ibn Kanbâr); Šâli, Awâlî, i, 30, 215; Šuqî, Zahr al-a'dâb, 155, 761; F. Bustânî, Dîvân, iii, 468; Muslim, Dîvân, ed. S. Dáhhân, index.  

(Ch. Pellat)

ḤAKAM b. SA'D, tribe of Arabia dwelling in the Tihâma. [q.v.].

(Al-)ḤAKAM IBN 'UK(K)ÂSHA, an Andalusian adventurer. His ancestor 'Uk(k)asha had been one of the numerous muwâlîs who had joined forces with Ibn Bâlsûn to rebel against the central power. But when Abd al-Malik b. Bishr went to Baghdad, where he appears in the company of Ibn al-Sâka, the vizier of Ibn Dîhwar [see MAWARIIDS]. The assassination of the vizier led to the imprisonment of (al-)Ḥakam, who nevertheless succeeded in escaping and joining the King of Toledo, al-Mâ'mûn. The latter, who also was aiming at annexing Cordova to his possessions, was anticipated by al-Mu'tamid of Seville. But when al-Mâ'mûn set him in command of one of his fortresses on the frontier of the Cordovan territory, Ibn 'Uk(k)âsha, much helped by the hostility which the Cordovans felt for the 'Abbâidis, managed by a sudden attack to gain entrance to the town and kill the governor 'Abbâd, the son of al-Mu'tamid, together with Ibn Martín, the chief of his mercenaries. He met with no resistance in making himself master of the city, and proceeded to proclaim as ruler al-Mâ'mûn, the son of al-Wâdîd. After a few months spent in Cordova was solemnly recognized as ruler on Friday 23 Dîjamâd II 467/13 February 1075. However, he died, possibly through poisoning, four months later on 14 Dhu 'l-Ka'âda 467/1 July 1075. The Cordovans rose in revolt and summoned back al-Mu'tamid; Ibn 'Uk(k)âsha fled without contemplating resistance, and as he was crossing the bridge over the Gua- dalquivir he was killed by a Jew on 29 Dhu 'l-Hijâda 467/15 August 1075. As a sign of contempt, his body was crucified together with that of a dog. His son Harzû fled to Toledo, where al-Kâdir, al-Mâ'mûn's successor, put him in command of Cala- trava (Kal'aṭ Rabâb); he is mentioned as a poet by al-Šâfi, Ibn Khâkân and Ibn al-Abbâr.


(A. Huici Miranda)

AL-HAKAM I b. HÎGÎM, Abu 'l-'Âs, third Umayyad amîr of Cordova. The second son of his father, who died prematurely, he succeeded on 3 Safar 180/17 April 796 when 26 years old. At his
proclamation the internal truce was broken and his uncles Sulayman and 'Abd Allāh, sons of 'Abd al-Rahmān I, disputed his authority. He therefore accompanied his forces to Barbary to Spain. 'Abd Allāh made for the Upper Frontier, but he found conditions unfavourable there and went with his sons 'Ubayd Allāh and 'Abd al-Malik to negotiate with Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle and offer him support in a campaign against Barcelona and the region of the Ebro delta. In the following year Sulayman also landed in the Peninsula with his forces and, at the instigation of his cousin, was uncovered, and 72 Cordovan notables were crucified and exposed on the causeway which he was proposing to have allegiance sworn to him. This action was the result of a stroke which he had suffered two years before falling ill he gave evidence of exemplary piety, in contrast with the conduct of his father, even before falling ill he gave evidence of exemplary piety, in contrast with the conduct of his father, and his artistic predilections seemed to augur well for a long and fruitful reign, but his health, which had always been delicate, took a serious turn for the worse as he lost his health and he withdrew into his palace. He died on 350/15 or 16 October 961. He had acquired a long and direct experience of public affairs and as a statesman showed himself not unworthy of his illustrious father. The fifteen years of his reign were peaceful; the only alarm to disturb them was a raid by the Danish Madīğ, which landed first at Alcacer do Sal and were repulsed on the plain of Lisbon in 365/975. The indubitableness of the Caliphs forces ensured the most complete security of the borderland right from the beginning of al-Hakam II's rule. It also imposed a truce on Christian Spain during which embassies arrived in Cordova continuously from 356/966 until 365/975, when count García Fernandez of Castile, with Galician and Navarrese support, broke the peace and was defeated at S. Esteban de Gormaz and later at Langa on the Duero and Estercuel near Tudela. Al-Hakam's activity in Morocco, now that the Fātimids had removed to Egypt, and until the rise to political and military power of Muḥammad b. 'Amir, known as al-Manṣūr (Almanzor of the Christian Chronicles [see AL-MĀNṢŪR]), was confined to deposing the Idrisid princes. In the course of ten years, by dint of intrigues, distribution of gold, and armed intervention, he saw to it that his best general, the famous muwāllad Ghalīb, subdued the Idrisid al-Hasan b. Gannūn and transported him and his relatives to Cordova. This minor triumph was celebrated with great pomp as marking the resolution of the last major problem for the Abd al-Rahmānids: the occupation of al-Andalus. This minor problem had been delicate, took a serious turn for the worse as he lost his health and he withdrew into his palace. He died on 3 Safar 366/1 October 976, and the bay'a to Hishām II took place on the following day. Even before falling ill he gave evidence of exemplary piety, in contrast with the conduct of his father, and sought with enthusiasm the company of jurists and theologians as well as literary men and scientists. 

Bibliography: Ibn al-Qalādī, ii, 233-53, 257-9 (tr. 384-418, 427-9); Ibn Sa'd, Muḥarrīb, ii, 114, 157; Ibn al-Kaṭṭāb, A'mālī, 47-8; Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, iv, 144-7; Ibn al-Barrā, Huṣa, 101-5; Maškārī, Anālecītes, i, 247-57 and passim (see index); Dozy, Hist. Mus. Esp., ii, 176-99; Codera, Dictionnaire des invasions et conquêtes de l'Espagne musulmane, ii, 413-7; E. Levi-Provencal, Hist. Esp. Mus., i, 131-5, 151-89, where all the known sources have been used, including the yet unpublished part of the Muḥtabīs of Ibn Ḥayyān, Fez ms., 1-101. (A. Husi Miranda)
**AL-HAKAM II — HAKIKA 75**


**HAKIKA**, Various approximate translations of this word can be given, as will appear. The meanings that predominate are "reality", in the sense of the intelligible nucleus of the thing existing, or "nature" of the thing, or "transcendental truth" of that which exists. The term is not Kur'anic, unlike *madīd* or *tasawwuf*; but always in keeping with a connation of "reality", the "true"). — There are two attitudes according to Avicennan usage, *hakika* possesses a two-fold meaning, the ontological and the logical. 

1. In rhetoric (and exegesis, *tafsir*), *al-hakika* is the basic meaning of a word or an expression, and is distinguished (a) from *madīd*, metaphor, metaphorical and figurative meaning, and (b) from *kayfīyya*, in the general sense of analogy. — Ibn Taymiyya has left (ms., coll. Rashīd Rīdā, Cairo) a treatise *al-Ḥakikat wa ʿl-madīd*. When the *madīd* becomes so habitual in use that it acquires as it is the basic meaning of a word or an expression, and becomes an abstract substantive. — Ibn Taymiyya is here clearly differentiated from *al-hakika* of a thing as it is in itself ("the exact conception of the thing") and its quiddity (*māhiyya*). — Deity and God, says L. Massignon, reserve *al-hakika* as a sense of the absolute intelligibility of things, understood through the spirit of the mystic, which thus leads to the Real but is not itself the Real. 'The [essential] reality ([al-hakika] of a thing is on this side of the real ([dān al-hakika])", said al-Hallādī (cf. Louis Massignon, *Passion*, 508). (b) From this same logical point of view, *hakika* or *madīd* is here clearly differentiated from *al-hakika* as the ultimate reality of the real itself in the uniqueness of being of all existence (*waḥdat al-wujūd*); and the *hakika* of the universe is to be God manifested in His attributes (cf. the central thesis of the *Fusūs al-ḥikam* of Ibn ʿArabī). Experience of union or identification will therefore be an effective experience (of intellectual-gnostic type) of the unique "reality" beyond the real. — Some Ṣūfī expressions applying this second meaning (al-Dūrjānī, *op. cit.*, 95): *hakibat al-hakika* is, "unique and universal degree of all realities", also called "presence of union" and "presence of being"; *hakibat al-asma* "realities" of the divine Names, determinations of the Essence (*dād*) and its connection with the manifested world, — that is to say, the attributes by which each thing is distinguished from each other; *al-hakika al-muhkamaddiyya*, the divine Essence in the first of these manifestations, "and it is the supreme Name". 

2. In falsafa (especially according to Avicennan usage), *hakika* possesses a two-fold meaning, the ontological and the logical. 

(a) Ontological meaning (*hakibat al-ḥakay*): "Everything has a *hakika* through which it is what it is. . . . It is what we have called "existent proper" (al-wujūd al-ḥakay); by that, we mean that we do not meant to signify concrete (*dhāt*) existent, immanent to that in question, but everything *hakika* which is its quiddity (*māhiyya*)." (Ibn Sīnā, *al-Shifā*, *al-Ṭibb*). Then *hakika* then becomes the "basic, divine and definitive meaning" (*ibid.*, n. 2).

(b) From this same logical point of view, *hakika* or *madīd* is here clearly differentiated from *al-hakika* as the ultimate reality of the real itself in the uniqueness of being of all existence (*waḥdat al-wujūd*); and the *hakika* of the universe is to be God manifested in His attributes (cf. the central thesis of the *Fusūs al-ḥikam* of Ibn ʿArabī). Experience of union or identification will therefore be an effective experience (of intellectual-gnostic type) of the unique "reality" beyond the real. — Some Ṣūfī expressions applying this second meaning (al-Dūrjānī, *op. cit.*, 95): *hakibat al-hakikat*, "unique and universal degree of all realities", also called "presence of union" and "presence of being"; *hakibat al-asma*, "realities" of the divine Names, determinations of the Essence (*dād*) and its connection with the manifested world, — that is to say, the attributes by which each thing is distinguished from each other; *al-hakika al-muhkamaddiyya*, the divine Essence in the first of these manifestations, "and it is the supreme Name". 

3. Other usages could be reviewed. Some references may be given, by way of example, to the usage of al-Ghazālī, who stands so to speak on the hinge between the two vocabularies of falsafa and tasawwuf (before the full elucidation of the "Uniqueness of Being"). — *Al-hakika* is the profound reality, the quintessence of things, the flesh that is discovered behind the peel. The expression *hakibat al-umūr*, "the essential realities of things", often recurs (e.g. Munkidh, 8), *hakibat al-umūr* here being almost synonymous with *asrār*; similarly *hakibat al-hakikat* is the "essential reality of the Real" (e.g. *Ishdrdt*, 56), which in a flash leads faith (iman) to *yaḥsin*, absolute certainty. 

We may further define the meaning of *hakika* according to two correlative distinctions (*mukābāl*) which frequently serve to explain it. A. *Hakika* is distinct from *ḥakīb*. The analyses given above form the first step. *Hakika* and *ḥakīb* can be differentiated as the abstract and the concrete: "reality" and "real". — Deity and God, says L. Massignon (*Passion*, 468). Now, "if reality is on this side of the real" (see above), "everything real, affirms al-
Halladj, has its essential reality" (ibid., 801, n. 1). And again (from al-Sulami, cf. L. Massignon, Lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, Paris 1954, 310): "The confusion of the students of the truth is, of course, due to their lack of comprehension, they are one single (Name); from the point of view of the Real (al-ha$k = God), they are Reality (al-ha$kha$)". Determined by the definite article, al-ha$k$ is the very Name which will most usually denote God in Şifa; usage; thus it could not be confused with ha$kika. But, without the article, ha$k$ can assume a fully abstract sense which approximates it to ha$kika, reality, truth (cf. L. Massignon, Lexique, 1954, 310, n. 2). Subsequently (in later Şifism), al-ha$kika$ so coming to denote an effective, deeply felt experience, the man in quest of God will fix his heart upon this by a purification (tansik) of his idea of the divine attribute (cf. al-Hudjwiri, Kashf al-mahk$u$b, Eng. trans. by Nicholson, Leiden-London 1911, 381). It is in this sense that ha$k$ can denote in God the essence not manifested, and ha$kika$ the divine attributes which are indeed the most important of things, their essential reality (cf. Dict. of techn. terms, 333 ff.). The Şifs of the "unity of Being" like to call themselves "the People of the ha$kika"; but "the People of the Sunna and the Community" claim the title of ali al-ha$k$ (cf. H. Laoust, La profession de foi d'Ibn Battja, Damascus 1958, 166, n. 2).

B. -Ha$kika$ differentiated (by contrast) from shari$'$a. This is one of the themes of the Kashf al-mahk$u$b of al-Hudjwiri. Ha$kika$ here receives a meaning very near to Ghazâlî's usage. It is the profound reality which remains immutable "from the time of Adam to the end of the world", like the knowledge of God, or religious practice, which only the inner purpose renders perfect. Shari$'$a ("Law") is the reality which can undergo abrogations or changes like ordinances and commandments. Two errors are to be guarded against: that of the pure jurists who refuse to distinguish between inner reality and the regulations of the Law, and that of the batin$'$iya and extremist Şî$lîs (eg. Karmâtî), teaching that the Law is abolished when profound Reality is attained. In fact, says al-Hudjwiri, the shari$'$a cannot possibly be maintained within the Law. If of the latter without observance of the shari$'$a (Kashf al-mahk$u$b, Eng. tr., 381). Each of them rests on three pillars: for ha$kika$, it is the three-fold knowledge (a) of the Essence and Unity of God, (b) of His Attributes, (c) of His Actions and His Wisdom; for shari$'$a, the three-fold knowledge (a) of the Kur$'$an, (b) of the Sunna, (c) of the ijma$'$ (ibid., 24). In conclusion, the "mutual relation of (shari$'$a and ha$kika$) may be compared to that of body and spirit" (ibid., 383).

Thus ha$kika$, in the sense either of profound or essential reality, or of transcendental truth, was to be currently used in very different lexicons (the Hanball al-Barbahârî, Tarba$'$h, ii, 22, was to speak of "the reality of the faith"; ha$kî$zat al-î$mân, which only observance of the whole body of religious prescriptions guarantees; cf. H. Laoust, op. cit., 82, n. 1). Falsafa was to make it a precise term of ontology and logic; and tasawwuf employed it very differently, depending on whether the inner experience specified was or was not situated within a monist view of the relations of God and the world.

Bibliography: in addition to the references in the text: Raghib, Mufradât, 125; Lone, Lexicon, 609; M. Hortal, Theologie des Islam, 152-5; Kughayry, Risâla, with comm. of ʻArâfî and Zakariayyû, ii, 92 ff.; F. Jabre, La notion de certitude selon El-Hakîm, Paris 1958, see Index, s.v.; Ansârî-Harawi, K. al-Andalûs, text and Fr. tr. by S. de Laugier de Beaurecueil, Cairo 1962, 92-101/121-8. (L. Gardef)

HAKIM [see Tabîb].

HAKIM-ATA (d. (?) 582/1186), Turkish saint of Khârizm, the disciple and third ka$'$ifa of ʻAbd-al-Ḥarîm, author of of popular poems on the mystic life. His personal name was Sulaymân and he was the niais Bastaghân là (i.e., [according to Barthold, Turkestân], 200 and n. 1) of ʻAbd-al-ʻAzîz, a locality near the modern Kung,ad, in the delta of the Amû Daryây, where his tomb is still pointed out.

The legendary biography of ʻAbd-al-ʻAzîz is recounted in the anonymous Ḩakîm Ata kitâbî (Kazan 1846); as a child he attracted the attention of ʻAbd-al-Ḥarîm, and at the age of 15 became his muhîd; he was given the name Ḥakîm ("wise") by the prophet Khîdr (see al-Ḥakîm), who inspired him to utter his poems (kitâbîs); his Ḥakîm having sent him out on a camel with orders to settle wherever the camel brought him, at Binâwî he attracted the attention of ʻBughra Khân' and received in marriage his daughter ʻAnbar, by whom he had three sons (for a summary see M. F. Koprulûzâde, İk mutasawwflar, 98-104).

Three works, all very popular down to modern times in Turkestan and especially in the Volga basin, are attributed to him: (1) Bahrgâm ha$kîlî (MS very common, printed Kazan 1846, etc.) is a collection of the works of 14 authors, consisting of 124 poems of which 44 are by ʻSulaymân') and 8 versified tales (with two, on the mi$'$râd$'$ and on Abraham's sacrifice of Ismâ'îl, by Sulaymân) the spirit and style is close to that of ʻAbd-al-Ḥarîm's Diwân; (2) ʻA$'$îr samân kitâbî (Kazan 1847, etc.), in hasâ$'$â metre, on the Day of Judgement; (3) Ḥavatî-i Maryam ha$kîlî (Kazan 1858, etc.), in maddî metre, on the death of Mary the mother of Jesus (a story given also by Râghîbî [s.v.]). His Mi$'$râd$'$-nâmé and some of his short poems are included also in the Diwân-i Hikmet of ʻAbd-al-Ḥarîm (Istanbul 1899, 47-56).

Bibliography: M. F. Koprulûzâde, Türk edebiyâtında ilk mutasawwflar, Istanbul 1918, 40-2, 98-104 (legends of his life), 193-5 (his works), with references to some of the others; S. de Laugier de Beaurecueil, Cairo 1962, s.v. Hakim-Ata, by R. Rahmeti Arat, with further references.

GÖNYÂ ALPAY

ḤAKĪM-BÂSHI [see HEKIM-BÂSHI].

AL-ḤAKĪM BI-AMR ALLĀH, sixth Fâtimid caliph, whose name was ʻAbd al-ʻAzîz al-Mansûr, one of the most famous caliphs because of his excesses, his cruelty, his persecutions, particularly of the Christians, the divine character which certain of his supporters attributed to him and which is an article of faith with the Druzes, and because of his mysterious end. It is difficult to form an exact idea of his personality, so strange and even inexplicable were many of the measures which he took, and so full of contradictions does his conduct seem. His main characteristic is a tyrannical and cruel despotism, with intervals of liberalism and humility.

Al-ʻAzîz, born in 375/985, was only eleven and a half years old when his father, Al-ʻAzîz, died at Bilbays on 28 Ramadân 386/14 October 996. He had been proclaimed wali al-ʻulâm in 383/993. On his deathbed, Al-ʻAzîz had instructed the chief ʻAlî Muhammad b. al-Nîmân and the leader of the Kutâfâ, al-Hasan b. ʻAmâr, to proclaim his son caliph. He made his entry into Cairo on the day following his father's death, dressed in a monochrome
durra, wearing a turban ornamented with precious stones, with a lance in his hand, a sword at his waist and preceded by his father's corpse. On the following day he was solemnly presented to the dignitaries in the great ʿsāfāt of the Palace, seated on a golden throne, and was greeted with the title of ʿṣāfāt with the lašab of al-Ḥakīm bi-amr Allāh.

Right at the beginning of his reign, the Kutāma Berbers, who were the mainstay of the dynasty, insisted that the leadership of the government be entrusted to their chief, al-Ḥasan b. ʿAmrār, who was also the leader of the Kutāma Berbers. In Sicily, and he was appointed ʿṣāfātāt [see ʿṣāfātāt], with the lašab of Amin al-Dawla. He showed favour to the Berbers in the army, at the expense of the other elements—Turks, Daylamis and Blacks, had ṣaṣa b. Nasṭūrus, the vizier of al-ʿAẓl, put to death, and quarrelled with the young caliph's tutor, the eunuch slave Bardiawan [q.v.]. The latter, made anxious by the plan formed by the followers of Ibn ʿAmrār to suppress al-Ḥakīm, made an alliance with the governor of Damascus, the Turk Manguṭekin. But Manguṭekin, having marched towards Egypt accompanied by his Bedouin ally Mufarridj b. Daghfīl b. al-Djarrah [see Djarrahids], was abandoned by him and defeated near ʿAṣkāla by Ibn ʿAmrār's troops under the command of Sulaymān b. ʿAṣfāt b. Fallāḥ. However, Ibn ʿAmrār's government lasted only a short time. One of the most powerful Berbers, Diṣṣysh b. Šamsāma, who had been dismissed from his post as governor of Tripoli, joined with Bardjawān. A revolt broke out against Ibn ʿAmrār, who was defeated and had to go into hiding, and Bardjawān seized power and took over the position of ʿṣāfātāt at the end of Ramadan 397/beginning of October 997 and caused the oath of loyalty to the young caliph to be sworn again. Ibn ʿAmrār, at first pardoned, was later assassinated.

The administration of Bardjawān, helped by his secretary, Fahd b. Ibrāhīm, had to face numerous difficulties: the Byzantine offensive in northern Syria, a rebellion at Tyre of the adventurer ʿAllākā with Byzantine support, and disturbances at Damascus and at Barša in Tripolitania. Affairs in Syria ended successfully when the defeat of the Byzantine army at Tyre, with the help of the most powerful Berbers, Diṣṣysh b. Šamsāma, although at first defeated outside ʿĀfamiya, pursued and conquered the Byzantines who were disorganized by the death of their leader Damascus (see M. Canard's translation of the account by Ibn al-Kalānīn in Reves des Études Byzantines, Paris, xix (1961), 297 ff.). Just before the beginning of this campaign against the Byzantines, Mufarridj, who wished to make himself master of Ramla, had had to submit to Diṣṣysh b. Šamsāma. Order was restored at Damascus. It was restored also at Barša, but the attempt to take Tripoli from the Zirid ruler of Ifirkiya failed. The negotiations with the Byzantines, begun after the ʿĀfāmiya incident and initiated either by the Emperor Basil or by Bardjawān, came to nothing and Basil began a new campaign in 390/1000, which was being rebuilt, and the erection in its place of the Rāšida mosque (on this see al-Makrizi, Khitāt, ii, 282); the conversion of two other churches into mosques; the transfer of the Melkite Christians from their own quarter to that of al-Ḥamra (on which see ʿAbd b. ʿAbd al-Majīd, Khitāt, i, 298): the prohibition of wine, although Muslim law permits it to Christians, and orders to destroy the wine-jars and to empty the wine onto the ground.

The measures taken against the Christians and the Jews were one of the most striking features of his reign, and it must be admitted that there had already been similar edicts issued by the ʿAbbasid caliphs. We list al-Ḥakīm's measures briefly here: 393/1004: a proclamation of the prohibition of wine which was being rebuilt, and the erection in its place of the Rāšida mosque (on this see al-Makrizi, Khitāt, ii, 282); the conversion of two other churches into mosques; the transfer of the Melkite Christians from their own quarter to that of al-Ḥamra (on which see ʿAbd b. ʿAbd al-Majīd, Khitāt, i, 298): the prohibition of wine, although Muslim law permits it to Christians, and orders to destroy the wine-jars and to empty the wine onto the ground.

395/1004: the forcing of Christians and Jews to wear black belts (ṣumārd) and turbans.
396/1005-6: a new prohibition of wine.
397/1007: the prohibition of the Palm Sunday procession at Jerusalem and elsewhere.
398/1008: the confiscation of the possessions of the churches and monasteries in Egypt.
399/1009: the forcing of Christians and Jews to wear black belts (ṣumārd) and turbans.
400/1009-10: the demolition of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem; according to Ibn al-
This was because the caliph was indignant at a fraud practised by the monks in the miracle of the descent of the holy fire on to the altar (on this miracle see Krakovskiy, The "holy fire" according to the accounts of al-Biruni and other Muslim writers of the 10th-12th centuries (in Russian), in Khristianskiye Vostochnii, iii/3 (1915), 226-42).

In the same year: the prohibition in Cairo of the Epiphany Procession, the Muslim authorities being forbidden to attend it as they had formerly done; the destruction of the Melkite monastery of al-Kasir on the Makaat'ajm Hills and the desecration of the graveyard; the destruction of a church at Danietta.

401/1010: the repetition of the order to the Christians and Jews to wear black belts; a new prohibition of wine and of its use in the Mass.

402/1011-12: the forbidding of the display of crosses and the sounding of lahūs [q.v.].

403/1012-13 (in 404, according to al-Maqrizi): an order to the Christians and the Jews to wear black turbans and head veils (taylasathom), and to Christians to wear a wooden cross round their necks; an order forbidding them to ride on horseback; the replacement of Christian officials by Muslims. These measures were made still more severe after Christian petitions were received, and a large number of Christians were forced through fear to embrace Islam. This was a disastrous year for the Christians, all of their convents and churches being destroyed and their treasures confiscated. Only the monastery of Sinai was spared, thanks to a ruse on the part of the abbot. But it did not escape confiscations, since, in 411/1021, the abbot complained to the caliph about them.

In general this policy had the approval of the Muslims, who hated the Christians because of acts of misappropriation and of favouritism by the Christian financial officials, which led for example to the execution in 393/1003 of the secretary Fahd b. Ibrāhim, who had been at the head of affairs for more than five years, and the imprisonment, although temporary, of several Christian secretaries of the various offices. It should be mentioned that these measures were perhaps not always strictly enforced, otherwise they would not have been necessary to repeat them.

On the other hand, in 404/1013 al-Ḥākim allowed the Christians and the Jews, even those who had embraced Islam, to return to their faith and to emigrate to Greek territory. In 412/1021, when he learned that some Christians who had become Muslims were attending Mass in certain houses, he took no action against them, and in the same year he produced a whole series of measures in favour of the Christians: authorizing the rebuilding of the monastery of al-Ḵaṣr and the restoration of its possessions, granting protection to all the churches of Jerusalem, restoring some churches and returning their possessions to all the churches, and authorizing Christians who had embraced Islam to apostatize.

One wonders whether al-Ḥākim was not at times inspired by the memory of his Christian mother. The specifically Shi'i and anti-Sunnī measures encountered a vigorous opposition from the mainly Sunnī population of Egypt, and were, either because of this or in an access of liberalism, sometimes repealed. Although, in 393/1002-3, thirteen people were arrested, publicly exhibited and imprisoned for three days for having performed the prayer of al-duhd [see §11.2] which had been forbidden since 370, in 399/1009 it was once again permitted to perform it, according to Yahyā b. Sa'id al-Anājī. Similarly there were authorized the kullāt [q.v.] in the Friday prayer (which was considered as having been introduced during the 4Abbāsid period: cf. al-Nu'mān, Daš'atim, i, 121) and the prayer of the tarāwīh in Ramadān; it was permitted in summoning to the prayer of al-fāṣir to say twice (talawih), in accordance with Sunni practice, "prayer is better than sleep"; it was no longer obligatory to call, in the adhām, "Come to the best of works", which was a specifically Shi'i formula (cf. al-Maqrizi, ii, 287 and 342, where the latter matres de ligature are repeated similarly in al-Maqrizi, ii, 342, in 403/1012 he ordained a return to the formula "Come to the best of works", suppressed the talawih and once again forbade the salāt al-duhd and that of the tarāwīh. The forbidding of women to weep and lament at funerals should probably also be attributed to a reaction against a popular practice which had been forbidden by the Prophet but which the Sunnīs do not seem to have combated very successfully.

One of the measures which often gave rise to disturbances was the anathema pronounced in 395/1005 against the first caliphs and the Companions of the Prophet: orders were given to inscribe these maledictory formulas on the walls of the mosques and of various other buildings and also on the bazaar shops, and this gave rise to a brawl at the time of the return from the Pilgrimage. The edict was therefore repealed twice years later and an order was given to efface the anathemas and to punish any who insulted the Companions. This order was renewed in 403/1013. To this reversal of policy and return to Sunni practice belongs also the authorization to celebrate the fast and the breaking of the fast as the Sunnīs did, when the new moon was actually observed, whereas the Fātimid law fixed the beginning of the month by astronomical calculations; and also the suppression of the Feast of Ḥaḍīr Khumm (al-Maqrizi, i, 389, 10).

The rigorous measures against the Sunnīs produced a great zeal for Shi'ism and people thronged the lectures which were given at the palace by the chief Kādi' Abād al-'Azīz b. Muhammad b. al-Nu'mān, to such an extent that people died of suffocation.

The creation of the dār al-tīm or dar al-ḥikmah [q.v.] in 395/1005 was another measure intended to combat Shi'i propaganda and promote Sunnī doctrine.

The edicts of an ethico-social character are among the most curious decisions of this caliph, and when they were not the result of caprice and of outright whims, it is possible to attribute them to an anxiety to promote good morals and to combat libertinism.

The prohibition of wine which we have already mentioned affected the Muslims as well as the Christians. It was not observed during the revolt of Abū Rakwa (see below). It was repealed in 396/1006, when al-Ḥākim's physician had pointed out to him that wine would be beneficial for his health. But this order was re-introduced several times, certainly out of a concern for morality. Of a similar nature were the suppression of houses of ill-fame, the forbidding of people to appear in baths without wearing a loin-cloth, the forbidding of the sale of slave singing-girls, the suppression of the sale of honey and of raisins (which could be used to make intoxicating drinks), the prohibition of musical instruments and the forbidding of performances by singers and musicians. For the same reasons he forbade women to adorn themselves and to display their jewels, to go to the baths, the cemeteries and even, at one time, to go out at all, in 405 forbidding the shoemakers to make shoes for them so that they were forced to remain indoors. Some women who
went to the baths in spite of the prohibition were walled up there.

Al-Hākim also forbade pleasure parties on the banks of the Nile and boating excursions on the Khaldjī; he also ordered all doors and windows which overlooked the Khaldjī to be closed. He even forbade people to walk about at night or to keep shops open after sunset, though at other times he himself took pleasure in strolling in the crowded streets.

All these measures were extremely unpopular; al-Hākim was certainly anxious to deal severely with the tendencies to criminals and to profligates among the population and he did not hesitate to punish most severely any infringements of the prohibitions.

Although it can be admitted that the caliph's motives in issuing certain of the prohibitions were serious, the same cannot be said of a number of other measures. Among these was a series of prohibitions concerning food, which werereesome both for trade and for the consumers. He forbade mushroom, a magnumious vegetable, on the pretext that Abū Bakr, Abū 'Isha and Mu'āwiya had liked it; the salad known as muuwakaliyya (rocket), lupins, certain shell-fish (tellina), fish without scales (which recalls the prohibition in Deuteronomy, XIV, 3 ff.). The forbidding of the killing of cattle except for the Feast of Sacrifices may have arisen from the need to preserve them for agriculture (compare the policy of al-Hadīdja). But we can say of the order, twice issued, to kill all the dogs because their barking annoyed the caliph, and of the prohibition of the game of chess? What explanation can be found for al-Hākim's confiscation in 399 of his mother's, his sister's and his wives' possessions?

Infringements of all these regulations were sometimes punished by death, for al-Hākim resorted to executions for all kinds of reasons, among them to inspire terror and as a method of government. The number of viziers, high officials and ordinary individuals whom he put to death is considerable. We mention here only a few cases: the assassination of Bardjawaun and execution of Fahd b. Ibrāhīm (see above); the execution in 395/1005-6 of all the inmates of the prisons; tortures inflicted in 399/1009 on a number of Christian officials (hanging up by the heels of them in 399/1009, execution of the vizier 'Ali b. al-'Uṣayna, the Maghribī, and of the ex-vizier Sālih b. 'Ali, and in 401/1010 of his successor, the Christian Mansūr b. 'Abdūn, and also of Husayn b. Djawhar and 'Abd al-ʿAzīz b. Muḥammad b. al-Nūmān who, after having fled to the Banū Kurra, had returned under safe-conduct; in 401/1010, the mutilation of Abu 'l-ʿKāsim al-Dīwrāja and of the black eunuch Ghayn, a high official of the Palace, and in the same year the execution by drowning of several of al-Hākim's concubines; in 405/1014, the execution of the vizier al-Ḥusayn b. Zahir al-Wazzaun and of two other viziers, one of them being al-Fadl b. Diʿyar b. al-Furāt. He even had secretly put to death, in 400/1010, his maternal uncle Arsenius, the Melkite patriarch of Alexandria, whom he himself had elected ten years earlier. His hypocrisy and cynicism were such that he would even load with gifts people whom he was soon afterwards to execute.

It is not surprising therefore that the whole population stood in terrible fear of al-Hākim.

One of his most cruel acts—for it was inspired solely by the desire for vengeance—was his decision, at the end of 410/March 1020, to burn al-Fustāṭ, as a result of the circulation of libellous statements against him, accusing him of abandoning Islam completely and of having abolished its fundamental prescriptions (fasting and the pilgrimage) and of preaching of al-Darāzī and of Ḥamza (see below), and because of the riots which had followed the proclamation of the divinity of al-Hākim by a propagandist at the Mosque of ʿĀmr. He gave orders to his black troops to plunder and to burn al-Fustāṭ, and these troops committed atrocities on the inhabitants. The eunuch slave ʿAdī, whom the caliph had sent to restore order, gave him such an angry account of what had happened that al-Hākim had him killed on the spot. But he had to intervene himself to stop the fighting, for the Turks and the Berbers had taken the side of the inhabitants of al-Fustāṭ and were fighting against the black troops. Some traditions state that the caliph was hypocritical and cynical enough to ask: "But who gave orders for this?", and that he amused himself by watching the burning of al-Fustāṭ from the top of the Mūṣṭaṭṭam hills. The disturbances lasted for a whole week and left much of al-Fustāṭ in ruins:

The reign of al-Hākim was moreover disturbed by a number of rebellions. First there was a revolt of the Arab tribe of the Banū Kurra in the region south-east of Alexandria, the Buḥayra. But the most serious was that of Abū Rakwa Walīd b. Ḥishām, an Umayyad prince driven out from Andalus. After several adventures in different regions, even in Syria, he appeared in the region of Burj and won the support of the Zanāta Berbers. He already had with him the Banū Kurra, who had revolted previously. He set himself up as anti-caliph and defeated first one army at the end of 395/1005, then that of the Turk Inal (according to Yahya, the Armenian Kābul) which al-Hākim had sent against him. At this point al-Hākim's distress was all the greater in that the population of Egypt and the troops, tired of the executions and the cruelties that the caliph had inflicted on the Banū Kurra and the Kutāma of the Syrian army, showed their joy and hoped that they would be rid of the tyrant. It seems even that the vizier Husayn b. Djawhar had entered into correspondence with Abū Rakwa. Al-Hākim then called on the Ḥamdānī ghulāms who were in Syria and on the Ṣayyid Bedouin of Mufarrīdī b. Daghlīf and put them under the command of al-Fadl b. Salīh. A battle took place between detachments of the two armies on the outskirts of Alexandria. Then Abū Rakwa penetrated as far as the Fayyūm and sent one of his detachments towards Diža where the caliph had sent reinforcements under the command of ʿAll b. Fallāḥ, who was defeated. But in Diḥa 'l-Hidīdja 396/August 1006, al-Fadl b. Salīh gained a decisive victory over Abū Rakwa at Fāyūm and. Abū Rakwa, who was fleeing towards Nubia, was captured and delivered up by the amīr of the Nubian marches and executed in Cairo in Diḵmād II 397/March 1007. The alarm had been great. The caliph had had to humble himself to regain the sympathy of the troops, apologizing for the executions which he had ordered. It seems even that at one point he considered fleeing to Syria, for it was expected that the rebel would enter Cairo and the unrest of the population had caused a serious rise in prices. During the two years that this rebellion lasted, al-Hākim's prohibitions concerning food were waived and it was at this time also that he mitigated the anti-Sunnī measures.

A further alarm was caused by the revolt in 402/1011-2 of Mufarrīdī b. Diḏarrābīd in Palestine,
encouraged by al-Husayn b. 'Ali al-Maghribi (the vizier al-Maghribi), who had taken refuge with his son al-Mansur b. Lu'lu', after the execution of his father 'Ali al-Maghribi in 400. See the article DARRĀHĪDS for details of how their intrigues were successful in installing in Palestine an anti-caliph in the person of the Sharif of Mecca in 403/1012-3 and how al-Hākim bribed Ḥassān to abandon the Sharif, who returned to Mecca and gave himself up to al-Hākim, who pardoned him.

The eccentricities in which al-Hākim indulged when he was no longer under the tutelage of Bar-djwān are well-known. He began to wander around the streets and alleys of al-Fustāṭ at night, accompanied by a few companions. When this happened, the merchants would illuminate their shops and houses and the streets were as lively as in the day-time. He liked to watch scenes of wrestling (muṣṭarā'ā) among the street loafers—brawls which sometimes degenerated into murderous battles between rival groups. He showed at times an unhealthy curiosity. Ḣāybhā b. Sa'īd relates a revolting scene which took place in 407/1016-7, when actually in the street he made one of his black attendants make an old debauchee submit to a degrading assault and laughed as he watched this spectacle. Sometimes during these walks he was seized by a fit of absolute madness. One day as he passed a butcher's shop he seized the butcher's chopper and with it struck and killed one of his attendants, passing on without paying any more attention to the body; the terrified crowd did not dare to do anything and the body remained there until al-Hākim sent a shroud in which to bury him.

In 405/1014-5 these expeditions increased; he was seen in the streets several times in one day. He did not give up his outings even when he was ill, but he had himself carried in a litter.

There can also be counted among his eccentricities his sudden fits of humility and of asceticism, unless it is thought that he had always an inclination towards Sīfism. In 405/1013-2 we see him forbidding his subjects to prostrate themselves in front of him, to call him "Our Lord", and to beat drums or sound trumpets in the neighbourhood of the palace. He made a great point of celebrating the two great Islamic festivities without a procession and without ornaments. He showed abstinenence in all he did—in food and in bodily pleasures. He allowed his hair to grow long and wore coarse garments of black wool, rode only on a donkey and distributed alms lavishly. In 404/1013, after his cousin 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Ḥāytham had been proclaimed heir-presumptive, he delegated all the affairs of state to him. It was the heir who rode on horseback in the official processions, wearing all the insignia of the caliph, whereas the latter continued to ride on a donkey. Towards the end of his reign, this humility and asceticism increased to the point that he no longer changed his clothes and wore them filthy with sweat and dust and sticking to his body, that he travelled about the countryside, climbed the Mukāṭṭām hills and went for longer and longer solitary walks, when, having ordered his attendants to wait for him at a distance, he imagined that he was speaking to God.

His madness (unless it really was absolute religious conviction—Ismā'īlism taken to its ultimate conclusions) led him to accept and encourage the theories of Iṣnaṣrā'īl extremist factions, particularly of the Druzes, who were accompanying him and whom he had ordered to wait for him. They did not see him again and returned to the palace next morning. A search was made and five days afterwards his clothes were found, pierced by dagger blows. According to one plausible version, he was assassinated at the instigation of his sister, Sitt al-Mulk, with whom he had had a disagreement: Sitt al-Mulk had reproached him for his extravagance against the body of the caliph by an unknown assassin, to have taken refuge in a monastery to end his days there, etc. The Druzes believe in a mysterious gha'ib (q.v.) (a well-known Shi'i theme) which is to last until the time when he will re-appear (the Shi'i theme of the "return" [see RAQIA]). The theory that al-Hākim withdrew into solitude because he saw the impossibility of realizing his ideas in Egypt (A. Müller) is merely hypothetical.

The picture we have given of the reign of al-Hākim does not apply to the whole present him in a favourable light. It is not, however, he said that his reign was particularly unfortunate for Egypt. It had some less gloomy aspects.

During his reign the vast Fātimid domain lost none of its territory and in fact al-Hākim was even recognized at Mosul by Kirwāsh, the Uqaylid of Mosul, for a time in 407/1016-1. It was during his reign, also, in 406/1015-6, that Ṣaṣḏuṣr b. Lu'lu' of Aleppo submitted
to the Fatimid caliphate, and after his disappearance Aleppo had several Fatimid governors. It is true that at the end of his reign the situation at Damascus was troubled. In 410/1019-20, he had appointed as governor the designate who had introduced liberal measures, such as the authorization of wine-drinking, which were not in accordance with al-Hakim's ideas; he had the support of some classes of the population—the abdātīs—but others did not approve of him. As he had in addition entered into relations with the Djarrāhīd, al-Hakim recalled him. He obeyed this order very reluctantly; al-Hakim was satisfied and sent him back to Damascus. But there broke out a revolt against him and, on the death of al-Hakim, Sitt al-Mulk had him arrested and brought back to Cairo.

It is to al-Hakim that Cairo owes the building of the mosques of al-Rāṣīda (see above) and of al-Maks and the completion of the mosque known as that of al-Hakim which had been begun by al-ʿAzīz. He was also responsible for the foundation of the first Muslim university, that of al-Miṣrīkh, where he himself attended to the lessons (see above), with its considerable library. He patronized the development of the sciences and of letters; the historian al-Muṣabbībī was one of his close friends and the astronomer ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān wrote for him his work al-Ziyā al-kabīr. He was on excellent terms with the physician Ibn Muḥāṣṣhir, on whose advice he returned to wine-drinking. It is true, however, that he had another physician put to death.

At the beginning of his reign his intention was to rule in regular consultation with the important men of Cairo, but he soon tired of this. This was no doubt one of his fits of humility which, like the others, seems to have contained more of affectation than of sincerity. But all the historians agree that he was generous; that he did his utmost to combat famine by making gifts and by trying to stabilize the price of food; that his concern for justice was such that he himself attended to the ḥisāb, and that he appointed in addition to the chief of police two ʿaddī witnesses, without whose consent no sentence could be pronounced. Yāḥyā states that he never allowed himself to seize anyone's property, that he abolished taxes (mukāṣ) and other unjust dues and that he restored to their owners goods which had been unjustly appropriated. The same writer depicts him among the people, welcoming all their requests and endeavors to satisfy them. He abolished the "fifth" (no doubt the fifth that Fatimid juridical theory decreed should be paid to the caliph on any profit made), as well as the nadīd, the tax which had to be paid by those who were present at the majlisāt al-ḥisma, the Ismāʿīli learned meetings which were held at the Palace.

A pen-name of al-Hakim by a Jewish writer is found in a fragment of a chronicle published by Neubauer in JQR, ix, 25; in it he appears as a benefactor of the country and the author praises his sense of justice (see D. Kaufmann, Beiträge zur Geschichte Aegyptens aus jüdischen Quellen, in ZDMG, li (1897), 442-3; but also M. Schreiner in REJ, xxxi, 217, on the burning by al-Hakim of a Jewish quarter).

It is an account of his liberality also which has been preserved in some of the tales of the roor Nights, such as the story of the Cairo merchant who, having given splendid hospitality to the caliph when he had stopped in front of his garden during an official procession to ask for a drink, received from al-Hakim as a reward all the coins struck by the Mint in that year (Lane, The Arabian Nights . . . , London 1914, iii, 56). Similarly, in the Hīdāyat Wardān al-Dījasr maʿ al-mara wa l-dubb (1002 Nights, Cairo, nights 333-5): a treasure guarded by a bear is discovered by the butcher in question (see the complicated story) and he gives it to al-Hakim who has come on his donkey to see the treasure that the butcher has told him about; the caliph keeps a part of it and gives the remainder to the butcher who is thus enabled to build all the shops of the sūk which is called after him Sūk Wardān. This story is related by Ibn al-Dawārāḏī, who claims to base it on the Hāl al-rumās fi sim al-kuns of a certain Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raẓāq b. Abūl-ʿAbd al-ʿAfra al-Kayrawānī.

The historians have formed very varied judgments of al-Hakim; they judged according to their own ideas of al-Hakim's personality. Dozy and A. Müller have tried to show that there was in him a certain idealism. Ivanov, Rise, 123 ff., thinks that he was anxious to realize the ideals of the Sunnis as well as of the Ismāʿīlim and to this end to suppress Christianity, and that in addition he was always trying to make the Ismāʿīlī doctrine more perfect. But he sees in him also a desire to "play to the gallery" and thinks that there may have been a histrionic streak in him. He even sees a democratic flavour in some of his acts; but this is going rather far.

Yāḥyā, who was a physician as well as a historian, tried to give a medical explanation of his "madness" as a mixture in his brain of pernicious and morbid humours which from his childhood caused him to suffer from a kind of melancholy (in the true sense) and a trouble of the mind which made him a prey to fantasies. He states that in his youth he was subject to fits and that the ill-constitution of his brain caused him to suffer from insomnia (see Yāḥyā-Cheikh, 218 ff.). This insomnia may explain al-Hakim's nocturnal walks.

In any case, al-Hakim's personality remains an enigmatic one. He seems to have been several persons in succession or even simultaneously.


**AL-HâKIM BI-NAYSÂBûRÎ, MùHAMMAD B. ‘ABD ALLAH B. MùHAMMAD ABU ‘ABD ALLAH IBN AL-BAVYY, a traditionist of note, b. 321/933, d. 405/1014. He travelled in various countries to study Hâdîth and heard traditions from about 2000 shaykh. Because he held the office of kadi for a time he became known as al-Hâkim. He wrote many books, among them, Ma‘rijat ‘ilmâm al-haddîth, an important work on the science of Hâdîth, which set a standard for the method of dealing with the subject. Though he was held in high esteem for his scholarship and was visited by many scholars, his writings have met with criticism. He has been called a Shî‘î, but al-Subki stoutly denies this. Al-Dhahabî who, in Taqdîrât al-buhîsîs, calls him “the great kâlis, the divine of the traditionists”, also includes him in his Mîsân al-Hâdîdî, where he says that he made mistakes in his book al-Musâdrakh ‘ala ‘l-Sâhkây, Ibn Hâdjâr, in the parallel passage in Lisân al-mâhn, remarks that he is too distinguished to be mentioned among weak traditionists, but that some say he became careless in old age. In spite of criticism he holds an honoured place among traditionists. Printed works by al-Hâkim: al-Musâdrakh ‘ala ‘l-Sâhkây, Haydarâbâd 1334-42; al-Madjkah jî usâl al-hâdîdî; ed. Muhammad Râghîb al-Tâbâkhâb, Aleppo 1351/1932; An Introduction to the Science of Tradition, ed. and trans. J. Robson, London 1953; Ma‘rijat ‘ilmâm al-haddîth, ed. Mr. Mâzqâm Husayn, Cairo 1937.


J. (Robson)

**HÂKK.** The original meaning of the root hkk has become obscured in Arabic but can be recovered by reference to the corresponding root in Hebrew with its meanings of (a) “to cut in, engrave” in wood, stone or metal, (b) “to inscribe, write, portray” (also in a Canaanite inscription of the 8th cent. B.C.; S. A. Cooke, North-Semitic inscriptions, Oxford 1903, 171, 185), (c) “to prescribe, fix by decree”, therefore “prescribed, law, ordinance, custom”, (d) “due to God or man, right, privilege” (cf. Brown-Driver-Briggs, Hebrew and English lexicon, Oxford 1952; L. Koehler and A. W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros, Leiden 1953). The word hâkk, meaning “right, true, just, real”, is common in pre-Islamic poetry and in the Arabic translation of the Hebrew University lists 916 passages in edited texts); it also occurs, with the meaning “truth”, in the proverbs of the Arabs (Maydânî, ed. Freytag, Arabum proverbia, nos. 83, 123, 232). Derived from this is hâkî as a Divine Name. This is already attested, in the forms hakt and ḫkt, in the South Arabic inscriptions (V. Mâzqurr, Les noms, titres and attributes of Dieu dans le Coran et leurs correspondants en épigraphie sud-sémétique, in Musel, 1955, 86 ff.), and it also occurs in the Arabic translation of the Diatessaron (A. Cicais, Tisâmî Evangeliorum Harmoniae Arabice, Rome 1888, 172, on John, XIV, 6).

The primary meaning of hâkk in Arabic is “established fact” (al-thâbit hâkîkî), and therefore “reality”, and the meaning “what corresponds to facts”, and therefore “truth”, is secondary; its opposite is bîtîfî (in both meanings). This is well stated by Djrîdji (Ta’rifat, s.v.), whereas some of the lexicographers start from the secondary meaning (cf. Lane, Lexicon, s.v.) Hâkk in its primary meaning is one of the names of Allah (cf. AL-ASMA‘I AL-HUSNÂ, no. 52), and it occurs often in the Kurân in this sense, as the opposite of bîtîfî. The commentators of the Kurân, however, “to invert (a word or expression);” (Diwân, ed. Huber, xli, 9); a-lâ kullu shay’ mî hâkîkî, “Lo, everything except Allah is vain, unreal.” (The occasional explanation of the Divine Name hâkîkî as “Creator” is based merely on its alliterative contrast with hâkîs, “creation”. For another explanation, see Masâîbîn, K, al-Tawbîn, 174). But the use of hâkîkî in the Kurân, in Islamic traditions (cf. Wensinck, Concordance et indices, s.v.), and in Arabic literature in general, is not restricted to the Divine Name; it may refer to any “reality”, “fact”, “truth”; thus, the features of the Day of Judgment, Paradise and Hell are hâkîkî. A further meaning of hâkîkî (pl. hâkîkî) deriving directly from the primary one, is “claim” or “right”, as a legal obligation (see urûg); this use of the term is already fully developed in the hâkîkî Allâh, mainly Allah’s penal ordinances, and the hâkîkî, the civil right or claim of a human.

In Shi‘i terminology, hâkîkî al-ya’dânî, an expression taken from sûra LVI, 95, is that “real certainty”
which comes to the creature with his passing away (fana) in his fudl after he has acquired visual certainty ("ayn al-khimān") in intellectual certainty ("ilm al-qabāl"); cf. Dhjurānī, Tarīqat, s.v.; Koshayri, Risāla, Būlāk 1290, ii, 99 ff. In Sufi terminology, too, the hukak al-nafs are such things as are necessary for the support and continuation of life as opposed to the ḥusūṣ, things desired by the nafs but not necessary to its existence. The use of the formula ana 'il-hakak, 'I am the Ḥakak', by al-Ḥallāj [q.v.] was one of the counts on which he was condemned and exiled.

To sum up, the meanings of the root ḥkk started from that of carved, permanently valid laws, expanded to cover the ethical ideals of right and real, just and true, and developed further to include Divine, Spiritual Reality.


[1] (D. B. Macdonald—[E. E. Calverley])

HAKKĀRĪ, (1) name of a Kurdish tribe, who from ancient times have inhabited the practically inaccessible mountain districts south and east of Lake Van, a region called after them Hakkarīya by Arab geographers and historians [see kurds], and hence (2) the name of the extreme south-east wilâyêt of the modern Turkish republic (modern name: Hakkârî), population (1960) 67,766 (the most sparsely populated area of Turkey, with a density of only 7 persons per sq. km.); the chief town is Cölemek, s.v.). Named by Yaḵūṭ (Muḍjām, s.v.) as a town, district and some villages in the Ḩakkarī ṭarā, al-Kurūn, s.v., Venice, 1953, iv, 78). The district came under Ottoman suzerainty as a result of the winter campaign of Umar [see IBN IBAḤ], Paris 1836, 328; Admiralty, Histoire des Mongoles, London 1964, 221-2; Police Departmental, La Turquie d’Asie, ii, 1942-3, indexes s.v. Hakkarî. For a recent description of the region, with further bibliography, see D. C. Hills, My travels in Turkey, London 1964, 145-80. (Ed.)

[2] AL-HAKKĀRĪ [see ABD AL-HAKKĀ R SAYF AL-DĪN].

HAKKI [see İHHĀM HAKKI, ISMA‘IL ḤAKKI].

HĀL, as a term of grammar [see nahu].
a concomitance of several: the heart possessed by a hāl is seized entirely, even though this hāl evokes, as it were spontaneously, a second which finally brings it to perfection and denies it (dialectic of the muḥābāt).

Two remarks follow from this: (a) The same mansīl, the same resting-place, according to the authors and their analytical processes, may be classified among either the maṣāḥfūt or the āḥwāl, for example, maḥābba (love of the soul and of God). For al-Kalābādhi, this is the loftiest of the maṣāḥfūt reached; and for al-Anṣāri, the first of the maṣāḥfūt. (cf. Anawati and Gardet, Mystique musulman, Paris 1961, 127-8 and n. 10). (b) Repentance, asceticism, long-suffering, poverty, humility, fear of God, piety, sincerity, etc., the maṣāḥfūt follow one after another, the order no doubt varying to suit each particular treatise, but obeying a progressive principle. The āḥwāl, on the other hand, are subject to every sentiment that takes possession of the soul during its quest for God, and they can be received, according to the various degrees of activation, equally well at the start as during the progress or at the conclusion of the procedure. In conformity with a psychological law upon which the writers of taṣawwuf insist, they often present themselves in muḥābāt, in pairs of complementary opposites—contraction and dilation of the heart (kāf and baṣāf); absence and presence (γηγαβ and ghubāb); annihilation and survival (in God: fana and baḥā), etc.

It would be fruitless to attempt to draw up precisely defined lists of maṣāḥfūt and āḥwāl. Different examples are to be found in practically every treatise of Ṣūfism, e.g., the Luma of al-Sarrāj (seven maṣāḥfūt and about ten āḥwāl), the Kitāb al-Taʿāruf of al-Kalābādhi, the Manṣūrī of al-Anṣāri (ten āḥwāl, no "section" entitled maṣāḥfūt), etc.

It must also be noted that certain writers, basing their analyses upon the etymological meanings of these terms, maintain that hāl, once received through pure grace, can become maṣāḥfūt through the zeal of the recipient. "If the hāl endures, it becomes a possession (milk) and is then called maṣāḥfūt. The āḥwāl are given, the maṣāḥfūt are acquired; the āḥwāl come from the gift itself, the maṣāḥfūt are produced by the man: the first is the active and the second is the received" (says al-Djurjānī, Taʿārīfī, ed. Flügel, 85): establishing a continuity between hāl and maṣāḥfūt, the activation received in the soul being as it were destined to be possessed by it. A further point to note is a phrase of al-Hudjwīrī, according to whom "the fleeting state (hāl) of the saint is the permanent station (maṣāḥfūt) of the prophet!" (Kāḡī al-Mahdī, English trans. by R. A. Nicholson, Leiden-London 1911, 236). In general, however (cf. below, § 3), the stabilized hāl is rendered by some word other than maṣāḥfūt.

2.—Hāl and ṣawt. Unlike maṣāḥfūt, ṣawt may be said to occur on the same analytical level as hāl. As we have seen, hāl evokes a point of equilibrium, the impact of an "encounter". Ṣawt (time) must not be understood as a temporal measure; it transcends measured and measurable time, it is "the unit of psychic measure" (L. Massingham, op. cit., 556) of the wāḍıj, of the encounter, or its absence; cf. al-Hudjwīrī (op. cit., 368) for whom, to "the time of encounter", there corresponds "the time of absence (fakīd)". A whole Sūfī line, culminating in Ibn 'Abbād of Ronda, professes "the spirituality of time". But it is frequently emphasized (e.g., al-Hudjwīrī, 369) that ṣawt "has need of hāl", that hāl (state) is that which descends upon "time" (wāḍıj) and adorns it, as the spirit adorns the body". It is the actualization of hāl which is possible to lose wāḍıj, and it is thanks to wāḍıj that the hāl received is actualized in the soul. According to the degree of completeness of the spiritual experience, emphasis will be placed on either the one or the other. It is said that Jacob was the possessor of wāḍıj, while Abraham possessed hāl. Similarly, hāl qualifies the object of desire (murād) and wāḍıj the degree introspectively attained by the one who desires (murād). So much so that the maṣāḥfūt (which connotes the idea of novice, beginner) is "in himself in the pleasure of wāḍıj", and the murād "with God in the delight of hāl" (al-Hudjwīrī, op. cit., 370).

Hāl, an inner received state, may well at the start of the spiritual life be burdened with speech; however, it must succeed in transcending every description (naʿīl), just as wāḍıj inserted in time shatters time, when from "encounter" it becomes "ecstasy" (cf. al-Kalābādhi, Kitāb al-Taʿāruf, ed. Arberry, Cairo 1952 (1913), 54).

3.—Hāl and tāmkin. Muḥāsibī, taking his idea of hāl from the medical vocabulary (cf. above), laid stress on the point of equilibrium experienced internally, from which it followed that hāl, not measured temporally, was enduring. Other writers (e.g., al-Ghazzālī, Ḩiyā, Cairo 1932, iii, 16-7) emphasize the multiplicity of āḥwāl in the soul, the lack of continuity in their order, and the extreme difficulty of stabilization.

But it is generally stated that hāl, the internal reality of self transiens, unstable at the start of spiritual life, can tend to become stabilized—beyond speech and beyond temporal order. The vocabulary of al-Djurjānī, who regards it as becoming maṣāḥfūt because "possessed" by the subject, here seems to be at fault. For preference, it is the idea of tāmkin, strengthening, stability, that emerges. The maṣāḥfūt is a place, the station where one remains; tāmkin is the spiritual act of enduring and stability. Tāmkin, says al-Hudjwīrī (op. cit., 372), is contrasted with taḥāw, which indicates a change, an alternating transition from one state to another.

Moreover, maṣāḥfūt, exactly like hāl, can and must be strengthened by tāmkin. And this last is of two kinds, depending on whether the action of God or the subject's act is dominant. In the second case, it qualifies the maṣāḥfūt and the āḥwāl and is coloured by them; in the first case, "there are no attributes". The weak soul could not persist in the act of hāl—which may arise, vanish, give way to some new favour. The soul endowed with tāmkin becomes stabilized beyond the reach of every psychological change.

According to al-Anṣāri, the stabilized āḥwāl progressively become "ascendencies", wāḥid, then "realities", baḥāʾīkh, in order finally to attain the "limits" of the mystical ascent, niḥyādī. Cf. S. de Beaurecueil, introduction to Sharh al-manṣūl, of Ābd al-Muṭṭ, Cairo 1954.

HALAB, in Turkish Halep, in Italian, English and German Aleppo, in French Alep; town in Syria, the most important after Damascus.

It is situated in 38°6'5" E. and 40°12' N., and at an altitude of 390 metres/1275 ft., at the north-west extremity of the inland plateau of Syria and on the banks of a small river, the Kuwayk (average rate of flow varying from 10 to 12 cubic metres per second) which descends from the last foothills of the Taurus. It is surrounded by a vast chalk plain with a healthy though severe sub-desert climate with wide variations in temperature (winter average: 5° to 17° Centigrade; summer average: 20° to 30°) and a low and irregular rainfall (annual average: 420 mm/16½ ins, spread over 40 to 50 days). The basic resources of this arid country come from the growing of wheat and cotton and the rearing of sheep; olive and fig-trees and vines also thrive there, and, in addition, in the immediate outskirts of Aleppo there are market gardens along the banks of the river, and pistachio trees (L. Pistacia vera), which have for centuries been a great speciality of the town. At all periods these local resources have supplied Aleppo with commodities for trade and for sale in the neighbouring regions and also the opportunity to develop manufacturing industries which are still active today: chiefly textiles and soap-making. In addition it is a market centre for the nomadic Arabs of the steppe of the northern Shamíyya who bring to it sheep, alkalis and salt (from the lagoon over 40 to 50 days). The basic resources of this arid country come from the growing of wheat and cotton and the rearing of sheep; olive and fig-trees and vines also thrive there, and, in addition, in the immediate outskirts of Aleppo there are market gardens along the banks of the river, and pistachio trees (L. Pistacia vera), which have for centuries been a great speciality of the town.

At all periods these local resources have supplied Aleppo with commodities for trade and for sale in the neighbouring regions and also the opportunity to develop manufacturing industries which are still active today: chiefly textiles and soap-making. In addition it is a market centre for the nomadic Arabs of the steppe of the northern Shamíyya who bring to it sheep, alkalis and salt (from the lagoon over 40 to 50 days). The basic resources of this arid country come from the growing of wheat and cotton and the rearing of sheep; olive and fig-trees and vines also thrive there, and, in addition, in the immediate outskirts of Aleppo there are market gardens along the banks of the river, and pistachio trees (L. Pistacia vera), which have for centuries been a great speciality of the town. At all periods these local resources have supplied Aleppo with commodities for trade and for sale in the neighbouring regions and also the opportunity to develop manufacturing industries which are still active today: chiefly textiles and soap-making. In addition it is a market centre for the nomadic Arabs of the steppe of the northern Shamíyya who bring to it sheep, alkalis and salt (from the lagoon over 40 to 50 days).

Aleppo's importance as an urban centre dates largely from pre-Islamic times: it is certainly not an exaggeration to claim that it is one of the most ancient cities of the world and that no other place which is still inhabited and flourishing can boast of a comparable history. Aleppo is first mentioned in history in the 20th century B.C., under the same name as it now has (Hittite Khalap; Egyptian Khrb; Akkadian Khalaba, Khalman, Khalwan) and in conditions which clearly imply that even at that early date it already had a very long past behind it. It seems that a rural settlement was formed there in prehistoric times and that this village gradually gained ascendance over the others in the area, owing to the relatively wide resources of its site and in particular to the presence there of a rocky eminence on which the citadel still stands today: it was this acropolis, one of the strongest and the most easily manned defensive positions in the whole of northern Syria, which enabled the masters of the place to extend control over their neighbours so as to found the "great kingdom" which was, in the 20th century B.C., to enter into relations with the Hittites of Anatolia.

At first the relations of the two states were friendly; but at the end of the 19th century B.C. the Hittite king Mursil, attempting the conquest of northern Syria, "destroyed the town of Khalap and brought to the land of the citadel of Khalap the Hittite army of Mitannis (before 1650 B.C.) and about 1430 fell again into the hands of the Hittites, who formed there a principality which was destined to collapse at the same time as the Anatolian kingdom. The Aramaeans, who then settled in northern Syria, seem to have neglected Aleppo in favour of new localities which they founded in its neighbourhood. Nothing is heard of the town either in the period of the Assyrian or of the Persian domination; it seems that this temporary disappearance was the consequence of a more or less serious destruction of the settlement, which probably occurred at the time of the fall of the Hittite kingdom and the effect of which was to reduce it to the status of a small rural town.

Aleppo owed its recovery to the conquests of Alexander and to the foundation of the Seleucid kingdom. Seleucus Nicator, to whom it was allotted, founded on its site, between 301 and 281 B.C., a colony of Macedonians called Beroia, built according to a regular plan (a rectangular town with streets crossing at right angles, ramparts whose four sides formed a square, and a system of canals bringing water from the springs of Haylan 11 kilometres away. Though Beroia never took an important part in the destinies of the Seleucid kingdom, this foundation nevertheless formed a decisive turning-point in the history of the place: not only did it restore to it permanently the urban character which it had lost, but its layout was to be maintained in the Islamic town, some of its characteristic features surviving until the present day.

Incorporated into the Roman province of Syria, which was formed in 64 B.C., Aleppo owed to its new masters a long period of peace and the construction of magnificent market buildings (an agora and a colonnaded avenue). A Christian community established itself there at an early date and it would seem that the town had a very active economic life during the Byzantine period, for many Jews settled there and there grew up at this period, outside the walls, a suburb for caravan trains inhabited by Arabs of the Tanūkh tribe, whence its name, of Arabic origin, al-Ḥādir ("the settlement of sedentarized Bedouin"). But the Persian invasion of 540 A.D., led by the king Chosroes I, inflicted a great blow on Aleppo: the citadel, into which the population had retreated, held out against the attack, but the town itself was burned. Its defences were rebuilt by Justinian, who built there a fine cathedral, but the sack of Antioch and the constant threat of Persian invasions inevitably prevented the recovery of the district.

It was in 16/636 that the Muslim troops appeared before Aleppo under the command of Khalid b. al-Walid: the Arabs in the suburb surrendered immediately, followed very soon by the rest of the inhabitants, in favour of whom Abū 'Ubayda signed a solemn pact guaranteeing them their lives, the preservation of the fortifications and the possession of their churches and houses, against their agreement to pay tribute. As a consequence of this the first mosque of the town was built on a public roadway; it was in fact the monumental arch which stood at the entry to the colonnaded street; its bays were simply walled in to transform it into an enclosed space.

Attached to the qurud of Hims, and then to that of Kinnasrin, Aleppo played an important political rôle under the Umayyad caliphate, although some governors of the province did reside in its neighbourhood. Its life seems to have been modified only very slowly by the Muslim conquest; not only did there remain a large Christian community, which continued to be split by the same dissensions as in the past, but in addition it was to be more than a century before the number of Muslims in the region had increased enough to warrant the building of a monumental Great Mosque: it is not known whether it was al-Walid I [q.v.] or his brother Sulayman [q.v.] who was responsible for the construction of this building on the site of the ancient agora, which was
to remain until modern times the chief place of worship in Aleppo. The Abbasid caliphate was for Aleppo, as for the whole of Syria, a period of eclipse: it remained during this period a provincial centre, deprived of any political or administrative importance. It fell into the hands of Ahmad b. Tülün [q.v.], who appointed as governor the chief of the Arab tribe of the Kilab; this encouraged an influx of the latter to this city into northern Syria, which was later to have regrettable consequences for the town. Disputed between Ibn Rā'îk [q.v.] and the Ikhshïdîs, Aleppo was finally captured from the latter, in 333/944, by the famous Hamdânîd amîr, Sayf al-Dawla [q.v.], who established himself there.

Thus, for the first time since the advent of Islam, Aleppo became the capital of a state and the residence of a ruler, and was to share in the admiration accorded by historical tradition to the Hamdânîd prince because of his military successes against the Byzantines, and the brilliant literary activity which centred round the vast palace which he built outside the walls: al-Mutanabbî [q.v.], Abû Fârâs al-Hamdânî [q.v.], al-Wâ'wâî [q.v.], Ibn Nubâta [q.v.], Ibn Khâlahâwî [q.v.], Ibn Dûmmî [q.v.] and many others less famous, were to give to the court of Sayf al-Dawla a brilliance which at this time was unique. In contrast to this, the administrative methods do not seem to have been very favourable to the development of economic activity. Furthermore, during the winter of 351/962, Nicephorus Phocas appeared unexpectedly before the town, took it by storm after elaborate siege operations, and left it as a deserted ruin, having methodically pillaged and burned it for a whole week and either massacred its inhabitants or led them away captive.

It was to be a long time before Aleppo recovered from this catastrophe. Sayf al-Dawla abandoned it for Mayyâfîrîkîn [q.v.] and on his death it passed to his son Sa'd al-Dawla Abu 'l-Ma'sîî Sharîf, whose accession there began the darkest period in the history of the town since the Muslim conquest. The ambition of the governors and the weakness of the central administration: the latter soon became so pronounced that the Turks annexed Aleppo to the empire of the Great Seljûcks in invasions, the Bedouin raids, and the repeated attempts of the Fâtîmîd[s] of Egypt to seize a place whose possession would have opened to them the route to 'Irâk all resulted in half a century of disorders, fighting and violence (for details see HAMDÂNIDS). Nor did the Fatimid occupation in 406/1015 bring any noticeable improvement, because of the revolts of the governors and the weakness of the central administration: the latter soon became so pronounced that in 414/1023 the Bedouin tribes of Syria decided to divide the country among themselves. In this way Aleppo fell to the chief of the Kilab, Sa'îh b. Mirdâs, whose descendants, the Mirdâsîs, remained in possession of it for slightly over fifty years under the merely nominal suzerainty of the caliphs of Cairo. Sa'îh himself was powerless to do back the Fatimid[s] temporarily as far as Palestine, but the division of their territories among his sons was the signal for an incessant series of quarrels and civil wars which brought anarchy and misery to the town and enabled the Byzantines and the Fatimid[s], each in turn appealed to for help by the rival claimants, to intervene continually in the affairs of the dynasty: thus in 457/1065 the Mirdâsî Rashîd al-Dawla Ma'mûd succeeded in taking Aleppo from his uncle with the help of Turkish mercenaries enlisted with funds provided by the Byzantines.

It was in fact in the Mirdâsî period that the Turks began to penetrate into Syria, as isolated bands which the Mirdâsî princes often took into their service, but which usually roamed the region unhindered in search of plunder. Towards the end of the 5th/11th century, Aleppo itself was to come under the domination of the Turkish dynasties.

In 462/1070, under the pressure of political circumstances, Ma'mûd had officially caused the Abram [q.v.] to be received in the name of his great-grandfather al-Kâsim al-Kâsimî and of the Seljûk sultan Alp-Arsîlân, in spite of the disapproval of the inhabitants, the majority of whom had from the time of the Hamdânîs been adherents of the Imâmi Shî'î doctrine. This attachment to the Seljûk empire remained a purely theoretical one, in spite of a military demonstration by the sultan outside the walls of the town in 463/1071. Some years later, on the occasion of a dispute between two Mirdâsîs for the succession, Ma'mûd [q.v.], sent against Aleppo his brother Tutuş [q.v.:] the Arabs of the Kilab and the Uqaylîd chief Muslim b. Kuryây [q.v.,] who had joined him, having secretly entered into negotiations with the besieged prince, Tutuş raised the siege, to return to the attack in the following years. Unable to hold out against him, the last Mirdâsî, Abu 'l-Qâdî Alî Sâbi', surrendered the town to Muslim b. Kuryây (472/1079).

This could be only a provisional solution, but the political conditions of the time, in a world which was in the process of change, meant that no stable situation could immediately be established: it was to be another half-century before the fate of Aleppo was settled.

On the death of Muslim b. Kuryây, which occurred in 478/1085 in an encounter with Sulaymân b. Kutûlûmî, Tutuş, at the request of the citizens of Aleppo themselves, hastened from Damascus in order to oppose Sulaymân's design on the town, but he in his turn had to retreat before Malik-Shâh; the latter, in 479/1086, sent to Aleppo as governor Kâsim al-Dawla Ak-Sunkûr [q.v.], whose beneficial administration ensured for the town a few years' respite. This annexation of Aleppo to the empire of the Great Seljûks was not to remain unquestioned, because of the political conflict created by the death of Malik-Shâh. Tutuş defeated and put to death Ak-Sunkûr, who had set himself up as defender of the rights of Bâkyûrûk [q.v.], and thus made himself master of Aleppo; on his death in 488/1095, it passed to his son Ridwan [q.v.]; Ridwan was succeeded in 507/1113 by his son Tagh al-Dawla Alp-Arsîlân, who was assassinated in the following year and replaced by his brother Sultan-Shâh, a minor to whom there was given as regent one of his grandfather's slaves, Lu'îrû al-Ya'la. This small Seljûkî dynasty was not to gain any more than a purely local importance: the smallness of its territory, of modest dimensions and impoverished by so many years of wars, disorders and impov-erishments, its rivalry with the Seljûkî dynasty of Damascus, the resistance of the Shî'î elements of the population (to whom were joined Ismâ'îlîs, who were active and dangerous enough for it to be necessary to humour their demands), all combined to render its authority precarious. The princes of Aleppo were not, any more than were their neighbours, of a stature successfully to oppose the Crusaders, who were able to push forward their enterprises in northern Syria; they even came to attack the town itself (493/1100, 497/1103), which was forced to submit to paying
tribute to them. The assassination of Lu'lu' was to render this long political crisis still more acute: the assassination of Lu'lu' was to
tribute to them. The assassination of Lu'lu5 was to render this long political crisis still more acute: the assassination of Lu'lu
remained until the Mongol conquest powerful enough to oppose with some success the claims of al-Malik al-Adil [q.v.], against whom it obtained support by means of an alliance with the Ayyubid kingdom of Mayyâfârîkîn and with the Saljûqs of Konya. Ghâzî himself, his wife, Dayfa-Khâtûn, and his mam-lûk Toghrî, who was proclaimed regent on Ghâzî's death, all displayed remarkable political qualities and were able not only to preserve Aleppo in the hands of the direct descendants of Salâh-ad-Dîn, ousted everywhere else by those of al-Malik al-Adil, but also to make it the capital of a strong and prosperous state (annual revenue of the treasury in the middle of the 7th/13th century: about 8 million dirhams), which was surpassed only by the realm of Egypt. This period marks the apogee of mediaeval Aleppo. Increased by new suburbs in which there lived the Turkish cavalry of the rulers, its industries stimulated by the presence of the royal court, enriched by the trade with the Venetians whom the commercial treaties (1207, 1225, 1229, 1254) had authorized to establish a permanent factory there, its fortifications restored according to modern techniques, its citadel entirely rebuilt to become one of the most splendid works of military art of the Middle Ages, its canal system repaired and extended to reach throughout the town, and its sâks enlarged, Aleppo became at this time one of the most beautiful and most active cities in the whole of the Muslim East. Madrasas continued to be built (the Zâhirîyya madrasa of Ghâzî; the Madrasat al-Firdaws of Dayfa Khâtûn), as well as Sûfi convents (the Khânjâh of Farâra, of Yûsûf II), both erected in a logical and sober style of architecture and housing an intellectual life which was remarkable for its time, as is witnessed by the names of Shîhâd al-Dîn al-Suhrawârdî [q.v.], of Kamâl-ad-Dîn Ibn Hûdâr 5-31, of Kamâl-ad-Dîn Ibn Shaddâd [q.v.], of Ibn Salâh al-Shahrûzî (Brockelmann, I, 356), and of 'Alî al-Harâwî [q.v.].

The reign of Yûsûf II [see al-Malik al-Nâşîr] was to mark at the same time the zenith and the collapse of the dynasty: chosen as sultan by the amirs of Damascus, he annexed central Syria and began at the same time an open conflict with the Mamlûks of Egypt, which was ended by the intervention of the caliph of Baghhd. But, on the other hand, Aleppo, which had already had to defend itself twice against armed bands of Khârîzim, was attacked by the Mongols of Hâlûgâd; abandoned by its ruler and a proportion of its inhabitants and taken by assault on 8 Safar 658/24 January 1260, it was ruthlessly sacked, and Yûsûf II, taken prisoner by the Mongols, was put to death.

Occupied by the Mamlûks after the battle of Ayn Djalàt, retaken by the Mongols, again recovered by the Mamlûks, Aleppo was to remain under Mamlûk domination until the Ottoman conquest; it was made by these, the capital of a niyâba which came immediately after Damascus in the hierarchy of the provinces: corresponding roughly with the area of the former Ayyubid kingdom, it owed its importance to its geographical situation, on the northern fron-
rier of the empire, whose protection it ensured. Nevertheless the town recovered only slowly from the disaster it had suffered in 625/1228: the continual threat of a renewed Mongol offensive kept it in a semi-deserted state for nearly half a century; it was 32 years before the citadel was repaired and 130 years before the destroyed fortifications were rebuilt. Once security had been restored, the revolts of its governors, the turbulence of the troops and the severe taxation system scarcely helped to restore its activity, and the ravages of the Black Death of 1348, soon followed by those of Timur, completed its paralysis.

But from the beginning of the 9th/15th century, the destruction of the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia and of the Genoese factories on the Black Sea, through which the commercial traffic between Europe and Persia had passed, gave Aleppo a considerable economic advantage, which was very soon to make its fortune: the town became the starting point for the caravans which fetched silk from Diyarbakr to sell it to the Venetians in exchange for cloth of Italian manufacture, and thus enjoyed a vigorous impetus whose effect was to change its topography. While its suks grew and were provided with large khans which are among the most remarkable and typical buildings of the town (the Khan of Abrak, the Khan of Özdemir, the Khan of Khayr-bak), vast and populous suburbs grew up along the caravan routes, doubling the area of buildings and necessitating the rebuilding further out of the eastern walls. In all of these suburbs there arose great mosques provided with minarets (the mosques of Altunbugha, of Akbugha, of Manklibugha) and zaviyas intended for the devotions of the Sufis, whose doctrines and practices were then very popular. One of these suburbs housed the Christians—Maronites, and especially Armenians—who served as brokers and dragomans to the European merchants.

Occupied without fighting by the Ottomans after the battle of Marj Dâbiik, Aleppo became the capital of a vilayet, which corresponded to the nizâb of the Mamlûks and whose governors had the rank of mir-i mirân.

The rebel governor of Damascus, Dînbirdîl al-Ghazâlî [see al-Ghazâlî, Dînbirdîl], failed to capture Aleppo in 926/1519, which was incorporated in the new province of Syria. The first detailed (muqâsâl) register of the Dafar-i Khâhnî [q.r.] is dated 924/1518; several other surveys were made during the 10th/16th century. During the Ottoman decline, from the late 10th/16th century, it suffered like other provincial capitals from the factional and political activities of the local military forces. For some years the Janissaries of Damascus imposed their domination on Aleppo, from which they were finally expelled only in 1023/1614. Situated at a junction of the trade of Aleppo did not exceed even 2 million gold francs. The intense commercial activity of its hey-day naturally was reflected in a further extension of the khans, many of which were entirely rebuilt in cut stone; the raw materials supplied by its hinterland (drugs, cotton, nut-gall). In 1775, the total annual value of this trade stood at nearly 18 million gold francs, but after this date it declined continually because of the slowing down of the industrial and maritime activity of France, which had finally obtained a virtual monopoly over Aleppo. Another reason for this decline was the corrupt administration, and also the earthquake of 1822 which destroyed the greater part of the town; in addition, the constantly expanding place which the new trade with Asia and America was filling in world economy deprived the Levant of much of its former importance: in the period from 1814-16 the trade of Aleppo did not exceed even 2 million gold francs.

The intense commercial activity of its hey-day naturally was reflected in a further extension of the khans, many of which were entirely rebuilt in cut stone; and clients of the Aleppine našîb al-Âşrâf, Muḥammad b. Ahmad Tâhâzâde, called Celebi Efendi. There is evidence that the Âşrâf tended to belong to the higher social groups, while the Janissaries, assimilated to the townspeople, were petty artisans and tradesmen. The factional struggles continued after Celebi Efendi's death (1786); in a notorious clash in 1212/1798, the Janissaries treacherously slaughtered a party of Âşrâf. The leader of the Âşrâf was now İbrahim Khârîşâh, a former servant and protege of Celebi Efendi. On the occasion of the restoration of Syria, he commanded a contingent of Âşrâf, sent to fight the French: there was a separate Janissary contingent. İbrahim was twice appointed governor of Aleppo, but failed to perpetuate his power there, or to secure the ascendancy of the Âşrâf. The Janissaries regained power after his removal in 1223/1808, and although proscribed by the governor, Capan-ı Şehzâde DÎnârî Pasha, in 1228/1813, remained a force in local politics. In 1235/1819 they combined with the Âşrâf to head an insurrection against the governor, Khoûrshîd Pasha. Even after the dissolution of the Janissary corps in 1826, they survived as a faction in Aleppo, as did the Âşrâf, until the mid-19th century.

During the whole of this period, in spite of the heavy taxation (treasury revenues farmed out in 921/1515-4 for the towns proper, 3,503,095 akîses; total together with the surrounding villages: 6,497,829 akîses), Aleppo did not merely maintain the commercial importance it had acquired under the last Mamlûk sultans, but developed it to the point of becoming at one period the principal market of the whole of the Levant. The signing of capitulations with the western European powers led, in fact, to the opening of new factories there: besides the Venetians, who in 1548 had brought there their consulate and their commercial headquarters, the French in 1562, the English in 1583 and the Dutch in 1613 also opened there consulates and trading offices which, throughout the 11th/17th century, were in fierce competition. Relegated to second place by the rapid development of Smyrna (Izmir) and by the Ottoman wars against Persia, whose effect was to cut it off from the regions with which it traded, and still more adversely affected by the efforts of the English and the Dutch to make Russia and the Persian Gulf the commercial outlets for Iran, Aleppo nevertheless continued to be a centre of world-wide importance, importing from Europe, via Alexandria and Tripoli, manufactured goods (cloth, metals, chemical products, glass, paper, etc.) which it re-exported to eastern Anatolia, Kurdish and Persia, exporting the products of its own manufacture (Silk, cotton) and the raw materials supplied by its hinterland (drugs, cotton, nut-gall). In 1775, the total annual value of this trade stood at nearly 18 million gold francs, but after this date it declined continually because of the slowing down of the industrial and maritime activity of France, which had finally obtained a virtual monopoly over Aleppo. Another reason for this decline was the corrupt administration, and also the earthquake of 1822 which destroyed the greater part of the town; in addition, the constantly expanding place which the new trade with Asia and America was filling in world economy deprived the Levant of much of its former importance: in the period from 1814-16 the trade of Aleppo did not exceed even 2 million gold francs.
Meşmed Paşa, 963/1555: a great mosque, three khamâs, three hasiriasivas and four suks, covering nearly 3 hectares; the ma’âf of İbrahim-Khan-zâde Meşmed Paşa, 982/1574: the customs kham and two suks consisting of 344 shops, the whole covering 8,000 square metres; others, which conform more closely to the traditional type, are no less noteworthy (the kham of the Vizier, the kham of Kurt-bak). Thanks to these building works of the Ottoman paşâs, Aleppo possesses today the most beautiful suks in the whole of the Muslim world. The great mosques, built at the same time, which reproduce the building style current in Istanbul, show the same breadth of conception, the same lavish resources, and the same successful result (the djami of Khusraw Paşâ, and of Bahram Paşâ; the Ahmadiyya madrasa, the Şâbâniyya madrasa, the madrasa of Othman Paşâ).

At the same time, as a result of the commercial activity in the town and the impoverishment of the rural districts, which together produced a drift of the peasants to the town, new suburbs arose, inhabited by small craftsmen (weavers etc.), increasing the town to an area approaching that which it occupied today: at the end of the 11th/17th century, it contained about 14,000 hearths, a considerable figure for the time.

The installation of the European merchants had naturally been profitable to their habitual intermediaries: the Jews and more especially the Christians. The latter in addition, by acting as dragomans for the consulates, were able to obtain diplomas of immunity [see Beratî]. Thanks to the activities of European missions, many of them became Roman Catholics (4,000 Catholics in 1700; 14,478 Catholics as against 2,638 non-Catholics in the middle of the 19th century). Their suburb grew and middle-class houses were built in it which are among the finest in the town, and it even became a centre of intellectual activity.

Thus, in many respects, the first half of the Ottoman period (10th/16th-12th/18th centuries) constituted the culminating point in Aleppo's history.

From 1831 to 1838 the Egyptian occupation [see İbrahim Paşa], which temporarily removed Aleppo from Ottoman administration, placed a heavy burden on the population and the financial resources which were imposed, but, here as elsewhere, it opened a new chapter in the history of the town: the revolt of 1266-7/1850, led by the leading inhabitants against the Ottoman governor, can be considered as the last spectacular manifestation of a social system which was already doomed. Throughout the second half of the 19th century, profound changes took place, under the influence of Europe, in social (schools, newspapers), administrative (the legal system) and economic life (the introduction of the tomato, and of kerosene and machines). New districts, planned and built in western style (Azi-ziya, Djamîliyya, Talal) grew up outside the old town and attracted primarily the more Europeanized elements of the population: Christians and Jews. When Aleppo became linked by railway to Hama and Damascus (1906), and then to Istanbul and to Baghdad (1912), the proximity of the stations gave a new life to these districts, and today the centre of gravity of the town tends to move towards them.

Joined to Syria at the end of the 1914-18 war, Aleppo increased in administrative importance but suffered a great economic crisis, being cut off by the new political and customs frontiers from the countries with which it had formerly been trading—Anatolia, Upper Mesopotamia and Irâq. This crisis was averted fairly rapidly by the discovery of new outlets for the commerce and manufactures of the town. The capital of a muhâmmed was equipped with a very well-organized and methodically organized administrative machinery, and provided with many flourishing schools, Aleppo gradually became an industrial town (spinning and weaving mills) and a political and intellectual centre second in importance only to Damascus. Its continually expanding population, which in 1945 was approaching 300,000, even made it appear, immediately after the Second World War, that it had a future as great as its past.

In fact the town of Aleppo now has over 450,000 inhabitants, among them 320,000 Muslims, 130,000 Christians and a few thousand Jews. But it is unfortunate that this development has taken place without any definite measures of town-planning and that the new districts which have grown up on the outskirts, and which are occupied mainly by a population of manual and minor office workers, have not been planned as a harmonious extension of a city whose originality of architecture and intense activity had ensured it a unique place among the other great Muslim cities of the Near East. Although its commercial activity has recently benefited from the construction of the port of al-Ladhikîyya, the increase in vehicles has led to traffic problems which caused the authorities to open some thoroughfares through the ancient blocks. In addition Aleppo suffers from its situation as the "second" town of Syria, in relation to a capital to which both its history and its ambitions are traditionally opposed; the problems arising from the development of the northern provinces of Syria and of the "market place" among which has long served as their centre.

**Bibliography**

The basic work remains J. Sauvaget, Aleppo: essai sur le développement d'une grande ville syrienne des origines au milieu du XIXe siècle, Paris 1941, of which the above article is a résumé and which contains a systematic bibliography and list of the sources. See also IA, s.v. Haleb, which is here reprinted (with some additions and revisions). Various later publications should be added, in particular the following studies: M. Canard, Hôtel-dieu et jalous, ed. S. Dahan, i-ii, Damascus 1953-7, 4-6 (tr. 6-12). For Aleppo in the Ottoman period reference may be made to: Barkan, Reglements fiscaux ottomans, 206-10 (text of an Ottoman Kanunlar, 133. Some basic texts have been edited or translated: J. Sauvaget, "Les trésors d'or" de Sayh Ibn al-'Ajamî, Beirut 1950; Ibn al-Adim, Zubdal al-halab fi tarîkh Halab, ed. S. Dahan, i-ii, Damascus 1951-4; S. al-Dahhan, Bughyat al-falâb l'imâ l-'Adîm, in Annales archéologiques de Syrie, li (1951), 207-25 (publication of an extract on the walls and the citadel); D. Sourdel, La description d'Alep d'Ibn Saddâd, Damascus 1953; al-Harawi, K. al-Ziyârât, ed. and tr. J. Sourdel-Thomine, Damascus 1953-7, 4-6 (tr. 6-12). For Aleppo in the Ottoman period reference may be made to: al-Barkan, Kanunlar, 206-10 (text of an Ottoman Kanânname, for Aleppo, dated 978/1570); R. Mantran and J. Sauvaget, Règlements fiscaux ottomans, Paris 1951, 97-118 (for an earlier German version of this Kanânname see Hammer, Staatsverfassung, i, 239-41); B. Lewis, The Ottoman archives as a source for the history of the Arab lands, in JFRS, 1951, 150-1 (registers of Aleppo in the Daftar-ı Akhâmî [q.v.]); Herbert L. Bodman, Jr., Political
factions in Aleppo, 1760-1826, Univ. of N. Carolina Press, Chapel Hill 1963 (note..., "...");...kdd[egdn] [q.v.].
and later in Cairo, where Djalal al-DIn al-Suyuti
led a retired and unworldly life, devoted to study,
fikh, kird^a, hadith, tafsir and particularly
He died Celebi (d. 945; at the mosque of
in 956/1549, more than 90 years old.
his hostility to Ibn c...
his main work is the
Mukhtdr of Burhan al-Dm
Mahmud al-Mahbudi (on whom see Ahlwardt, cat.
and devotes some attention to its affairs. For
the present-day situation see N. Chehade, Aleppo,
apud The new metropolis in the Arab world, ed.
M. Berger, New Delhi 1963, 77-102 (Arabic version:
Tadbil al-mudun fi l'-lam al-arab, Cairo 1964,
frequently published independently of the works of J. Sauvaget, by E. Herzfeld, CIA, part ii, Northern Syria, Inscription
s et monuments d'Alep, Cairo 1954-5.
(J. Sauvaget)
AL-HALABî, BURHAN AL-DIN IBRÂHÎM B. MUHAMMAD B. IBRÂHÎM, a famous Hanafi author.
Born in Aleppo, he studied first in his native town
and later in Cairo, where Djalal al-DIn al-Suyuti
HAMMAD B. IBRAHÎM, a famous Hanafi author.
led a retired and unworldly life, devoted to study,
fikh. His main work is the
Multaka 'l-abhur, a handbook
of the furu* according to the doctrine of the Hanafi
school. It is based on four works, the
Mukhtasar of al-Kud^arî (q.v.), the
Mukhtdr of al-Buldah, the
Kans al-adab^ah of Abu 'l-Barakat al-Nasafi (q.v.), and the
Wikayat al-nu'as of Burchan al-Din
Muhammad al-Mahbudi (on whom see Ahlwardt, cat.
Berlin, no. 4546). Completed in 923/1517, it had an immediate success, acquired very numerous com-
mentaries (the two most popular ones are the
Madgima al-anhur of Shaykh-zade, d. 1078/1667, and
al-Shakdik al-nu^mdniyya (q.v.), which is an exhaustive treat-
mentary (the two most popular ones are the
Mukhtdr al-Sira al-awan of Ibn
al-Salahiyya. He died in Cairo on 29 Sha'a'bân 1044/ 17 February 1635. His best known work is the
Insin al-nayin commonly known as Al-Sira
al-Halabiyah. It is a biography of the Prophet, written at the request of Abu 'l-Mawâhid b. Muhammad
al-Bakri, then head of the leading Shaykh-family of Egypt. The work is based on two earlier biogra-
phies, viz. 'Uyin al-anher by Ibn Sayyid al-Nâsh [q.v.] and Al-Sira Al-Sha'amiyya by al-Sâhibî, but it also contains materials taken from other sources. It found a wide circulation, was printed several
times and translated into Turkish. For ms of it and of its abridgments see Brockelmann II, 307 and S II, 418. Amongst his other writings enum-
erated by al-Mujabbî, we may mention Al-Nâshiha
'l-Awsiyah fi bayn bu'nu tarîkat al-sâda al-Ahmadiyyah in defence of the Brotherhood of Ahmad al-Badawi [q.v.].
(Bibliography: Mujibibi, Kuqilasa al-dâhar, iii, 122 ff.; Brockelmann II, 307 and S II, 418.
(J. W. Fock)}
On 4 Ramadan 1217/29 December 1802 he was appointed ambassador to France, with the rank of bahş-mühālîb. His mission to Paris was a failure, but it enabled him to learn about the Western world.

After his return to Istanbul (late 1806) he was appointed be在家 kişis vekişi and on 23 Rabî’I 1222/31 May 1807, two days after the revolution which deposed Selim III, was promoted to the post of re’sî al-hātîb[a]. At the request of the French ambassador Sebastiâni, who alleged that he was pro-British in his policy, he was dismissed on 5 March 1808 and exiled to Kütâhâya; this banishment was in fact a fortunate accident for the young Mustafa IV, who was exiled on 28 July following. In Şabâb 1224/September 1809 he was permitted to return to Istanbul.

The new sultan Mahmûd II sent him on a mission to Baghdad, where he arrived on 25 Dümâdâ I 1225/28 June 1810. His task was to persuade the quasi-independent wallî Kültûcî Sîleymân Paşa to pay various sums due to the sultan. When Sîleymân refused, Hâlet Efendi retired with the Mülûk to Mosul where, with the help of the merchants of Mosul and Bûhân, he prepared a military expedition against the recallînt wallî. The expedition was successful, Sîleymân Paşa being murdered and the former kethâdû ʻAbd Allâh Âgha being appointed in his place.

In 1226/early 1811 Hâlet Efendi was appointed kethâdû-ı rûhî-i hâmâyûn and on 5 Şawwâl 1230/10 September 1815 niğhâbâni. He enjoyed the confidence of Mahmûd II, who sought his advice in state affairs (for the secret correspondence between Hâlet Efendi and the berber-bashi ʻAli Âgha, see Diewdet, Ta‘rîkh, 3, x, 262-78, xii, 226-8). He supported the sultan in his policy of subduing the derebeyran [q.v.] in the provinces, but he did not favour the project to abolish the corps of the Janissaries: indeed he used them as an instrument to maintain his influence over the sultan. For a time he was so powerful that he controlled nominations to the posts of Grand Vizier and of Shâykh al-İslâm. According to Slade, his intimacy with the Phanarions brought him under suspicion, and he tried to justify himself by showing ‘as great hatred to the Greeks as he was supposed to have friendship’ (Record of travels, i, 246). His fall was brought about by the part he played in procuring the deposition, in 1820, of ʻAli Paşa Tepedelenli [q.v.].

During his short term in office he took charge of the office of the gegenbeg, upon the deposition of the sultan. He was permitted to return to Istanbul.

Despite many vicissitudes, Hâleti had, on the whole, a successful career and reached the second highest position of his profession; his diwân, however, is full of complaints against Fate, and the jealousy of intriguing colleagues. The sources generally agree that Hâleti was one of the most learned men of his time. He wrote and translated many books on law, and he left a library of several thousand volumes, most of them annotated in his own hand.

Apart from various religious treatises, he is the author of: (1) Diwân, dedicated to Mehmed III in its early version. It has not been edited. MSS contain varying numbers of қâṣidas, ḡaṣâls and қâfîs. Some include his rub‘îs, some do not. For a fairly good copy, see Topkapî Sarayî Müzesi, Hazine 894, which contains 31 қâṣidas 721 ḡaṣâls, 300...
Haletl cannot be considered a major poet, but his *diwan* contains many poems of impeccable form, fresh inspiration and colourful imagery. He owes his fame and place in Turkish literature almost entirely to his *rubd'is*, for which reason he has often been compared with 'Umar Khayyam. His *rubd'is* are either included in copies of his *diwan* or form an independent *risâla*. In both cases their numbers vary greatly (between 70 and 600). These *rubd'is* are exquisite in form, impeccable in style and often very personal in expression, are not always original in respect to matter. They treat mostly the old themes common to most *diwan* poets: All things are ephemeral, Fortune is fickle, life is fleeting, Fate is merciless, the beloved is cruel, consolation is to be found in mystic love, etc. But all these thoughts and feelings are so skilfully expressed that poets, scholars and biographers alike proclaimed him as the greatest master of *rubd'is* (cf. Nedim's famous verse: *Hâleti* in *Rubd'is* Umar Khayyam. His *diwan* contains many *rubd'is* and he is on the topmost heaven of *rubd'is* like the *Abâh*.

2) *Sâki-nâme* (the Book of the Cup-bearer), a *matnâvari* of 520 distichs in *mutahârib*, which *Hâleti* wrote following the vogue of the time, when many poets produced works of varying length in this genre, introduced from Persia. It consists of a short introductory prologue followed by 15 sections (*makâles*) and an epilogue (*hayâm-i keîâm*). Following the pattern, *Hâleti* uses this genre to glorify mystic love symbolized by wine, elaborates on the transience of worldly things and mocks the ostentatious practices of the hypocritically devout; finally he invites all "men of heart" to join in drinking this wine and become brothers.

3) *Munzâhâd*, a collection of the letters *Hâleti* wrote to various important personalities of the time. Although they are written in the usual flowery and bombastic *inkâh* style, they contain a number of enlightening references to events and personalities of the time.

*Bibliography*: Kâtîb Çelebi, *Fedhileke*, ii, 135; Riyâdî, *Tedhîrî* (in MS), s.v.; Fâzûl, *Tedhîrî* (in MS), s.v.; *'Aţâ'î, Hadâmî al-bahtîb*, 739-41; Gibb, *Ottoman Poetry*, iii, 221 ff.; A. C. Yöntem, *Hâleti*, in *IA*; Rieu, *Haddîk al-hâdîk,* (in MS), s.v.; Istanbulul Kütüphaneleritürkçe yasama divânlar haikalîhâletî*, (hâletî hydrî)*HALFÁ'* (A.), alfa-grass, esparto-grass. This name is generally used, loosely, of two rather similar plants: the true alfa-grass (*stipa tenacissima*) with leaves folded into a half-sheath and ears which somewhat resemble those of barley; and the lygeum or esparto-grass or "wild alfa" (*lygeum spartum*), a smaller plant which has stiffer leaves. The former grows in mountainous districts and on high plateaus; in Tunisia it is called *halbâ* (*halbâ*) and *halâm*; the latter prefers low-lying ground (*halbâ* *mahâila, semnâgh*). Although it is difficult to recognize them at first, the experienced eye can distinguish the yellow-green of alfa-grass from the blue-green of esparto-grass. A field of alfa or a pre-Saharan steppe pasture where alfa is predominant is sometimes given the name *zemêla*.

The true alfa flourishes in the area extending from the Dabra of Morocco to beyond the Djabal Nafusa in Libya and including the Ksûr Mountains, the plateau of the Awlad Siddî Shâykh, Djelfa, Bû Sa'dâ, the Bû 'Ṭâleb and the Ma'sûdî, in Algeria, and the High Tell, the *ziqâlb* situated to the south of the Dorsal, the chain of the Matmâta and the plateau of the Hâwiya, in Tunisia. This alfa is sometimes sub-divided into "sparterie" alfa, with very fine stalks about 40 centimetres long, which have a regular diameter, and "paper-making" alfa, with coarser stalks of varying length. It is used in paper-making, etc.

Usually only the true alfa is used to make pulp for paper-making, since the discovery, in the 1850's, by Thomas Routledge of Eynsham of the possibilities of its use in this industry. The wild alfa or esparto-grass, although its fibres are equally suitable for paper-making, is preferred for sparterie (see below) and rope-making. They are, however, to a certain extent interchangeable.

The alfa fields have given rise to many juridical problems. Originally the state of Tunisia tended to consider the alfa areas as its domain and to instal there workers to harvest it, and public weighing officials. Soon, however, there developed a system of "concessions" with privately employed workers.

The season for the harvesting of alfa, but not of esparto-grass, is officially fixed from September 15th to April 30th, the spring months being left to allow the plants to grow again. The alfa is harvested by women and consists of separating the fibrous stalk from the sheath by a sharp pull done with the help of a rod (mogla) 30 centimetres long. The woman takes a handful of stalks (mostra), twists them round the rod, and, with a brisk action, separates them from the rhizomes. The product of the harvest, first collected into hanks (terza), then bound into sheaves (hâdîq) of from 10 to 12 bunches, is put into a wide-meshed net (djeyyâba, ghabka) to be carried to the public weighing machine in the market place (mungâra). A good worker can gather as much as 100 kgs. in a day. Among the Awlad 'Âziz (Maknâsî) a woman's harvesting ability is considered as part of her dowry. After being weighed, the alfa is put into stacks (gûm) in the stack-yard to dry thoroughly. After a week it is put into bales which are piled up (testîl) to await transport by train or lorries to wholesale markets or factories.

In Tunisia, the markets, the first of which were set up at Sousse and Karyâwân, multiplied with the building of the railway between Hanshir Swâtîr and Sousse. Local markets were set up near stations: Ḥâidejeb al-'Uyûn, Sbyetla, Kâsîrin, Thelepte, Haydra, in the High Tell. Centres at Mazzûna, Sénéd, Maknâsî, Khâsfâ, Siddî Bû Zîd, Fayîl and Bîn Hafey supplyalfa to Sfax or to the recently built cellulose factory at Kâsrîn.

In addition to this industrial use there should be mentioned some uses of alfa in local handicrafts. In Hergla, the Chebbâ and Kerkêna it is used for plaiting the special baskets (şâdâmî) which are used for holding the pulp of crushed olives when it is put under the press to extract the oil. In Zriba, Takrûn, and the Matmâta it is used for weaving on a high-warplow loom decorated mats with a warp of wool and a weft of alfa, the stalks being either left in their natural colour or died red and black; this craft is done by women and those of Bû 'Ṭâleb (Algeria) also excel in it. Alfa is used also to make long plaited strips (dîfra) which are made into hump covers for camels (bîgâh), double panniers (šûdîya) or pairs of saddle-bags (sombîli), grain silos (gambîli, rušîna) which are stored in the ksars of the south or in the court-yards of cave-dwellings, sleeping mats, and even sandals (tarbûga), which consist of a simple sole fastened to the foot by two or three thongs which are passed between the toes and round the side of the foot and fastened in front. If soaked in lukewarm water alfa can if necessary be twisted into ropes.

In southern Tunisia alfa is used also as fodder for...
camels. In spring the semi-nomadic camel-owners graze them on the surrounding alfa-growing plateaus.

Esparto is more easily worked than alfa rusiyya and there are two methods of using it. A. Louis (Les Keersmaeker, 1913) describes the various processes which transform esparto: from the bale to the soaked fibre (drying, baling, steeping in the sea, drying again, silage) and from the beaten fibre to useful objects.

Fibre which has been steeped in sea-water and beaten on a round stone or a wooden block, then twisted (teftil) once, is made into string or thin ropes (tefa). This fibre, which is being washed up from water wells or for haulage (khol, djarr) and even, after being twisted again on an implement for twisting the strands (zaghla), ropes for fishing boats. Twisted cords of esparto are used also for making nets for carrying loads, camel harnesses, sacks and various objects in current use in agriculture and fishing.

Esparto which is simply soaked and not beaten is used for plaiting. The plaits are then joined to make double donkey-panniers, hump covers for camels, saddle bags, carriers for water-coolers (nagila), and various other everyday objects similar to those made from the true alfa.

This is a family craft and many are skilled in it (though it is agreed that the inhabitants of Kerkena are specialists in twisting and plaiting alfa), hence the proverb "A house without alfa is a deserted house".

Halil (مَهْلِل) appeared in 1884 and of the life and work of Sayyid Ahmad Khan (Ifayt-i Djawayd) in 1901. Beginning of the modern standards of literary criticism in Urdu.
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Works: Musaddas-i Hali, Dihli 1935; Maqma’u’-s na‘am-i Hali; Doaww-i Hali, Lahore 1945; Mahaddi-i Hali (Urdu and Persian letters ed. by Muhammad Isma’ul Fandpati, Lucknow 1950; Muhaddami ghfir-o ghaffar, ed. by Walid zaqidi. Lahore 1953; Kulliyd-i na’s-na‘am-i Farsi wa Arabi, 1941; Tiryak-i masmum, Panipat 1868; Risalat Tababat al-arid, Lahore 1883; Shawkadi al-ilmam (a polemical treatise written in refutation of a similar work by a Christian missionary), 1870; Usayl-i Farsi, 1868; Hayaydi-Sa’di, 1884; Yadgar-i Ghilif 1937; Hayaydi-Dinayd, Kampion 1901; Mahaddi-i Hali, Dihli 1934-36.


Halide Edib (see KHALIDE EDIB).

Halima, a mare, or a valley, or a Ghassanid princess, after whom was named one of the most famous of all the ayyam [g.s.] of pre-Islamic Arabia, sometimes identified with the yaawm of ‘Ayn Ubaghi. It is possible that yaawm Halima was the “day” which was the victory of Ghassan over Salih [g.s.] late in the 5th century AD. But more probably, it represents the victory of the Ghassanid al-Harith b. Djabella over the Lakhmid al-Mundhir b. Nu’man, who was killed in the encounter. If true, the battle would have taken place in June, A.D. 554, at the spring of ‘Udhayiya, in the district of Kinnasrin.


Halima Bint Abi Dhu’ayb, foster-mother of the prophet Muhammad. She and her husband belonged to the tribe of Sa’d b. Bakr, a subdivision of Hawazin. Muhammad was given to her to suckle from soon after his birth until he was two years old. Well-to-do families thought desert-life residence are legendary: Halima and her family prospered miraculously while Muhammad was with them; she and her foster-brother were herding lambs, two men cut him open, purified his heart with snow and returned it to his body, and Halima, fearing demonic possession, hastily took him back to his mother.

Bibliography: Ibn Higham, 103-6, 856-7, 877; al-Wakildi (tr. Wellhausen), 350, 364, 377; Tor Andrae, Die Person Muhammeds, Leipzig 1917, 34; 53; Buhl, Das Leben Mahomeds, Leipzig 1930, 116 f.; Watt, Muhammad at Mecca, 33-5; idem, Muhammad at Medina, 99 ff.

(W. Montgomery Watt)

Halk al-Wadi (the “throat”, or the “gullet”) of the wadi, in French La Goulette (from the Italian form Goletta), township situated on the coastal strip which encloses the wide but very shallow lagoon of Tunis (less than 3 feet deep), to the north of the channel by which it is linked to the sea. After the ports of Carthage were abandoned, this became the port of Tunis; for a long time it had no artificial improvements, the ships anchoring at the entrance to a channel which had to be constantly dredged. There goods were trans-shipped onto flat-bottomed boats which carried them to Tunis, 10 kilometres away, at the west of the lagoon, as is described by al-Idrisi as early as the 6th/12th century (Description, 111-121). The entrance to the channel was guarded to the north by a fortress which is probably the “castle of the chain” mentioned by al-Bakri in the preceding century (Description, 85); it was used for defence and as a customs post. When La Goulette and Tunis were captured from the Hafsidis in 940/1534 by Khayr al-Din (Barbarossa), the fortress was extensively rebuilt and became a strong bastion. The following year, however, it was seized by the Emperor Charles V who left a garrison there. During his reign and that of Philip II, the bastion was incorporated in a large citadel. But in Rabf II 682/August 1574, the Turks, under the command of Sinan Pasha and Uludj Ali, drove the Christians permanently from Tunis and La Goulette. The Turks restored the old fortress, but demolished the other parts of the citadel, of which only the substructure now remains. La Goulette was a haunt of corsairs, which was scarcely disturbed by the demonstrations of European fleets. Under the Bey Hammuda (1782-1814), the fortifications were completed: in about 1829, the traveller Nyssen saw there a second fort (to the south) and several batteries. The Bey Ahmad (1837-1855) built there an arsenal and a summer palace. La Goulette was the first Tunisian port; between 1861 and 1865, it was visited by an average of over 600 ships each year, carrying a total of 50,000 tons**, which comprised 90% of the imports and 45% of the exports of the Regency (Gaunier, 55-6). In 1872, that is to say nine years before the establishment of the French Protectorate, La Goulette was linked to Tunis and to the palace of the Bardo by a railway track, which never, however, offered serious competition to the inconvenient small boats.

With the construction of the port of Tunis at the end of the lagoon and the digging out in the mud of a channel 20 kilometres long and 7.5 metres deep, La Goulette became, after 1893, the outer harbour of the capital, with a basin of eleven hectares which now permits ships with a draught of up to 10.5 metres to come alongside: iron ore and phosphates from the Haut Tell are loaded there and hydro-
carbons and coal are unloaded; it contains the main electricity station, whose output has recently doubled. This outer harbour is shortly to be enlarged. There exist two bastions—a fishing village whose inhabitants are mainly of Italian origin and which has become a doubled. This outer harbour is shortly to be enlarged.

Tunisia became independent).

whom 2,000 were Jews and nearly 4,000 Europeans, two-thirds of the latter being Italians; in 1956 its

[ q.v. ]

Mzab

a religious council made up of twelve "recluses" to which the whole existence of the Mzabi putative for their needs. Unfortunately apart from already heard of this institution. This took place in the first half of the 5th/nth century) there belonged another Ibadi scholar who

Al-Dardimi [q.v.]

women of the town of al-Hamma in the Tunisian

did have a wife, a fact which disturbed him greatly). It seems therefore that celibacy was considered essential for a member of the halka already in this "prehistoric" stage of the institution as represented by the group of students presided over by Abu 'l-Kasim. There is reason to suppose that a "council of recluses", composed, as will appear below, of twelve members grouped around a shaykh, existed also at a still earlier date among the Nukkār [q.v.], an Ibāḍī sect which was hostile to the Ibāḍīs. In fact, according to a passage in Ibn Khaldūn's History of the Berbers, the famous political head of this sect in the first half of the 4th/10th century, Abū Ya'qūb, a famous Ibāḍī scholar of Djarba, were very active, particularly under Abū 'Amrād, the Aures (in about 331/942-3), in revolt against the Fatimids. Since Abū 'Ammār was teaching in the first half of the 4th/10th century in the Bilad al-Djarid (at Tuzer or at Ṭāqyūs, i.e., Kuf, Tagyūs, the ancient Thuges), where he was the teacher of Abū Ya'qūb al-Ma'ṣūl and Abu Zakariyya b. Abu Nuh Sa'd, who lived in the second half of the 4th/10th century. After the death of Abū Nūḥ, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Bakr, who was responsible for the first rule concerning the constitution of an Ibāḍī council on his native island. To the following tabāka (first half of the 5th/11th century) there belonged another Ibāḍī scholar who was a native of the Bilad al-Djarid: Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Bakr, who was responsible for the first rule concerning the constitution of an Ibāḍī council, was Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Bakr who was responsible for the first rule concerning the constitution of an Ibāḍī council.

According to al-Shāmamākhi [q.v.], he also presided over a halqa in his native island.

The first mention of the halqa among the Ibāḍīs of the Maḡrib is found in the chronicle of Abū Zarkariyya [q.v.].

Abū Ya'qūb, a famous Ibāḍī scholar of Djarba [q.v.], who was the teacher of Abū 'Amrād, the Aures (in about 331/942-3), in revolt against the Fatimids. Since Abū 'Ammār was teaching in the first half of the 4th/10th century, Abū Ya'qūb al-Ma'ṣūl and Abu Zakariyya b. Abu Nuh Sa'd, who lived in the second half of the 4th/10th century. After the death of Abū Nūḥ, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Bakr, who was responsible for the first rule concerning the constitution of an Ibāḍī council, was Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Bakr who was responsible for the first rule concerning the constitution of an Ibāḍī council.
very similar versions of these rules, one of which is
contained in the Kitāb Ṭabarāt al-maṣāḥihīyāt of al-
Darqūfīn (7th/13th century) and another in the
Kitāb Dīwān al-muṣnūhīyāt of al-Barrādī (beginning
of the 9th/15th century). The critical edition of the
Siyar al-ḥalākā based on these two versions is by
M. R. Rubinacci. This document shows that the members of a ḥalākā were known as ʿaṣṣāba (singular form: ʿaṣṣābi). They were distinguished from the laity by their tonsure (they had to shave their heads completely and wear simple white habits. New members were admitted to this council only after a very detailed investigation. At the head of a ḥalākā was a ʿghaykh, who retained this position until his death. He governed the ʿaṣṣāba, took charge of the administration, judged, and taught, being responsible for the material possessions (kubus) and the spiritual well-
being of the ḥalākā. He was assisted by a khalīfa who might take his place if necessary. It was he also who appointed certain experts (inspectors, ushers) known as ʿurafāʾ (singular: ʿarif), one of whom supervised the collective recitation of the Kurʾān, while another took charge of the communal meals, and others were responsible for the students’ education, etc. All the time which the ʿaṣṣāba had free after the performance of their professional duties was devoted to prayers and other pious exercises, important among them being the formal recitations, prayers, and the recitation of the Qurʾān. The members of the ʿaṣṣāba were subject, according to the rules laid down by Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Bakr, to a severe discipline. They were governed by a strict moral code and any misdemeanour was punished immediately.

Tradition also attributes to Abū ʿAbd Allāh a missionary zeal, considering him to have been the most active agent in disseminating and popularizing ʿIbadism in the northern Sahara. It is in fact mainly to him that is attributed an achievement which had far-reaching consequences in the history of African ʿIbadism: the conversion of the Banū Muṣāb, a Berber tribe settled in the Tadmayt, in the area of the present-day Mzab, which until then had adhered to another mountain tribe of the Tinawat, from the fraction which was held in the mosque of the town Kufra. He was responsible for the production for this “council of recluses” of a special code of rules (in Arabic sīra) which has to a large extent retained its importance until the present day and which today among the ʿIbadī scholars of the Mzab is known as Sirat Abī ʿAmmar Abī al-Kāfī al-Warg-
glānī. It is a small work of about ten pages, of which the ʿIbadī collection at Kraków possesses two manuscripts brought from the Mzab by the late Z. Smogorzewski and part of which has been translated into French by E. Masqueray (Chronique d’Abou Zakaria, 254-7, note). The ʿaṣṣāba, say these regulations, must cut themselves off from their family and live only in a retreat. They must pray at night on the mountain tops. They must wear only woollen clothes; they must know the Kurʾān by heart and must occupy without complaining the post assigned to them by the ḥalākā. An ʿaṣṣābi must be anxious to possess the Sciences, he must defend energetically the rights of the weak, and he must maintain order in the town. The ʿghaykh of the ḥalākā must be intelligent, polite and moderate. He appoints the members of the ḥalākā and distributes them into three sections, the first of which consists of the wardens of the mosque for the Ibāḍīs, the second of which consists of the wardens of the mosque for the Ibāḍīs, the third of which consists of the wardens of the mosque. The first section consists of four other eminent members of the ḥalākā, and they form, with the ʿghaykh, a special coun-
cil which directs all the affairs of the ḥalākā (there is also a full council composed of all the members of the ḥalākā). When one of the members of the special coun-
cil dies, another ʿaṣṣābi has to replace him. Among the members of the ḥalākā there is a muḥtārin, three others teach the children in the school, five wash the corpses of the dead, one acts as imām and recites the prayers in the mosque, and two others manage the possessions of the mosque. One member of the ḥalākā is responsible for distributing the food to the ʿaṣṣāba and to the pupils and another supervises the cleaning of the mosque.

Al-Darqūfīn, who was a member of the ḥalākā of Wargla for two years (616/1219-617/1220-1), has given us a number of details concerning the internal life of this institution (R. Rubinacci, Op. cit., 74-5). It is interesting to learn that it was composed not only of the people of Wargla, but also of ʿaṣṣāba who were natives of other ʿIbadī communities, including the Mzāb, such as the pious Abā Yāzmīr al-Muṣābīl, who had preceded al-Darqūfīn in the ḥalākā in question by seven or eight years.

The “council of the recluses” soon became an institution so closely linked with the ʿIbadī-Wāḥḥī sect

the organization of the ḥalākā. He was the founder of a ḥalākā which was held in the mosque of the town of Tīghīrīt (Tunis) in the Wādī Rīgh. It was prob-
ably for this council that Abū Zayd drew up a rule which we find mentioned by al-Darqūfīn and by al-
Shāmīn al-Muṣābīl. This seems to be the beginning of the use of mosques for the ʿIbadī ḥalākās.

After Abū Zayd, it was Abū Ṭāmmār Abī al-
Kāfī al-Tīghīrītī al-Warglānī who made a consider-
able contribution to the definitive elaboration of the rules of the special council, of which the most eminent ʿIbadī scholars of the period, originated from the Berber tribe of the Tinawat, from the fraction which had settled in the Warglān (Wargla) oasis. He lived in the first half of the 6th/12th century. After having begun his studies in this oasis, he went to Tunis, where he studied among other things the Arabī language. Then he performed the Pilgrimage to Mecca. He died at Wargla and was buried there. He is renowned in the history of ʿIbadism for the part he played in the organization of authority in the ʿIbadī communities, helping to centralize this in the institution of the ḥalākā. He was responsible for the production for this “council of recluses” of a special code of rules (in Arabic sīra) which has to a large extent retained its importance until the present day and which today among the ʿIbadī scholars of the Mzāb is known as Sirat Abī ʿAmmar Abī al-Kāfī al-Warglānī. It is a small work of about ten pages, of which the ʿIbadī collection at Kraków possesses two manuscripts brought from the Mzāb by the late Z. Smogorzewski and part of which has been translated into French by E. Masqueray (Chronique d’Abou Zakaria, 254-7, note). The ʿaṣṣāba, say these regulations, must cut themselves off from their family and live only in a retreat. They must pray at night on the mountain tops. They must wear only woollen clothes; they must know the Kurʾān by heart and must occupy without complaining the post assigned to them by the ḥalākā. An ʿaṣṣābi must be anxious to possess the Sciences, he must defend energetically the rights of the weak, and he must maintain order in the town. The ʿghaykh of the ḥalākā must be intelligent, polite and moderate. He appoints the members of the ḥalākā and distributes them into three sections, the first of which consists of the wardens of the mosque for the Ibāḍīs, the second of which consists of the wardens of the mosque. The first section consists of four other eminent members of the ḥalākā, and they form, with the ʿghaykh, a special coun-
cil which directs all the affairs of the ḥalākā (there is also a full council composed of all the members of the ḥalākā). When one of the members of the special coun-
cil dies, another ʿaṣṣābi has to replace him. Among the members of the ḥalākā there is a muḥtārin, three others teach the children in the school, five wash the corpses of the dead, one acts as imām and recites the prayers in the mosque, and two others manage the possessions of the mosque. One member of the ḥalākā is responsible for distributing the food to the ʿaṣṣāba and to the pupils and another supervises the cleaning of the mosque.

Al-Darqūfīn, who was a member of the ḥalākā of Wargla for two years (616/1219-617/1220-1), has given us a number of details concerning the internal life of this institution (R. Rubinacci, Op. cit., 74-5). It is interesting to learn that it was composed not only of the people of Wargla, but also of ʿaṣṣāba who were natives of other ʿIbadī communities, including the Mzāb, such as the pious Abā Yāzmīr al-Muṣābīl, who had preceded al-Darqūfīn in the ḥalākā in question by seven or eight years.

The “council of the recluses” soon became an institution so closely linked with the ʿIbadī-Wāḥḥī sect
that Ibn Khaldun, writing (towards the end of the 8th/14th century) in a passage of his History of the Berbers, (tr. of 1934) of the Ibadi-Wahbi inhabitants of the Wadi Righ (which he contrasts to the Nukkâris), refers to them simply as al-'azâbâ.

A halka seems to have existed (but only in an undeveloped form, more akin to a simple gathering of a group of students round a famous shaykh) on the island of Djérba, in the second half of the 4th/10th century. This institution still existed there in about 916/1510, at the time of Navarro's expedition against Djérba. The council of the 'azâbâ, presided over by the legal scholar Abu 'l-Nâджât Yûnûs b. Sa'id, directed at this time the affairs of the Ibâdi-Wahbi inhabitants of Djérba, in this case assisting the "governor" of this island, one Abu Zakariyyâ, who also was an Ibâdi. At the same period, there were also some Ibâdi-Wahbi 'azâbas in the Djabal Nafusa (see AL-NAFUSA, DJABAL), in the northern part of Tripolitania; they were in communication with the 'azâbâ of Djérba. In fact 'azâbâ existed in this district until very recently. Indeed, the Ibâdi mudir of Djadu, who lived in the middle of the 19th century and who was known to H. Duveyrier, bore the by-name of al-'azâbî. In the Berber description of the Djâbal Nafusa composed at the end of the 19th century, there are mentioned houses belonging to the families of the 'azâbâ in the bayr of Umm el-Djârsn (cf. A. de C. Motylinski, Le Djebel Nefousa, Paris 1899, 73). It must nevertheless be admitted that very little is known of the history and organization of the 'azâbâ in the island of Djérba and in the Djâbal Nafusa.

After the disappearance of the Ibâdi-Wahbis from the Wâdî Righ and Wargla, which took place between the 9th/15th and the 12th/18th century (Ibn Khaldûn still speaks towards the end of the 8th/14th century of the existence in the first of these oases of a large number of Ibâdis belonging to the various branches of al-Ibâdiyya), the Ibâdi halkâs survived in the kusûr of the Mzab where the remnants of the Ibâdi population of these two oases had fled. According to the description of the Mzab given by Leo Africanus in 1526 (Description de l'Afrique, tr. A. Épaulard, Paris 1956, ii, 437), there were already six of these kusûr, inhabited by a wealthy population. They were composed of "the candidate were obligatory. According to the regulations, an 'azzâbî might not reveal the secrets of the halka, on pain of being excluded from the council. The 'azzâbî were expected to uphold the interests of those who had suffered wrongs, and to judge impartially between rich and poor. The regulations dealt also with the organization of the meetings of the halka and the rules of procedure of the council of recluses, of the mosque and for the support of the 'azzâbî and talaba, etc. It is interesting to note that they are silent on the question of the celibacy of the 'azzâbî, which hâd formerly been so important.

The part which the 'azzâbî played in the Mzab immediately before the French annexation of the country was a very important one. An account of the history of one of the Mzâbi towns, Karâra (Guerara), composed in about 1883 by Si Muhammad b. Shetlwl, 7
b. Silmân, an orthodox Muslim inhabitant of this town, gives an impressive picture of the importance of the Makrîs in the Mzab. According to this account, the administration of Karara in the Mzab was used of "everyone who is not a jâlib" and the armed force responsible for maintaining order, composed of soldiers who were known as makârîs. The word makârîs, of which makârîs is a plural, means in Algerian Arabic "an adolescent of 12-14 years" and in the Mzab they had already ceased to possess any political power. Their authority nowadays is limited only to the 'aszâba and the falâba of the individual towns of the Mzab, and to the mosque itself. They also ensure that the lay population fulfils the regulations of the Ibâd doctrine, making use in serious cases of a tabrî'a (excommunication). Within this field the authority of the 'aszâba and of the shaykh of the halka is still very great. They control all the Ibâdi population of the Mzab. The halka still remains the supreme religious and moral institution of the Makrîs. Nowadays a Mzabi halka has 12 'aszâba members (sometimes there are 24, 12 of whom, however, are only substitutes). The 'aszâba are recruited from among the falâbas, i.e., students (in the Berber of the Mzab they are called arû, plural urwân), both the oldest and the most learned, though it is true that the moral qualifications of the candidates often take precedence over their learning. One exception only is known: Banû Ismân, where candidates for admission to the rank of aIsh, known as urwân, are subjected to an examination (they have to know the whole of the Kûr'ân by heart). The candidates must be married, in contrast to the rule of Abû 'Amrâm 'Abd al-Kâfi al-Wardjâlî who obliged the candidate to separate from his wife. The shaykh, who is today primarily a teacher, teaches the falâba in a mosque. The falâba are supervised by an arîf chosen from among the oldest and most learned of the urwân. Another arîf supervises the communal meals (which are provided by the kubus and from gifts). Two or three masters are chosen from among the 'aszâbas to teach the children the elements of the Arabic language and also the Kûr'ân (such an 'aszâba bears the title mutâlîm). One 'aszâba acts as imâm, another is mu'âlîhîn, four or five wash corpses, etc. The shaykh selection is made from among the members of the halka by the other 'aszâbas. The choice of the hakkas is made by a shaykh, chosen from among the eldest and most learned of the urwân. Another arîf supervises the communal meals (which are provided by the kubus and from gifts). Two or three masters are chosen from among the 'aszâbas to teach the children the elements of the Arabic language and also the Kûr'ân (such an 'aszâba bears the title mutâlîm). One 'aszâba acts as imâm, another is mu'âlîhîn, four or five wash corpses, etc. The shaykh selection is made from among the members of the halka by the other 'aszâba. The hakkas are elected by the halka, which is the thirteenth member of this council. The four eldest 'aszâbas, summoned by the shaykh, form the special council which acts in more important cases. The decision of this council is binding (also for the shaykh himself). The halka meets in the town mosque and the meetings of the 'aszâba are always secret. They are also in the Mzabi towns hakkas composed of women. These female 'aszâbas have an imâm (who also is a woman), but no shaykh, and the hakkas of women have only a limited power. Thus, for example, the tabrî'a concerning a member of such a halka may be imposed only by a shaykh from a halka of men in the area.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources cited, see Abu 'l-Fadl Abû 'l-Kâsim b. Ibrahim al-Barrâdî, Kûlîb al-Djawdhir al-mundâshîn, Cairo 193/1884-50; A. Coyne, Le Mzab, Algiers 1879, 29-30; T. Lewicki, Les historiens, biographes et traditionnistes ibdîdites-wahbîtes de l'Afrique du Nord du VIII* au XVI* siècle, in Folia Orientalia, lii (1961), 29-31, 33-7, 56; idem, Notice sur la chronique d'al-Darîfînî, in RO, xii (1936), 146-72; E. Masqueray, Chronique d'Abou Zakaria, Paris-Algiers 1878; M. Morand, Les Kanouns du Mzab, Algiers 1903; A. Maârîs, of the laity of the Islamic religion, who were responsible for the administration of the individual towns of the Mzab, there was also a djamâ'a, or rather a general medînîs, composed of the delegates from the whole country (at least two 'aszâbas from each town). This djamâ'a, which was responsible for the most important matters which concerned all the Mzabi towns together, met in the mosque of the cemetery of the shaykh 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Kurtî, situated between Bû Nûra and Banû Ismân, near Ghardâtây.

After the annexation of the Mzab by the French in 1882, the shaykhîs of the 'aszâbas still continued to wield great moral authority in the Mzab towns, but they had already ceased to possess any political power. Their authority nowadays is limited only to the 'aszâba and the falâba of the individual towns of the Mzab, and to the mosque itself. They also ensure that the lay population fulfils the regulations of the Ibâd doctrine, making use in serious cases of a tabrî'a (excommunication). Within this field the authority of the 'aszâba and of the shaykh of the halka is still very great. They control all the Ibâdi population of the Mzab. The halka still remains the supreme religious and moral institution of the Makrîs. Nowadays a Mzabi halka has 12 'aszâba members (sometimes there are 24, 12 of whom, however, are only substitutes). The 'aszâba are recruited from among the falâbas, i.e., students (in the Berber of the Mzab they are called arû, plural urwân), both the oldest and the most learned, though it is true that the moral qualifications of the candidates often take precedence over their learning. One exception only is known: Banû Ismân, where candidates for admission to the rank of aIsh, known as urwân, are subjected to an examination (they have to know the whole of the Kûr'ân by heart). The candidates must be married, in contrast to the rule of Abû 'Amrâm 'Abd al-Kâfi al-Wardjâlî who obliged the candidate to separate from his wife. The shaykh, who is today primarily a teacher, teaches the falâba in a mosque. The falâba are supervised by an arîf chosen from among the oldest and most learned of the urwân. Another arîf supervises the communal meals (which are provided by the kubus and from gifts). Two or three masters are chosen from among the 'aszâbas to teach the children the elements of the Arabic language and also the Kûr'ân (such an 'aszâba bears the title mutâlîm). One 'aszâba acts as imâm, another is mu'âlîhîn, four or five wash corpses, etc. The shaykh selection is made from among the members of the halka by the other 'aszâba. The hakkas are elected by the halka, which is the thirteenth member of this council. The four eldest 'aszâbas, summoned by the shaykh, form the special council which acts in more important cases. The decision of this council is binding (also for the shaykh himself). The halka meets in the town mosque and the meetings of the 'aszâba are always secret. They are also in the Mzabi towns hakkas composed of women. These female 'aszâbas have an imâm (who also is a woman), but no shaykh, and the hakkas of women have only a limited power. Thus, for example, the tabrî'a concerning a member of such a halka may be imposed only by a shaykh from a halka of men in the area.

HALKA — AL-HALLÄDJ


(T. Lewicki) HALKA, term used in Ayyûbid and Mamlûk times for a socio-militaiy unit which, during most of the period of what is known as the Mamlûk state, was composed of non-Mamlûk soldiers. The sources do not indicate the date of its foundation, and there is no convincing explanation of the meaning of its name (for two different views, see Quatremère, Histoire des Sultans mamlouks, i/2, see Quatremère, i/2, 305, reprinted in Studies on the civilization of Islam, London 1962, 74). Under Sa’ûd al-Dîn it seems to have been called the elîte of his army. Under his Ayyûbid successors, this unit is mentioned only rarely, yet it must have preserved a considerable part of its power and status, for even during the early years of Mamlûk rule it was still very strong. In those years the halika included a considerable number of pure Mamlûk commanders. The commanders of the unit, called mubaddam al-halika, held honoured positions, and were named side by side with the Mamlûk amirs in all important ceremonies. They also served as envoys to important states, functions which were usually reserved for the hâßikatîyya (see also Z. Smogorzewski, Unpublished materials on the Mzâb; Watîn, Les Tolbas du Mzab. Origine. Part I). (unpublished account known thanks to the full extracts made by Z. Smogorzewski; the original was in 1913 in the Archives de la Direction du Personnel Militaire des Territoires du Sud.)

The halika, term used in Ayyûbid and Mamlûk times for a socio-militaiy unit which, during most of the period of what is known as the Mamlûk state, was composed of non-Mamlûk soldiers. The sources do not indicate the date of its foundation, and there is no convincing explanation of the meaning of its name (for two different views, see Quatremère, Histoire des Sultans mamlouks, i/2, see Quatremère, i/2, 305, reprinted in Studies on the civilization of Islam, London 1962, 74). Under Sa’ûd al-Dîn it seems to have been called the elîte of his army. Under his Ayyûbid successors, this unit is mentioned only rarely, yet it must have preserved a considerable part of its power and status, for even during the early years of Mamlûk rule it was still very strong. In those years the halika included a considerable number of pure Mamlûk commanders. The commanders of the unit, called mubaddam al-halika, held honoured positions, and were named side by side with the Mamlûk amirs in all important ceremonies. They also served as envoys to important states, functions which were usually reserved for the hâßikatîyya (see also Z. Smogorzewski, Unpublished materials on the Mzâb; Watîn, Les Tolbas du Mzab. Origine. Part I). (unpublished account known thanks to the full extracts made by Z. Smogorzewski; the original was in 1913 in the Archives de la Direction du Personnel Militaire des Territoires du Sud.)

I. — BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

Origins. Al-Hallâdj was born in about 244/857-8 at Tûr, to the north-east of al-Bayyâd in Fars. In Tûr an Iranian dialect was spoken; al-Bayyâd was an Arabized town where Sîbawayh was born. It is said that al-Hallâdj was the grandson of a gâ’ith (see also Zubda, 103-6, and BSOAS, xvi, 71-2). The halika survived in Syria, after a fashion, into Ottoman times (see B. Lewis, in BSOAS, xvi (1954), 479).

Bibliography: D. Ayalon, Studies on the structure of the Mamluk Army, in BSOAS, xv (1955), 448-59 (the reasons for the halika’s decline being discussed at 455 f.). (D. Ayalon)

AL-HALLÄDJ (the wool-carder), Abu ‘l-Mughith al-Husâyn b. Mânsûr b. Mâshâ‘im al-Bayyâdî, Arabic-speaking mystic theologian (244-309/857-922). His life, his teaching and his death throw light on a crucial period in the history of Muslim culture, and the interior experience which he describes can be considered a turning point in the history of tasawwuf. (This article includes, as well as the article of EI², some extensive additions drawn from the later works of L. Massonii.)
Prophet. His father, who was probably a wool-carder, left fur for the textile region which extended for the textile region which extended minority, and the centre of a famous school of Kur'ān readers. At Wāsīt, al-Husayn lost the ability to speak Persian. Before he was 12 years old, he learned the Kur'ān by heart and became a kāfīf. He very early attempted to find an inner meaning in the teaching of the suras and applied himself to asceticism at the school of Sabīl al-Tustarī.

At Baṣra. When he was twenty he left Tustarī to go to Baṣra. There he received the habit of the Ṣūfīs from ‘Amr Makki, and married Umm al-Husayn, the daughter of Abū Yaḥyā al-Akṭā’ī. He did not take any other wives and he and his wife remained united all their lives, having at least three sons and one daughter. His marriage earned him the jealousy and the opposition of ‘Amr Makki. When he was absent from home, al-Hallādī was able to entrust the support of his family to his brother-in-law, a Karnabā’ī. Through the latter, he found himself in contact with a clan which supported the Zaydi rebellion of the Zanjī [q.v.], who were contaminated in varying degrees by Shi‘ī extremism; this is probably the origin of his persistent but unconfessed passion as being a Shi‘ī da‘ī or “missionary preacher”. He retained from this period some curious and apparently Shi‘ī expressions, but continued to lead at Baṣra a fervently ascetic life and to remain profoundly faithful to Sunnism. He went to Bağhdād to consult the famous Šūfī Djiunaydī, but in spite of the latter’s advice, tired of the conflict which existed between his father-in-law al-Akta’s and ‘Amr Makki, he set off for Mecca immediately after the Zanjī rebellion and was crushed.

First Pilgrimage. At Mecca he made his first Pilgrimage, and made a vow to remain for one year of umra in the courtyard of the sanctuary, in a state of perpetual fasting and silence. In this he was trying out his personal way to union with God, and, going against the discipline of secrecy, began to proclaim it. ‘Amr Makki then broke off relations with him, yet he began to attract disciples. Khūṣīzān, Khurāsān, Tustarī. Having returned to Khūṣīzān, he gave up the tunic of the Šūfīs and adopted the “lay” habit (probably the kābā, a cloak worn by soldiers), in order to be able to speak and preach more freely. This beginning of his apostolate, the main aim of which was to enable everyone to find God within his own heart, and which earned for him the name of Hallādī al-Aṣrār, “the carter of consciences”, exposed him to suspicion and hatred and scandalized the Šūfīs. Some Sunnīs, former Christians some of whom were to become viziers at Bağhdād, became his disciples. But some Mu’tazīlīs and some Shi‘īs, who were important treasury officials, accused him of deception and of false miracles and incited the mob against him. He left for Khūṣīzān to continue his preaching among the Arab colonies of eastern Iran and remained there for five years in the city or in its suburbs, standing for some time on the frontiers in the fortified monasteries which housed the volunteer fighters in the “Holy War”. He returned to his region of Tustarī, and, with the help of the Secretary of State, Ḥamd Kunānī, was able to instal his family in Bağhdād.

Second Pilgrimage, distant journeys. Third Pilgrimage. With four hundred of his disciples, he then made his second pilgrimage to Mecca, where some of his former friends, Șūfīs, accused him of magic and sorcery and of making a pact with the Devil. In 301/913, the vizier Ibn Mu’tazz, seeing that he undertook a long tour in India (Hinduism) and Turkestān (Manicheism and Buddhism), beyond the frontiers of al-dīr al-Islāmīm, “the del of the Communauté musulmane, c’est à toute l’humanité qu’il pense pour lui communiquer ce curieux désir de Dieu, patient et pudique, qui dès lors le caractérise ...” (L. Massinou). About 290/902, al-Hallādī returned to Mecca for his third and last Pilgrimage. He returned there clad in the musurāka’s, a piece of patched and motley cloth thrown round his shoulders, and a sāfā, an Indian loin-cloth, round his waist. His prayer at the station of ‘Arafāt was that God should reduce him to nothing, should make him despised and rejected, so that God alone might grant grace to Himself through the heart and the lips of His servant.

Final preaching at Bağhdād. After returning to his family at Bağhdād, he set up in his house a model of the Ka‘ba, prayed at night beside tombs and in the daytime proclaimed in the streets or the sāfās his burning love of God and his desire “to die accursed for his Community” “O Muslims, save me from God” ... “God has made my blood lawful to you: kill me” ... This preaching aroused popular emotion and caused anxiety among the educated classes. The Ẓāhir Muhammad b. Dīwādī was angry that al-Hallādī should claim a mystical union with God; he denounced him at the court and demanded that he should be condemned to death. But the Șūfī jurist Ibn Surayjī maintained that mystical inspiration was beyond the jurisdiction of the courts. It was at this period that, according to the hostile account of the grammarians of Baṣra, al-Hallādī replied to al-Shiblī, in the Mosque of al-Mansūr, by the famous ērābī (“theopathic phrase”): Āma l-hābīk, “I am [God] the Truth”, proclaiming that he had no other “I” than God.

Arrest. A movement for the moral and political reform of the community was taking shape in Bağhdād, inspired by the preaching of al-Hallādī and by those of the faithful who were anxious to see in him the hidden “Pole” [see āyān] of the time. He dedicated himself to Hannām and composed several treatises on the duties of viziers. In 296/908, some Sunnīs reformers (under the Hanbali influence of al-Barbāhārī, see H. Laoust, La profession de foi d’Ibn Baṣṭa, Damascus 1958, passim) made an unsuccessful attempt to seize power and to raise Ibn al-Mu’tazz to the caliphate. They failed, and the infant caliph, al-Muqtadir, was restored, his vizier being the Șūfī financier Ibn al-Furāt. Al-Hallādī was involved in the consequent anti-Hanbali repression and succeeded in fleeing to Sās in Aḥwāz, a Baṣran town, although four of his disciples were arrested. Three years later, al-Hallādī himself was arrested and brought back to Bağhdād, a victim of the hatred of the Sunnīs Ḥāmid. He remained in prison for nine years.

Imprisonment. In 301/913, the vizier Ibn Ḥisā, the cousin of one of al-Hallādī’s disciples, put an end to the trial (cf. the fatwa of Ibn Surayjī) and the imprisonments and the executions of the Șūfīs were released. Nevertheless, owing to pressure from his enemies and the influence of the chief of police, who was an enemy of the vizier, al-Hallādī was exposed for three days on the pillory with “Karmātī agent” written above him. He was later confined in the palace, where he was allowed to preach to the ordinary prisoners. In 303/915, he cured the caliph of a fever, and in 305 “restored to life” the crown prince’s parrot. The
Mu'tazilis denounced his "charlatanism". The vizier Ibn 'Isa, who had been favourable to al-Halladj, was replaced in 304-6 by Ibn al-Furat, who was anti-Halladj, but the influence of the queen-mother prevented the latter from re-opening the trial. It appears that two of al-Halladj's most important works date from this period: the  Date al-Asal, a meditation on the case of Iblis, "the disobedient monotheist", and the short work on the "ascension" (mīrād) of Muhammad, who hailed on the threshold, two bow-shots from the Divine Essence.

The condemnation was refused and suggested that beyond the experience of Muhammad there could be attained a union in love between man and God. They seem to have been a reply to the Shī'ī extremist al-Shalghamān, who considered that faith and impiety, virtue and vice, election and damnation were all mubādal ("related opposites") and equally pleasing to God. Al-Shalmaghānī had a considerable influence at the Baghdad court and even on the course of the trial of al-Halladj.

The condemnation. The trial was re-opened and the case argued in 308-9/921-2. The background to it was Hāmid's financial speculation, which had been opposed in vain by Ibn 'Isa. It was to destroy the latter's influence that Hāmid procured the re-opening of the trial of al-Halladj. He was helped in this by Ibn Mughālīd, the respected leader of the corporation of the Kur'ān readers and a friend of the Sūfīs Ibn Sālim and al-Shībī but opposed to al-Halladj. The Ḥanbalīs, at the instigation of Ibn 'Atā', himself a Ḥanbali and a mystic, held demonstrations and "prayed against" Hāmid: both in protest against his fiscal policy and in order to save al-Halladj. They even demonstrated against al-Ṭabarī, who condemned the riot. These disorders gave the vizier Hāmid the opportunity to make Ibn 'Atā' appear before the tribunal. But Ibn 'Atā' refused to witness against al-Halladj and maintained that the vizier did not possess the right to judge al-Halladj. They were ill-treated by a guard during the court hearing and died from the blows he received.

Hāmid and the Mālikī šaikh Abū 'Umar Ibn Yūsuf, who always supported those in power at the time, arranged in advance the judgement of the tribunal which was to condemn al-Halladj. Al-Halladj had said "The important thing is to proceed seven times around the Ka'ba of one's heart": they therefore accused him of being a Karmāṣī rebel who wished to destroy the Ka'ba of Mecca. There was no Şāfīi present at the trial. The Ḥanafī šaikh declined to give judgement, but his assistant agreed to support Abū 'Umar, and the syndic of the professional witnesses succeeded in producing eighty-four signatures. Sitting in judgement, Abū 'Umar, urged by Hāmid, pronounced the formula: "It is lawful to shed your blood".

The execution. For two days the grand chamberlain Naṣr and the queen-mother interceded with the caliph, who, stricken with a fever, countermanded the execution. But the intrigues of the vizier triumphed over the hesitation of al-Muqtada. When he was hearing a great banquet, sighted the warrant for al-Halladj's execution. On 23 Dhu 'l-Ka'da, the sounding of trumpets announced the impending execution. Al-Halladj was handed over to the chief of police, and in the evening in his condemned cell exhorted himself to face martyrdom and foresaw his glorious resurrection. These prayers, noted down and handed on, were to be re-grouped in the  Abkhab al-Halladj.

On 24 Dhu 'l-Ka'da, at Bāb Khurasān "before an enormous crowd", al-Halladj, with a crown on his head, was beaten, half-killed, and exposed, still alive, on a gibbet (sālih). While rioters set fire to the shops, friends and enemies questioned him as he hung on the gibbet and traditions relate some of his replies. The caliph's warrant for his decapitation did not arrive until nightfall, and in fact his final execution was postponed until the next day. During the night there spread accounts of wonders and supernatural happenings. In the morning, according to al-Tūnī, those who had signed his condemnation, grouped around Ibn 'Ata, cried out: "It is for Islam; let his blood be on our heads". Al-Halladj's head fell, his body was sprinkled with oil and burned and the ashes thrown into the Tigris from the top of a minaret (27 March 922).

Witnesses reported that the last words of the tortured man were: "All that matters for the ecstatic is that the Unique should reduce him to Unity", recapitulating the appeal to the one authentic tawākīl, that which God utters through his heart of hearts; and that he then recited Kur'ān, XXII, 18.

II. — Principal (published) works

(1) Twenty-seven Rūḍāyīt, collected by his disciples in about 290/902, in the form of hadīth kudāsī, Arabic text in 3rd ed. of the  Abkhab al-Halladj (Fr. tr. L. Massignon, Passion d'al-Halladj, Paris 1922, 893-904); (2)  Kitāb al-Tawāfūn, a series of eleven short works (including the  Tā Sin al-Asal), Arabic text and Persian version of Baklī, ed. by L. Massignon, Paris 1933; (3)  Kitāb al-Šalāt, 3rd ed. (Fr. tr. L. Massignon, Paris 1931; new Fr. tr., Paris 1938; (4) some logia and especially the novissima verba of the last night, collected in the  Abkhab al-Halladj, ed. L. Massignon (Paris 1914; *Paris 1936; *Paris 1957). (For the other writings of al-Halladj and the discussion of their authenticity, see L. Massignon, Kitāb al-Tawāfūn, introd. i-iv; Kitab al-Shamā'il, Paris 1922-23; 804-22; Diwān al-Halladj, 1913 ed., i-5; and Opera Minora, Beirut 1963, ii, 40-5 and 191).

III. — The main accusations

The trial of al-Halladj took place against the background of the religious and political intrigues, and those concerning financial policy, which disturbed the Baghdad court during the minority of al-Muqtada. It illustrates the position of the 'Abbāsid dynasty at the beginning of the 4th/10th century and the rôle played in it by the viziers held together by common interests. Al-Halladj's two main enemies were the Shī'ī vizier Ibn al-Furat and the Sunni vizier Hāmid. All his sermons in the Baghdad sūbahs were aimed at a drastic application of the values of faith to the inner life and at the proclamation of a union in love between the soul and God: all this within the framework of a dogma which deliberately stressed the Sunni axioms. But his sermons fell on deaf ears, not only among the political circles of the court, but also in the world of the traditional jurists, the majority of them Mālikīs and Ḥanafīs, who revolved around them. It is surprising that al-Halladj's strongest supporters were recruited among the Ḥanbalīs, whose pietism had at that time a considerable influence among the common people. Al-Halladj's demands for moral reform and his influence on the
people were an annoyance to many of those in power. They based their accusation on two pretexts:

(a) Religious pretext: al-Halladj's unprecedented utterances called in question the esoteric prudence and the discipline of secrecy which had become the rule in Sufi circles since the time when Nuri and his followers had been called to give an account before the courts of their teaching on the love of God. One result was that the Sufis such as "Amr Makki and Djinayd who had been al-Halladj's friends blamed him for having spoken publicly of his personal experience and for having expressed it in "theopoeic statements" (takāshādā); in addition, some rather confused Sufi tendencies, particularly those concerning "Ujālī love", felt that they had to condemn the search for the One through willing love and the way of suffering. This was perhaps the main reason why the Zāhirī Ibn Dāwūd became an enemy of al-Halladj, bent on his destruction. After this al-Halladj was accused of blasphemy and of claims to ḥulul (substantial union with God); and his anxiety to give an inner significance to ritual acts ("proceed seven times round the Ka'ba of your heart") was denounced as a wish to abolish the acts themselves.

(b) Political pretext: this was probably the most telling and the most decisive. Al-Halladj's marriage had connected him with the Zaydi Čālgī; his distant travels made him seem to be a Karamī dāfī ("missionary"); and the language which he used, and even his themes of meditation, did borrow a certain number of Ǧītha thematic elements, even although his replies to the interrogations on this matter remained of profoundly Sunnī inspiration. His accusers, who feared his influence on the people as well as on the members of the court, then decided to present him as an agitator and a rebel who was a threat to the order of the Community. A falsely literal exegesis of some of his sayings (see above) accused him of wishing, like the Karmātīs, to destroy the Ka'ba at Mecca. It thus became "lawful to shed his blood" in the name of the Community itself.

Actually, during the last years of his life, al-Halladj seems to have drawn onto himself his tortures and condemnation—but for quite different reasons: recognizing that the way of union with God through love and suffering which he must follow was something which transcended the juridical framework of the Community, and offering himself as a sacrifice for this Community by submitting voluntarily to its laws.

IV. — SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EXPERIENCE AND THE WITNESS

In the history of tasawwuf, al-Halladj retains a privileged position in the line known as ṭawādat al-ghuṣūd. It has sometimes been suggested that this phrase should be translated as "unity of vision" or "of look" (in reference to the meaning of the 3rd form of the root šḥṭ-d); or, rather better, by "unity of presence". But ʿghuṣūd really means the act of being present at, of being a witness of, and we consider it admirable to retain the meaning of "unity of witness" (or "monisme testimonial"), L. Massignon, Lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, Paris 1954, 103). The ṭawādat al-ghuṣūd is not only "sight" or "look", but an actual presence which is total witness: it is God witnessing to Himself in the heart of His votary (ʿābdī). This union with God (djām) leads to a unification (istiḥdād) which is not a unification of substance, but operates through the act of faith and of love (jāhī, makhbāba), which welcomes into the emptiness of oneself the Loving Guest (God), the essence whose "Essence is Love", as al-Halladj expressed it.

The mystical experience thus understood was to be sharply criticized by the other main Sufi line, that of the ṭawādat al-ʿawdīydī ("unity of the Being" or "monisme existential"), Massignon, ibid.), which was dominant from the 6th-7th/12th-13th centuries [see ALLĀH, 416]. A double objection was made:

(1) An objection to the idea of ʿḥūlūl, infusion of substance, was probably the most telling and the most decisive. Al-Halladj was accused of blasphemy and of the ṭawādat al-ʿawdīydī had in fact written: "Thy Spirit has mingled itself with my spirit as amber mixes with fragrant musk" (Diwan, M. 41), and above all "We are two spirits fused together (ḥalānī) in a single body" (ibid., M. 57). But the whole context of the poems and the writings makes it clear that ʿḥūlūl here was not to be understood in the sense, which later became current, of "incarnation" or fusion of substance. In its most obvious sense the ʿḥūlūl of al-Halladj is to be understood as an intentional complete union (in love), in which the intelligence and the will of the subject—all in fact which enables him to say "I"—are acted upon by Divine grace. Thus the "we are two spirits fused together in a single body" should be compared with the saying of the Christian mystic St. John of the Cross: "Two natures (God and man) in a single spirit and love of God".

(2) From this arose the second, and most frequent, objection aimed at al-Halladj by the ṭawādat al-ʿawdīydī, which was to be, as expressed by Ibn 'Arabī, that he maintained in the djām and the ʿistiḥād a "duality". The monism of the "unity of Being" in fact intends that the ʿistiḥād should operate not, indeed, through ʿḥūlūl but through a total submersion of the divine "I" for the empirical "I". To be "one" (ahād) with God is to make actual the divine which in man's spirit has emanated from God (emanated, not been created ʿex nihilo; cf. al-Ghazālī's statement in the Risāla ḥudūdiyya: "the (human) spirit is from the amr of God"). This charge of "duality" aimed at the "unity of witness" reveals the difference in orientation between the two ways: the unification in and through the acts of faith and love (supreme Witness), for the ṭawādat al-ʿawdīydī; and the reabsorption of the acts of the created being in his first act of existence (conceived here as emanating from the Divine Being) for the ṭawādat al-ʿawdīydī.

V. — VOCABULARY AND "TECHNICAL TERMS"

The principal writings of al-Halladj are either meditations on themes symbolizing the progress of the mystic in his quest for God, or the direct (poetic) expression of this actual progress. He was constantly making his vocabulary more precise; his profound knowledge of the technical vocabularies of ʿfikh, of ʿilm al-ḥalām and of the nascent falsafa combined to produce a semantic equipment which was strikingly suited to the analysis of the "spiritual states" (ahādī). "Halladj, a dialectician and an ecstatic (cf. Lullius, Swedenborg), endeavoured to bring doxa into harmony with Greek philosophy on a basis of mystic experience; he was in this a precursor of Ghazālī" (L. Massignon in ElI).

In the last section of the Kitāb al-Taʿāruf, al-Kalābdīḥī devotes several chapters to the ʿistiḥdād ("technical terms") of Sūfism. The definitions of these terms are clearly based on al-Halladj: thus ʿwādī ("ecstasy"), ʿubr ("intoxication"), djām ("union"), etc., and in particular those mukbhāls
("related opposites") which are ta'frijd ("enclosed solitude") and ta'frid ("open solitude"); ta'dfllad ("action of veiling, making secret"), farad ("annihilation") and bakh ("continuing existence"), etc. These terms were to have a very precise meaning in the waqdat al-ghuwhad of the school of al-Halladj; they were to receive another meaning in the future waqdat al-wudjul; and in each case were to be understood with reference directly to the experience being described and to the conception of the world which underlay their formulation. Nevertheless their first definition by al-Halladj was of prime importance in the development of the im al-tasa'awwaf. It often gave rise to disagreements, even among al-Halladj's followers themselves: as with the use of ishk, concurrently with, and often in preference to, mahabba, for the love of God and of man. Ishk was part of the vocabulary of the earliest Sifism (cf. al-Hasan al-Baqli); but the sense of "desire", which was one of its usual connotations, was to be rejected, through fear of attributing to God either mutability or passivity. L. Massignon has shown that the editors of the texts of al-Halladj among them the Shfi Bakli, had no hesitation in substituting mahabba for iskh in these texts, thus diluting al-Halladj's thesis that iskh is a divine attribute of Essence (cf. Notion de l'essentiel D'sir", in Massignon, Opera Minora, Beirut 1963, ii, 226-53).

VI. — THE SCHOOL AND THE SECTS OF THE HALLADJYYA

It seems that in 909/922 al-Halladj's disciples had been formed into a farida (religious fraternity). After the execution of their Master, they went into hiding and dispersed, and thus even became split up. In fact legal persecution continued, and in 311-2/924-5 several followers of al-Halladj were beheaded in Baghdad.

A certain number of disciples fled to Khurasan, where several of them took part in the Hanafi-Maturidi reform movement. Ibn Bishr and particularly Farkis Ibn Isr (founder of the Hallajiyya-Buuliyya) upheld and spread al-Halladj's teaching in the SfLI circles in Khurasan. The Kitab Ta'awuruf of al-Kalabadji stems from this tradition. In the 5th/11th century, according to al-Sulami and al-Kh. the doctrines of the Hallajyya became subdivided into three groups: (a) Jurists, which is subdivided into radd (simple rejection) and takfif (excommunication); indicated in the following list by the sigla radd; (b) takfif ("canonization") or wilaya (affirmation of sainthood), which is subdivided into iti'dhar (justification with excuse) and kabul (full and complete acceptance); sigla fr; (c) tawabuf (suspension of judgement, abstention): sigla t.

(A) Jurists (fuqaha'): Zahiris: Ibn DAW and Ibn Hazm (radd); Ismailis: Ibn Bidaya, Abu 'Abdurrahm Tusi and HilI (radd), Shushtari, 'Amili (r); Malikis: Turtis, 'Uyayn, Ibn al-Kaladani (radd), 'Abdari, Duhailawi (r); Hanballis: Ibn Taminia (radd), Ibn 'Akl (who retracted), Tawft (r); Hanafis: Ibn Buhuri (t), Naululis (r); Shafiis: Ibn Surayji, Ibn Hajar, Suyuti, 'Urmi (r), Dhuwayri, Dha'ababi (radd), Makdisi, Yafi, Sharawi, Haythami, Ibn 'Akl, Sayyid Murtada (r).

(B) "Theologians" (mu'takallimun): Mursiis:
The page contains a text discussing various topics such as historical figures, their contributions, and their significance in the context of Islamic history. It also references a variety of works, including those by Ibn Tufayl, Suhrawardi, and others. Additionally, there is a section discussing the geography and economy of Haly, a region in the Arabian Red Sea coast. The text is rich in detail and provides insights into the cultural and political landscape of the time.
link between Ham and the black races, produced by multiple incests, Afrldun should also be considered as descended from him, at least according to an indication in al-Bad` wa *l-ta*rîkh, iii, 144-9.


Languages. Words derived from this name have served to designate languages related to the Semitic languages. The Hamito-Semitic family (chamito- semitique, hamitisch, chamitiques) has had its name since 1887. It was generally believed to embrace a clearly defined group, the term Hamitic must be used to designate languages related to the Semitic group. As the non-Semitic branches do not show any common characteristics by which to unite them in a defined group, the history of this study and its bibliography can be found in Marcel Cohen, Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phondite du chamito-sembitique, Paris 1947; see also by the same author the chapter Langues chamito-sémites, in the 2nd edition of Les Langues du monde, 1952, and Résultats acquis de la grammaire comparée des langues chamito-sembitiques, in Conferences de l'institut de Linguistique de l'Université de Paris, 1976. For a detailed comparison see SâM.

Physical types. The terms Hamites (Hamiten, Chamites), Hamitic (Hamitische, Chamitiques) are sometimes used to designate the African peoples who speak non-Semitic Hamito-Semitic languages and certain others, and seem to be a mixture of Whites and Blacks; these elements are also referred to as African whites and Ethiopians (in the anthropological sense). See William H. Worrall, A study of races in the ancient Near East, Cambridge 1927 and, more recently, in R. Bisutti, Le razze e popoli della terra, Turin 1953-7. (M. Cohen)

HAMA (see Hamat).

HAMADHAN (HAMDÂN), city in central Iran located in a fertile plain just south of Mt. Alwand, 48° 31` E. (Greenw.), 34° 48` N., altitude ca. 1800 m. (6000 ft.).

Hamadhan is a very old city. Whether the name is first mentioned in cuneiform sources dating about 1100 B.C., telling of the conquests of Tiglatpileser I, is uncertain but unlikely. Herodotus (1, 98) says that the Median king Deiokes in the seventh century B.C. built the city called Aqbatana, or Ekbatana according to other Classical authors. This name has been interpreted as an Iranian word *hamangata, "(place of) gathering", but an Elamite form *hâl. matsu na, "land of the Medes", might suggest another etymology. The city was well known as the capital of the Medes, a winter capital of the Achaean medes, and an important city on the trade route between Mesopotamia and the east under the Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian dynasties. The city is mentioned in Armenian sources as Ahmatan and Hamatan, in the Bible as Ahmeta (Ezra, VI, 2), and in Syriac sources in various forms. It underwent sieges and suffered destruction several times in its ancient history.

The ancient, but mythical, pre-Islamic history of the city was known and mentioned in many Arabic sources, principally the geographers (see Schwarz, below). After the battle of Nahawand, in 641 or 642 A.D., the Persian commander in Hamadhan made peace with the victorious Arabs. The circumstances of the Arab conquest of the city are contradictory in the sources, but it seems that the initial agreement of submission of the inhabitants and the city had to be taken by storm, probably in the spring of 645 (Tabari, i, 2650, 6 and Baladhuri, 309). Arabs from the tribes of Rab`a` and `Udî were settled in the city, since they are mentioned as residing there in 77/696 (Tabari, ii, 994, 17). Christians and Jews are mentioned as part of the population.

The city is described by the geographers as strongly fortified, perhaps the strongest in the entire area called Dibbî by the Arabs, which encompassed ancient Media. In the fighting between Ma`mûn and Amlûn for the caliphate in 195/810, the city underwent a long siege (Tabari, iii, 829, 15).

Hamadhan of the 4th/10th century is described by the geographers as a large city, mostly rebuilt since the Arab conquests. It had four gates in its walls, three bazaars, and extensive suburbs. The main mosque was already then called an old structure. Unfortunately, no history of Hamadhan has survived. A history of the city by Abu Shudâr Shârâyây b. Shahvâd (died 509/1115) was used by...
Yākūt in his geographical dictionary. Ḥāḍīḍī Khālīfī (i, 310) mentions other histories of the city, none of which have survived, an indication of the lack of a strong and continuous scholarly tradition in the city. One of the famous sons of Hamadhān was the rustic poet Bābā Tāhir, also a mystic, who lived under the early Ṣalāṭūkūs. Ibn al-Fāzik al-Hamadhānī, the geographer (d. circa 903/1207) also came from the city, but he gives few details about his birthplace.

Under the Il-Khāns Hamadhān regained its former importance, and Abābā Khān died there in 681/1282. The ruler of the Il-Khāns was the rustic poet Baba Tahir, also a mystic, who was probably born in Hamadhān circa 645/1247. The city, of course, passed from under the Diwān to Timūr, and later to the Aq Ḵoyūnlu, until the Ṣafawīs established their rule in the city after 908/1503. Several times during the 10th/16th century Hamadhān was occupied by Ottoman troops. In 1126/1712 Ahmed Paša, the Ottoman governor of Ḵūbdahūd, held the city until he was expelled by Nāṣirī, where the intellectual atmosphere appeared as a two-volume survey (see Dāftār-i Ḵārāfī) of the town and district of Hamadhān, compiled during this period, is preserved in the Turkish archives—see B. Lewis in Māngūn Musāti, Tehran 1963, 260). After changing fortunes Hamadhān reverted to Iran in 1732. In 1759 the city was taken by Aḥṣ̄ā Muḥammad Kāḏīr, founder of the Kāḏīr dynasty, and the citadel, on the hill now called al-Muṣṣalī, was destroyed.

The population of the city about 1820 was estimated at 40,000 by Ker Porter. Curzon in 1889 estimated it as 20,000. The 1931 census gave 51,000; in 1934 it was 60,000, and in 1950 about 120,000. The principal remains of the past in or near the city are the Gandj Kūnā-i Ḵūnān, two Old Persian inscriptions by Darius and Xerxes carved on Mt. Alwand 12 kilometres south-west of the city, the pre-Islamic stone statue of a lion mentioned in Arabian sources (see Schwarzer, 528), the so-called tomb of Esther and Mordecai, the Ala-wiŷān mosque from the Ṣalāṭūk period, the Burdī-i Kūrbān, a mausoleum from Mongol times, and the tomb of Bābā Tāhir.

Bibliography: A Guide to Hamadhān published by the geographical division of the General Staff of the army, under the direction of Ḥ. ʿA. Ṭārān (Tehra 1954) gives a map of the city and general survey. Schwarzer, Iran, i, 513-34, and Le Strange, 194-196, give references to the geographers. There is no general history of the city and historical citations have been mentioned above. For more recent history see R. Ker-Porter, Travels in Georgia . . ., London 1821; G. N. Curzon, Persia, London 1892.

AL-HAMADHĀNĪ, Ahmad Bādiʾ al-Zamān “the Prodigy of the Age”, Arabo-Persian writer and letter-writer, was born at Hamadhān in 358/968 and died at Herāt in 398/1008. He pursued his early studies in his native town, where his master was Ibn Fāris [q.v.]. Aided by an exceptional memory and talents, he was soon noted for his virtuosity in handling the Arabic and Persian languages. He apparently remained true to Shiʿism for the greater part of his life. At about 22 years of age, he settled at Rayy where the intellectual atmosphere appeared favourable to his ambitions; the Būyid waṣīr Ibn ʿAbdāb [q.v.] granted him his patronage; it is possible that in this town the young man mixed with the local beggars’ guild and notably with the unorthodox poet Abū Dulaf, an intimate friend of the waṣīr (see al-Ṭāribīlī, iii, 175-94). It may be supposed that these contacts gave to al-Hamadhānī the idea of composing certain of his first Maḥāmātī. Perhaps as a result of a quarrel, the young man went to Dūr-gān where he is said to have come into contact with Ismāʿīlī elements. In 385/992 he went to Nihāpūr, apparently attracted by the renown and the activity of this intellectual metropolis; there he made some useful contacts but clashed with the letter-writer Abū Bakr al-Khārīzmi, then at the height of his fame; he finally prevailed and eclipsed his adversary, who died, overcome by chagrin. From this time al-Hamadhānī undertook a series of journeys which were also triumphs; perhaps he went to Zarandjī (in Khurāsān) to the court of the Khorasānīs, whose panegyrist and favourite he was. After the deposition of the Sāmānīs, he attached himself for a while to Māhmad of Ghazna, whose praises he sang (see al-Thāribīlī, iv, 200) before settling finally at Herāt where he died, scarcely aged 40; a short time earlier he had embraced Sunnism.

Even in his lifetime it would appear that al-Hamadhānī had created for himself a certain reputation as a master of the waṣīr, under his name (ed. Cairo 1903) does not, however, reveal any originality, and by the subjects dealt with as well as by the style it is related to the poetical works composed at this time in the circles of the wāṣīr of Irāk and Iran. The same may be said of the “Epistles” or Rasaʿūli in rhymed and rhythmic prose, part of which has been published (İstanbul 1298, Beirut 1890); the brilliance of the often affected style does not succeed in convincing us that so much artistry should be put to the service of such wordly and empty preoccupations. Of a completely different interest is the volume of Maḥāmātī or “Séances”, which has perpetuated the writer’s name. Al-Hamadhānī seems to deserve the title of creator of this genre. The hypothesis of Zakī Mubārak that the idea of the “Séance” is to be found in the works of the grammarian Ibn Buraydī arises from a mis-interpretation of a passage of al-Ḥusr. The composition of the Maḥāmātī, begun about 380/990, seems to have extended over many years. Al-Hamadhānī is said to have dictated not less than four hundred of them; only fifty-two are now known. These “sketches” vary in length but rarely exceed a few pages; they are made up according to a strict balance; they are of rhymed and rhythmic prose, mixed with verse; the learning and the wit of their author are sometimes also panegyrics of patrons. It may be said that in al-Hamadhānī’s hands the maḥāmātī reflects contemporary society. This writer has the final merit of having given a framework to this genre; with the exception of a few “sketches” which are narratives set in the past (such as the Sêance of Ghaylān, Beirut ed., 42-8), the greater part of the collection is made up of accounts which portray a cultivated and cynical bohemian and a bourgeois suffering for his own credulity. The “Séance” thus conceived was to serve as a model for almost a thousand years (see Maḥāmātī.

Bibliography: Thāribīlī, Yalta, iv, 107 ff.; Ibn Khallīkān, Cairo 1310, i, 39; Maḥāmātī
Hamallism, or Hamaliyya, Hamallism, an African Islamic movement which is named after Sharif Hamallah, whose name was thus transcribed by the first French writers (P. Marty, Étude sur l’Islam et les tribus du Soudan, Paris 1920, v); others have rendered it as Ḥamā Allāh, or Ḥamāla. His followers call themselves Ḥamāliyyin; their Tijānī adversaries call them “eleven beads”, ṣaṣo ẹ g’d (in Tukolor), and akhdar, beginning of this century, not as a new confraternity to the structure of society of that period.

The founder of this movement was Shaykh Sidi Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh, known as Sharif al-‘adbīn, a native of Touat, who is said to have received the Tijānī wādī from Tābir b. Abū Tayyib (Thaar ben Bou Tayeb), wādī of the Tijānī zānīya of Tlemcen (Algeria). He settled at Nioro in 1904 and determined to restore the Tijānīyya to its pristine purity; he caused the chaplet with eleven beads to be adopted, but he died in 1909 without being able to spread his doctrine, despite the help of some Wolof messengers. His disciple, Sharif Amadou Ḥamā Allāh Haydara, born in 1886 and 26 years of age when his master died, took over the teaching with much greater success. Ḥamā Allāh belonged to the tribe of the Ahl Sidi Sharif of Tichit. His grandfather and his father Muhammad ʿabd (wālīd) Sayyidna ʿUmar, of a Sharīf family, were traders who had settled in the town of Nioro at the end of the 19th century; his mother Aissa Diallo was a Fulani from Niamina. Shaykh Ḥamā Allāh traced back his genealogy to Abū Bakr, the Prophet’s son-in-law, through Muhammad Ghali, in Mecca; but, in his work al-Rimāḥ, he wrote that the true number of recitations was eleven.

In about 1925, he took the title Shaykh and appointed mukaddams. Without leaving his niyya, he was able to employ propagandists who spread his teaching to Niore, Walata, Kiffa, Kayes, Timbreta, Nara and Nema. In a few years his doctrine, which had not had much success with the Moors, had spread over a wide area among the negroes inhabiting the river basins of the Senegal and Middle Niger; he also had mukaddams among the Awlād Zayn, Aḥl Terenni, Aḥl Tobga, Ladoum, Awlād Naṣir, Awlād Måbrek, Aḥl Sidi Ṣāmīd and Laghāli. He preached the purified Tijānī waṣīda, his followers vowed themselves for life and could not adopt any other creed; the obedience of his waṣīda had to be absolute. He was reputed to be a ‘aṣīr, and some regarded as māhdi. Among his disciples he had officials of the administration and some of the local police. His prestige spread throughout the Sahel, but he lost control over the most turbulent of his followers.

The preaching of Ḥamā Allāh soon came up against very lively resistance from Tijānī circles, especially among the Kaba Diakité and the Sila, disciples of al-Hādīdī ʿUmar [q.v.]; it was also challenged by the Kādiryya and several Moorish tribes. The origin of this hostility, apart from the matter of the eleven beads, lay in the fact that his preaching was given in Nioro, the fief of powerful Umarian families, and that it revealed a social aspect that was opposed to the structure of society of that period.

Shaykh Ḥamā Allāh granted the wādī to women, prisoners (Harāṭin [q.v.]) and young people, releasing them from paternal authority or that of their masters; finally, he authorized women to take part in ceremonies which brought men together without any distinction of caste. He criticized the depravity of women and recommended the wearing of decent garments; secular and social problems he ignored. It is certain that although Ahmad al-Tijānī had prescribed the recital of the prayer Dīwārat al-Kamāl eleven times on the instructions of the Prophet whom he saw in a dream, which was in conformity with the mystique of numbers, he had the same prayer recited twelve times, for reasons not explained, at a period when he was compelled to struggle against the Turks (ʿĀyn Mahdī was captured by the Turkish forces in 129/1813 and in 202/1807); it is possible that the number eleven derives from Muhammad al-Ḵabīr. The Ḥamāliyya chaplet consists of eleven beads on each side, counting from the pendant.

Al-Hādīdī ʿUmar Tall, initiated in 1835, practised the eleven recitations until the moment when he received the wādī, for the second time, from Shaykh Muhammad Ḥālī, in Mecca; but, in his work al-Rimāḥ, he wrote that a great number of recitations was eleven.

Ḥamā Allāh’s disciples preached the equality of castes, of men and women; they made recruits among the opponents of the Tall clan, among people of caste, slaves, and also certain families with mystical tendencies. The doctrine was exalted by the mukaddams, some of whom disturbed public order by extravagant hero-worship of the Shaykh; one of the most active was Yaqūb (Yaṣṣūb) ʿṢylla of Kayes. The conflict passed swiftly from the social sphere to the political. The French administration tried to temporize and to avoid becoming involved in a religious quarrel, but was compelled to intervene when incidents became more serious: in 1923, politico-religious conflicts broke out between the Lāghāl and Tenourdajou tribes, starting a vendetta which lasted for several years. In 1924, the Ḥamāliyyists attacked...
HAMALIYYA — HAMAM

the chief of Nioro's house; Shaykh Hamâ Allah, who had not intervened to put a stop to these incidents, was sent to Mederdra. In 1939, Yacouba Sylla was the source of a scandal in Kayes; the Tidjâns accused him of orgies and seditious songs, and to avoid disturbances he was sent away to Kaedi. In the same year, further serious incidents broke out in Kaedi, on the occasion of his preaching on the equality of women, the wearing of jewellery and the uselessness of the Kurân; he caused luxurious textiles to be burned and gold necklaces to be sold; later, Yacouba Sylla organized public confessions which led to numerous divorces; he also organized the "dances of Paradise"; on 15 February 1930 a riot in which Tidjâns and Hamallists were the opponents led to fifteen deaths. In 1933 Fodie Sylla proclaimed the usefulness of the Kur'an; he caused luxurious textiles to be burned and gold necklaces to be sold; in the town itself, more than half the population is Hamalliyya. They teach their faith in about thirty Kurân schools; in the rest of Mali, there are about 150,000 followers at Bamako, Ségou, Timbuktu, Amongo, Kidal, Kayes and Bandiagara. In Mauritania, there are more than 300,000 Tidjâns and Hamallists; some are found as far away as Atar; in Haute-Volta there are about 80,000 at Ouahigouya, Dori, Yako and Bobo Dioulasso; and there are some in the valley of the Senegal and at Niamey.

The present holder of the word is apparently Sharif Ahmad ould Hamâ Allah, who is 50 years of age and lives at Nema, in Mauritania.


HAMAM (pl. hamâmîm, hamâmâdi), a collective substantive which, taken in a wide sense, denotes any bird "which drinks with one gulp and coos" (kull fayr 'abbâ wa hadara fa-huwa hamâm), that is to say the family of the Columbidae, with which the mediaeval Muslim naturalists incorporated that of the Pteroclidae, the sand-grouse (sâdâ [q.])..morphologically they are fairly numerous in Egypt and Syria, but the Hamâmâdi, which hamâm represents, are fairly widespread from 'Iraq to the Maghrib with their different species of pigeons and turtle-doves, both resident (awbûd) and migrant (bawîdî). In the genus Columba we find—(a) the ring-dove or wood-pigeon, Columba palumbus (warâqân, såh bûr, hâyâwân, dalâm, Maghrib: za'âsî, saâfî), a bird of passage in 'Iraq and Syria, absent from Egypt and resident in the Maghrib with the sp./ C.p. exelsus;—(b) Bruce's green pigeon, Treron vaalais, (hadâm, abu 'l-ahhâd, hâdrât), especially in southern Arabia;—(c) the stock-dove or blue dove, Columba oenas (yamâm, hamâm barri), a winter visitor in 'Iraq and Egypt and the Maghrib;—(d) the rock-dove, Columba livia (î-uri, hamâm khalasa), with the sp./ C.l. livia, in the Maghrib, C.I. palaeasinae in Syria, Jordan and northern Arabia, C.I. gaddi from Palestine to 'Iraq, and C.I. schimperi in Egypt; it is from this pigeon that all the tame and domesticated breeds are descended. The genus Streptopelia is represented by—a) the turtle-dove, Streptopelia turtur ('Iraq: shîfin; Arabia and Syria: wârîshâl, târkhûl, 'âbîr Allâh, Abû 'âbîr, şarûfî; Egypt: bârî; Maghrib: imâm), with the sp./ S.l. turtur, a bird of passage in autumn and spring in...
all the Arabic-speaking countries, S.t. arenicola which nests throughout the Maghrib as far as Tripolitania, a bird of passage in Syria, Palestine, ‘Irāk and northern Arabia, S.t. aegyptiaca a resident in the highlands of Jordan, S.t. isabellina a bird of passage on the east coast of Arabia;—e) the red-eyed dove, Streptopelia decaocto (fīkhīta, sitt al-rūm, yd karīm, karīma), with its flight; ordinarily they were sent in duplicate, without any mention of address; any Muslim, not the intended addressee, could claim to be the owner of the bird. This was a very popular sport among those who had the means to keep such birds and enjoy them in competitions.

In the restricted sense, hamām denotes the domestic pigeons originating from the rock-dove, whether the free or “roof-pigeons” that are established in towns (hamām ahli, hamām al-‘amādr) and on which the Meccans prided themselves (hamām Makka), or the artificially bred or “dove-cot” pigeons (buṣīt, dāḏīm) trained to live (muwaṭṭān) in private lofts (‘amādr, pl. ‘amīda) or official pigeon-houses (burūj, pl. burūj). It is to this last category that mediaeval writers in Arabic devoted so much of their work in both prose and verse; indeed; the contact established between the Muslims and the pigeon-loving Byzantines gave such a fillip to pigeon-keeping (laḥ bi ‘l-hamām) among the Arabs that it quickly became a pastime that attracted several caliphs, such as the ‘Abbāsids’ al-Mahdī, Hārūn al-Raṣīl, al-Wāḥik and al-Nāṣir. It is necessary only to recall the lengthy passages devoted by al-Dajhīz to the homing pigeon (K. al-Hayawān, iii) to be able to assess the passion with which this hobby was pursued in the great cities of Baghdad, Basra, Damascus and Cairo. On the subject of the “sporting pigeon” (al-hadīl, pl. al-huddāl) the philologists have compiled a large quantity of lexicographical material drawn from the technical vocabulary of pigeon-devotees (arbāb al-hayawān) and on which the bird is said by the Muslim historians to have no margin and should be without any preamble (inhtidd), it had to be trained so that its homing instinct should be “acquired” (muwaṭṭ). For this purpose it was mated at a very early age, and the owner relied on the absolute constancy of the pair to make completely certain that the bird would return when taken away from its mate; it was carried in a basket, the distance being increased each time, and was released from each of these stages (masḏūlāt).

Like the Greeks and the Romans, the Muslims made skilful use of the valuable qualities of the homing pigeon, employing it as an entirely trust-worthy means of communication. Pigeon post, an official institution integrated into the Intelligence Service (barīd), is said by the Muslim historians to have been the work of the atabeg of Syria Nur al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Zangī (541-60/1146-74). The ‘Abbāsids caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (575-622/1180-1225), an ardent pigeon-enthusiast, restored this institution, which disappeared with the coming of the Mongols (656/1258) under the caliphate of al-Mustaṣim bi ‘l-lāh; we know from Jowith-ul that when St. Louis landed at Damietta (1249) “for a moment the sky was darkened by the thousands of pigeons released by the inhabitants to warn the sultan of the danger threatening their city. The Mamlūk Baybars (688-76/1259-78) made Cairo a centre for pigeon-keeping, and it included nearly two thousand pigeons bearing the symbol of the State (dāḏ); only the sultan himself used to open the messages, which had to be brought to him by the pigeon-officer (barīd, barīda) as soon as they arrived. These notes were written on special very thin paper called “bird-paper” (warāq al-tayr) and were perfumed if they contained good news, bad news being carried by a bird whose plumage was darkened with soot. It was the custom that the text of the message should have no margin and should be without any preamble of formal praise of Allāh, since it might fall into the hands of infidels, that it should not bear the date of the current year but only the day and year and what by way of signature at the end there should be the formula kafā bi-lālīh ḥaḍīt** (Allāh is sufficient guide). These air-borne letters were rolled up and fastened to one of the carrier pigeon’s remiges, without in any way interfering with its flight; ordinarily they were sent in duplicate, without any mention of address; any Muslim, not the intended

---

*This text is a translation and contains corrections and notes for better understanding.*
recipient, who by chance received a message of this sort felt it his duty to send it on, after attending to the pigeon's needs and making a note of his action on the back of the message.

It was during the 9th/10th century that the use of the pigeon-post gradually disappeared. Whatever the chroniclers may say, there is every ground for asserting that this method of communication was in current use in Islam well before the 6th/12th century, as is proved by the remains of the "pigeon stages" (marāhi al-ḥamām) placed at regular intervals (mudarralādja) along the shores of the Persian Gulf, following a continuous line of ribāt (q.v.) and ensuring the safe dispatch of the correspondence of the Aghlabid governors of Ifriqiya (3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries); the modern place-name Hammamet (al-Ḥamāmd, "the pigeons") is a living reminder.

The theme of the "gentle dove", the messenger of love, peace, and good fortune, was the unfailing inspiration of Arab poets of all periods and in all the Muslim countries, and it would be useless to try to enumerate all the frasidas (mardkiz al-badmūn) which, in their conclusion, evoked the image of eternity in the tender cooing of turtle-doves (al-ḥaṣālīf) up high among tall trees. In Islam, as everywhere else, this bird is regarded with popular affection, and a pair in a cage are very often the chosen companions of the Muslim home; at a very early date, this affection found expression in various proverbs and legends which hold up the Columbidae as examples of sweetness, attachment and fidelity, as for instance Noah's dove, or the two carrier pigeons sent from Mecca by Allāh to the Prophet Muhammad when hidden in the cave. It appears, however, that the latter did not share this feeling of affection since, by a tradition which relies on the testimony of Abū Hurayra (see Sunan of Abū Dāwūd), he is alleged to have included pigeons among the ranks of the demons. Nevertheless, in the eyes of Kurānic law the flesh of the columbidae is permitted as food, and mediaeval Muslim medicine credited both it and also pigeon-dung with great inspiration of Arab poets of all periods and in all the Muslim countries, and it would be useless to try to enumerate all the frasidas (mardkiz al-badmūn) which, in their conclusion, evoked the image of eternity in the tender cooing of turtle-doves (al-ḥaṣālīf) up high among tall trees. In Islam, as everywhere else, this bird is regarded with popular affection, and a pair in a cage are very often the chosen companions of the Muslim home; at a very early date, this affection found expression in various proverbs and legends which hold up the Columbidae as examples of sweetness, attachment and fidelity, as for instance Noah's dove, or the two carrier pigeons sent from Mecca by Allāh to the Prophet Muhammad when hidden in the cave. It appears, however, that the latter did not share this feeling of affection since, by a tradition which relies on the testimony of Abū Hurayra (see Sunan of Abū Dāwūd), he is alleged to have included pigeons among the ranks of the demons. Nevertheless, in the eyes of Kurānic law the flesh of the columbidae is permitted as food, and mediaeval Muslim medicine credited both it and also pigeon-dung with great

Bibliography: given in the art. Firāwn; see also J. Horovitz, Koranische Untersuchungen, 149; A. Jeffery, The foreign vocabulary of the Qur'ān, 284. (G. Vajda)

HĀMARZ, Persian officer who, at the battle of Dḥū Kār [q.v.], was in command of the Persian troops who were driven back by the Bakr b. Wālī [q.v.] and who was killed in the battle. Al-Mas'ūdī (Murūdī, ii, 228 = ed. Fellat, i, 648) calls him, in error, al-Hurmuzān, but he should not be confused with the Persian general of this name [q.v.] whom he was assassinated by Ḍubayy Allāh b. Umar.

Bibliography: Ṭabarī, i, 1030, 1032, 1034 f. (tr. Nöldeke, Geschichte der Perser, Leiden, 1879, 333, 334, 340, 342); Ibn al-Wardī, Tāʾrīḫī, Cairo 1328, i, 117; see also the Bīlī of the article Dḥū Kār.

(Ed.)

HĀMĀSA (A.), "bravery", "valor" (used nowadays together with hamās, to translate "enthusiasm"), is the title of a certain number of poetic anthologies which generally include brief extracts chosen for their literary value in the eyes of the anthologists and classified according to the genre to which they belong or the idea which they express; these works are related to a more general category, that of "poetic themes", maʿāni l-šarʿ [q.v.], but differ from it in the apparent effacement of the author who abstains from any comparison or judgement and imposes his taste without indicating the reasons for his choice. The origin of the title, which has embarrassed modern critics, seems however very clear: al-Ḥamāsa (verses on bravery in war) is the title of the first—and incidentally the longest—chapter in the oldest and most celebrated anthology of this type, that of Abū Tammām (d. 231/849 [q.v.]) following a procedure currently practised until our own times in many literatures, this title has been adopted for the complete work a whole and has replaced the name which its author had given to it: al-Iḥṣāʿ al-mūmān in ghīr al-ghawra, the name of another name which more probably attributed to it (see al-Masʿūdī, Murūdī, vii, 160). This anthology met with such success, in both Maghrib and Maghrib, that later anthologists imitated it and retained the title, which little by little lost its etymological sense to become synonymous with mukhāṭārāt, "selections", "anthology"; this is so much the case that the Hāmāsa of Ibn al-Shaqqārī (see below) was also published, in Cairo, in 1306, under the title Mukhāṭārāt ḍūwarī al-ʿArab.

1. — ARABIC LITERATURE

The Hāmāsa of Abū Tammām marks a new orientation in comparison with earlier anthologies which contained complete poems [see e.g., Al-Muḥfaddal al-Ḍabbī] or the whole available work of a poet, or even of a tribe [see e.g., Ḫuwaylī]. Here, on the contrary, the anthologist, himself a poet, allows his own personal taste to be exercised in extracting from a poem the one or more verses which seem to him to illustrate most felicitously a literary genre and later, after Abū Tammām, a given theme. This Hāmāsa is divided into ten chapters of unequal length containing respectively, in no apparent order, lines on bravery in warfare, death (marāḥi), morality (adab), love (nasīb), the faults of the adversary (ḥaḍīth), hospit-
ality (diyafa'), various qualities (sifdt), the sleep enjoyed by travellers (al-sayr wa'l-nu'ds), witticisms (al-sayr wa'l-nu'ds), al-wati'a (diyafa'), various qualities (sifdt), the sleep enjoyed by travellers (al-sayr wa'l-nu'ds), in fact feeling convinced of the superior value of their own poetry, they scarcely knew the Iliad or the Odyssey, and going back to the pre-Islamic period or to the beginnings of Islam, but some are more recent.

The success of this Hamása inspired several commentaries (see al-Baghdādi, Khizdna, Cairo ed., i, 33), of which that of al-Tālīrīzā (his name is best known (see R. Blachère, HLA, i, 151; see also Abu Tammām, adding there: a Hamása sughri or K. al-Wāhidīyīdī by him was edited by al-Kayāfī, Damascus 1964). In the Maghrib, its vogue was no less great; study of it constituted one of the foundations of literary culture (see H. Pērs, Poésie andalouse, 28), and al-Aʿlam al-Šāntamārī, who imitated it, made a new commentary on it.

In order not to be left behind, al-Buhtūrī (d. 584/1187 [q.v.]) also composed an anthology which he entitled Hamdsa, so contributing in a decisive manner to the definitive adoption. In the Hamása of al-Buhtūrī, the verses are no longer divided under a small number of rubrics, but are grouped together, according to the poetic themes that they contain, in 174 very subtly graded chapters (e.g., thirteen of them are concerned with fleeing from the enemy), with the result that this anthology may be considered to come into the category of maʿdīi l-ghīr. It should be added that it enjoyed far less success than the earlier work; it does not seem to have been studied in Spain, where al-Buhtūrī was, however, held in great esteem, and only a single manuscript of it has been discovered.

The next work chronologically appears to be that of a certain Abū Dūnmāgh (or Dīmāgh), of which we have only a brief mention in the Fihrist (Cairo ed., i, 120); then come those of Muḥammad b. Khālaf Ibn al-Marzūbān (d. 309/921), of which we know only the title (see Fihrist, ii, 384, which does not mention the Hamása; Yākūt, Udābā, xix, 52; F. al-Bustānī, Dīrāt al-maʿārif, iv, 31-2) and of Ibn Fāris (d. 395/1004) entitled al-Hamása al-muḥdathī (see Fihrist, 119; Yākūt, Udābā, iv, 84). The two Khālidūs, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ḥāshim (d. 380/990), and his brother Abū ʿUṯmān Saʿīd (d. 400/1010), who lived in the entourage of Sayf al-Dawla, are the authors of a Klifā Hamūṣat al-maḥdithīn, the title of which shows the gradual change in the meaning of the word hamása (see Fihrist, 240; M. Canard, Sayf al-Dawla, Algiers 1934, 295-3; their Hamása, also entitled al-ʿAshīb al-wāl-natāʾir, survives in manuscript in Cairo).

In the following century, it was in Spain that al-Aʿlam al-Šāntamārī (d. 476/1083 [q.v.]), already the author of a commentary on Abu Tammām, composed a Hamása (quoted by al-Baghdādi, Khizdna, i, 33).

The same literary form was again followed by Ibn al-Shāṭari (d. 542/1148 [q.v.]), whose Hamása was published under this title by F. Krenkow at Haidarābād in 1345 (see above). Somewhat later, ʿAll b. al-Ḥasan al-iṣlaṣ al-Ḥumaym al-Ḥili (d. 601/1204 [q.v.]) composed a new and more original one; this grammarian and poet, with his inordinate pride and uncompromising xenity, thought himself entitled not only of selecting the best poems of the earlier poets, but also of himself writing other and equally good poems; thus, following Abū Tammām, he composed a Hamása in which he included only poems of his own composition (see Yākūt, Udābā, xiii, 72 ff.).

It was an Andalusian living in Tunis, Abu ʿl-Haidārī Yūsuf b. Muḥammad al-Andalusī al-Bayāṣī (572-653/1177-1255) who was the author of the next Hamása; a philologist, historian and poet well schooled in classical poetry, he compiled in Tunis in 646/1248 a collection of poems, stories and fables to which he unwarrantedly gave the name Hamása (see al-Maḵḵarī, Analectes, index; A. González Palencia, Literatura, 107; R. Brunschvig, Ḥafṣīsides, ii, 384, 399, 406; this work exists in manuscript at Goa.

The last Hamása that we know is that of ʿṢadr al-Dīn ʿAll b. Abī ʿl-Faḍrāl al-Baṣrī (killed in 659/1261); it is known by the name al-Mamās al-Baṣrīyya (see al-Baghdādi, Khizdna, i, 33), and a manuscript of it is preserved in Cairo.

The interest of these works, and especially of the Hamása of Abu Tammām, is multiple. For us, their merit lies in preserving poems by poets otherwise unknown, and of serving in a subsidiary way as secondary sources for the publication of the dīdāms of ancient poets, but they also provide us with reasonably precise indications in regard to the tastes of a period.

For general information on the subject, see U. al-Māʾṣūrī and F. Krenkow at Haidarābād, and also of himself writing other and equally good poems; thus, following Abū Tammām, he composed a Hamása in which he included only poems of his own composition (see Yākūt, Udābā, xiii, 72 ff.).

It was an Andalusian living in Tunis, Abu ʿl-Haidārī Yūsuf b. Muḥammad al-Andalusī al-Bayāṣī (572-653/1177-1255) who was the author of the next Hamása; a philologist, historian and poet well schooled in classical poetry, he compiled in Tunis in 646/1248 a collection of poems, stories and fables to which he unwarrantedly gave the name Hamása (see al-Maḵḵarī, Analectes, index; A. González Palencia, Literatura, 107; R. Brunschvig, Ḥafṣīsides, ii, 384, 399, 406; this work exists in manuscript at Goa.

The last Hamása that we know is that of ʿṢadr al-Dīn ʿAll b. Abī ʿl-Faḍrāl al-Baṣrī (killed in 659/1261); it is known by the name al-Mamās al-Baṣrīyya (see al-Baghdādi, Khizdna, i, 33), and a manuscript of it is preserved in Cairo.

The interest of these works, and especially of the Hamása of Abu Tammām, is multiple. For us, their merit lies in preserving poems by poets otherwise unknown, and of serving in a subsidiary way as secondary sources for the publication of the dīdāms of ancient poets, but they also provide us with reasonably precise indications in regard to the tastes of a period.

For general information on the subject, see U. al-Māʾṣūrī and F. Krenkow at Haidarābād, and also of himself writing other and equally good poems; thus, following Abū Tammām, he composed a Hamása in which he included only poems of his own composition (see Yākūt, Udābā, xiii, 72 ff.).

It was an Andalusian living in Tunis, Abu ʿl-Haidārī Yūsuf b. Muḥammad al-Andalusī al-Bayāṣī (572-653/1177-1255) who was the author of the next Hamása; a philologist, historian and poet well schooled in classical poetry, he compiled in Tunis in 646/1248 a collection of poems, stories and fables to which he unwarrantedly gave the name Hamása (see al-Maḵḵarī, Analectes, index; A. González Palencia, Literatura, 107; R. Brunschvig, Ḥafṣīsides, ii, 384, 399, 406; this work exists in manuscript at Goa.

The last Hamása that we know is that of ʿṢadr al-Dīn ʿAll b. Abī ʿl-Faḍrāl al-Baṣrī (killed in 659/1261); it is known by the name al-Mamās al-Baṣrīyya (see al-Baghdādi, Khizdna, i, 33), and a manuscript of it is preserved in Cairo.

The interest of these works, and especially of the Hamása of Abu Tammām, is multiple. For us, their merit lies in preserving poems by poets otherwise unknown, and of serving in a subsidiary way as secondary sources for the publication of the dīdāms of ancient poets, but they also provide us with reasonably precise indications in regard to the tastes of a period.
in any case were daunted by the difficulties of translating verse (see G. Wiet, Les traducteurs arabes et la poésie grecque, in MUSJ, xxviii/16 (1960), 361-8; the embarrassment of Mattā b. Yūnus is nevertheless instructive for, in his translation of Aristotle's Poetica (A. Badawi, Ṭabīṣūfī, Fanning, ‘al-aṣhr, Cairo 1953, 96), he was content to render ṣīwāl by ǧāl (while Badawi, in his own trans., 3 and passim, uses maḥlāmāh).

It has also been said that the rule of the monorhyme excluded long compositions in verse; now the ṣurdāsā permits the composition of very long works, and it is precisely in ṣūdāsā that some poems have been written that come near to being epic, without, however, ceasing to be versified when they have a purely didactic character; Ibn al-Mu‘āτazz is one of the first representatives of this form, which flourished especially in al-Andalus in the hands of Ghażāl, Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīh, Ibn Zaydūn, Ibn ʿAbdūn, Ibn al-Ḵaṭīb and others. In certain poems of Abū Ya‘qūb al-Ḵuraymī, of Abū Tammām, of Abū Firās or of al-Mutanabbī, there is certainly a strong feeling of epic, but it would be exaggeration to regard these ṣurdāsā as true epics.

Rather than attempt to find an explanation for the Arabs' continued ignorance of a noble literary form which has contributed to the universal prestige of the great literatures of antiquity and the Middle Ages, it is fitting simply to reflect that, while possessing all the necessary documentary, literary and technical elements for the creation of the epic, they did not achieve the final stage of the process; they preferred to follow a tradition which may be called national, and which Islam helped to anchor still more deeply in their hearts. This is basically the opinion of many modern Arab critics—from the talented translator of the Ilīad, Sulaymān al-Bustānī (see his Introduction) to Ahmad Abū Ḥāka, author of the Fanning, ‘al-aṣhr al-maḥlāmāh (Beirut 1960)—who agree that the epic genre, in spite of the works mentioned above, is lacking in Arabic literature.

From the nineteenth century onwards, the translation of Homer and the reading of great epics have inspired some more or less successful attempts, among which may be mentioned those of Ahmad Mūḥarram, al-Ḥīyāhā al-islāmiyya (an epic of the Prophet), of Būluṣ Saḥāla, Ṭal‘ al-Qadr (a Shī‘ī epic) and Ṭal‘ al-Riṣād (a Sa‘udi epic), and of Fawāzi Ma‘īnī, Bīṣīl al-‘ānī, which Abū Ḥāka considers the best.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references in the text: Ḥājjīdī Khālīfī, iii, 125-6; A. Trabulsi, La critique poétique des Arabes, Damascus 1955, 26-8; Sarks, 297, 530; R. Blachère, HLA, i, 150-2; Brockelmann, index; S. Achtar, Bisturi, Sorbonne thesis 1953 (unpublished); Z. al-Mahāsīnī, in ʿAṣaţ (Rabat), i/3 (1963), 52-5; F. Klein-Franke, Die Hamasa des Abu Tammam: Ein Versuch, Cologne 1965. (Ch. Pellat)

ii. — **Persian Literature**

When introduced into Iran by the Arabs, the word ḥamāsā at first retained its original meaning (bravery) and then, rather later, was used in Persian to denote the heroic and martial epic (ḥamāsā-i pāhlavānī), a literary genre, the works composed in this form being comparable with the heroic epics of the other Indo-European peoples; this is the meaning of ḥamasa-sarāyit (from sardāyidan, to sing, and, by extension, to compose), the title of the work by Dr. Ṣafā on the Persian epic.

The earliest texts of a heroic character are concerned with the kings of antiquity and the period when the Iranians were still in direct contact with the Aryans of India. In brief, the heroic legend in Iran started to take shape even before the Iranians emigrated from India towards what was later to be Iran; it was subsequently enriched with new elements and developed into oral or written narratives, particularly during the last period of the Sāsānid dynasty. Upon comparing the Vedas and the Avesta, one observes that the Indo-Iranians, even before their separation, were familiar with the legendary exploits of the national heroes. Some of these narratives were mainly products of the imagination (the creation of the world and of man); others had some historical basis but, with the passing of time and the accretion of oral elements, they assumed a legendary aspect.

In the Avesta, the Yašt are of great importance in regard to national legends. Several sections allude to legends and beliefs similar to those found in the Vedas; thus Vivasvat, father of Yama, and Trīta Aptya (of the Rig-Veda) correspond to Vivasvan, father of Yima (Djam), and to Athwīya (Abtin) father of Thraetaona “the child of Thrīta” (Farīdūn) who are named in the Hom Yašt (of the Yasna), “the most important chapter for the comparative historical of the beliefs of Avestan Persia and Vedic India” (J. Darmesteter, Zend-Avesta, i, 79); they appear later in Persian epic texts (see ḫawāmsī ḫanīdī, Farīdūn); other Yašt mention heroes, most of whom figure in the Book of Kings of Firdawsi, and places situated in North-West Persia (ancient Media). According to Nöldeke (in Gr.I.Pk., ii, 131), it can be accepted that, at the period when the Avesta took shape, some presentation of the mythical history of Iran, if not written at least traditional, was in existence. But, unlike the Persian epics composed from the 5th/11th century, which bring together a mass of details, these particulars are short and incomplete in the Avestan texts.

On the other hand, striking analogies have been found between the legendary accounts recorded by Greek historians and several episodes in the Book of Kings of Firdawsi—but only from the time of the Achaemenids: for example, the fragments by Ctesias, physician to Artaxerxes II (4th century B.C.), collected in his History of Cyrus the Siculo (i, 50); they inform from Median tradition; as for the parallels, Achaemenes as a child was brought up by a falcon, according to Aelianus, just as the hero Zal (in the Shāh-nāma) was brought up by the Simurgh (a kind of phoenix); the histories of Cyrus and Kay Ḵurṣaw, the one recounted by Herodotus, the other by Firdawsi, present obvious analogies; on the one hand we find the new-born Cyrus exposed by order of his maternal grandfather Astyages, king of the Medes, but left in the keeping of shepherds by his minister Harpagos and, on reaching manhood, overthrowing the empire of the Medes; on the other hand the infant Kay Ḵurṣaw left among the shepherds in the mountains on the orders of his maternal grandfather Afrāṣīyab (the murderer of his son-in-law and king of Turan), then recognized as the lawful heir of the kings of Persia and taking vengeance on Afrāṣīyab for the murder of his father and his uncle; in the 5th century A.D., Moses of Khorene attributes the same adventure to the Sāsānid king Ardaghīr and records other legendary Iranian narratives (the Persian epic had a great influence on the Armenian epic; see F. Macler, in J.A., ccxxvii, 549). In short, the influence of the Avestan texts was maintained over what was later to become the Persian epic up to the time of the Parthian period and even later, for the
ancient names were often given to the sovereigns and leading personages of the Sasanid period. Moreover, on the decline of the Sasanids, several works were written in Pahlavi containing traditions and stories of heroes; and there were also others during the 7th and 8th centuries A.D. Of some, only the title is known (through the medium of Arab authors): such are the Kšab al-Sakhasaran, the title of a prose work named by al-Mas'ūdī (Murūjī, ii, 118 = tr. Pellat, § 541)—probably Saghṣaran (the chiefs of the Saka, of Sistān, perhaps connected with the family of the Barmakids, see A. Christensen, Les Kayamids, 143)—and hence a text of great importance for epic traditions, translated into Arabic by Ibn al-Mu'allaḳa, and the Kitāb-ı Payqār, “Book of combats”, named by al-Mas'ūdī (Tanbih, Fīrūz, tr. c. 136). Others were preserved in part; such are the history of Bahram Cabīn, which survived thanks to the Arab historian al-Dinawari (Akbār wa ṣuwar, ed. Guirgass, 81-104) and also to Firdawsi (trans. J. Mohl, in-12, vi, 450) and vii; the duel of Rustam and Iṣafendyr, translated into Arabic prose by al-Ṭā'ālībī (Qharar) and into verse by Firdawsi (iv, 461 ff.); the Mudūjmīl al-tawârikh mentions a work relating to the hero Fīrūz (Tehrān ed., 66, 70) and an ‘Aḥā-ī Ardāshī (61-4) which was used by Miskawaih (Ṭaḏḡārī al-umum); the Ta'rīḥī-ī Sistān (Tehrān ed., 8) mentions a Bakhshār-nāma devoted to the great exploits of a commander-in-chief under Ḥusraw Parvīz. The history of Alexander by the pseudo-Callisthenes was probably translated into Pahlavi, and then from Pahlavi into Arabic, with additions relating to Dhu 'l-Karnayn (see ISKANDAR NĀMA); other works concerning the Sasanid period and mentioned in the Fihrist (Ṣāfā, Hamāsa, 45 and n.) survive as fragments in the works of Arab authors; several short Pahlavi post-Sasanid works (collections of moral aphorisms, pand-ndmak) are to be found scattered in Firdawsi.

All of these works, only two survive in their Pahlavi text; they are therefore essential for the study of the genesis of the Persian epic. The Memorial of Zarir (Aštakēr-ī Zarirān; see Gr.I.Ph., index, s.v. Yatāk) the versified form of which (in syllabic metre) has been identified by E. Benveniste, represents the Sasanid adaptation of a poem of the Araš period. Before the work was completed, A.D.—the time of the Persian invasion under Yazdgard II, written down systematically, with the assistance of mobads and learned men (Nōdeke, in Gr.I.Ph., ii, 141)—this book was entitled Khwāly-nāmak; several Arab and Persian authors refer to the Arabic translation of it under the title Sīyār al-mulūk, which corresponds with the Pahlavi title, the word khwâlīd (‘god’) having also the meaning of ‘sovereign’ (cf. al-Bīrūnī, Aḥārār, Leipzig ed., 103); it gave the history of the kings of Iran, from mythical times to the end of the Sasanids, mingling legendary and historical facts, the latter being predominant for the Sasanid period. The Arabic translation by Ibn al-Mu'allaḳa (2nd/8th century) was an indispensable source for Arab historians. The Pahlavi original disappeared, but much of it was preserved thanks to Ibn al-Mu'allaḳa (cf. al-Ṭā’ālībī, Histoire des rois des Perses, ed. and tr. Zotenberg, introd. 42). On account of the copyists' carelessness, copies of the Sīyār al- mulūk are by no means in agreement: according to Hamza Ḥefāḥī, Mūsă b. ‘Īsā al-Kasrawī collated several copies and did not find any two the same. According to Ibn al-Mu’allaḳa, others (who are named by al-Bīrūnī, Aḥārār, Leipzig ed., 99) had translated the Khwālīd-nāmak into Arabic, each in his own way, sometimes introducing accounts from other countries into the history of Iran (Nōdeke, Tabarí, Gesche Abd al-Perser . . . zur Zeit der Sassaniden, introd.; and especially the résumé of V. Rosen's study of these Arabic translations and the changes and alterations of the Pahlavi text in these translations: A. Christensen, op. cit., 54 and n. 1). Not one of these translations survives; but fragments from them can be seen in a series of Arabic and Persian works, with occasional variants resulting from the diversity of the sources. Apart from the material issue, the importance of the traditions and legends transmitted orally is not negligible. But it is certain that the earliest Persian epics derive from written sources, using Pahlavi documents (either directly or through Arabic translations), as well as traditions preserved in families and transmitted orally by narrators or story-tellers (rāst) from Khurāsān, Sistān or Transoxania. Al-Bīrūnī gives the names of some of those he had heard (Aḥārār, 42, 44, 90); the author of the Mudūjmīl al-tawârikh states that “the rāstes of earlier days based their stories on the ancient books of the Fārsīs” (Tehrān ed., 2). Finally, the influence of the Arab authors who devoted themselves to the history and legends of ancient Iran must not be forgotten. All these factors led the Iranians to undertake a general compilation, on the lines of the annals drawn up on the orders of the ancient kings: thus, during the 4th/10th century, three prose Shāh-nāma were written [see FIRDAWSI], the last of which, by Abū Maṣūr, was freely used by Dāḵšt and later by Firdawsi; all that remains of it is the very important introduction, published by Muhammad Kāvān (Bst masūla, Tehran 1313/1935, ii, 1-64); it was consulted also by al-Bīrūnī (Aḥārār, 112 and 116), which tends to prove that at the end of the 4th/10th century
century, and afterwards, it was regarded as the accepted Shdhndnma al-Tha'labi (Ghurar) similarly drew upon it to a considerable extent, a fact which provided Nizami with the opportunity to complete the whole epic structure that he had brought into being; poems celebrating Gershasp (the most original and the oldest, composed about 458/1066 [see ASADI]), his grandson Sâm, the three children of his great-grandson Rustam—Dzhâhîndr, Farâmarz and Banû Gushasp—, Bârzo (see Bârzo-Nâma), Bahman, Rustam’s redoubtable adversary (by Irângâhî, in about 499/1066), Shâhryâr, Bârzo’s son, the Persian (see Mukaîr, d. ca. 545/1150) and about eight epics celebrating minor heroes (Sa’fâ, op. cit., 3rd part, ch. III).

From the 6th/12th century onwards, the decline of the epic gradually became evident under the influences of Islam, of Arab culture and, later, of the predominant of the Turks; in any case, the great epic and national subjects of Iranian antiquity had already been treated. However, one of these subjects, which Firdawsi was unable to develop to its fullest extent, provided Nizami with the opportunity to write a vast and learned epic (587/1191), the Romance of Alexander [see ISKANDAR, ISKANDAR NâMA, NIJAMI]—a subject to which Amir Khusraw and Dzhâmi later returned, not to speak of the adaptations made in Turkey, India and other Oriental countries. The first epic to honour a contemporary prince was the Shâhnhâd-NâMA, written by Muhammed Padâ’zî in honour of sultan ’Ali al-Din Muhammed Kh’warizm Shâb, in about 506/1200. The most important historical epic, after Firdawsi’s, is the Zafar-NâMA (Book of victory) of Hamd-Allâh Mustawfî Kazwîni which concludes the Book of Kings from the occupation of Iran by the Arabs up to the period in which the author was living, the time of the Mongol invasion; hence the real interest, at once historical and romantic, of the first part and last part of this poem which consists of 75,000 bayts (completed in 735/1335). Another epic relating to the history of the Mongols down to the successors of Chingiz-Khân is the Shâhnhâd-NâMA, completed by Ahmad Tabrizî in 739/1338. The epic by Abu’l-Tust (d. 866/1462), devoted to the history of the Bahmanid sultans of Dakhân, left unfinished, was completed by an anonymous author. The hero’s resounding exploits were celebrated by Hâtîfî (d. 927/1521), a nephew of Dzhâmi, under the title Zafar-NâMA (ed. Lucknow 1889); to the same poet we owe a thousand lines of verse of an epic on the reign of Shâh Ismâ’îl which he left unfinished. The reign of this same ruler and that of his son formed the subject of an epic written by Kâsim Gunahâbî and completed in 939/1533 (ed. Bombay 1287); to him we owe also an epic on the reign of Shâh Rukh, the son of Timur. The capture of the island of Khîshn and the town of Hurmuz (Djarun) from the Portuguese was recounted in verse by Kâder (Djângâhî-NâMA Kishn, 1032/1623, and Djarun-NâMA). Lastly, a Shâhnhâd-NâMA was written by Ŝabâ’ (d. 1282) in honour of Fa’th ’All Shâb. These are the principal epic works, most of them written under the influence of Firdawsi or Nizâmî. In addition, throughout the 11th/17th and 12th/18th centuries, a series of secondary works commemorated certain sovereigns and leading personalities of Iran, India and Turkey (Gr.I.Ph., ii, 238).

As regards the second category of these epics (devoted to heroes of the Shi’i faith; Ŝabâ, op. cit., 305 ff.), the oldest is the Khâvarrân-NâMA of Ibn Hûsâm (d. 875/1470), celebrating the virtues and exploits of the caliph and imâm ’Ali. The anonymous Shâh-bî-rîn-NâMA (1072/1662) similarly honoured Hâmza b. ’Abd Minhâj, the son of the most important among these heroes, the Hamla-i Haydarî, glorifies the lives of Muhammed and ’Ali, their saintliness and their achievements; its authors are Muhammad Ra’fi Bâdghîl, a native of Ma’shûd, who had emigrated to India where he held high office; after his death (1123/1711), his work was completed by Abu Tâlib Fanduruski. The same subject was used in a more extended work (30,000 bayts) written in a better style than the preceding one by Mullâ Bâmân ’Ali (ta’khâsilis; Râjî) entitled Hamla-i Râdîji (ed. 1270/1854). Sa’âb, named above, is the author of the longest of the works in this category, the Khudîvand-NâMA, on the same subject as the Hamla-i Haydarî; here, more than in these other works, the influence of Firdawsi is to be discerned.

As hamâsëa denoted exclusively the heroic epic, it has been necessary to leave out of this account the cycle of romantic epics (the earliest of which, Zaryadves and Odatis, was known as early as the 4th century B.C., according to Athenes, XIII, 575), that is to say the episodes devoted to love, which are treated briefly in the Shâhnhâd of Firdawsi and which the poets of different periods (Nizâmî, Amir Khusraw and Dzhâmi in particular) magnified into vast versified romances (not to mention Firdawsi’s other works, for example Farkhâd u Şîrîn, and Gurgânî’s Wîs u Kâmîn; see also ASADI).

himself on the fropuz, have not survived, and the
Oghuzndme, the national epic of the Oghuz Turks, can
be studied only through a prose compilation made in
the 8th/14th or 9th/15th centuries. But although the ancient
destam, epic poems transmitted by oral tradition,
have not survived, there are known some works of
epic character, which are composed according to the
rules of Arabo-Persian prosody, in the
epic character, which are composed according to the
metre, and which have the title
ramal. For example, the
Kitdb-i Dede Korfrut
of Umur Pasha,
destdn.
To this category belong the
Iskenderndme
of Enwerl, written in 869/1465, which celebrates
the form of an epic poem, the history of the first Ottoman
destdn.
Huns copied some poems from their Gothic allies as
that these copied them from the Huns. Indeed, al-
though there may have been mutual influence and
although each of the two peoples may have cultivated
both panegyric and epic lay, the extant evidence
permits us safely to infer only the panegyric lay for
the Huns and the epic lay for the Goths. The fact
that these copied them from the Huns. Indeed, al-
cultivated both epics; the poet often gives to these verse chronicles
the name of destam. To this category belong the
Ghazawetndme which forms part of the Iskenderndme
of Ahmed [q.v.] (d. 816/1413) and which relates, in
the form of an epic poem, the history of the first Ottoman
rulers up to Emir Sulayman (d. 813/1410), and the
Destam of Umur Pagha, the second part of the
Destam of Enwerl, written in 881/1475, which celebrates
the exploits of Umur Aydnoglu [q.v.]; to describe
this part of his work, written in the form of a popular
tale in verse, the poet uses the term

Bibliography: Apart from the works cited in the article, see, on Turkish epic literature: A. Bombaci, Storia della letteratura Turch, Milan 1965, 192/95 century. The
Kilbâ-ı Dedê Korbus (see Histoire générale des littératures, Paris 1961, i, 782-8, 787-8, ii, 183-4; I. Melikoff, La geste de Melik Dânîsmend, Paris 1960, i, 41-52, edem, Abû
Muslim, the "Porte-Hache" du Khorassan, dans la tradition épique turco-iranienne, Paris 1962, 20-1; F. Taeschen, Die osmanische Literatur, in Hand-
buch der Orientalistik, v/1, Turkologie, Leiden 1963, 256-62.

I. MELIKOFF

IV.—CENTRAL ASIA

However near to extinction the tradition of oral
heroic poetry among the Turkic-speaking peoples may
or may not be, it is one of the most important in
living memory and deserves closer study in the West
than it has as yet received.

Oral heroic narrative in Turkic dialects ranges from
the hero-tales of the Altai tribes (Schifmer, Radloff, Ulagachev)
from the hero-tales of the Altai tribes (Schifmer, Radloff, Ulagachev)
full-scale epics of great
bards like the Krlzg Sagimbay and Sayakbay (Manas)
or the Özbek Fazl Yulduz-oghîl (Alpamish). If we
go north of the Altai to include the hero-tales of, in
part, non-Turkic tribes, we can trace one of several
hypothetical lines of epic development entire, from
shamanistic adventures in the upper and lower worlds,
where the hero is borne on the wings of eagles if not
of thought itself, to military expeditions against
empires beyond the steppe, where man's dream of
free movement and unimpeded conquest is
matured in the taming of that heroic beast, the
horse.

If, as is probable, some Huns were Turks, the Turkic
peoples will have had some form of heroic poetry for
at least the past fifteen or sixteen hundred years. As
companion of a Byzantine ambassador extra-
ordinary, Priscus witnessed a performance of
panegyric heroic poetry glorifying Attila as he presided at
a banquet. "When evening fell, torches were kindled,
and two thousand people went into the banquet hall,
and recited lays of their composition lauding his
victories and warlike qualities. The feasters gazed at
them fixedly, and while some took delight in the
verse, others recalled the battles and were fired in
their hearts, while yet others, because their bodies
were grown frail with age and their spirit abated,
shed tears." ('Epistugnogenie eü eüstéras dedes
Anfôrâtis, hte éz éntik xov tò Attilla pare
khtôntes àézézâor resolution Dëttak,
Atoo tóóxu, xées tis xóócias àetpelóntes, ois i mi
xóócias tois poísmenos, hte dú tóóxu anâ
mamhísmowen déngírenw tóóxu fonísmenos,
êlloin hte éz égrówmw eü Bécwro, ún yép tòóxu
fouísmenos, tois xóócias òotú wce wce, hte
 nouns, the Tangut of the Koko Nor region, or with
fellow-Turks of the 'idolatrous' Buddhist religion,
the Uigur—patterns which are repeated in the 19th
d and 20th century epics, with the Kalmik as hated enemy.
The form is that of long couplets with rhyming
caesura: A-J-A, A-f-x, B-J-B, B-J-X, etc. This enables
scholars to reassemble couplets scattered by al-
Kâshghârî, as Brockelmann has done, under
the three heads: 'Battle with the Tangut', 'Campaign
against the Uigur', 'Battle with the Yabaqû' (a Turk-
icized Mongol tribe), furnishing some idea of what
a 9th or 10th century Turic lay may have looked
like: but there can be no guarantee of unbroken
sequence among these couplets, as some have as-
sumed. The internal sign of Islamic influence,
and it is a negative one, is the unquestioning assu-
ance with which the warriors desecrate the images of
the Buddhist Uigur.

Although there is no surviving epical version, the
legend of Oghuz Kaghan, the mythical eponymous
founder of the Oghuz tribes, cannot be omitted from
even the briefest account of Turkic epic. Both Rashid
al-Dîn [q.v.] (Chap. I) and Abu 'l-Qâhîr [q.v.] quote
the legend; but the most important witness to it is
the text in the unique Schefer ms. Paris, Bibl. nat. suppl. ture 1001, written in the Uigur script. It is reasonable to suppose that the account of the realms subdued by Oghuz Kaghan must postdate the period of Cingiz and his immediate heirs; but, after this, opinions diverge. Pelliot (followed by Şekerbak) considered the text to be a recension in the Uigur of the 13th century (while Şekerbak considers the writing to resemble that of the yarlık of Toktamış). Bang, on the other hand, held that it was written in 'later East Turkic' but that beyond this its date and dialect are totally inscrutable. Stürmer argues that it was written in Iran, under Ghażan Khan or his successor, by an Uigur bahdand or bitikçi on the basis of Türkmen oral narrative. The text is incomplete at beginning and end, and there are other imperfections. As the text stands, it is not possible to determine whether the hero's birth is miraculous or merely remarkable, though one must suppose the former in the light of what follows. For, later, Oghuz Kaghan's acquisition of at least the first of his two wives (future matrons of groups of tribes) is due to heavenly intervention. His first exploits are against wild beasts, and preeminently a unicorn. Before he sets out to conquer nations, he assembles his princes, proclaims himself Kaghan, and chooses 'Grey Wolf!' as his war-cry. And, indeed, before his first battle, a grey wolf emerges (like his first wife) from a heaven-sent ray, and leads the army. Together they conquer Asia, Egypt and Byzantium. Various Turkic tribes, like the Klîpa and Karluk, are founded en route; and when Oghuz Kaghan comes to rest he gives each of the three sons of his first wife, Kûn (Sun), Ay (Moon) and Yultuz (Stars), a third of a golden bow, and the sons of his second, Kök (Sky), Tagh (Mountain) and Tengiz (Sea), each a silver arrow as insignia of their tribal organization. The legend is evidently a tribal origin-myth fused with a wishful travesty of the saga of the more dazzling Mongols as reflected in their Secret History, from the totemistic Grey Wolf onwards, but always at the poetic level of myth and folk-tale. The form of the narrative is prose, but Riza Nur and Pelliot each detected a group of 'fragments' at the end of the manuscript preserved by Oghuz Kaghan in octo-syllabic rhyming metre (XI, 6-XII, 3; XII, 3-7), which Pelliot interprets as citations from an epic poem now lost. Nevertheless, prose or rhyming prose breaking into verse at points of heightened interest is a favoured narrative vehicle among the Turkic and neighbouring peoples. As to the influence of the legend in later days, it is thought that the figure of Manas in the 19th and 20th century Kirgiz cycle owes something, in his rôle of conqueror, to the figure of Oghuz Kaghan.

Some modern epics, like the Kirgiz 'national epic' Manas [q.v.], are confined to one Turkic people, though some of its characters (including Manas himself) may also appear in the epics of other Turkic peoples. Other epics, like Alpamış [q.v.], Edige-b, Kol-b, Shora-b, and the romantic epic Közî Köröög, may be shared by several peoples, although not at the same level of literature and development. For example, among the Özbek at least ten variants of Alpamış are known, among the Kazakhs two, among the Karakalpaks one, and the scale ranges from shorter poems of ca. 2,500 lines to full scale epics of some 14,000; whereas in the Altai it appears as the rather primitive hero-tale of Alp-

Beyrek in the Kıdigr-i Dede Korkut [q.v.]. Manas is unique in that by a process of dynastic and other cyclization, it has engulfed not only Kirgiz epics which were once independent of it (e.g., Er Kükä, Er Tööök, the latter a tale of a hero's adventures in the underworld much as in Altaic hero-tales) but also the bulk of Kirgiz oral folklore, leaving only such 'minor epics' as Dianích and Bayyök closely linked with the Türkmen-Özbek Yüşef and Ahmed, v. infra), Kurmanbek, Soylu, Er Tabibi intact. The Manas-bards (manasci) were either permitted or encouraged to record in the laboratory such high numbers of Manas and of its continuations: Semey (2nd generation) and Sytelek (3rd generation) as 250,000 ( Sağlimbay, 1867-1930) and 400,000 (Sayakbay, b. 1894) respectively. The ca. 12,500 lines of Manas recorded by Radloff in the latter part of the 19th century on the other hand represent rather the 'bare bones' of possible live performances, having been taken down by the frustrating method of dictation to hand. Genuine performances suited to various types of patrons and audiences could last from one evening to many weeks of evenings and so run to many thousands of lines. Such length was obtained not so much by wealth of incident as by means of 'static' lyrical elaboration of any matter of beauty or interest. This fluidity in the treatment of basic themes also extended in part to the subject-matter itself; for example, as a compliment to Radloff (or is he thought), his singer introduced the White Czar (a figure to whom the great Manas himself looked up in awe), compelling him of the remote Czar of Russia and the great white god of the shamans. So far, two main 'schools' of Manas tradition have been distinguished: those of Tien Shan ( Sağlimbay) and Issik KuP (Sayakbay). Themes of Manas are the hero's miraculous birth and prodigious boyhood; his unification of the Kirgiz tribes after defeating rebellious kinsmen and other khâns; various expeditions, above all the Great Expedition to China with its tragic return, ending in Manas' death; and his resurrection, linked with legends attached to ancient tombs in Kirgizia. Unusual depth is given to the epic by the unhappy rôle of Manas's milk-brother Almambet, a Chinese (Radloff: Oirot) prince converted to Islam, to whom he demoting loyal old Bakay in order to do so and thereby inflaming Kirgiz jealousy. In addition to relying on magic animal helpers who are clearly of shamanistic origin, Manas has the stock Turkic retinue of forty warriors (kirk-lro), most of whose names are common to Radloff and the 20th century bards. The chief Kazakh heroic epics are: Alpamîs-b, Edige-b, Er-kokâ, Er-samî, Er-targhî, Kumbat-b, Koks, and Shora-b. (period of the capture of Kazan). Kiz-ibek and Kûzî Köröög and Bayan Süli (the Turkic Romeo and Juliet) are of a more lyrical and romantic turn. Ayman Sholpan and Uruk-b are derive from the Russian influence on Central Asia. As stated above, the poem of Alpamış attained truly epic dimensions in Özbek. Özbek shares the military romance of Yuşef and Ahmed with the Îbarizm Türkmen (Boz-Ogkhan) and also has the historical dastan Shevshisî-khân and the romances Kûntumgsh, Şirîn and Şakhar, and Orijül. The leading epic of the Karakalpaks is Kîrök-lro—'The Forty Maidens'. Although this poem has undergone much influence from the recent past, the heroine Gulaym conforms to an ancient Central Asiatic type of woman-maiden remembered in poetry over a wide area despite the intrusion of Islamic notions of womanhood. Gulaym's
father Allayar, ruler of the Karakalpak stronghold of Sarkop, gives her the fertile region of 'Miueli'—widely known but has not been taken to the stage of epic. As well as in Turkey, Armenia, Georgia and Persian Adharbaydjan, the Gorogll cycle is kept alive in the specie of the Turkmens, Karakalpaks and Uzbeks, the last of whom told it elaborately, though not yet epically, as 'The Forty Dastans of Gorogll'.

In the epics of the Kazakhs, and, through them, of the Krglz, the heroic prestige of the Nogay, like that of the Achaean in Homer, is great. In Radloff's version of the Krglz epic, Manas himself is of the Nogay-Nogay, whereas Sagimbay makes him the grandson of the eponymous Nogay-khan. This is undoubtedly a reflection of the standing of the historical Nogay (d. 1299), and then of his following, among the Tatars of the Golden Horde and also among their eastern neighbours. As was stated above, the Kazakhs also know an epic of Edige, another Emir of the Horde (d. 1419). It is from this time onwards that the modern epics receive traces of names or events, however faintly or however generalized, which can be related to the aecasaneous to myth and legend. The Krglz, Kazakhs and Karakalpaks share their conception of the pififid, jibbering, heathen Kalmk as paramount enemy. This must derive from the centuries of Kalmik expansion and pressure from the lands of the Turkmens, Kazakhs and Karakalpas. In recent centuries the epics have come to the West. Epic poetry of its nature is intimately bound up with political life, and the Iliad will have been no exception, so that it is not of itself disturbing that modern bards have become, for example, radio personalities. But the Central Asiatic and Mongolian epics have experienced such marked fluctuations of fortune, following political and social decisions, that they are not disinterestedly given. Some recent publications, however, both editions and critical studies, encourage the belief that the basic recordings of a still living major tradition of heroic epic are intact and may one day be given to the world in full.

HAMASA


The first heroic epic poem in the modern sense is, perhaps, a short anonymous Dakani mañiwañi written to lament the fate of Títpa Sulthan [q.v.] fighting with his back to the wall. Mū'min Kháñ 'Mū'min' (1800-1851) is the most eminent of Urdu poets who wrote short heroic poems supporting theджхкан and the movement of Sayyid Ahmad Barelwi [q.v.]. Mawlawi Liyâkät al-Lâh and others among Barelwi's disciples wrote the short rasmîyâ mañiwañi for incitement and the call to theджхкан in an unpoetic and colourless style.

The marthiya written in Lakhnaū in the middle of the nineteenth century lamenting the tragedy of Karbalâ (61/680) receives epic treatment and rises to epic grandeur in the work of Mr Babar 'All 'Aniś' (1802-1875) and his contemporary Mirzâ Dabîr (1803-1875). In the vein of martyrological epic it dwells upon the theme of the heroic martyrment of Husayn b. 'Alî, fighting heroically against overwhelming odds; it contains elaborate descriptions of the desert and the hero's horse and sword, but confuses anachronistically the emotional and social, and to a large extent geographical, milieu of ist/7th century Trâk with nineteenth-century Awadh.

After 1857, when Urdu poetry entered its modern phase, the epic theme and glory of historical Islam became the dominant note underlying the political poem which began with Altâf Husayn 'Half's muṣṭaddas Ma’dd-a dijâr-i Iklâm and culminated in the poems of Iklâb. In the political poem the epic intent emphasizes revivalism and juxtaposes it with modernism; usually the treatment is not narrative and the epic motive is served by references to particular men or events in Islamic history. Hażî Dîjjâlandhârî has written a narrative Shâhkâñ-i Islâm which is versified history and lacks genuine epic elements.

**Bibliography:** Apart from the works of the poets mentioned above see Shân al-Haqq Hakî (ed.), Naṣîḥ-i Hûrrîyâri, Karachi 1958; 'Abd al-Madjîd Ŝîdâlî, Introduction to his edition of Nuṣratî's ʿAllî-nâmâ, Haydârâbâd 1959; Shâhîl Nuʿmânî, Muṣâwâna-i Anîs wa Dabîr, A’zâmgarh; Ram Babu Saksena, A history of Urdu literature, Allahabad 1944; M. Sâdiq, A history of Urdu literature, London 1964.**,208,209**

**HAMAT**, town in central Syria, 54 km. north of Hîmâs and 152 km. south of Halaq on the road which connects these two towns, and built on both banks of the Nahr al-ʿÂsî [q.v.] or Orontes, which at this point winds a great deal. The steppe plateau which surrounds the town is in part made into ploughed land (cereals), Mediterranean-type orchards and market gardens, thanks to the hydraulic installations which bring water from the river to its fertile soil.

The town of Hâmat goes back to early antiquity: it was occupied by the Hittites, who left inscriptions there, then, in about the 17th century B.C., it passed into the hands of Aramaean kings; it is at this period that it is mentioned in the Bible under the name of Hamath. After having been fought over, in the reign of Solomon, to recognize the supremacy of the Hebrews, these kings regained their independence, then, in the middle of the 7th century B.C., fought on the side of the Aramaean kings of Damascus against the Assyrian Salamaneser and finally, in 738 B.C., had to pay tribute to Tiglath-pileser; soon afterwards, in 720 B.C., following a revolt, the Aramaean kingdom
of Hamat was incorporated into the Assyrian empire. In the Hellenistic period, the town received, probably under Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the name of Epiphanes, which it did not retain after the Arab conquest. This took place in 156/57 and the town, now of little importance, which had been taken "by capitation", belonged until the beginning of the 4th/10th century to the giyūd [q.v.] of Hims. Little is known about its organization at this time; we know only that already in the Umayyad period it contained a Great Mosque, which seems to have been built on the site of a Byzantine church, parts of which were used in building it, which was later restored under the Abbāsid caliph al-Mahdī, and that during the reign of the caliph al-Mu'taḍijd (end of the 3rd/9th century) it was a large market town protected by walls.

During the reign of the Ħamdānī Sayf al-Dawla, the town of Ħamāt was incorporated into the district of Ḥalab, and until the beginning of the 6th/12th century its destiny was to continue to be linked with that of Aleppo in one direction and to Eftum and Damascus in the other. At the beginning of the 20th century its population seems to have been stable: approximately 60,000 inhabitants are recorded in 1893 and in 1930. By this time such importance as the town had arose in the 8th century its destiny was to continue to be linked with that of Aleppo in one direction and to Eftum and Damascus in the other. At the beginning of the 20th century its population seems to have been stable: approximately 60,000 inhabitants are recorded in 1893 and in 1930. By this time such importance as the town had arisen.

In the Ayyūbīd period, and during the govern-orchry of Abu 'l-Fidā', the town of Ḥamāt (which was the birth-place of the geographer Yāḥūd [q.v.]) enjoyed true prosperity. Its unusual appearance is stressed by eastern and western travellers, and in particular by Ibn Djubayr. While possessing no monuments of outstanding grandeur, it occupied an unusual site, on both banks of the Orontes, with its houses crowded close to the river, and possessed its own peculiar charm which, it was said, was appreciated only by those who explored its various quarters. Along the river thirty-two water-wheels or norias (madīrā) of various sizes (the tallest being 22 metres high) raised water to aqueducts which supplied both sections of the town and irrigated the surrounding gardens; drinking water was provided, it is not known exactly from what date, by a special aqueduct which came from the region of Sa'amia. On the right bank there extended a quarter which Ibn Djubayr describes as a "suburb" and which, joined to the other bank by an arched bridge, was known as the wadi, which was going through a troubled period. It is known that after the raid of Nicephorus Phocas in 557/968, during which the Great Mosque at Ḥamāt was burned, northern Syria had been under the nominal domination of the Fāṭimids, who allowed the Mirdāṣids to ravage it, and had then passed into the hands of the Saldāṣik princes. On the death of the last Saldāṣik, Rīdāwān, in 507/1113-14, Ḥamāt was probably occupied by the atādeh of Damascus, Tughtakār [q.v.], but in 509/1116-17 it fell into the power of the governor of Hims, Khūrkhān b. Karāḏḏā, who later gave it up to his brother Shīhāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd. During the first third of the 6th/12th century Ḥamāt was one of the principal stakes in the struggles between the rulers of northern Syria and those of southern Syria, while the Franks also coveted it, though they never succeeded in taking it. On the death of Maḥmūd, in 517/1123, the town of Ḥamāt was taken again by Tughtakān, then, in 522/1128, belonged to his son and successor Taḏā al-Mulūk Būrī [q.v.], who installed there his own son Sevīnd. After concluding an agreement with Zangī [q.v.], Būrī sent Sevīnd to him in 524/1130, when he was immediately and treacherously imprisoned. Zangī was thus able to enter Ḥamāt together with Khūrkhān b. Karāḏḏā to whom he had previously restored it, and which was taken over by the Zangī at this time that As'ad of Tripoli, but in the middle of the 18th century the town was attached to the qaṣīda of Damascus as a fiṭṭal (mālīkāne) of the Pasha. It was at this time that As'ad Pasha al-Azm built there a residence which still exists, now used as a museum, and which, while not the equal of the "Asm Palace" at Damascus, is nevertheless a very fine specimen of Ottoman civil architecture, and remarkable for its terraces overlooking the Orontes. In the 19th century, at the time of a new administrative reorganiza-tion, Ḥamāt was attached to the wilāyāt of Damas-cus. In 1906 the town was linked by railway to Aleppo in one direction and to Ḥims and Damascus in the other. At the beginning of the 20th century its population seems to have been stable: approximately 60,000 inhabitants are recorded in 1893 and in 1930. By this time such importance as the town had arose
from its position as a market used mainly by the Bedouin from the surrounding district, who obtained there various products which they needed and notably some very good textiles, while it remained one of the most picturesque cities of Syria, with nine norias still working out of the eighteenth recorded in the 18th century. But, since 1945, the town of Hamat has shared in the general tendency to expansion of the towns of Syria and its population now exceeds 150,000.

There remain in Hamat several monuments worthy of note. The most important is the Great Mosque, which dates from the Umayyad period, and is preserved by the presence in its courtyard of a pavilion on columns intended as the local bayt al-mal. The hall of prayer is of an original plan: its three naves are in fact each of different width and its eight pillars support five cupolas in the form of a cross. The courtyard is surrounded by vaulted porticoes with the western semi-circular arches, some of which appear to date from the time that the mosque was built. The western porch-Demohynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1953, 81-7. Principal Arabic texts and inscriptions, see: E. Von Mü llen, A genealogy of the tribe, having both tribal followers and client villagers in their service.

With the exception of one offshoot, which went to Shíráz, the tribe is supposed to have migrated from the area of Kirmānšāh, in Persia, about 1755/1775. They supported the Šabān princes of Sulaymānīya until their autonomy came to an end in 1847. For some decades thereafter the tribe continued to harass the Ottoman and Persian authorities equally, and earned themselves considerable notoriety by taking to systematic brigandage over the whole area between Baghdad, Kirmānšāh and Mosul. In 1889, however, having suffered losses at the hands of the Persians, they retired to Bāzān and were then deported by the Ottoman authorities, half to Adana and half to Tripoli in North Africa. Seven years later the latter contingent, men, women, and children, fought its way back to Bāzān and the whole tribe was shortly allowed to reunite. As late as 1908 caravan travellers from Kirkuk to Sulaymānīya did so in terror of attack from the tribe.


(D. N. MacKenzie)

HAMAWI [see sa'd al-dīn hamawi].

HAMID, WĀDI AL-. Idam of the classical Arab geographers, a seasonal watercourse in northwestern Arabia which enters the Red Sea 50 km. south of Medīna, Wādi al-Ham and is one of the major tributaries of the system in the north, drains the capped plateau to the east. Wādi al-Djizl, the main tributary of prayer is of an original plan: its three naves are equally, and earned themselves considerable notoriety by taking to systematic brigandage over the whole area between Baghdad, Kirmānšāh and Mosul. In 1889, however, having suffered losses at the hands of the Persians, they retired to Bāzān and were then deported by the Ottoman authorities, half to Adana and half to Tripoli in North Africa. Seven years later the latter contingent, men, women, and children, fought its way back to Bāzān and the whole tribe was shortly allowed to reunite. As late as 1908 caravan travellers from Kirkuk to Sulaymānīya did so in terror of attack from the tribe.
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upper reaches near Medina were called al-Kanah, and a tributary of Wadl al-Hamd near the city was called al-Kanah, and a tributary of Wadl al-Hamd near the city was still known by that name. The name Idam occurs in several places, such as Idam al-Malich near the dam of Idam which was built on the Wadl al-Hamd near Hadiyya Station, 165 km. from Medina, and follow its course nearly all the way to the Holy City.

Biography: Bakri, Muqaddim, Cairo 1934, pp. 165-6; Hamdani, 171; Yâkût, i, 305; Samhûdi, Wâfa al-Wâfa', Cairo 1932, ii, 220, 338; Tabari, i, 150, 151, 176, 179.

Maps: In the series U.S. Geological Survey, Miscellaneous Geologic Investigations, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, i: 500,000, see the following sheets: (a) Northwestern Hijaz, 1-206, 1-206, 1959, (b) Northeastern Hijaz, 1-205, 1-205, 1959, and (c) Southern Hijaz, 1-210, 1958. (J. Mandaville)

HAAMD ALLAH B. ABI BAKR B. AHMAD B. NASR AL-MUSTAWFI AL-£AZWINI, Persian historian and geographer, born about 680/1281-2 at Kazvin, d. after 740/1340. His name is that of a Shi'i family which had provided a series of governors of Kazvin in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries. His great-grandfather had been the Auditor-General of Úrâk and the family had since then borne the appellation Mustawfi. Hâmd Allâh was appointed financial director of his home town and of several neighbouring districts by the well-known minister and historian Rashîd al-Dîn (q.v.), who also inspired his historical studies. About 720/1320 he began with a Firdawsi, closely imitating Firdawsi in style and diction, which in 75,000 verses describes Islamic history up to 734/1333-4, that is, almost to the end of the Îlkân empire. Hâmd Allâh worked for 15 years on this material and in that connexion wrote his own studies of Firdawsi. This work has not been published. Ta'rîkh-i gustâ (completed 730/1330) is similar in content, concise and very readable in style; in essentials it depends on known sources (al-Tabari, Ibn al-Athîr, Dîwâynî, Rashîd al-Dîn, and also on the Shîk-nâma; or for the mythical period), but it contains a quantity of useful information about the author's times which is not to be found elsewhere, so that it is indispensable as a source for the later Îlkân period (pub. in facsimile with English paraphrase by E. G. Browne and R. A. Nicholson, Leyden and London, 1911-15; GMS, v, 316, esp. 10, 19, 321 f.; N. N. Poppe, Moschisch-nachsammelung der Ûrâk, Sultân, al-lahâka Kazvini (Mongolian animal-names in Hâmd Allâh's work), in Zapsiki Kollegii Vostochnoi, i (1926), 195-208). (B. Spuler)

HÂMD ALLÂH, SHAYKH, Ottoman calligrapher (see KLATT)

HAMDALA means the saying of the formula al-hamdu ilîlâh (for the different vocalizations—di, du, da) as an introductory phrase, does not seem to be used by itself in magic as is the basmala. Again, the tendency to use the phrase as an introductory phrase as Palmer does in his translation of the Kurgan. As the phrase occurs twenty-four times in the Kur'âan, besides other forms such as lâhu l-hamd, it naturally became frequent in Muslim usage. All things come from Allah, and for all things, pleasant or grievous, He is to be praised. Yet the word hamdala does not seem to belong to the classical language and is thus later than basmala, which may even be pre-Islamic. In the Shâhî and the Lîsîn it does not occur, though basmala is in both, in the latter fortified with a verse from 'Umar b. Abi Rabî'î (Schwarz, Dîsânî, no. 413, ii, 241; the evidence for the line and its usage is solid, in the Târist)." "Vaire belokho Allâh"; for from Him all praise-worthiness proceeds. Yet the word has been borrowed from the first of the seven stages of the Rîfâî târîkh (W. H. T. Gairdner, Way of a Mohammedan Mystic, 12, 23). Even in orthodox tradition the Fâthâ has begun to have magical value; cf. in al-Bûhlârî (Kilah al-Târsîf, Bîb Fâthât al-Kilah) the story of the man who used it as a charm (mekaya) against snake-bite, and the Prophet approved. For later elaborate developments in magic, see al-Bûnî, Shams al-ma'sârîf, fasî X, and Ahmad al-Zârîkî, in Mafātih al-qâyûb, 175. But the hamdala does not seem to be used by itself in magic as is the basmala. Again, the tendency to use the phrase as an introductory

References:

Bibliography: Storey, 1/2/1, 81-84, 1233 (MSS., editions, selections, translations); Browne, iii, 87-100 (with a quotation from the Zafar-nâmâ); Spuler, Mongol, esp. 19, 321 f.; N. N. Poppe, Moschisch-nachsammelung der Ûrâk, Sultân, al-lahâka Kazvini (Mongolian animal-names in Hâmd Allâh's work), in Zapsiki Kollegii Vostochnoi, i (1926), 195-208. (B. Spuler)
formula soon expressed itself as a tradition from the Prophet: “Whatever is not begun with praise of Allāh is маuad [see "basmala"]. Thus the Ḥamdala became one of the three required things at the beginning of any formal writing. But this requirement was distinctly later, for, while the use of the "basmala" in this way held from the earliest times, we do not find the Ḥamdala prefixed to the Sira of Ibn Ḥighām nor to the Kitāb al-ʿAgānī nor even to the Fihrist. See on this usage and the traditions supporting it, the commentary of Sayyid Murūdijā on the Ḣydā, i, 55 f. and on the praiseworthiness of thisclamation especially the sermon (khutba) in the mosques usually begins with the Ḥamdala; and in earlier days a khutba lacking the Ḥamdala was called baṭrā. Bibliography: References as above and also Baydāwī, ed. Fleischer, i, 5, 26 ff.; Ṭabārī, Tafsīr, i, 45 ff.; Rāzī, Maḥfīẓ, i, Cairo 1307, 115 ff. There exist numerous minor works, still in manuscript, on the "basmala" and the Ḥamdala but these works of W. Montgomery Watt, "Hamdan the Arab and His Movement," in the Tafsīr and the treatises. (D. B. MACDONALD)

ḤAMDĀN, a large Arab tribe of the Yemen group, the full genealogy being Hamdān (Awzala) b. Mālik b. Zayd b. Rabīʿa b. Awsala b. al-Khiyār b. Mālik b. Zayd b. Kahlān. Their territory lay to the north of Ṣanʿāʿ (q.v.), stretching eastwards to Maʿrib and Nadjran (q.v.). Ibn al-Kalbi (q.v.) mentions a large body of them in Kufa (cf. J. Wellhausen, Reste, 20, 22). Ibn al-Kalbi (Aṣnām, 10) suggests that they may have accepted Judaism at the time of Dhu Nuwās; many of their allies of Bal-Harith were Christian. There is little mention of them in poetry and in the accounts of early battles. When ʿAbraha (q.v.), ruler of the Yemen, marched against Mecca, Ḥamdān joined in the attack made on him by a Yamani prince, Dhu Nafr, allegedly to defend the house of God. On the “second day of Kulab” they, along with Kinda (q.v.), fought against the ruler, who shortly afterwards turned against them. The battle was fought at al-Kifā in the day of the Ḥamdān. To seek alliance with Muḥammad a deputation from Ḥamdān came to Medina in 9/631, led by the poet Mālik b. Namat and Abū Thawr Dhu l-Mīghāṛ, probably a prince (Ibn Ḥighām, 963; cf. Ibn Saʿd, ii, 73 f.); but this deputation seems to have represented only a part of the tribe. Others are said to have submitted to ʿAlī on his expedition to the Yemen in 10/632-3 (al-Masʿūdī, Ṭambīk, 274). Muḥammad set ʿʾĀmir b. Shahr (of Baklī) over Ḥamdān (Ṭabārī, i, 1851-3). At the riddā some of the tribe were inclined to revolt, but most stood firm behind the leaders (cf. W. Hoenerbach in Abh. der Akad. der Wissenschaften und der Literatur (Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Kl.), Mainz 1951, 274-7). According to al-Kalkashandā (Nihdyat al-arab, Cairo 1959, 438 f.) Ḥamdān became dispersed as they moved into the conquered lands, apart from those who remained in the Yemen. For a time, however, there was a strong body of them in Kūfā (cf. J. Wellhausen, Arab Kingdom, index); including ʿʾĀmir b. Shahr (Uṣūd, s.v.) and the poet Aṣḥāb b. Ḥamdān (d. 83/702 (q.v.), they were nearly all fervent supporters of ʿAllī and his sons (cf. al-Masʿūdī, Muṣrāf, index). Twelve thousand of them are said to have been in ʿAllī’s army at Sīfīn, and their leader Saʿd b. Kāys took a prominent part in the battle. For a time they were reckoned, along with Ḥamdān and Ḥimyarī, a “seventh” of the Arabs (Ṭabārī, i, 2495). The geographer al-Ḥamdānī (d. 334/945) (q.v.) belonged to the group remaining in the Yemen. Bibliography: (additional to that in article): al-Ḥamdānī, 49-95; 53-54-51; 61.14 f., 215-5; 85.6; 86.25; 101.1-3; 103.21; 105.13 f.; 106.16; 107.9 f.; 108.22-4; 115.9; 125. 1 f.; 132. 5 f.; 183-23; 190. 19 f.; 211-4; 218. 13-16; 219. 3 f.; 248. 1-2; 250. 22 f.; 251. 22; 273. 1-3; 274. 17-19 f.; 275. 1 f.; 276. 272; 278. 262; Ṭabārī, index; A. P. Caussin de Perceval, Essai sur l’histoire des Arabes avant l’islamisme, Paris 1847-8, index; F. Wüstenfeld, Genealogische Tabellen, T. 9.10 and Register, p. 200; Aṣḥāb, Tables; Ibn Ḥighām, 52, 950-963. (J. SCHLEIFER, W. MONTGOMERY WATT)

ḤAMDĀN KARMAJ b. ṬABRĪZĪ, the leader of the Karmaṭi movement in the ʿabbāsid period in al-Ḥimyar and al-Ḥimyarī, was one of the leaders of the Ismaʿīlī movement in which he was converted to the early Ismaʿīlī movement by the dāʿī (q.v.) al-Ḥusayn al-Abwāq. The date 264/877-8 given in this connexion by a much later report may be approximately correct. When al-Ḥusayn died or left the district, Ḥamdān became his successor. He organized the movement throughout the ʿabbāsid and appointed the dāʿīs for the major districts. His main assistant was his brother-in-law ʿAbdān (q.v.), who soon became the leading spirit and conducted the propaganda quite independently. The movement spread rapidly among the peasants, and many of the Bedouin clans and tribes in touch with the ʿabbāsid also became adherents. Various taxes were collected from the converts, culminating in the fifth on all income to be saved for the expected Mahdi. Eventually a kind of communal ownership of goods was introduced and care was taken of the needy in the community. In 778/1370 a fortified dār al-hijrā was built as a place of refuge and congregation. As the Baghdādī government had not since the time of the Zanjī revolt re-established effective control over the region, the movement escaped its notice until the year 786/1381, when some people from al-Kūfā accused it of creating a new religion and permitting warfare against the Muslims. No action was taken. As this, however, was the first Ismaʿīlī movement of which the government took notice, the name ‘Karmaṭi” was later applied to other groups not organized by Ḥamdān Karmat. The doctrine propagated by Ḥamdān and ʿAbdān probably closely resembled that ascribed to the Karmaṭians by al-Nawbaqī. Its central theme was that the appearance of the Mahdi Muḥammad b. Ismaʿīl, the seventh Imam and seventh Apostle of God, was at hand, ending the era of Muḥammad, the sixth Apostle. He would rule the world, establish justice, abolish the law of Islam, and proclaim the hidden truth of the former religions. This truth could already be attained at least partially by the converts on initiation. The doctrine had a distinctly antimonic character. Reports of the Sunnī sources that the followers of Ḥamdān dispensed with the Islamic ritual and law are trustworthy, but not so their allegations that this led to licentiousness and libertinism among them.

This was essentially also the teaching of the leaders of the Ismaʿīlī movement with whom Ḥamdān kept up correspondence. When the later Fātimid Caliph al-Mahdī succeeded to the leadership in Sala-
miyya, he introduced certain doctrinal changes which aroused the apprehension of Hamdān. Abūdān was sent to find out the reason for the change. He learnt that the new leader denied any connexion of Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl with the movement and claimed the Imāmate for himself. Thereupon Hamdān and Abūdān broke off the propaganda, causing a momentous split in the Īsmā‘īlī movement. This happened about the year 280/899. Hamdān soon afterwards went to Kālahādha and from there disappeared. A report of Ibn Mīlīk that he was killed in Baghūdīb, seems reliable.


AL-HAMDĀNĪ, ABU MUHAMMAD AL-HASAN B. AHMAD B. YA‘QUB B. YUSUF B. DAWŪD B. SULAYMĀN BIL ‘DUMAYNA AL-BAKIL AL-ARHĀBI, often known as Abū ‘Alī Djaämharat al-ansāb, was born in Sān‘a’. In the latter half of the 3rd/9th century, perhaps in the year 280/899 according to a cryptic notice in the recently discovered 10th makhāla of his Sarā‘īr al-khiama (Iklīl, i, ed. al-Hiwālī, Preface p. 62). Having received an excellent education in all branches of learning, he made extensive travels and acquired a detailed knowledge of Arabia, as is shown by his classic description of this peninsula (Ṣifat Djazīrat al-‘arab), which is perhaps not a supplement to the connection unknown work Kūdh al-Masālik wa-l-mamālik (cf. al-Kīfī, Inbāh al-ruwād, i, 283). He visited Trāk, lived for a long time, in Mecca and was in contact with many eminent scholars, such as the older Anbarlī, Zāhidī and Ibn Khālawayh.

The main authority of al-Hamdānī for South-Arabian archaeology and genealogy was Abū Naṣr Mūhammad b. AbūlAllāb b. Sa‘dīd, called al-Yaharī (after his ancestor Dhi Yāhar) and al-Hanbāsī (from his castle in Bayt Ḥanbās near Sān‘a’). Another rich material supplied by this authority, by the records (ṣiqiql) of the tribe of Ḥawlān in Sa‘dā, and by other oral and literary sources was collected in his magnum opus, the encyclopaedia al-Iklīl, “the Crown”. For our knowledge of the South-Arabian tribes the Iklīl plays the same fundamental rôle that the Dhu‘aybah of Ibn al-Kāfī does for the Northern ones. Only four of its ten parts are so far known to exist in manuscript: I, II, VIII, X. The first two books—treating the genealogy of Mālik b. Ḥimyar, vis. al-Hamaysa‘ b. Ḥimyar—are discovered in 1932 in the Berlin Ms. Or. oct. 968, of which a facsimile edition was published in 1943. This ms. gives the text in the recension of Mūhammad, the son of the famous Nashwān b. Sādīd al-Ḥimyarī, made about 600/1200. According to the introduction the redactor made only some minor omissions from the original text. There are, however, several later additions incorporated, among them some marginal notes of later scholars. A second manuscript of book V exists in Cairo. Book VIII, containing descriptions of the old castles of the Yemen, with much poetry inserted, enjoyed great popularity; it is preserved in several MSS. of mediocre quality, so that all editions and translations are unreliable in details. Extracts from this book in a better recension were found also in the Ambrosiana (see Orientalia, N.S., xii, 125-45). Book X finally gives the genealogies of the twin Hamdānī tribes, Ḥāǧīd and Bakīl.

Of the remaining, lost, parts of the Iklīl, book III is said to have treated the merits (faddl) of Kāṭān, books IV-VI the old history of South Arabia (al-sīrat al-badīma, al-wusūţ, al-āławī), until the beginning of Islam, book VII a criticism of false traditions, and book IX finally the Ḥimyaritic inscriptions (masā‘id). Quotations from this book in the commentary on NAShir’s Šimā‘a diṣha show that al-Hamdanī had some knowledge of the musnad writing, but no real understanding of the inscriptions.

Apart from genealogical, historical and topographical material, the Iklīl provides us also with a rich anthology of old Yemeni poetry. At the end of book I there are given three complete kuṣūdā of ‘Abd al-Ḥākīlī b. Abu l-Tālīl al-Shihābi, who is otherwise little known (cf. Şīfa, 38). The work also preserves numerous samples of al-Hamdanī’s own poetry, which was collected in a Diwān of six volumes and commented upon by Ibn Khālawayh (d. 370/980), but is now lost. Al-Hamdanī’s famous kuṣūdā al-Dimigka, is preserved at the end of the Berlin MS. of the Iklīl, II. With this fervent defence of the Banū Kāṭāan against the Banū ‘Adānān, al-Hamdanī engaged himself in the old fatal controversy between northern and southern tribes that had been started about 200 years earlier by Kumayt b. Zayd al-Asadī with his Mudkabha. His engagement in the tribal mujaḥīh, may have been fatal for al-Hamdanī, who was accused by his enemies of blasphemy against the Prophet, as belonging to the Banū Ḥāshim (cf. Iklīl, i, ed. al-Hiwālī, Preface p. 49, the passage from the Matā‘ al-budur of Ibn Abu l-Ridgāl).

Al-Hamdanī spent the greater part of his life in Raydā, where he enjoyed the favour of Abu Dja‘far al-Ḍabbbāk, called Sayyid Hamdān, and wrote his Iklīl in the castle of Talhum. Having moved from there to Sādā, he was involved in political controversies and put in prison by As‘ad b. Abū ‘Uṭir al-Ḥiwālī (d. 332/943) on behalf of the Rasi İman İbrahim al-Șafīr b. Yabyāl al-Hadi in Sādā. In his Kaṣidat al-djir, printed by al-Ḥiwālī in his preface to Iklīl i (pp. 49-56), al-Hamdanī blames As‘adī, while Yabyāl b. Abū Allāh al-Ukaylī, who released him from prison, is praised in the context of Iklīl i. A second imprisonment brought about a strong reaction among the Arabs and led to the battle of Katafā, and eventually to the death of al-Șafīr and his brother Ḥasan. Having been released from prison with the consent of Ibn Ziyād, the ruler of Ḥabīd, al-Hamdanī praised the leaders of the revolt in poems (see Iklīl, i, ed. al-Ḥiwālī, pp. 331 ff.). Hence there are strong reasons to disbelieve the current statement, made by Sā’d al-ṣuṣṭī in his Tābakāt (ed. Cheikho 59) on the authority of the Umeyyad Caliph al-Ḥakam al-Mustanṣir (350-366), that al-Hamdanī died in prison in Sān‘a’ in the year 334/945 (ibid., Preface 48, 59 s.).
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Only one other book of al-Hamdani, K. al-Djawharatayn al-catiyayn, on the two precious metals gold and silver, has been preserved and is being edited by Toll in Upsala. Of the astrological work Sarkh al-bikma a fragment has recently come to light (v. supra). Of the remaining works attributed to al-Hamdani nothing has been recovered so far; some of these are cited in the Iklil. Their titles are: (1) al-Siyar wa£al-akhbar (= Iklil iii-v), (2) Ayam al-arab, (3) al-Ya'sub (on shooting and hunting), (4) al-Kawal (on medicine), (5) al-Zadi (astronomical tables), (6) al-Talib wa£al-mudairah (mentioned only in the Iklil).


HAMDANIDS, three families of the Banū Hamdān whose tribal rule over Sanā’ passed to his son, Ṭall b. Ḥātim, during whose reign the Mahdī (q.v.) ruler of Zabīd in the Tihamah began his campaigns for territorial conquest and the spread of the apostate religious doctrines instituted by his father, Ṭall b. Mahdī (d. 554/1160). In 554/1160-61 the Mahdī attacked and defeated Hamdāl-Dawla, but was unable to seize Sanā’ from the Hamdānids.

On the death of Hamdāl-Dawla in 566/1171 the Mahdī sought and received the assistance of Ṭall b. Ḥātim, and was declared in the Tihama. The Zurayd, under Ţall b. Ḥātim and his brother, Ṭall b. Shāh, attacked and defeated the Mahdī in 567/1171-72 and was succeeded by his son, Ṭall b. Ḥātim, during whose reign the Mahdī (q.v.) ruler of Zabīd in the Tihamah began his campaigns for territorial conquest and the spread of the apostate religious doctrines instituted by his father, Ṭall b. Mahdī (d. 554/1160). In 564/1170 the Mahdī attacked the Zurayd (q.v.) ruler of Adda by laying siege to the city. The Zurayids, unable to withstand the Mahdī, in 565/1170-72, and received the assistance of Ṭall b. Ḥātim, and the Mahdī's own troops, the two other Hamdānī tribes of the highlands. In a series of encounters during the first part of 569/1173 the Mahdī was driven back to the Tihama by the allies.

HAMDANIDS, three families of the Banu Hamdan whose tribal rule over San'a passed to his son, 'Abd Allah, during whose reign the Mahdiid (q.v.) ruler of Zabid in the Tihama began his campaigns for territorial conquest and the spread of the apostate religious doctrines instituted by his father, 'Abd Allah b. Mahdi (d. 554/1160). In 564/1170-72 the Mahdiid attacked the Zurayid (q.v.) ruler of 'Adan by laying siege to the city. The Zurayids, unable to withstand the Mahdiids alone, requested and received the assistance of 'Abd Allah b. Mahdiid and that of two other Hamdani tribes of the highlands. In a series of encounters during the first part of 569/1173 the Mahdiid was driven back to the Tihama by the allies.

HAMDANIDS, three families of the Banu Hamdan whose tribal rule over San'a passed to his son, 'Abd Allah, during whose reign the Mahdiid (q.v.) ruler of Zabid in the Tihama began his campaigns for territorial conquest and the spread of the apostate religious doctrines instituted by his father, 'Abd Allah b. Mahdi (d. 554/1160). In 564/1170-72 the Mahdiid attacked the Zurayid (q.v.) ruler of 'Adan by laying siege to the city. The Zurayids, unable to withstand the Mahdiids alone, requested and received the assistance of 'Abd Allah b. Mahdiid and that of two other Hamdani tribes of the highlands. In a series of encounters during the first part of 569/1173 the Mahdiid was driven back to the Tihama by the allies.
of Šan`a` by the Ayyúbids in 570/1174-75 the Fátimid rule of the Ḥamdáníds of nearly a century came to an end. (C. L. Geddes)


**HÁMDÁNIDS, Taghlíbí Arab family which, in the 4th/10th century, provided two minor dynasties, which arose, owing to the decadence of the 'Abbásid caliphate, in Mesopotamia and Díyarbákır (Mosul) and in Syria (Aleppo), and whose most distinguished representative was the *amir* of Aleppo, Sayf al-Dawla.**

The first members of the family on whom historical information is available are Ḥámad b. Ḥámdún b. al-Ha�hrí, who appears in 254/868 with other Taghlíbí in an army which was fighting against the Kháridjís of Díyarbákır, but is found in 266/879-80 onwards, and particularly in 272/885-6, among the Kháridjís, whence his nickname of al-Shári. In 279/892-3, at the time when al-Mu`ta`díd assumed power and decided to re-establish the authority of the caliph in Díyarbákır, Ḥámad b. Ḥámdún was in possession of certain places there, including Maridín, and, on the left bank of the Tigrís, Ḥárusmu`aht (on this place see M. Canard, *op. cit.*, 112 and passim). In 282/895, the caliph seized Máridín, which Ḥámad b. Ḥámdún had left; then his troops took Ḥárusmu`aht, which Ḥámad b. Ḥusayn, who had been left to guard the fortress while his father fled, yielded to the caliph's forces, himself going over to the caliph's side. After a vigorous pursuit along both banks of the Tigrís, Ḥámad b. Ḥámdún was taken prisoner, but was freed in 312/925-6. (C. L. Geddes)

The first members of the family on whom historical information is available is Ḥámad b. Ḥámdún b. al-Ha´hrí, who appears in 254/868 with other Taghlíbí in an army which was fighting against the Kháridjís of Díyarbákır, but is found in 266/879-80 onwards, and particularly in 272/885-6, among the Kháridjís, whence his nickname of al-Shári. In 279/892-3, at the time when al-Mu`ta`díd assumed power and decided to re-establish the authority of the caliph in Díyarbákır, Ḥámad b. Ḥámdún was in possession of certain places there, including Maridín, and, on the left bank of the Tigrís, Ḥárusmu`aht (on this place see M. Canard, *op. cit.*, 112 and passim). In 282/895, the caliph seized Máridín, which Ḥámad b. Ḥámdún had left; then his troops took Ḥárusmu`aht, which Ḥámad b. Ḥusayn, who had been left to guard the fortress while his father fled, yielded to the caliph's forces, himself going over to the caliph's side. After a vigorous pursuit along both banks of the Tigrís, Ḥámad b. Ḥámdún was taken prisoner, but was freed in 312/925-6. (C. L. Geddes)

However, Harún b. Gharb, the son of the maternal uncle of the caliph al-Mu`takfi, was ambitious to take the place of the commander-in-chief, the eunuch Mu`hás, who was friendly to the Ḥamándínis. Having obtained the governorship of the Ḥdíjasjí, he dismissed the chief of police, Názús, who played a very
important part in the conspiracy and it was he who installed al-Kahir in the palace and procured al-Mukhtar's abdication; at the same time, keeping his own interests in view, he was compelled to bestow on himself the governorship of a wide area. But there arose a counter-revolt; the new caliph was besieged in his palace and Abu 'l-Haydja died heroically defending al-Kahir to the end. Al-Mukhtar, returned to power, evinced the most profound grief at Abu 'l-Haydja's death.

Abu 'l-Haydja was at this period the most notable member of the Hamdanid family. His great qualities of valour and generosity and his frank and independent spirit commanded respect and were universally esteemed. But he possessed also the spirit of intrigue which was characteristic of the great feudal lords of the time and he was finally the cause of his own undoing. Abû Firas gives him an important place in his biography and praises his powerful sword-strokes. Like Husayn, and probably the whole Kaysi tendencies, which were to re-appear in his son Sayf al-Dawla: Ibn Hawkal mentions that he was responsible for the restoration of the tomb of 'Ali at Kufa (on Abu 'l-Haydja, see M. Canard, op. cit., 347-76, and on his brothers, ibid., 378-81).

Abu 'l-Haydja's two sons were to be the most famous members of the Hamdanid family and, inheriting their father's prestige, were to follow his political example and to make renowned the two emirates, Mosul and Aleppo, which they governed. But Abu 'l-Haydja may be considered as the founder of the emirate of Mosul and of the Hamdanid dynasty. The Hamdanid emirate of Mosul. Al-Hasan b. 'Abd Allah b. Hamdan, the son of Abu 'l-Haydja and the future Nâṣir al-Dawla, had at first some difficulty in making himself amir of Mosul. On his father’s death he inherited only a part of his domains, on the left bank of the Tigris, his claim to Mosul being denied. He regained it in 318/930, however, but was deprived of it again as a result of the intrigues of his uncles, Nâṣr and Sa’id, who left him only the western part of the Diyār Rabi'a. In 322/934 he again became master of Mosul and of the Diyār Rabi'a, but was ousted once again by his uncle Sa’id, who was intriguing against him from Baghdad. He therefore rid himself of him by a villainous murder, then took advantage of his death, and died in the vizier Ibn Muqta. Hassan, who had fled to Armenia, prepared from there the re-conquest of Mosul. He defeated the lieutenant of the caliph and of the rival Taghlibi clan, the Banu Ḥabbab, who had sided with the caliph against him. At the beginning of 324/end of 935, the caliph al-Râdî finally appointed him governor of Mosul and of the three provinces of the Dijâzirâ (Diyār Rabi'a, Diyâr Muḍar and Diyâr Bâke). He nevertheless had to fight, with the help of his younger brother 'All, the future Sayf al-Dawla, in order to wrest Diyâr Bâke from one of his former auxiliaries, a Daylamî, and Diyâr Muḍar from some Kaysî tribes and an officer of the caliph. In 936 he was master of the whole of the Dijâzirâ and henceforward was to be able to give free rein to his ambitions.

The crisis in the caliphate which had forced the caliph al-Râdî to hand over his powers to an amir al-umârâd gave rise to rivalry among all the candidates for this position. Hassan, with the power which the possession of a rich province gave him, desired the possession of a rich province gave him, desired the possession of the caliphate. The crisis in the caliphate which had forced the caliph al-Râdî to hand over his powers to an amir al-umârâd gave rise to rivalry among all the candidates for this position. Hassan, with the power which the possession of a rich province gave him, desired the possession of the caliphate.

The crisis in the caliphate which had forced the caliph al-Râdî to hand over his powers to an amir al-umârâd gave rise to rivalry among all the candidates for this position. Hassan, with the power which the possession of a rich province gave him, desired the possession of the caliphate. But Abu '1-Haydja's death. At one moment Hasan gave his support to another amir al-umârâd, Ibn Râfik, and to the caliph al-Muttaq, who were being threatened by the ambitious Aḥmad al-Barîdî of Başra, but then had him arrested and installed Râlée empire for himself and his brother, after having brought back the caliph to his capital (4 June 942). He had earlier received the title of Nâṣir al-Dawla (Defender of the dynasty), while his brother 'All, who, with his cousin Ḥusayn b. Sa’îd b. Hamdan, had helped him, received that of Sayf al-Dawla (Sword of the dynasty). Nâṣir al-Dawla governed the attenuated Abbasid empire for about a year, but had to give up the position to one of his officers who had led a revolt against him, the Türk Tûzûn, and returned to Mosul. The caliph al-Muttaq quarrelled with Tûzûn and put himself under the protection of the Hamdanid, but the latter, after being defeated by Tûzûn, abandoned the caliph who, after trying to gain the protection of the Ikshid of Egypt, who was master of Syria, returned to Bagdad. Nâṣir al-Dawla then concluded in 943 a pact with Tûzûn which assured him the gouvernorship of the Dijâzirâ. Next he unsuccessfully opposed the Buwayhid Mu’izz al-Dawla when in 334/January 946 the latter took possession of the capital, and concluded an agreement with him in 335/946. He was confirmed in his possessions and the Buwayhid even supported him when his troops revolted. But twice there was conflict between them, in 337/948-9 and in 347/958-9, because of the Hamdanid's refusal to fulfil his financial obligations to the central power as represented by the Buwayhid. In 347 Nâṣir al-Dawla even had to take refuge with his brother Sayf al-Dawla, the master of Aleppo (from 336/948, see below), until the signing of a new treaty which Mu’izz al-Dawla concluded with Sayf al-Dawla, regarding Nâṣir al-Dawla as the subordinate of his brother. Nâṣir al-Dawla was once again driven out of Mosul by Mu’izz al-Dawla, and for the same reasons, in 353/964, but he was able to make a victorious return there with his sons. However, Mu’izz al-Dawla would have dealings only with Abû Taghib, the eldest son of Nâṣir al-Dawla, who was already beginning to follow a policy of his own.

This year 353 marks the decline of the power of Nâṣir al-Dawla, who, now old and in conflict with his sons, was deposed by them and exiled in 356/967 to Adharbaydjan. His penetration into Armenia in 325/936 is the first conflict with his brother Hamdan, who alone had the greater part of the Diyâr Muḍar. At the beginning of his reign, Nâṣir al-Dawla had made two unsuccessful attempts, in 324/935-6 and in 333/944, to extend his domination to Adharbaydjan. His penetration into Armenia in 323/935 when he was forced to leave Mosul (see above) was also only temporary, and it is doubtful whether he was able to make his authority recognized there as Sayf al-Dawla did later. In the Byzantine war Nâṣir al-Dawla played only a part of little importance (on the reign of Nâṣir al-Dawla see M. Canard, op. cit., 377-407, 409-54, 507-39, and art. Nâṣir al-Dawla)

He was succeeded by his son Faḍl Allah Abû Taghib al-Ghaḍanfar. Abû Taghib came into conflict first with his brother Hamdan, who alone had opposed the removal of Nâṣir al-Dawla and who had a certain amount of power at his command, for he held the governorship of Nisibis in the Diyâr Rabi'a, of Mârdîn and of Rañba in the Diyâr Muḍar, and he
HAMDĀNĪDS

had in addition seized Rakka and Rafika after the death of Sayf al-Dawla of Aleppo. In order to fight against Hamdān, Abu 'l-Mutac Dhu 'l-Karnayn made an agreement with Bakhtiyār, who had succeeded Mu'izz al-Dawla at Baghdād, and Hamdān was forced to abandon his possessions and to flee to Baghdād. Bakhtiyār succeeded in procuring his return to Rabba in 359/970; but the war between the two brothers recommenced, resulting in a battle, in which Hamdān mortally wounded another of his brothers, and in further quarrels in the Hamdānī family. The members of which abandoned Abu Ṭāhillī. Hamdān was defeated, however, and again obliged to flee to Baghdād where he was joined at the end of 360/971 by his brother Abu Ṣaḥir Ibrāhīm.

Abū Ṭāhillī did not on the other hand enter into conflict with his cousin at Aleppo, Abu 'l-Ma'sāli Shārif, the successor of Sayf al-Dawla, who, having difficulties in Syria, tacitly accepted the nominal suzerainty of the emirate of Mosul over that of Aleppo which had been given by Abu Ṭāhillī to the caliph al-Mu'izzī, thus continuing the state of affairs which had existed during the time of Nāṣir al-Dawla. Nor did he oppose Abū Ṭāhillī's seizure of the Diyar Bakr and the Diyar Muḍar.

But Abū Ṭāhillī's chief opponent was the Buwayhid Bakhtiyār, master of the caliphate and the representative of the central power to which the Hamdānī had to pay tribute. Hostility between the two was inevitable, especially as the Hamdānī's ambition was to play in Baghdād the rôle which had formerly been played by his father Nāṣir al-Dawla, and also as two of his brothers were there, one of whom especially, Hamdān, was urging Bakhtiyār to drive Abū Ṭāhillī out of Mosul. At first Abū Ṭāhillī and Bakhtiyār followed a policy of alliance, which showed itself in their common attitude towards the Karmāṭīs and the Fāṭīmīds, but in 368/973, prompted by Hamdān, Bakhtiyār undertook the conquest of Mosul and marched on the town. A shrewd move by Abū Ṭāhillī in the direction of Baghdād led Bakhtiyār to negotiate. The terms of the agreement, which contained one clause requiring the Hamdānī to keep Baghdad supplied with wheat, were observed by neither side and hostilities recommenced, ending in a new agreement in 974. Relations between the two were amicably resumed, and Abū Ṭāhillī persuaded Bakhtiyār to grant the laḳāb of Uddat al-Dawla, gave the Buwayhid his support against the rebel Turkish leaders and advanced even as far as Baghdād. But it was due to the intervention of the Buwayhid of Shīrāz, ʿAḍud al-Dawla (the son of Rukn al-Dawla of Rayy), that Bakhtiyār was restored to his throne at Baghdād. In 364/973 Abū Ṭāhillī obtained a new treaty, which freed him from the payment of tribute. When ʿAḍud al-Dawla attempted, in 365/977, to gain for himself Bakhtiyār's position at Baghdād and to send the latter to seek a new fortune in Syria, Abū Ṭāhillī gave his support to Bakhtiyār, who was trying to recapture Baghdād, on condition that his brother Hamdān, who was with Bakhtiyār, was handed over to him; he then had Hamdān put to death. But the troops of Bakhtiyār and Abū Ṭāhillī were defeated in the region of Baghdad by ʿAḍud al-Dawla in 365/978. The Buwayhid seized Mosul and forced Abū Ṭāhillī to flee. He reached Nīsibis, then Ma‘ṣūfārīkīn, then Arzan and Armenia, then Ḥisn Ziyād in the Byzantine territory of Anzītene held by the Byzantine rebel Skleros, hoping to obtain his help by forming an alliance with him. But his hopes were disappointed; he returned towards Amid without encountering any opposition from the Buwayhid troops who were engaged in besieging Ma‘ṣūfārīkīn. After the capture of this town in 368/978, Abū Ṭāhillī no longer felt secure and turned towards Rabba. From there he tried in vain to reach an agreement with ʿAḍud al-Dawla, who was now master of the greater part of the Dijārā, and decided to continue into Syria into Fāṭīmid territory, while the Buwayhid army arrived to occupy the Diyar Muḍar. Avoiding passing through the territory of his cousin at Aleppo, Saʿd al-Dawla, who had acknowledged the suzerainty of ʿAḍud al-Dawla and had been invited by him to enter Damascus, wished to enter Damascus and to obtain from the Fāṭīmid caliph the governorship of this town, which at that time was in the hands of a rebel, al-Kassāmī. But the latter prevented him from entering the town and Abū Ṭāhillī, after some skirmishes, headed southwards and reached Kafir ʿAṣīr on the Lake of Tiberias. He began negotiations with the Fāṭīmid general Faḍl and promised to help him to reconquer Damascus. But Faḍl had undertaken to support Mufarridī b. Daḥfal b. al-Ḍarrāh, the master of Ramla, who was disturbed by the presence and the ambitions of Abū Ṭāhillī. Faḍl, violating his agreements, on the contrary promised Ramla to Abū Ṭāhillī. Finally Abū Ṭāhillī joined forces with the enemies of Mufarridī, the Banū ʿUkayl, and with them embarked on an action against him. Mufarridī then appealed to Faḍl. In the ensuing battle Abū Ṭāhillī was taken prisoner by Mufarridī and put to death (365/979).

Abū Ṭāhillī had had to endure violent Byzantine attacks in 361-2/972, but in the following year his lieutenant took prisoner the Domesticus Melias, who died in captivity. In 974, the Emperor in revenge ravaged Mesopotamia. It appears that about this time Abū Ṭāhillī had played tribute to the Empire. At the time of the revolt of Skleros, after the death of John Tzimisces in 1976, the Byzantine rebel relied on the help of Abū Ṭāhillī, with whom he concluded a pact, and we have seen that in 368/978 he spent some time at Ḥisn Ziyād, the headquarters of Skleros (on the reign of Abū Ṭāhillī see M. Canard, op. cit., 541-77, 838 ff.).

The Hamdānī dynasty of Mosul ended tragically. It had indeed led a rather precarious existence from the time of the arrival at Baghdād of Mu‘izz al-Dawla. Abū Ṭāhillī's sister, Djamila, who had fled with her brother, also met a tragic end. One tradition had it that she took her life after being handed over to ʿAḍud al-Dawla. The other members of the Hamdānī family at Mosul, notably Abū Ṭāhillī's two brothers Abū ʿAbd Allah Ḥusayn and Abū Tahir Ibrāhīm, transferred their allegiance to the Buwayhid. After the death of ʿAḍud al-Dawla, a Kurdish amīr, Bādh, had taken possession of the Diyar Bakr. In order to halt Bādh's attempts to gain the remainder of the Dijārā, the Buwayhid ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Dawla, who had come to the throne in 379/989, authorized the two brothers to return to Mosul. They attempted there to regain power and fought against Bādh with the help of the Banū ʿUkayl. Bādh was killed in a battle against Ḥusayn in the region of Badh. Bādh's successor, his nephew Abū ʿAlī b. Marwān, carried on the struggle against the two brothers and took Ḥusayn prisoner, but released him on the intervention of the Fāṭīmid caliph al-ʿAzīz, who received him in Syria and made him governor of Tyr in 382/997. Another of Abū Ṭāhillī's brothers, Abu l-Muṣṭaṣfī Dhu l-Karnayn, also entered the service of the Fāṭīmid, and became governor of Damascus.


The Hamdānīd emirate of Aleppo. The formation of the Hamdānīd emirate of Aleppo was the work of 'Ali b. Abū Tāhir ībrahīm and his two sons, Abū Taghlib b. Hamdān and Sayf al-Dawla, their half-brother, who was under the protection of the Hamdānīd, and his half-brother, Sayf al-Dawla b. Hamdān, who was under the protection of the Hamdānīd. Sayf al-Dawla had in practice it was territorially and politically more extensive than its northern provinces, with the help of troops and money provided by his brother. He entered Aleppo in Rabi' I 330/944, by arrangement with the Khalīlī people of the region and without any fighting. The Ikhshīd of Manbahj, and formed for himself a court made famous by the poets who were attached to it. He reigned in Aleppo from 336/947 until 356/967. The first period of his reign was marked by successes both within the realm and outside it, but in the later period, from 350/962 onwards, he suffered serious reverses— the temporary occupation of his capital by the Byzantines, the loss of Cilicia, internal disturbances and rebellions, and finally his own illness (hemiplegia). He died at Aleppo in Safar 356/February 967, aged 51. Nevertheless the brilliance which he conferred on the emirate of Aleppo by his military victories and by his cultural influence, and through the poets and the prose-writers of what has been called the "circle of Sayf al-Dawla", has made him one of the most famous of the Hamdānīd rulers.
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recognizing the suzerainty of the Buwayhid ʿAṣṣūd al-Dawla in 368/979 (which gained for him from the caliph the ḫāṣab of Saʿd al-Dawla), he succeeded in recovering the Diyar Mudar, with the exception of Rabba and Rakka, from Abī Tāghlib, now a fugitive. He had appointed Bakdjiūr governor of Ḥims, but he lost no time in entering into conflict with him. Bakdjiūr relied for help on the Fāṭimid, who had promised him the governorship of Damascus and whose plan was to take advantage of the enmity between Bakdjiūr and Saʿd al-Dawla to seize the emirate of Aleppo for himself. In order to fight against Bakdjiūr, who relied on the help of the Byzantines, who, in 371/981-2, had just sent an army to Aleppo to remind the amīr of his obligations under the treaty of 359, which from then on he was obliged to fulfil more or less scrupulously. It was a Byzantine army which, in 373/983, forced Bakdjiūr, who had come to lay siege to Aleppo, to raise the siege, and which also returned ʿHims to Saʿd al-Dawla. The conflict between Bakdjiūr and Saʿd al-Dawla, which began in 370/980, was thus ended. The defeat of Bakdjiūr, driven out of ʿHims, was governor of Damascus for the Fāṭimid caliph ʿAbd al-Azīz, particularly as Saʿd al-Dawla, no longer able to rely on support from the Buwayhids whose power was then in decline, made overtures to the Fāṭimid caliph and recognized his sovereignty in 376/986. But hostilities recommenced when Bakdjiūr, engaged in conflict with the Fāṭimid vizier Ibn Killīs, was obliged to abandon Damascus and install himself at Rakka, whence he marched against Aleppo. He received little support from the Fāṭimid, whereas Saʿd al-Dawla received Byzantine reinforcements, and he was defeated at Nāʿūra to the east of Aleppo in 381/992, captured and executed. But Saʿd al-Dawla quarrelled with the Fāṭimid caliph over the arrest of Bakdjiūr’s children, which was done contrary to a promise that he had given, and if he had not died in Shawwāl 381/December 991, like his father of hlemegia, he would certainly have attacked the Fāṭimid possessions in Syria, as he had haughtily threatened the Fāṭimid ambassador that he would do. Saʿd al-Dawla’s policy had been to manoeuvre among Byzantium, the Buwayhid and the Fāṭimid. He was not absolutely loyal either to the Fāṭimid or to the Emperor, for in 375/985 the Emperor had to restore to him the town of Dālāt, because he was not fulfilling his obligations. Saʿd al-Dawla avenged himself for this intervention, which had led to the capture of Killīs and the bombardment of Apamea and of Kafartāb, by sending Karhūyāḥ against the monastery of Dayr Samān in Ḍiyar Bakr. When he completely dominated Saʿd al-Dawla, he turned against the Fāṭimid governor. The defeated Abu ‘l-Haydja ʿAli and Abu ʿl-Maʿālik Sharīf, were exiled to Cairo; a son of Saʿd al-Dawla, Abu ʿl-Haydja, fled, disguised as a woman, to the court of the emperor Basil. He died in 399/1008. His son Mansūr succeeded him and received investiture from the Fāṭimid caliph with the title of Murtaḍa al-Dawla (the Approved of the dynasty). His reign was marked by an attempt to restore the Ḥamdānids in the person of Abu ʿl-Haydja, the son of Saʿd al-Dawla. At the request of a large faction at Aleppo, his brother-in-law, the Marwānid Mamāhid al-Dawla of the Diyar Bakr, obtained the Emperor’s permission for Abu ʿl-Haydja to leave Constantinople. He reached Meyyāʾ afford, whence he sent a delegation to look at the possibility of an approach to the Emperor. But he was not given the Emperor’s support. Mansūr b. Luʾluʾ enticed over to his side the Killābīs who had joined Abu ʿl-Haydja and obtained in addition Egyptian help, for he was scarcely more than a Fāṭimid governor. The defeated Abu ʿl-Haydja fled towards Malatya and from there returned to Constantinople. The Emperor wished to send him back into Muslim territory but Mansūr intervened to persuade the Emperor to keep him with him. It is probable that he was converted to Christianity and served in the Byzantine army, for there exists his seal with on one side his name in Arabic and on the other the representation of a person who seems to wear his hair in military style and to wear a belt with a legend in Greek: Ῥαγιός Θεώδορος (Saint Theodore Stratiotes?). (See Hali Edhem, Šeâux du Maître de Constantinople, 133, 42, 40, 308). By a curious trick of fate, Mansūr b. Luʾluʾ, after he had been dehroned by Sāliḥ b. Mirdās in 406/1015-6, also took refuge in Byzantine territory and received as a fief the castle of Ṣilīḥ al-Laylūn, near to the frontier; he also made an unsuccessful attempt to return to Aleppo and served in the Byzantine army, for he appears on the side of Romanus Argyrus HAMDĀNIDS second attempt by the same Mangūtekīn in 384/994 was almost successful, for Bourztes, to whom Saʿd al-Dawla and his minister Luʾluʾ, the former chamberlain of Saʿd al-Dawla, appealed for help, was defeated at the Ford of the Orontes, and Aleppo was besieged for about eleven months. But on the one hand the persistence of Luʾluʾ and on the other the arrival of the emperor Basil II in person, sent for from Bulgaria by a Ḥamdānid ambassador, in the spring of 995, forced Mangūtekīn to retreat. The Ḥamdānid amīr and Luʾluʾ humbly prostrated themselves before the emperor in gratitude for this. Later, the Byzantines remained at the siege of Aleppo, and further over the emirate of Aleppo. In 388/998 they even defeated the Byzantines outside Apamea, which remained in Egyptian hands. In 389/999 a new Byzantine campaign, which advanced as far as Beirut, strengthened the defence of Aleppo against the Egyptians by the establishment of a Byzantine garrison at Shāyzar. But in 391/1001 Basil II concluded a peace treaty with the Fāṭimid caliph al-Hakīm, who, on his side, signed a treaty with the emirate of Aleppo. After this the emirate of Aleppo steadily declined. After the beginning of the reign of Saʿd al-Dawla, a large number of Ḥamdānīs ḡudūdams had passed into the service of Egypt. Luʾluʾ aimed to seize entirely the power which he was in fact already wielding, for he completely dominated Saʿd al-Dawla, to whom he had given his daughter in marriage. He therefore had Saʿd al-Dawla assassinated in 392/1002. From then on he held the power, which he shared with his son Mansūr. In 394/1003-4, he rid himself of the members of the Ḥamdānī family: the two sons of Saʿd al-Dawla, Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAli and Abu ʿl-Maʿālik Sharīf, were exiled to Cairo; a son of Saʿd al-Dawla, Abu ʿl-Haydja, fled, disguised as a woman, to the court of the emperor Basil.
at the battle of A'zib in 421/1030 (see Kamal al-Din, Zubdat al-balâb, ed. Dahan, sub anno; cf. M. Canard, op. cit., 709-17 and 859).

Thus ended, after that of the Hamdanids of Mosul, the dynasty of the Hamdanids of Aleppo. Both were of a character uncommon at this time, in that they were Arab dynasties. Both played an important political rôle; they had their period of greatness which was followed by decline. The historian of Mayyâlârî, Ibn al-Azrâk, has given a melancholy account of this (see M. Canard, Sayf al-Dawla. Recueil de textes, 1934, 275-80). The patronage of Nâşir al-Dawla and of Sayf al-Dawla favoured in Mosul and Aleppo a remarkable literary development. The names of Ibn Nûbâta, of Kâshâdîn, of al-Nâmî, al-Sârî, Bâbbâgâ, Abû Fîrâs, of al-Mutanabbi and others will always be associated with the Hamdanid dynasty. The Hamdanids have been praised, by writers impressed by their efforts in the Holy War, by their Arab qualities of courage and generosity and by their devotion to religion and their love for the Arab world. Their chivalry and their love for the Arab world has accorded them. The outstanding study of Freytag, Geschichte der Dynasten der Hamdaniden in Mosul und Aleppo, in ZDMG, x (1885) and xi (1887), although now out of date, remains of importance. See now M. Canard, Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdânides de Jazîrât et de Syrie, i, Algier-Paris 1951, with bibl. in the introd., 15-71. Information on the members of the family is also given in Abû Fîrâs, Dîwân, ed. S. Dahan, Beirut 1944, index. (M. Canard)

Hamdî, Hamd Allah (853/1449-905/1503), Turkish poet, born at Göynûk near Bolu. He was the youngest of the twelve (or seven) sons of the famous Şâyêh Aṭâ Shams al-Dîn [q.r.], who had succeeded Haṭîjî Bayram as the superior of the Bayrâmîyya. Hamdî lost his father at the age of ten. He had an unhappy childhood, which probably inspired him to write his famous mathnâwî Yâsîf we Şâyêhî. In the text, he relates that his lazy, ignorant and quarrelsome brothers ill-treated him and were jealous of him because of the great affection their father Aṭâ Shams al-Dîn showed him. "Joseph reached the extremity of his misfortunes, there is no end to my suffering" (Yâsîf we Şâyêhî, Istanbul, MS Universite T.Y. 675, fols. 11b-12a). Although he has nothing laudatory to say of his brothers, some of them surrounded themselves, and they retained enormous prestige. But they have also had their critics. In their own time, Ibn Ḥâkîm (1190-140 fl., 153-4) did not spare them his criticisms, for he was outspoken in his judgement of their tyrannical administration and their cupidity. Of present day writers, Kûr ‘Allî has also reacted against the unbounded admiration which the Arab world has accorded them.

Bibliography: The outstanding study of Freytag, Geschichte der Dynasten der Hamdaniden in Mosul und Aleppo, in ZDMG, x (1885) and xi (1887), although now out of date, remains of importance. See now M. Canard, Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdânides de Jazîrât et de Syrie, i, Algier-Paris 1951, with bibl. in the introd., 15-71. Information on the members of the family is also given in Abû Fîrâs, Dîwân, ed. S. Dahan, Beirut 1944, index. (M. Canard)
ditional science of physiognomy, dealing with the relationship between physical features and moral characteristics, without particular literary value (a good copy see Sültemeyniye-Esad Efendi, in a medjum'a, no. 3613, fols. 84-90; (6) Mevâlid, a mathnavî on the life of the Prophet with particular emphasis on the events accompanying his birth, his heavenly journey, miracles and death, one of the many poems of this genre, the most famous of which is Sîleymân Celebi's Westâlet al-neşîd. Hamdî's work varies in many details from some sources give its name as Muhammediyye, Wastel al-mathnawi form in praise of the Prophet. Although Hamdî himself is quite clear about it: "I called this poem Hamdiyye and completed it in 900" (Selimâna Kemankeş, no. 1111). Hamdî's works have not been edited. For extracts see Bibliography.

**Bibliography:**

The letters of Sehi, Latifi, 'Aqlûn Ali, 'Abd Allah Mubarak, 'Abd Allah Atash, Khâlid 'Abd Allah, and the chief of the Malamatis (who incurred blame by concealing their good deeds, in order to avoid self-conceit). He lived and taught in Nishapur, where he died in 271/884, and was buried in the cemetery of Hira. Among his associates were Abu Nu'mân al-Sulami, Hilyat al-awliya, Khâlid Kâf-zade Fa'idi, Beyani, s.v.; Hüseyin Enisi, Hilyat al-awliya, s.v.; A. Bombaci, Storia della letteratura turca, Milan 1956, 347. (FAHİR İZ)

**HAMDİ BEY, 'OTHMAN** [see 'OTHMAN HAMDİ BEY].

**HAMDUN AL-KASSAR**

Hamdun b. Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah Mubarak. As I myself do". He taught asceticism and also tolerance of others, counselling men to associate with the learned, but to have patience with the ignorant. He advised contentment with little, "Sufficiency will bring you ease without weariness: you weary yourself in seeking praise should lead to pride. To a man who reviled him, Hamdun said, "My brother, if you were to accuse me of all ill-doing, you would never revile me as I myself do".

**Bibliography:**


**HAMİ, or HAMI OĞULLARI,** the sons of Hamid, one of the Muslim principalities in Anatolia in the 8th/14th century. Founded in the region of Uluborslu in Pisidya by Iyâs, the son of the eponym, in 728/1328, it embraced the whole region of the Pisidyan lakes, and then the Pamphylian plain and the mountain passes linking them, thereby constituting a state that was situated on an important road and so controlled one of the principal variants of the South-North route from the Mediterranean to the Mongol Empire. Two branches had their respective centres at Eğirdir [q.v.] and in the region of Antalya and its šâyla Korkuteli, ruled by Yûnas, elder son of Iyâs. The Eğirdir branch, whose tenure was for a time interrupted by the defeat and death of Falak al-Din Dündar, the younger son of Iyâs, at the hands of the governor of Anatolia for the Ilkhanids, Demir-tash, in 724/1324, was revived by İshâk in 728/1328 and by his brother İmâmed, who was ruling in Göl-hîsar in 733/1333 (Ibn Battüta, trans. Gibb, ii, 423).

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:**

Captain S. B. Haines, Memoir to accompany a chart of the south coast of Arabia, in IRAS, iv (1839), 135; Abbott, Erdhunde, 635, 639; Van den Berg, Jadharmout, Batavia 1886, 11; Leo Hirsch, Reisen in Südarabien, Mahraland und Hadramût, Leiden 1879, 11, 37, 38; Th. Bent and Mrs. Th. Bent, South Arabia, London 1900, 210, 211. (J. SCHLEIFER)

**HAMI-I ÂMID, AHMED ÂMID, (1090?-1169?), 1747), an Ottoman poet from south-east Anatolia. He was born at Âmid (Diyar-Bakr) and taught by his brother Mehmed, who was ruling in Gaziantep in 728/1328 and by his brother Mehmed, who was ruling in Göl-hîsar in 733/1333 (Ibn Battûta, trans. Gibb, ii, 423).
A prince of this family was in command at Şuhud near Afyon Karahisar in 769/1368. This northern principality was absorbed by the Ottomans in 793/1391. The Antalya branch was exposed to the attacks of the Cypriots who occupied the town from 1361 to 1373 (Mübäriz al-Dîn then retreated to Korkuteli). Annexed by Yıldırım Bâyezid in 794/1392, the southern principality was restored in 805/1402, after the battle of Ankara, by a certain Oğmân, who reconquered all its territories except Antalya, despite his alliance with the Karaman ghullars, and whose defeat and death in 868/1463 marked the end of the dynasty.

**Bibliography:** the sources, which are essentially epigraphic, have been collected by I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Kitâbeler, 1929, and subsequently in Ün (review of the Halkfevi of Isparta), passim, years 1934-5; historical syntheses: I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Anadolu byelikleri, Ankara 1937; idem, article Hamid oğulları in TA; X. de Planhol, De la plaine pampylienne aux lacis pisidiens, Paris 1958, 90-4 (for economic history and historical geography); Barbara Flemming, Landschaftsgeschichte des Gebildes Abendland, Wiesbaden 1964, especially 67-92, with map (p.132). (X. DE PLANHOL)

**HÂMÎD B. MUHAMMAD AL-MURDJIBI** [see AL-MURDJIB]
HAMIDI — HA-MIM


Bibliography: Latffî, Tâddhîka, Istanbul 1314, 115; Asâkîî Celbelî, Malekîr al-shârîa (İst. Univ. Lib. T.Y., 2406), 868-82a; Bellûgh, Gûlûst-i riyâdî-i ırfân, Bursa 1302, 454-5 (a copy of this in the author's handwriting is in the 1st. Univ. Lib. no. T.Y. 6195, f. 222a); Âât (Enderûnû), Tavâvî, v, 160; (Abdulkadir Karahan) A. B. M. A. Hamidî Dîvânî (1) İbrahim b. Abî 'l-Sâ'îd al-Hamândî, the second dâ‘î mu‘âlah of the Tâyyîbî Ismâ‘îlîs in the Yaman. According to ‘Umâra, not supported by Tâyyîbî sources, the Sulayhîd Queen al-Sayyida in 526/1132 appointed Sülâyîhîd Queen al-Sayyida in 533/1138, the first dâ‘î mu‘âlah of the Yaman. If the report is reliable, Ibrâhîm may have been elected for his sympathy with the claim of al-Tâyyîbî. After the death of the dâ‘î al-Khâṭîb b. al-Hamandî in 533/1138, the first Tâyyîbî dâ‘î mu‘âlah, Dhu‘ayb b. Mûsâ, chose him as his assistant. After Dhu‘ayb’s death in 546/1153 (Hamândî: 556/1141-2) he became his successor as the highest religious authority in the absence of the Imam. The situation of the Tâyyîbî community was precarious, because it found little protection among the Yamîds rulers. Tâyyîbî sources, the thirteenth describes Balkh, at one time a prosperous place but devastated in 548/1153 by the invasion of the Ghuzz; he apologizes for ending the work ex aorupio because, he says, he has been overwhelmed by the calamities of the time. His work was praised by the poet Anwari (in lines translated by E. G. Browne) and by Nîfâmî-i ‘Arîdî (Câhâr makâlî, tr. Browne, 14, n. 6).

Bibliography: Rieu, Cat. Persian Ms. British Museum, 747 (list of the makdamî); Ethê, Gr.I.P., ii, 228; Browne, ii, 346 (extract translated by the 13th makdama); A. Bausani, Storia della letteratura persiana, Milan 1960, 806-7. (H. Massûb) HAMIDIZADE MƯSTAFÃ EFENDI [see H. MADELUNG]

HAMA-MIM b. MANN ALAH b. HĂPÎZ b. ‘AMR, known as AL-MUFTARI. Berber prophet of the beginning of the 4th/10th century, who appeared among the Ghûmârîs Berbers, or, to be more exact, in the tribe of the Madjkasa settled not far from Tetuan. He began to preach his religion in 313/925 and was driven not far from Tanger, in a battle against the Masmuda. 313/925: He appears to have survived him for a period whose length is unknown, but which did not go beyond the end of the 4th/10th century. Just as in the religion of the Barghawâtî [q.v.], this doctrine, about which we have very little information, was in part a garbled version of Islam, with a ‘Kur’ân, in Berber, only two daily prayers, a weekly fast day, a fast of three or ten days in Ramadân, a little given in alms, but no ablation or pilgrimage. Forbidden foods were fish, birds’ eggs, and the heads of any animals. On the other hand the meat of wild animals was allowed, but not that of the wild boar. Breaches of these laws were punished by fines of which Ha-Mim and his relatives reaped the benefit. Lastly, two women played an important rôle in this religion, a paternal aunt of the prophet and a sister of his, both of them sorceresses.

In short, this belief appears to have been a mixture of distorted Islam and Berber beliefs.

HA-MIM — Ḥ-MMAD ʿADJRAD


(R. Le Tournhau)

AL-Ḥ-MMAD, Sp. Ḥ-MMAD, a name commonly given to hot springs and which, in those regions of Spain long occupied by the Muslims, replaced the old Romance terms Caldas (aguas calidas) and Baños (balnearios). This same name was also given, however, to two rivers which are in no sense thermal: one is the river called by the Muslims of Syria the principal or eastern branch of the Ebro; the other is a minor stream of the northern slope of the Sierra Nevada which flows into the river Fardes. The Alhamas which are best known for their history and their baths are four: that of Almería, which according to the Raued al-ʾmirāf had the best medicinal waters of the Peninsula; that of Aragón, known to the Hispano-Romans as Aqība Bihibīlātah; that of Murcia, also Roman, which was reconquered by James I of Aragón, who handed it over to Castile; finally, the best known, that of Granada. It was rich through its celebrated textile factories, well fortified by nature and art, and the summer residence of the kings of Granada. It lies about 25 miles from the capital. The Muslims possessed it till 887/1482, in which year, after a stubborn resistance, it was taken by assault by Diego Ponce de Merlo, the marquis of Cadiz, and Diego Hernández Portocarrero, the governor of Andalusia. The sultan Abu ʾl-Hasan ʿAlī tried three and the summer residence of the kings of Granada, so they reinforced it with numerous troops and the sultan had to give up the attempt. Well-known romances such as "Ay de mi Alhama" sing of this loss which was so severely felt by the Muslims, and the epic assault was commemorated in a fine bas-relief in Toledo cathedral.

Bibliography: Madoz, Diccionario geográfico de España, s.v.; Enciclopedia Española, iv, 660-3; Aguado Bleye, Manual de Historia de España, ii, 44; Soldevilla, Historia de España, ii, 419.

A. Huici Miranda

Ḥ-MMAD B. AL-ZIBRIKĀN [see next art.]

Ḥ-MMAD ʿADJRAD (in stricto sensu constructus), Arab satirical poet whose genealogy has not been exactly established; his kunya, Abū ʿUmar, would justify the following: Ḥ-MMAD b. ʿUmar b. Yūnūs (rather than b. Yabhāʾ or Yūnūs b. ʿUmar) b. Kulaib b. ʿAlūfī. Born at the latest at the beginning of the 2nd/8th century, this mawlawī of a clan of the ʿAmīr b. ṣaḥāfā probably owes his by-name (udjarid = completely naked) to the saying of a Bedouin. His biographers agree in declaring that he achieved fame only under the ʿAbbāsids, but they do not fail to point out that al-Walīd II b. Yazīd II (125-6/743-4) had him come to court, with a certain number of other poets, and that he returned to his native land after the death of the Umayyad caliph (R. Blachere, in Milanes Gaudafroy-Debombymes, 110-30, does not quote, however). This is, in any case, the only datable information we possess on his life, which appears to have been quite eventful. Only al-Dījahshiyārī (Wiesteri, 190) represents him as a secretary in the chancellery and notes that he had served under Yabhāʾ b. Muhammad b. ʿSūl at al-Mawṣil and ʿUṣba b. Salm b. ʿUṭayba in Bāḥrān, and it is possible that this activity dates before the year 140/758. Under al-Saffābī he seems to have en-joyed the company of the governor of Kūfah, Muḥammad b. Khālid, and to have been the tutor of the caliph's son, Muḥammad b. Abī ʾl-ʿAbbās; under al-Ḥ-MMAD b. ʿUmar, he was in touch with the emir al-Raḥb b. Yūnūs [q.v.], and the caliph himself is said to have appreciated his satirical verve. According to one tradition, the latter even induced him to accompany, with other dissolute characters, Muḥammad b. Abī ʾl-ʿAbbās to Baṣra on his nomination as governor of the city (147/764-5), for al-Ḥ-MMAD wished to discredit his nephew and to disqualify him for the caliphate. This is once again the only person with whom the poet al-Dījahshiyārī (Death, 230) wonders whether one of his ḥadīdās addressed to Muḥammad was madāʾ or hiḍāʾ? he mourned him at his death, in 150/767-8. But since he had composed for him some amorous verses about an ʿAbbāsid princess, Zaynab, her brother Muḥammad b. Sulaymān had been striving to take revenge. Therefore the poet left Baṣra to take refuge with al-Ḥ-MMAD, who did indeed protect him and even engaged him to satirize his enemy. Some biographers describe his stay in Baghdād, with others of his kind, during the reign of al-Mahdī (125-6/775-85), but the traditions concerning his death diverge widely. According to some, Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, who was three times governor of Baṣra (see Ch. Pellat, Milleu, 287), had him assassinated at al-Ahwāz, where his presence is indeed attested; according to others, he died of sickness between al-Ahwāz and Baṣra, but the date of this event varies considerably according to the sources, and is placed in 155, 161, 167 or 168. The date 161 appears probable because, on the one hand, he died before Baḥshād (d. 167 or 168/784-5), and, on the other, legend tells that the latter, by a strange irony of fate, was buried next to him.

The greater part of Ḥ-MMAD's extant verses are nothing but diatribes against Baḥshād, and the Akgānī is full of anecdotes about the contentsions of the two men. Although the blind poet recognizes the talent of his adversary, certain of whose verses had affected him grievously (Akgānī, Beirut ed., iv, 328; al-Dījahshīrī, Bayān, i, 100; idem, Bayāwūn, iv, 66), criticism is unanimous in considering that the two poets cannot be compared. According to the Akgānī (xiv, 332), the scholars of Baṣra found only about forty verses of merit in the epigrams of Ḥ-MMAD, while they discovered more than a thousand in those of Baḥshād; al-Dījahshīrī, while occasionally appreciating the talent of Ḥ-MMAD (cf. Bayāwūn, i, 239, 240-2), places him well below his adversary (cf. Bayāwūn, iv, 453-4) and even judges him far inferior to Abān al-Labiḥī [q.v.].

Skilled at setting friends at loggerheads, incapable of respecting his own friendships, he let fly at them, even at Muṭīf b. Iyās [q.v.], sallies which were often scurrilous, practised a sordid blackmail, and busied himself in bringing dishonour to his victims in terms which detract from his own character. There is no reason to be surprised that posterity, since the end of the 2nd/8th century, should hold against him the most odious accusations of Manichaeism, which he certainly did not deserve, for he does not seem capable of feeling the slightest religious sentiment; his sandaka lay, in fact, in an attitude of profound religious indifference, of libertinism and of impertinence, which was shared more or less by his habitual companions, amongst whom figured his two namesakes Ḥ-MMAD al-Rāwīya [q.v.] and the grammarian Ḥ-MMAD b. al-Zibrikān (on whom see particularly Bayāwūn,
HAMMAD 'ADJRAD — HAMMADA

iv, 445, 447; Aghdni, index; al-'Askalani, Lisan al-
Miṣdn, ii, 347). Ibn al-Nadim (Fihrist, 473) does not
mention him amongst the 'Asiṣṣa, and G. Vajda holds
conclusively that the accusations of Mani-
Chalism made against the libertines with whom he is
generally mentioned (see Les sincïïïs en pays
d'Islam, in RSO, xvii (1937), 173-229).

From his poetic works, which were certainly
abundant, there survive only a few relatively feeble
verses, mostly satirical. There are some poems, how-
ever, in which he displays a wisdom that is surprising
for him, also some erotic verses which do not lack
freshness and were deemed worthy of being set to
music.

Bibliography: Notices and verses are to be
found in Dāḥîb, Bayân and Ḥayāwān, index; Ibn
Kutayba, Ṣhir, 754-6 and index; idem, Uyun al-ādhar, index; Buṭūrī, Ḥamṣa, 372; Ibn al-Mu'tazz, Ṭabaḥâd, 23-6; Aghdni, xii, 70-98
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ṭasâm; Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, Ḥadīth al-arba'ī, i, 197-
212. (Ch. Pellar)

HAMMĀD AL-RĀWIYA, i.e., "the transmitter," Ibn Abi Laylā, a collector of Arabic poems, especially
the Mu'llāfīydt [q.v.]. He was born at Kūfah in 750/964-5 (the date 95 is a misreading). He was of Iranian stock, his father being a captive from al-Dāy lam, named Sāhūr or Humurous or Maysara. Hammād, like his namesakes and boon-companions Hammād 'Adjrād and Hammād b. al-Zibrākīn, belonged to a
beau of the poets; Ḥamṣa, who at their merry
gatherings used to drink wine and recite verses and
verse in the eyes of the pious suspect of heresy
(sandīka). Hammād was very fond of poetry; many
anecdotes show him in conversation with al-Tirmīzhī
(Aghdni, vi, 95), al-Kumāyti, (Aghdni, xiv, 113),
'Umar b. Abī Rabī'ā (Aghdni, vii, 50), Kūthāyir (Aghdni, vii, 252 ff.), al-Baraḍīdak (Aghdni, vii, 73),
Dīnīr (Aghdni, vii, 36), Dhu 'l-Rumma (Marzūbānī, Muwaṣṣabāh, 177), and other poets. His intimate
knowledge of the poetry, genealogy, history and
lore of the Bedouins won him the favour of the
caliph, especially all-Wādī b. Yazīd, and their
dignitaries. It is uncertain whether he was invited
already by Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik; for the story
(Aghdni, vi, 75 ff.) is chronologically inconsistent,
because Yūsuf b. 'Umar was appointed governor of the
East only in 120/738. The downfall of the Umayyads hit him hard. It seems that it went to al-Manṣūr (Aghdni, vi, 80) but felt disappointed
(Aghdni, vi, 82; vii, 223 f.) and returned to Kūfah
where he died in 155/772 (Yaḥkūt) or in 156/773
(Fihrist). Later dates are unwarranted. He was
mourned by Muḥammad b. Kunās in an elegy
(Fihrist, etc.). Amongst his pupils were his rāwī
al-Hayṯyām b. 'Adī (Aghdni, vi, 70, 72), Khalīf
al-Aḥmar (Yaḥkūt, iv, 179), and al-Aṣma'ī who owed
nearly all the poems of Imrā' al-Kays to Hammād.

Hammād was no scholar, but rather a dilettante
who enjoyed poetry as one of the good things in
life and did not care too much about scholarship and
authenticity. He took no interest in the studies of
grammar which were making rapid progress during
his later years. There was in addition the rivalry
between the schools of Baṣra and Kūfah. He was
held in high esteem by Abū 'Amr Ibn al-'Alāʾ [q.v.],
the founder of the Baṣra school (Aghdni, vi, 73), but
was denounced in the next generation. According to

the Baṣra Yūnus b. Ḥabīb, Hammād knew nothing
about grammar, prosody, and correct speech
(Aghdni, vii, 383; Djamāh, 14), whilst his rival,
the Kūfah Mufaddal b. Mulakī in the Dīwān of his
did not deny his vast knowledge, but accused him
of having ruined the tradition of Bedouin poetry
beyond repair by his clever forgeries (Aghdni, vii, 89).

Hammād collected, according to al-Nahāshā, d.
337/948-9 (Ibn Anbārī, Nuzhah al-ahlibā, 48), the
seven long odes, commonly known as the Mu'llāfīydt.
Abū Ḥātim al-Sigīṣānī quotes poems of al-Ḥujay'rā
from the Mu'llāfīydt (q.v.) of Hammād, mainly to blame him for admitting spurious verses
(Ibn al-Haḍjār, Muḥtārāt, 123, 127, 135; cf.
Goldziher, ZDMG, xi, 48 ff.). In the Dīwān of
Abūn b. al-Ṭafâyūl there is a piece (no. 26, ed. 'Laylāy)
which corresponds to the verses copied by Ibn al-
Kalbī from a manuscript which again is called the
"book of Hammād al-Rāwiya". Other traces of
Hammād's literary activities are scarce.

Bibliography: Dīwān, Maṣāri', 288; Aghdni,
vi, 70-95; Fihrist, 92-2; Muraḍā, Amālī, i, 90-2;
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HAMMĀDA (A,) is synonymous with 'plateau'
in the Sahara of the southern Maghrib and Tripoli-
tania, but is used only by some of its Arabic-speaking
inhabitants. The word stands for large areas which
are the outcrops of horizontal beds of secondary
or tertiary limestone or sandstone (or calcareous or
gypso-calcareous crusts of the quaternary era),
and which stand out as a result of the erosion caused
by running water during periods which were less
ardid than the present. The surface of the hammūdas
is almost always rocky and totally devoid of vege-
tation except in small basins where the limestone
has dissolved (dāya; classical addī); it is often
blackened, consolidated and rendered barren by a
"desert patina" due to the exudation of iron salts;
it is sometimes partly covered by a reg formed by
the breaking up of angular stones. The edge of the
hammerdās in the desert of Morocco and the alluvial
formation of their piedmont, the hammūdas, is not
found in Eastern Libya beyond lat. 14° E. (Greenwich) and has not the same meaning
as the term hammūdas in the Sahara region in Southern Algeria, that of Murzūk and the Hammā-
da al-Hamrā, in Southern Tripolitania. The use of
the word hammūda is extended to even very small
hills with calcareous incrustations in the lower
steppes and in the Sahel of Tunisia and even to small plateaus on the Tunisian backbone (hammūda of the Awlād
Ayār, of the Awlād Aouīn, of the Kessera). The term
hammūda is not found in Eastern Libya beyond
lat. 14° E. (Greenwich) and has not the same meaning
in the East, where it is applied to semi-arid plains.
In the Sahara the word hammūda is rivalled and
replaced, on fairly large areas, by ādār (back,
reverse of slope), both in the Tunisio-Tripolitanian
range of plateaus and in the Mauritanian Adrar, or,
less frequently, by the word gālta which was
around the Ahaggar massif are called āssilīī, a Ťuāreg Berber
term; in the south of Morocco kemkem, another word of Berber origin, is the synonym of hammūda; the
great lava plateaus of the Tibesti are called larso by the Tūbī. (J. Despois)
HAMMÄDIDS (BAN B Hammåd) a Central Maghrib dynasty (405-547/1015-1152) collateral with that of the Zirids of Eastern Barbary, taking its name from its founder Hammåd b. Buluggin b. Zir b. Manåd.

The aspirations towards Ifrikiya of the Şanhâdja amirs, the Zirids, lieutenants and vassals of the Fâtîmids in the Maghrib, brought about the split between the Central Maghrib and Ifrikiya proper. Under the second Zirid, al-Mansûr b. Buluggin, his uncle Abu ʿl-Bahâr b. Zir had already tried without success to carve out a kingdom in the Central Maghrib (379-83/989-93). Now al-Mansûr’s successor Bâdîs had to confront a powerful Zanâta wave which broke from Tiaret to Tripoli from 386/996 and at length overwhelmed him (391/1001), thanks mainly to his uncle Hammåd b. Buluggin. In 395/1004-5 he gave Hammåd the task of pacifying the restive West, and undertook never to recall him and to give up to him Asgîr, the Central Maghrib and any town he was able to conquer. Hammåd met with such success that in 398/1007-8 he founded a new town north-east of Msîla with an eye to its serving as his capital, the celebrated Kâfâ (Kâfâ Hammåd/Kâfâ Bani Hammåd/ al-Kâfâ [q.v.]). Hammåd disobeyed Bâdîs’s order to surrender part of the Constantine territory to his heir, and, with his brother İbrâhîm, rebelled (405/1015).

I. Hammåd b. Buluggin (405-19/1015-29). He severed his relations with the Fâtîmids of Cairo and had made with al-Muʿizz b. Bâdîs, who marched against him and besieged the Kâfâ for two years; at the end of this time a reconciliation between the two cousins was brought about (434/1042-3). There is some uncertainty about the date of al-Kâfî’s repudiation of the Fâtîmids and his recognition of the ‘Abbâsids, but it must be around the time of al-Muʿizz (whose break with Cairo was an established fact by 439/1047) since he sent him a body of cavalry which participated in the famous battle of Ḥiydarân (443/1052). But most likely it was after this Hîlîf victory, which put an end to the culture of Kayrawân, that he once more recognized Fâtîmid suzerainty, thus acquiring the honorific appellation of Şarâf ad-Dawla which had formerly been borne by his cousin.

III. Al-Muḥsin b. al-Kâfî (446-7/1054-5). His father’s advice to deal circumspectly with his uncles was unheeded. His violent and tyrannical disposition got the better of him, and led to his assassination, after nine months’ rule, by one of his cousins, who succeeded to his throne.

IV. Buluggin b. Muḥammad b. Hammåd (447-54/1055-62). As the alliance between the Hammådids and the Hîlîlî Ahbâdi grew closer, so the Zirids relied more and more on the Riyâh and the Zughba. Then, when thrown out of Ifrikiya by the Riyâh, it was the turn of the Zughba to put themselves at the disposal of the Hammådids. In 450/1058-9 Buluggin obliged the Biskra chiefs to recognize him and treated the

transferred his allegiance to the ‘Abbâsids of Baghdad; thus the Hammådîd kingdom came into being. Bâdîs laid siege to the Kâfâ and after six months gained a decisive victory in 406/1015; but death overtook him when he seemed about to reduce his uncle to obedience (end of 406/May 1016). His successor al-Muʿizz b. Bâdîs dealt the rebel so severe a repulse that his successor al-Muʿizz b. Bâdîs, who marched against him and besieged the Kâfâ for two years; at the end of this time a reconciliation between the two cousins was brought about (434/1042-3). There is some uncertainty about the date of al-Kâfî’s repudiation of the Fâtîmids and his recognition of the ‘Abbâsids, but it must be around the time of al-Muʿizz (whose break with Cairo was an established fact by 439/1047) since he sent him a body of cavalry which participated in the famous battle of Ḥiydarân (443/1052). But most likely it was after this Hîlîf victory, which put an end to the culture of Kayrawân, that he once more recognized Fâtîmid suzerainty, thus acquiring the honorific appellation of Şarâf ad-Dawla which had formerly been borne by his cousin.

III. Al-Muḥsin b. al-Kâfî (446-7/1054-5). His father’s advice to deal circumspectly with his uncles was unheeded. His violent and tyrannical disposition got the better of him, and led to his assassination, after nine months’ rule, by one of his cousins, who succeeded to his throne.

IV. Buluggin b. Muḥammad b. Hammåd (447-54/1055-62). As the alliance between the Hammådids and the Hîlîlî Ahbâdi grew closer, so the Zirids relied more and more on the Riyâh and the Zughba. Then, when thrown out of Ifrikiya by the Riyâh, it was the turn of the Zughba to put themselves at the disposal of the Hammådids. In 450/1058-9 Buluggin obliged the Biskra chiefs to recognize him and treated the

Genealogical table of the dynasty


II.—al-Kâfî (419-46/1028-54)

III.—Muḥsin (446-7/1054-5)

IV.—Buluggin (447-54/1055-62)

V.—al-Nâṣir (454-8/1062-89)

VI.—al-Mansûr (481-98/1092-1105)

VII.—Bâdîs (498/1105)

VIII.—al-ʿAzîz (498-515 or 518-1105-21-2 or 1124-5)

IX.—Yahyâ (515 or 518-47/1121-2 or 1124-5 to 1152)

transferred his allegiance to the ‘Abbâsids of Baghdad; thus the Hammådîd kingdom came into being. Bâdîs laid siege to the Kâfâ and after six months gained a decisive victory in 406/1015; but death overtook him when he seemed about to reduce his uncle to obedience (end of 406/May 1016). His successor al-Muʿizz b. Bâdîs dealt the rebel so crushing a blow (468-1017) that he sued for pardon, which was granted him. This peace, consolidated by alliances by marriage, which gave him complete sovereignty over all Central Maghrib, was to be respected by Hammåd until his death (419/1028). It would seem that he had returned to the Fâtîmid allegiance.

II. Al-Kâfî b. Hammåd (419-46/1028-54) successfully checked an adventure of the Maghrâbi amir of Fez, and made him swear allegiance (430/1039-9). In 432/1040-1 he broke the pact his father
and Tebessa) he suffered a defeat comparable in
gravity with that inflicted on al-Mu'izz b. Badls at
Hadjarun. Anarchy and devastation spread through-
out Central Maghrib, which now experienced the
kills that Ifriqiya had suffered for years. The
crushing of the Sanhadjia at Sabba (457/1065)
finally sealed the ascendancy of the Hilalids over all
eastern Barbary, while the Rihay held sway in
Ifriqiya and the Aghbadi in Central Maghrib. Just
as the Zirids had been forced to give up Kayravan
and to retire on Mahdia, so the Hammadids lost their
hold on the Kal'a and fell back on Bougie, named al-
Nasir (484/1090-7). The Zirids installed himself there shortly after 461/1069-9. There
was some indication of a revival of Zirid-Riayid power
when they seized Khurassani Tunis (459-60/1069-70),
and to thwart this al-Na'ir led the Aghbadi in an
attack on Ifriqiya (460/1067-8), took Laribus and
then Kayravan (though this he had to give up), and
he returned to the Kal'a. Al-Na'ir certainly played
some part (though the affair is obscure) in the sale of
the coinage, and it was he who "civilized" the Ham-
madid-Almoravid hostility, with the signing of a
peace, which was destined to last until the end of
Tamim's reign (501/1108), marks the peak of Ham-
adid superiority over their Badisid cousins, over-
whelmed by the Hilalid invasion. Al-Na'ir led a
number of expeditions to the West and made allies
of the heads of an important Zanata tribe, the Banu
Makhukh. On many occasions he had to take
vigorous action against the Zanata when they joined
with the Arabs in acts of brigandage.
VI. Al-Manṣūr (481-98/1088-1105). In spite of
his youth, this son of al-Na'ir and Ballara followed
firmly in his father's footsteps and was the recipient
of Ibn Hamdun's panegyrics. Although the district
was overrun by Arabs, he stayed in the Kal'a until
he left it for Bougie (483/1090-1). Ibn Khalidin
considers that he was the first of his line to issue a
coining, and it was he who "civilized" the Ham-
madid kingdom, hitherto semi-nomadic and totally
lacking in the polish of the Badisids of Kayravan.
On his accession, he instructed Abü Yakn to remove
Balbar, an uncle of his and governor of Constantine,
and rewarded him with the governorship of that city
d and of Bône. In 487/1094, Abu Yakn rebelled and tried
to overthrow Tamim's authority and assume the
throne. He was imprisoned in Algiers, where he
finally died, and assigned the town to one of his
uncles (522/1128). Bône stayed in Hammadid hands
until 543/1148-9. A Hammadid army took the
citadel of Tozeur (the date is uncertain) whose
minister was seized by the Almoravids and was obliged to fall back on the Banu
Makhukh. On many occasions he had to take
vigorous action against the Zanata when they joined
with the Arabs in acts of brigandage.
VII. Al-Ma'mūn (498/1105). This son and successo
of al-Manṣūr was a Caligula whose bloody tyranny
fortunantly endured for less than a year.
VIII. Al-'Azīz (498/1105 to 515 or 518/1121-2 or
514/1124-5). Biographical references are sparse but
there is evidence of an illness, his lifelong love of
peace and reign. He took pleasure in the company
of lawyers. He made peace with the Zanata and
married one of Makhukh's daughters. Nevertheless,
his fleet subdued Djerba (the date is uncertain) and
in 514/1124-5 he laid siege to Tunis and obliged the
Khurāsani Ahmad b. Abü al-'Azīz to offer sub-
mission. About this time he laid on his son the duty
of recovering the Kal'a from Hilalid occupation.
IX. Yahyā (512-538/1121-49) drove the Khurāsani Ahmad b. Abü al-'Azīz from Tunis and deported him to Bougie where he eventu-
ally died, and assigned the town to one of his
uncles (522/1128). Tunis stayed in Hammadid hands
until 543/1148-9. A Hammadid army took the
citadel of Tozeur (the date is uncertain) whose
minister was seized by the Almoravids and was obliged to fall back on the Banu
Makhukh. On many occasions he had to take
vigorous action against the Zanata when they joined
with the Arabs in acts of brigandage.

HAMMĀM or steam bath, often still referred to as "Turkish bath" (and in French as "bain maure"), is a building typical of the Islamic world where archaeological remains witness to its existence as early as the Umayyad period (in addition to references in texts which mention the construction of baths in the first towns founded after the conquest: the bath of 'Amr at Fustāṭ in Ibn Dūjkām, i, 105; the first three baths of Baṣra, in al-Balādhurī, Fatāk, 355) and where it has continued until the present day to occupy a position of primary importance, recognized by the Arab writers themselves (for example mention ḥammāms among a town's ancient claims to pre-eminence, and compile contemporary detailed lists of these buildings in addition to inventories of monuments).

The ritual use of the ḥammām in the performance of the major ablution explains why it has always been considered one of the essential amenities of the Muslim city, gradually assimilated as "a sort of annex of the mosque" (W. Marçais), while at the same time the life of a whole quarter revolved around it. Thus the Muslims gradually forgot the prejudices that had at first surrounded it as being an element which was borrowed from a foreign civilization (as late as the 4th/10th century mention is still found of ḥammāmīt rūmiyya) and whose decoration was for a long time derived from conventions of pre-Islamic times. People went to it for relaxation as well as to fulfill the laws of hygiene or a religious regulation, and the public baths, which were numerous in every town (and reserved on certain days or at certain times for men and at others for women), formed considerable sources of revenue for the private individuals or the authorities who established them. The popularity of the use of the ḥammām had also led to the installation of private baths in the precincts of palaces, where they were larger than the public baths.

Information on the number of baths existing in the Middle Ages in the chief Muslim towns can be found in the early sources, and this information has sometimes been used as a basis for modern estimates of the populations of towns at that period. In fact the value of the details thus provided varies greatly according to whether they are obtained from accurate inventories of monuments or simply from estimates by chroniclers.

To the first category belong for example the data provided by Ibn 'Asakir on Damascus in the 6th/12th century (57 baths inroo mauro: Tāriḥī Di- mağḥ, ed. S. al-Munajjdid, ii/1, Damascus 1954, 162-4) and, a century later, by Ibn Shaddād on the baths of Alepp (80 public baths inroo mauro and 94 extra mauro plus 31 private baths, making a total of 155; Descriptions d'Alexandrie, ed. D. Sourdel, Tarnacs 1953, 130-8) and of Damascus (83 baths inroo mauro and 31 extra mauro, making 176 in all: Description de Damas, ed. S. Dahan, Damascus 1956, 291-302), data which seem reasonable when we consider that about 30 years ago Damascus had 60 baths of various dates, 41 of which were still in use.

On the other hand the contradictory data given by them. Their charges are not governed by a tariff, and in general they seem to be satisfied with what they are given. Moreover their honesty is proverbial, and any shortcoming is severely punished by the amin. Quite recently, they were still sleeping, at night, in small groups in the markets, stores and funduks and making their rounds for the purpose of preventing thefts and giving the alarm in case of fire.

Bibliography: in the text.

(ℋ. HUART-[Ch. PELLAT])
such a writer as Hilal al-Sabi about Baghdad seem much less reliable: for a period extending from the 3rd/9th to the 4th/10th century the figure he gives for a bath. The numbers vary from 60,000 to 1,500 [see Abbâd]. Similarly for Cordova at the end of the 4th/10th century we find figures ranging from 300 baths in the reign of ʿAbd al-Rahmân III (Ibn ʿIdhârî, Bayân, ii, ed. Dozy, 247; Fr. tr. Fagnan, 383) to 600 in the period of al-Mansûr b. ʿAbd al-Mâjkârî, Analectes, i, 355.

The information given by Leo Africanus for Fez in the 10th/16th century seems more reliable (100 baths listed, whereas in 1942 not more than 30 existed), also that given for 11th/17th century Istanbul by Ewliyâ Celebi (61 baths intra muros and 51 extra muros, plus private baths, making a total of about 150), details which can hardly be accused of exaggeration. But we have given these few statistics only as examples to demonstrate the extent of the potential documentation, which would demand careful comparisons between parallel sources of information (historical, literary, et cetera) in order to produce a reliable contribution to social and economic history.

From another aspect there should be mentioned the graphic descriptions of Muslim baths which feature in the accounts of early or later Western travellers, from Chardin or La Boullaye le Gouz for example (on the less well-known account of the latter, see Voyages et observations, Paris 1657, 40-2) to E. W. Lane (Manners and customs of the modern Egyptians, chapter 16; see also the text of N. Diaz de Escovar, De como se construía un baño en tiempo de los árabes, cited by E. Lévi-Provençal), not forgetting the iconographic material provided by some Persian or Turkish miniatures, such as the representation of a hamâmât by an artist of the school of Bihâz (see B. Gray, Persian painting, Geneva 1961).

But even more useful information could be obtained from the juridical works and from the manuals of ḥisâba [q.v.], which provide much detail on the control exercised by the muḥāṭāb over the cleanliness of the buildings as well as over the seemly behaviour of the users and of the bath attendants.

Unfortunately at present there has been no sufficiently detailed study of the number and the use of the hamâmâms which are still functioning in the old quarters of Muslim towns; but in this respect modern records do not mention much what has been done for Damascus, where an archaeological inventory of the buildings of this type, begun in 1931, has very recently been completed by some new observations. The existence of these baths is in fact a proof of the continued vitality—at least among the common people—of habits which have long been traditional in Muslim society and many aspects of which need to be clarified by means of sociological and linguistic studies, in particular the local variations in arrangement and terminology.

The details thus collected could then usefully be compared with those supplied in addition by juridical or literary texts, for example the nomenclature of the various personnel connected with the running of the hamâmât which is found in a writer such as the 4th/10th century Hilâl al-Shâbî [Rūmān dâr al-ḥâlâbât, Bagdad 1964, 19]. In the latter case for instance, a brief research has shown that two members of the staff, the wâkâḥîd ("stoker") and the sâbbâl ("superintendent of the supply of dung-fuel for the furnace") are still called by these names in Damascus (at Fez they are called sâkkhâkîn and ghabbârî, while it appears that there is no longer in use today the term sâbbî al-sundâhî for the superintendent of the changing-room (called gelâsî in Fez and combined with the mawṣûlîm or "proprietor") nor that of kâyûmîn for the lessee of the bath. These posts of the staff, which are named after the technical terms gâmmî ("cupper"), "blood-letter"), also mentioned by Hilâl, seem to have lost their importance in favour of that of mukâyysi or kâyûyîs, the "maseur" (who wields the kîs or bag of tow used to massage the clients), who is probably connected with the hâkkîk ("beater") attested in Cordova in the 4th/10th century and with the dâlîkî, with the same meaning, mentioned for Istanbul by Ewliyâ Celebi.

Thus we have to deal with an extremely rich and changing vocabulary, which reflects the variations which must have existed between the usage peculiar to each region and each period and is often preserved in the abundant literature of proverbs, tales and popular legends which seems always to have surrounded the hamâmât, a favourite centre for local beliefs and superstitions and in particular the favourite haunt of the dîns [q.v.] (see for example the "Força de Karagueuz en dialecte arabe de Damas", published by E. Saussey, Une force de Karagueuz en dialecte arabe de Damas, in BEO, vii-viii (1937-8), 5-37).

It is, however, the architectural aspect of the Islamic bath which would be most worthy of study, so much were buildings of this type governed by the factors of siting (e.g., the necessity for an abundant supply of water) and by the practical exigencies imposed by the solution of difficult and often interesting problems. Not only do the hamâmâms which are identifiable and available for archaeological study today provide, because of the long periods they have occupied the same sites, excellent starting points for the exploration and the reconstruction of the stages in the development of the towns to which they belong; but in addition the older parts of them provide significant illustrations, in compositions which are often original both in plan and in form, of the methods of construction, the tastes in ornament and the technical abilities of their early builders.

For this reason it would be particularly useful to know the stages in the evolution of these buildings, which have not yet been traced with the necessary thoroughness—chiefly because of lack of sufficient numbers of preliminary monographs—but the broad lines of which at least we can already attempt to trace. These have to deal with the first appearances of the hamâmîn in the Umayyad period until the spread of these buildings into the furthest provinces, by the existence of a rigid procedure, which is apparent in the most varied interpretations and which was conditioned by the nature of the operations performed in Muslim baths.

The order in which these operations are performed has remained practically the same everywhere. The clients of the hamâmîn, who have removed their clothes and put on a simple loin-cloth composed of towels knotted together, gradually accustom themselves to an atmosphere which becomes increasingly hot and humid as they proceed towards the centre of the building, where their spell in the sweating-room produces an intense perspiration. They pass into the hands of specially-trained staff, male for men and female for women, who wash them clean with soapy lather, rub them vigorously, massage them, remove their body-hair and shave them. They next proceed either to wash in warm water or to immerse themselves in baths of warm or hot water. Finally a brief period of relaxation in a rest room is intended to restore bodies exhausted by this vigorous treatment.

To provide for this programme, the hamâmîn
consists basically of a certain number of rooms each with its especial function: first an undressing and rest room, generally known as maqālaš or māqālah in the East, māqālah in Egypt and Morocco, and mahrā in Tunisia, which communicates with latrines and may be linked to the central part of the bath by staggered corridors of varying length; then a transition room, without means of heating but whose atmosphere is nevertheless already warmed by its proximity to the heated section and which in winter is used for undressing; and which may be known as “outside” (bāt al-barzd) as in Fez, or “first room” (bāt awlūd) as in Cairo, or more precisely as “intermediate outside” (waṣṣāni barrāni) as in Damascus, or bīt al-barzd in Tunis (adjoining a bīt al-bodūl); next a first heated room, or warm room, which in Damascus is called “intermediate interior” (waṣṣāni ḏawwāni), in Fez “middle” (waṣṣā), and in Tunis usually bīt ez-šāghān; finally a second heated room, the hot room proper or steam bath (lāshīm; ṣarrāba or šīb in Tunis) which may be called simply bārāna as in Cairo, or more expressively “interior”, ḏawwāni at Damascus and ḍāḥlí at Fez. This steam room is generally provided with a certain number of alcoves (called in Damascus māsāyārās), where are found either benches of stone or brickwork (māšatās), used for the attentions given to the bathers by the staff, or pipes bringing supplies of hot or cold water (kānāfiyyas), or stone basins which serve as little swimming pools (māšgās), filled with hot or cold water.

Although in some cases light and air are obtained through vents with adjustable flaps, usually neither windows nor ventilation holes are provided for in the central section, where the efficient retention of heat and steam is ensured by means of thick walls, crowned by vaults or cupolas which are equally thick, with steam-proof linings of marble or of varnished plaster over paved floors, provided with runnels to carry off the water. Light penetrates only through thick pieces of glass, a sort of “bottle-ends” inlaid in the domes, where they often form simple decorative motifs. Furniture is provided only in the changing and rest room, which is the most luxurious, lavishly arranged, with wooden benches, covered with cushions, generally disposed around a pool with a fountain (in Tunis: ḳaṣṣaṣa). The clients’ entrance itself, the only opening through which this tightly closed building communicates with the world outside, is only rarely conceived as an architectural motif to embellish an important façade.

To the collection of rooms accessible to the public, or used by the owner of a private bath (for the two types of building, conceived according to the same model, have never differed from each other except in size or in the degree of richness in their decoration), are joined the indispensable annexes which house the heating system and its services, which are not linked by any passage to the hammām proper but which possess their own exit onto the street, used especially for deliveries of fuel. The furnace room, which in Damascus is called ḳhīṣāna or “reserve” of heat and steam (in Tunis: fōrnād), is separated from the hot room only by a thin partition, pierced with holes through which the steamy air passes: in it a continually stoked furnace maintains the temperature of the cauldrons (in Tunis naḥāsa) of boiling water. From these hot water is circulated in the interior of the bath, where it is complemented by the circulation of cold water, by the system of ventilation from the stove and by the circuit evaporating the waste water, all of which are usually led through earthenware pipes embedded in the walls or beneath the floor. Finally, the supply of water from outside is assured either by pipes, drawing it off from the town system of water supply when one exists, or by the use of an elevating machine, usually worked by a draught animal.

Based on this classical and complete arrangement, there emerged later developments, some successful and some not, which may take the form either of a slightly different arrangement (e.g., the situation of the boiler in the centre of the steam room instead of in an adjacent room separated from it by a partition), or particularly by simplifications involving most often the omission of one or several of the rooms whose purpose was to permit a gradual increase in the temperature. These various modifications correspond to local habits or temporary customs which, in the present state of the documentation, it is still difficult to ascertain precisely.

Among the types of baths in which most information is available, however, are the Umayyad hammāms, succeeded to the latter by the baths of antiquity from which they presumably derive—which explains their sudden appearance in the 2nd/8th century in an already developed form—but not without undergoing transformations profound enough to banish any idea of a mere slavish imitation of their models. We have only to compare the most important remains of baths from this period with earlier buildings to realize, in spite of the striking similarities in the methods of construction (the use of hypocausts and of heating pipes in the walls for example), the originality of the layout, in which we no longer find for example the traditional succession of the apodyterium, the frigidarium, the tepidarium and the calidarium nor their relative proportions.

In fact only the first of these terms can continue to be applied to the changing and rest room of the Umayyad hammām, which more or less retained the functions and appearance of the ancient apodyterium, even to the extent of including in its decoration statues and frescoes with figures imitated from Hellenistic works. But the adjacent unheated room has no longer any feature in common with the frigidarium (even though the frequently used name of “cold room” has led to a certain amount of confusion in this matter), of which it has retained neither the vast dimensions nor, more especially, the appointments (kānāfiyyas), with which was probably made this room the chief element in the antique baths and the centre of the social and sporting activities which took place there. Finally, the two heated rooms also differ from the ancient tepidarium and calidarium or sudatorium in that they have come to fill, in relation to the other sections of the hammām, a place whose importance indicates a change from the customs practised in late antiquity.

This fact was first pointed out by D. Schlumberger, when he published the results of his preliminary investigations of a small private hammām of the Umayyad period, that of the castle of Kašar al-Ḥayr al-Gharbi [q.v.] near Palmyra. But the same adaptation of the antique plan to new requirements by the suppression of the frigidarium and parts of the architectural features henceforward of no use, is seen in the ruins of many other Umayyad sites, the transformation of which was first defined in the researches of J. Sauvaget. In fact not only is it illustrated by the famous baths of Kašar ‘Amrī [q.v.] and of Hammām al-Ṣarākh [q.v.] (the former of which owes its fame to its rich décor of paintings and both of which possess examples of an interesting elaboration of the rest room, adapted in this case to the function of
Fig. 1. Plan of a typical Umayyad hammām: the hammām of 'Abda, where A and B are the undressing rooms, C is the unheated room, D the hot room, E the steam room, F the boiler, and G the service court (cf. J. Sauvaget, Remarques, fig. 7)

reception room for official personages), but it also explains the less well-known buildings, of sometimes doubtful date, the remains of which are still visible in the Syro-Jordanian steppe (at Djabal Says, Khirbat al-Bayda, 'Abda, Ruḥayba and al-Ḥuṣub), and in which there regularly appear, besides the series of three small rooms—unheated, warm and hot—a room reserved for rest or for undressing and another, formerly containing the boiler, which was flanked on

one side by the steam room and on the other by the essential service court (fig. 1).

The only exception to this uniform type is the magnificent hammām of Khirbat al-Mafjar [q.v.], recently discovered in an Umayyad residence in the Jordan valley, which deserves in this connexion a special mention. Its two small interior rooms supplied with steam by an orifice made in the wall of the adjacent furnace room, and the two intermediate rooms of the same dimensions which preceded them, were in fact accompanied by a huge square hall, more than 30 metres long, with interior pillars and a roof of cupolas to which were annexed elaborate latrines and a small room with an exedra decorated with especial care. This vast apodyterium, access to which was through a huge porch, surmounted by a princely statue, which itself served as ante-room to the room with exedra where probably the owner of the bath sat, had been provided with a remarkable ornamentation—a mosaic pavement and painted and sculpted stucco in all its upper section. The presence of a large swimming-pool occupying the whole of the length of the south wall of the room reveals in addition a deliberate adaptation of the frigidarium of antiquity. This arrangement is quite exceptional in an Islamic hammām, and has already been proved to be compatible with the luxurious tastes of the founder of the castle; it must be seen in this setting of costly fantasy in order to understand why (apparently) no later building was inspired by it.

The arrangement of the later mediaeval baths, so far as can be judged from the scattered examples which exist, merely reproduces, with further simplification, that of the classical Umayyad prototypes: four rooms, consisting of an undressing room, two intermediate rooms and a steam room adjacent to the section containing the heating apparatus. This

Fig. 2. Ayyūbid type: restoration of the original plan of the Sūk al-Bzūriya bath at Damascus, where A indicates the unheated rooms, B the hot room and its annexes, and C the steam room (cf. M. Ecochard, Monuments ayyoubides, fasc. ii, fig. 57)
Fig. 3. Typical plan of a Marinid bath at Rabat (cf. H. Terrasse, in *Mélanges William Marçais*, fig. 3)
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Fig. 4. Monumental Ottoman type: the Haseki (Khâşêki) ħammâm at Istanbul (cf. B. Ünsal, *Turkish Islamic architecture*, fig. 34)
is the plan to which in particular the Damascus baths of the Ayyubid period conform. These have been the object of especially detailed archaeological studies and can therefore be profitably cited here, although unfortunately there exist no architectural data on the hiatus of four centuries which separates them from the Umayyad buildings or on the Iranian baths of the Saljūq or earlier periods which might perhaps foreshadow some of their features (the brief notes by E. Schroeder, in A. U. Pope, A survey of Persian art, Oxford 1939, 998, concerning the existence of an early hamam at the south of Kirmān are in this respect quite inadequate).

At Damascus, in the 6th/12th century, we first notice the abandoning of the system of hypocausts in favour of a more simple solution, which consists of passing the chimney of the stove beneath the paved floors that are to be heated: hence the rooms of the central part of the hamam are laid out according to the axis of this flue pipe. Next the effect of Mesopotamian influences on the architectural methods is felt in the lavish use of couches and ribbed cupolas. Finally there should be mentioned the clear predominance, in the arrangement of the whole, of the middle or warm room, which may have an elaborate octagonal form and which then forms the centre of the plan of the building (fig. 2).

The modifications which the following periods brought to this scheme involved firstly the displacement of the hot room which increased in decoration and in size, thanks to the multiplication of the masjūras which surrounded it, until, in the 12th/18th century, it predominated over all the other rooms and, in still more recent buildings, became the only room. Before a more than local importance is attributed to this arrangement, a similar evolution (which would have to be linked with a previous change in the habits of the users of the baths) would have to be established in other Syrian towns, in particular in Aleppo. It would also be useful to know whether it appeared in a neighbouring province such as Egypt, particularly in Cairo, where some early hamma.ms with a radiating plan, the majority of which go back to the Manūlī period, have not yet been the subject of sufficiently detailed archaeological research.

In Spain and the Maghrib on the other hand, the buildings appear to belong to a different tradition, which is of Andalusian as well as Umayyad origin. Some very early specimens, including baths of the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries at Granada and Tiemcen, thus show a very great simplicity in conception and execution, with no attempt at architectural decoration anywhere except in the changing rooms. Next, in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, there appears a certain elaboration of the buildings due to the adoption, within axial and rectangular plans, of the types of cold, warm and hot rooms (with the warm room predominating) which were found in the Ayyubid hamma.ms in the East. But the possible connexions between the well-known Manūrid baths (fig. 3) and their Eastern models at varying distances from them have not yet been studied nor even mentioned with the attention which the hypothesis deserves.

The baths built after the Saljūq conquest in Iran, and the baths of Turkey, form a particularly important chapter in the history of the hamma.m, especially noticeable in the remarkable proliferation of buildings of this type in Anatolia and Istanbul. More solidly built than the Šafawid baths, on which in any case studies and surveys are lacking (one rare example is a bath of Rāghān, the plan of which has been published by P. Coste, Monuments modernes de la Perse, Paris 1867, pl. 45), the Turkish hamma.ms have often been cited as works of the utmost technical perfection, conforming to the habitual Muslim arrangement while also inheriting the experience which the Byzantine builders had acquired earlier in this field. The Ottoman period above all saw the erection of many harmoniously arranged buildings, in which the principle of a multiplicity of rooms was abandoned in order to put the emphasis on the changing room and the steam room, which were most frequently built as majestic domed halls. These baths often consisted of two symmetrical groups of buildings which had no communication with each other—since one was reserved for men and one for women— but which were supplied by the same service annexes, on the model of various works of Sinān [q.v.] and of the Kilâşıkê hamam in Istanbul (fig. 4). Bibliography. The references to the Arabic sources have been given in the text; see also al-Hamadhānī, who gives, in ma‰̄ma hul-waniyya, a humoristic description of the behaviour of the attendants of a hamma.m. On the role of baths in Muslim society, particularly in some large towns, see A. Mez, Renaissance, ch. xxi; H. Pérez, La poésie andalouse en arabe classique, Paris 1957, 333, 338-41; E. Leví-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., iii, 430-1; R. Le Tourneau, Les amphores de l' epoque protectorat, Casablanca 1949, 247-9; E. Pauty, Les hammams du Caire, Cairo 1961 (MIFA0, vol. lxiv); R. Mantran, Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle, Paris 1962, 503-5. On the layout and functioning of the bath from Damascus examples, with extremely detailed technical and architectural descriptions, the basic work is M. Ezzochar and Ch. Le Cour, Les bains de Damas, 2 vols., Beirut (PIFD) 1942-5; see also the review by J. Sauvaget, in JA, ccxxiv (1943-5), 372-37, and J. de Maussion de Favières, Note sur les bains de Damas, in B. Ét. Or., xvii (1961-2), 121-31 and 12 pl. For the purely archaeological point of view see K.A.C. Creswell, Early Muslim architecture, Oxford 1935, 235-6 (Kusayr 'Amrah and hamma.m of al-Sarakh); D. Schlumberger, Les fouilles des carrières de l' église St-Elie-et-Sharabi, Paris 1936-7, 47-47 (Ronda), xi (1946), 443-6, xvii (1952), 176-86 (Torres Torres and other places in the Levant), 433-8 (Murcia); K. Klinkhardt, Türkische Bäder, Stuttgart 1927; B. Ünsal, Turkish Islamic architecture, London 1959, 74-6. See further Ildina, KAPoLIA.

(J. Sourdel-Thomine)

In the Maghrib the hamma.m, as well as being a place intended for the major purification of the
Believer and for his bodily hygiene, is a meeting place and a centre of social life. With its entrance near the mosque, of which its acts almost as the antechamber, and sometimes situated in the middle of a saks, it assumes in the Maghribi city the character of a social centre. The hammam is often several centuries old and proudly displays its letters of pedigree; and its double entrance door, painted in green and red, is sometimes surmounted by a marble plaque with an inscription testifying to its early foundation.

Although it is true that the forty or so Turkish baths in Tunis differ in size and in the comforts they offer to their patrons, there is scarcely any variation in the general layout of the building and the way in which it works.

The area reserved for the users consists of two quite distinct parts: the section for dressing and resting and the bath proper, which includes warm and hot rooms, usually three in all, one leading into the next (see above).

The proprietor of the hammam (hammadji) and the attendants formerly came from among the Mzabins from southern Algeria who had settled in Tunis. They formed a guild. In addition to the manager, the personnel consists of: one in charge of the dressing room (harez el-mahras) helped by staff stationed in the rest room (harez el-maksura); one in charge of the linen (harez el-bazaz) assisted by a number of servants and an assistant; and the maid, in charge of the cloths and several masseurs (fayyad) whose services are available on request; one in charge of the heating (franki) with one or two assistants. The name of "master of the bath" (ra’is al-hammam) which is often given to him is a clear indication of the importance of his duties. Formerly the master of the furnace and his assistants were always natives of Ouargla (southern Algeria) and they too belonged to a special guild. They were employed without a contract, receiving each year from the owner a lump sum. The hairdresser and coffee waiter available for the clients do not form part of the staff but are tenants of the hammam. The staff of the women’s baths are all women: the manageress and her deputy are assisted by a number of female attendants (harez). There are no professional masseuses.

The young boy is given himself to the manager, who acts as cashier. When he enters the dressing room he is in charge of the harez el-mahras or the superintendent of the maksura, who gives him a loin-cloth (futa), a bath towel (bozghir) and a pair of pattens (ba’b), He is given also a second towel in which to wrap his clothes. He then goes into the "cold room", he gives his long bath-robe to the harez el-badawl; in charge of the linen, and, wearing only a loin-cloth, is led into the second room (bi’t al-skan). As soon as he has become sufficiently accustomed to the heat, he proceeds to the third room where he waits until he starts to sweat. After sweating abundantly he leaves the arad and returns to the second room for friction with a special glove (hassa), the scouring of his skin and, if he wishes, massage (tansid). The friction-glove is made of a mixture of woolen and goat's hair threads. The friction-glove and the small round "curry-comb" (makhkka, bakaka) made of threads of coarse wool or of hemp tow mounted on a cork disc. The clay (fah) had been bought long before in the saks and perfumed with rose-water, essence of rose geranium or orange-flower water.

Although most town houses contain all that is necessary for a woman's toilet, the Tunisian woman still patronizes the hammam. Nowadays many modern beauty-products replace the traditional lotions taken with the clean linen in the suitcase to the bath; but some of the procedures are repeated from one generation to another: after washing the body and the friction comes the application of fial to the hair, the removal of bodily hair, etc. The session at the bath might be prolonged if the master of the heating did not produce a violent jet of steam, the kaftis, to remind the bathers that it is time to wrap themselves in the towels held out for them by the attendants and to go and rest in the maksura.

These women’s sessions provide the occasion, both in towns and villages, for the young bride to parade herself before her friends in the various items of her trousseau. The proceedings are enlivened with songs, "youyou" and lengthy gossip. Women also take advantage of meetings at the hammam in order to make themselves up and wear all their finery.

In addition to its use for ritual purification [see wudu?] the hammam is considered, in the popular phrase, as a "silent doctor" (at-bibol-bakkah), able by its warm atmosphere, as well as by the abundant perspiration which it produces, to cure all ailments and particularly the various forms of rheumatism.

All the great occasions in life are accompanied by a bath in the hammam. The expectant mother comes there in order to ensure an easier delivery; forty days after the birth, she comes again for purification. The young boy is taken there before his circumcision. The young bride visits it three times during the period of the marriage festivities: hammam ni-asakh, the bath for cleanliness, seven days before the wedding; hammam ni-dhagab, the bath for the application of
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Henna on the third day of the celebrations; and hammâm el-'ajdid, the rinsing bath, on the eve of the consummation of the marriage. The future husband and wife are taken in procession to the bath at the beginning of the marriage celebrations, returns after the application of henna, and is there again a few hours before entering the conjugal home and on the day following the wedding night.
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HAMMAM AL-SARAKH — HAMPÍ

room at Khirbat al-Mafjar, attributed to al-Walid b. Yazid. Hammam al-Sarakh may then be dated some years or decades earlier; perhaps to the Caliphate of al-Walid b. Abd al-Malik, if Kuşayr Qamran and another closely similar bath at Djarābīd Sayyid (Syria, xx, 246-56) have been rightly so attributed. Bibliography: H. C. Butler, Ancient architecture in Syria: Section A: S. Syria, 77-80; and appendix, xix-xxv; K. A. C. Creswell, Early Muslim architecture, i, 273-84.

(R. W. Hamilton)

HAMMÛDIDS, dynasty which reigned over various towns in Muslim Spain from 407/1016 till 450/1058. Of al-Walid b. Abd al-Malik, the second pretender to the caliphal throne in Shawal 403/1058 on his second succession to the caliphal throne in Shawal 403/1058 on his second succession to the caliphal throne, nothing is known. The ambitious 'Ali b. Hammûd the governor of Cæuta and to his brother-al-Kasîm that of Algeciras, Tangier, and Arzila. The two were genuine Idrīsids [q.v.], their great-grandfather Hammûd being the great-grandson of Idrîs II. 'Ali, who considered himself to be the heir of Hishâm II [q.v.], proclaimed his independence, and on the pretext of liberating Hîghâm (whom he thought to be still alive), decided to make himself master of Cordova. Sulaymân al-Mustâ'în put up almost no resistance and was defeated and made prisoner in Muharram 407/July 1016. The ambitious 'Ali ordered the corpse of Hîghâm II to be disinterred, and on it being proved that he had been murdered, took it upon himself personally to execute Sulaymân as a regicide and had himself recognized as caliph with due form and ceremony. Thus he became the first non-Marvā'nîd to occupy the Cordovan throne since the restoration of the Umayyads on Spanish soil. During the first eight months of his rule he won the approval of his subjects by applying the law strictly to the Berbers, who had become accustomed to immunity. But soon, seeing that Cordovans were beginning to mutter against him as a foreign usurper and to show their sympathy for the Umayyad pretender al-Murtadâ, he forgot his moderation, allowed the Zanata to enjoy their privileges and immunities, and subjected the capital to a reign of terror until he was murdered by three Slav palace slaves. His Zanata partisans called upon his brother-al-Kasîm, who was in Seville as governor, and proclaimed him caliph. The only pretender to dispute the throne was 'Ali b. Hammûd, who was a great-grandson of 'Abd al-Rahmân III, who was proclaimed caliph on 10 Dhu '1-Hijja 408/29 April 1018 by the Slav Pâshâ Khîyârân, lord of Almería, and the Arab Mundhir of Saragossa, but on attacking Granada before making for Cordova he was vanquished and killed. The Cordovans could now enjoy an unexpected tranquillity for three years, thanks to the moderation of al-Kasîm who, surrounded by a bodyguard of Negro mercenaries, won over the Slav chiefs who had upheld al-Murtadâ. This liberal régime could not last. The Berbers of the capital, feeling themselves disregarded, invited Yahyâ, the eldest son of 'Ali b. Hammûd, to cross from Morocco to Mâlaga and march against Cordova. His aged uncle al-Kasîm gave up the struggle and took refuge in Seville. Yahyâ was proclaimed caliph in the Alcázar of Cordova on 22 Rabî’ I 412/14 August 1021. He could maintain himself on the throne for only a year and a half, for his insufferable arrogance alienated the sympathies of the very Berbers who had enthroned him, and he fled to Mâlaga. His uncle al-Kasîm returned from Seville to install himself once more in the capital, but after six months, on 21 Djumâdâ I 414/10 September 1023, the Cordovans, weary of the insolence of the Africans, rebelled and forced him to flee. The Sevillans declined to receive him and when he went to take refuge at Jerez his nephew Yahyâ went from Mâlaga to besiege him. He gave himself up and was imprisoned with his two sons, to be murdered after a few years in prison. Yahyâ reigned at Mâlaga until 427/1035. He had successors at Mâlaga until 449/1057, in which year Bâdsî (see Zirids of Spain), the Berber prince of Granada, entered it and dethroned the last Hammûdîd, Muhammad II al-Mustâ'îf. At Algeciras al-Kasîm’s son Muhammad al-Mahdzî reigned from 440/1048 and his son al-Kasîm al-Wâshîk from 440/1048 to 450/1058. In this latter year Mâlaga was occupied by the Abbâdîds of Seville.


Hâmôn, Moses, chief Jewish physician to Sûleymân I. His father, Joseph Hâmôn, a native of Granada, served as physician at the court of Bâyezîd II and Selîm I. Probably born ca. 1490, Moses Hâmôn became a leading court physician and influential courtier under Sûleymân I. He seems to have allied himself with the powerful court faction headed by Khûrrem Sultân [q.v.], the Sultan’s favourite consort, her daughter Mîhr-î Mâh [q.v.], and the latter’s husband, the Grand Vizier Rûstem Pâshâ [q.v.], who, inter alia, conspired against the heir presumptive, Prince Mustâfâ [q.v.], executed in 1553. Shortly before Hâmôn’s death in 1554, he was dismissed as a result of the intrigues of envious colleagues or the temporary disgrace of Rûstem Pâshâ.

Hâmôn possessed a valuable collection of manuscripts, among them the famous Dioscorides codex of the 6th century A.D., now in Vienna. He wrote an early Turkish treatise on dentistry and was instrumental in the printing of several Hebrew works and of a well-known Persian translation of the Pentateuch. He also played an important part in Jewish communal affairs.

Bibliography: H. Gross, in REJ, liv (1908), 1-29 and lvii (1909), 55-78; U. Heyd, in Oriens, xvi (1963), 152-70 (and the sources cited there). (U. Heyd)

HAMPÍ, the name now commonly given to the ruins of the capital city of the Vidjayanagara [q.v.] empire, on the right bank of the Tungabhadra river 60 km. north-west of Bellary. The name seems to be derived from the prominent temple to Pampâpâti (Kannada h < Old Kann. p) in the bâsrâ area.

The Vidjayanagara empire is of importance for the Muslim world not only as an active Hindû power which defied its Muslim neighbours for over two centuries, but also for the evidence it offers of the progressive synthesis of certain aspects of Hindû and Muslim cultures from the 8th/14th to the 10th/16th centuries; this article is concerned with that
synthesis as expressed in its buildings.

Most of the buildings of Vidjayanagara are characteristically Hindu works in the late Hoysala style; but in some, a distinct Muslim influence is apparent, especially when the building concerned is (presumably) one built for the Muslim community or by a section of it. It is known that the ruler Devaráyá I (1406-22 A.D.) had many Muslim mercenaries in his service: the first of his line to appreciate the advantages of cavalry, he had imported many horses from Arabia and Persia and enlisted trained troopers to ride them; and reference is made also to the 'Turkish' bowmen he attracted by liberal grants of cash and land. The northern gate is of the typical Hindu beam-and-bracket construction, but the remains of the turret and part of the energetic, pointed arches, one square and one octagonal, have arched openings on all their faces and are thus strikingly unlike any other Hindu work in the sub-continent, although the synthesis of the Hindu and Muslim styles appears here in that the roofs are of the stepped pattern which characterizes the temple roof (śikhara). Within the enclosure stands the finest and most complete of the mixed-style buildings, known as the Lotus Pavilion; this is an open pavilion on the ground floor, with massive piers and foliated arches showing a triple recession of planes of the intrados which recalls the style of the Lodí mosques of Dihlí [q.v.]. The upper storey is provided with numerous small arched windows in each face, originally equipped with wooden shutters, and is separated from the ground storey by a deep eaves roof on corbelled brackets very similar in effect to the deep eaves of the Bid gpur buildings. The roof, however, is of the Hindu pyramidical variety; this appears to be a late building (ca. 972/1565).  

Outside the sanāna enclosure is a long oblong building with eleven tall arched openings alternating with walls of blind arches, generally known as the 'elephant stables', but which Havell takes to be the palace called a 'guard-room' by Longhurst and 'Ram Rāḍi's treasury' by Havell; it has also been known as the 'concert hall'. This shows the best use of the structural arch in the Hampi buildings; foliated arches with radiating brick voussoirs supported on slender columns; the roof is incomplete. Its purpose cannot now be known, but it obviously reflects work by Muslim craftsmen.

Other buildings of Muslim style at Hampi include some of the constructions associated with the elaborate irrigation system, the relation of which with the irrigation systems of the Muslim cities of Bídār and Bigidāpur has not yet been ascertained. These include two tombs—the southern gateway, one of the main entrances to the city, shows a tall domed structure supported on four open arched sides, similar to the late Bahnānī and Bārīd Shāhī tombs at Bídār [q.v.]. Within the citadel is a large high-walled enclosure generally referred to as the sanāna; the accounts of travellers to the Vidjayanagara court suggest that the kings did indeed keep their women in seclusion—a practice which was known in early Hinduism but seems to have been most freely adopted by Hindūs as a direct imitation of Muslim practice—but that they were allowed to watch spectacles taking place in the city. The so-called 'watch towers' on the walls of the enclosure appear to have been built for the pleasure of the ladies of the sanāna, a purpose similar to that seen in the Mughal palaces [see būrg, iii, ad fin.]; these towers, one square and one octagonal, have arched openings on all their faces and are thus strikingly unlike any other Hindū work in the sub-continent, although the synthesis of the Hindū and Muslim styles appears here in that the roofs are of the stepped pattern which characterizes the temple roof (śikhara). Within the enclosure stands the finest and most complete of the mixed-style buildings, known as the Lotus Pavilion; this is an open pavilion on the ground floor, with massive piers and foliated arches showing a triple recession of planes of the intrados which recalls the style of the Lodī mosques of Dihlī [q.v.]. The upper storey is provided with numerous small arched windows in each face, originally equipped with wooden shutters, and is separated from the ground storey by a deep eaves roof on corbelled brackets very similar in effect to the deep eaves of the Bigidāpur buildings. The roof, however, is of the Hindu pyramidical variety; this appears to be a late building (ca. 972/1565).  

Outside the sanāna enclosure is a long oblong building with eleven tall arched openings alternating with walls of blind arches, generally known as the 'elephant stables', but which Havell takes to be the palace built by Devarāyá II (1422-46 A.D.) for his Muslim troops. The arched chambers are domed, and the central chamber is surmounted by a square turret, probably originally crowned by a stepped tower of the Hindū pattern, approached by steps from within and therefore providing access to a high place to cry the adghām. A local tradition asserts that this building was later used as a stable for the state elephants, but there seems to be no trace of the occupancy of these animals; further work on the site, including excavation, will be necessary if the thesis that it was the mosque can be supported. A structure in the army commander's enclosure has been identified by Longhurst as Devarāyá's mosque; but this building faces due north (the kibla here being slightly north of west) and the identification may be rejected.

Near the 'elephant stables' is an oblong arced building called a 'guard-room' by Longhurst and 'Rām Rāḍi's treasury' by Havell; it has also been known as the 'concert hall'. This shows the best use of the structural arch in the Hampi buildings; foliated arches with radiating brick voussoirs supported on slender columns; the roof is incomplete. Its purpose cannot now be known, but it obviously reflects work by Muslim craftsmen.

Other buildings of Muslim style at Hampi include some of the constructions associated with the elaborate irrigation system, the relation of which with the irrigation systems of the Muslim cities of Bídār and Bigidāpur has not yet been ascertained. These include two tombs—the southern gateway, one of the main entrances to the city, shows a tall domed structure supported on four open arched sides, similar to the late Bahnānī and Bārīd Shāhī tombs at Bídār [q.v.]. Within the citadel is a large high-walled enclosure generally referred to as the sanāna; the accounts of travellers to the Vidjayanagara court suggest that the kings did indeed keep their women in seclusion—a practice which was known in early Hinduism but seems to have been most freely adopted by Hindūs as a direct imitation of Muslim practice—but that they were allowed to watch spectacles taking place in the city. The so-called 'watch towers' on the walls of the enclosure appear to have been built for the pleasure of the ladies of the sanāna, a purpose similar to that seen in the Mughal palaces [see būrg, iii, ad fin.]; these towers, one square and one octagonal, have arched openings on all their faces and are thus strikingly unlike any other Hindū work in the sub-continent, although the synthesis of the Hindū and Muslim styles appears here in that the roofs are of the stepped pattern which characterizes the temple roof (śikhara). Within the enclosure stands the finest and most complete of the mixed-style buildings, known as the Lotus Pavilion; this is an open pavilion on the ground floor, with massive piers and foliated arches showing a triple recession of planes of the intrados which recalls the style of the Lodī mosques of Dihlī [q.v.]. The upper storey is provided with numerous small arched windows in each face, originally equipped with wooden shutters, and is separated from the ground storey by a deep eaves roof on corbelled brackets very similar in effect to the deep eaves of the Bigidāpur buildings. The roof, however, is of the Hindu pyramidical variety; this appears to be a late building (ca. 972/1565).  

Outside the sanāna enclosure is a long oblong building with eleven tall arched openings alternating with walls of blind arches, generally known as the 'elephant stables', but which Havell takes to be the palace built by Devarāyá II (1422-46 A.D.) for his Muslim troops. The arched chambers are domed, and the central chamber is surmounted by a square turret, probably originally crowned by a stepped tower of the Hindū pattern, approached by steps from within and therefore providing access to a high place to cry the adghām. A local tradition asserts that this building was later used as a stable for the state elephants, but there seems to be no trace of the

(2) Several villages in southern Morocco, see V. P. Lancere, Repert. alph. des considérations de tribus . . . et des agglomérations de la zone francophone de l’Empire chérifien, Casablanca 1939, 380, 432.

(3) Al-Baṣra (q.v.): the identification is given by al-Bakrid, K. al-Masālik wa’l-mamālik, ii, 110, Tr. fr. M. G. de Sane, Algiers 1912-13, 216.

4) Dar al-Hamara: Marmol, L’Afrique, Fr. tr. Perrot d’Albancourt, Paris 1667, ii, book IV, 200, gives this name to an ancient Roman town situated to the North of the mouth of the Wādī Luκkus, and adds in the table of contents “on the mountain of the Zarhoun” . . . but this mistake has not been made on the map of the “Kingdom of Fez” (between pp. 136 and 137). Marmol identifies this locality, without either proof or reason, with “l’Epticienne de Ptolémée”. Dar al-Hamara has not yet been discovered.

5) Fās: al-Khūrī, in his Aḥrab al-maṣārif, Beirut 1889, records under the word al-hamra6, though without any evidence, “the name of the new town of Fās”. We know of a mosque at Fās with this name, the significance of which remains enigmatic.

(Sidīlmās did not bear the name al-khūrī, but rather al-ṣame‘ā7; see D. J. and J. Menfm, Abbar, cité royale du Tafilalet, in Hesp., i/2 (2nd trim., 1959.) Bibliography: in the article.

(G. Deverdun) AL-HAMRA5, the Alhambra of Granada [see ḠARNAṬA4].

HAMRIN, Djabal, modern name of an isolated western chain of the mountains of the Iranian border, about 500 miles long. Its northern extremity crops up in the Djazira, south of the Djabal Sindjar and the Tigris flows through it at al-ṇāṭa. At Shahrahān it is crossed by the great road from Baghdad to Hamadān and Tehran, at Ahvaz it separates the plains of the ancient Elam, the modern Khūzestān, from those of the ʿAṬṭār, and is finally united with the Iranian plateau in the province of Fārs. This range has had its name repeatedly changed. Its Assyrian appellation is not certain. The Syrians called it Dūkik or ʿArūkh, which appears in Polybius, v, 52 with reference to the campaign of Antiochus III against Molon, as τὸ ᾄροφον ὄρος. Bārmām is the oldest Arabic name, which may be traced to the Syriac Beth Rmnān, i.e., temple of Rimmon, probably an Assyrian sanctuary. The mountains took this name from a village on the eastern bank of the Tigris, where the river flows through the mountains. It lay on the Baghdād-Mawsil road, was inhabited by Jacobites and for a time formed a bishopric with Beth Wāzlī. Ḫudāmā and Yāḵūt give the Syrian name Sāṭiddāmā to the western part of the range in the Djabal; the word means blood-drinker and appears elsewhere as the name of frontier rivers. Later in Ibn Ḥawkal, this western part is called Djabal Shāhū, traces of which name remain in that of the modern village of al-Shāhk. Ḫuṣaqīr and Yāḵūt, following Abū Zayd al-Balkhī, say that there were springs of pitch in the midst of the waters, as indeed is still the case at the place where the Tigris breaks through the Bārmām, and that the centre extended from the centre of Djabal in the west, to the borders of Kermān in the east, where it becomes the hills of Masābdān (Pushi-t-i kūb). The remarkable length of this homogeneous range has given rise to fanciful notions, so that Yāḵūt, for example, speaks of al-djabal al-muṣammad bi ‘l-ard, as comparable with the ocean surrounding the earth. The modern name of Hamrīn appears first in Yāḵūt (iii, 7) under the form Ḫurmīn. It is found also as early as 78/1347 in the great wakīyya inscription of the Madrasa al-Mirdżāniyya (cf. L. Massinon, Mission en Mésopotamie, Inst. Français d’Arch. Or., Cairo 1912, 16, 28). The part west of the Tigris is now called Djabal Mukhīl. A parallel range is called Djabal Mukanṭūr, i.e., colourless, probably a name of the village on the Tigris (Assemeni, Bibl. Orient., ii, 218, and Marāṣid). Such names derived from colours are nowadays fast driving out the ancient names from Arabic nomenclature; even Ḫurmīn is a modern name, the “reddish”, from ʿaḥmar, in spite of the old Syriac ending in -in. A place close to the Tigris bears the ancient, expressive name of Kānūk, which means the “stranded” or “confined”.

In the unpublished Turkish work Dāmmu‘ al-anwār fi manābiḥ al-abbāyir of Saḥf al-Dīn Ṣādu ʿAl-Durūfand al-Nakhsbandi al-Bandānidī of 1677/1666 a tomb of Mājdīj al-Kurdu (d. 677/1277-8) is mentioned as a well-known place of pilgrimage on the Ḫamrīn; it has not yet been identified (see Massinon, op. cit., 60).


HAMULA, name given in some parts of the Arab Middle East to a group of people who claim descent from a common ancestor, usually five to seven generations removed from the living. The word is derived from the Arabic term hamula, to carry, and literally means a “female carrier”. Some writers believe that the reference is to a beast of work and that the word was originally used in this sense to describe the landless, patronymic groups who worked as tenants for landowners. A more plausible explanation is that the reference is to a woman in her capacity of bearing children. E. Peters [see Bibl.] suggests that such reference symbolizes descent from ‘one womb’ and signifies full brother unity and hence a high degree of group cohesion.

The hamula is usually a territorial group whose members cooperate economically and politically. In Arab villages in Palestine during the Ottoman régime each hamula occupied a special quarter (ḥāra) and its members held adjacent plots of common land (mushfa). The members cooperated in agricultural work, exchanged gifts on special occasions and helped each other economically when in need. Politically, the hamula formed a “blood group” whose members paid or received blood compensation (diya) collectively in cases of homicide. Its members were described as ‘those who stand together in one line’ (yāṣaffa ma‘a ba‘dī). They literally ‘stood’ in this way on two major occasions: in a peace-making ceremony (sulha [q.v.]) and in the graveyard when
burying one of their number.

The men of a hamula were also linked together through the sharing of a number of rights and obligations. In the event of dispute, the members of a hamula were bound to protect the honour of hamula women. Through the practice of preferential in-hamula marriage they were further linked together by matrilateral and affinal ties. Children born of such marriage had the same status as both paternal and maternal uncles and cousins (mu'allama, mu'ahwasawalin) and in cases of disputes were not likely to harbour conflicts of loyalties.

In subsequent decades law and order came progressively under the control of the centralized government, and common land was increasingly converted to private property. As a result the hamula lost some of its economic and political functions. Also, stratification cut across hamula boundaries and the principle of in-hamula marriage came into conflict with the principle of equality of status between spouses in marriage (see Kafa'a), and this brought further disruption to the hamula.

However, largely through the enduring ties resulting from in-hamula marriage, from co-residence and from continued cooperation in a number of ways, the hamula has shown a remarkable degree of persistence in the face of drastic social change. Under some circumstances it has assumed new functions in new political and economic situations.


HAMLUN, name for a salt plain in eastern Iran, Afganistán and Balóčistán, usually the drainage area of a river. The etymology of the word, found in Pahlavi as a horm, is disputed, but it is used especially for the lake in Sistán into which the Hilmán River drops. This lake or swamp changes its size and even location according to the season. The usual name for the lake, until recent times, was Zarah or Zirí (compare Avestan srayah "lake"), but this name is now used for the depression in Afganistán south of Sistán into which the Hilmán flows when the water is excessive (Gawd-i Zarah). One may find much information about the lake of Sistán under the name Zarah in the Arabic and Persian geographers.

Bibliography: Le Strange, 338; Tā'īr, ed. M. Bahár, Tehran 1936, passim; Ḥudúd al-‘adám, 185; G. P. Tate, Seistan, Calcutta 1910-12, 2 vols. (R. N. FRYE)

HAMZA, archaographical sign alif, which is the first letter of the Arabic alphabet, with numerical value one; transcribed ' internally and at the end of words, ignored initially (except in special cases) in the system of tie-points. Definition: unvoiced glottal occlusive. For the Arab grammarians, hamza is a harf sabíh defined as: madj'hara, having as hamzad: aksa l-ḥalk “the farthest part of the throat” (like h) (al-Zamakhsharī, Mu'āṣarat, § 732). For the phonological oppositions of the phoneme hamza, see J. Cantineau, Esquisse, 178; for the incompatibilities, ibid., 201. Hamza madj'hara. Hamza, a priors, should be unvoiced. As a consequence, when he placed it, “with every reserve” it is true, as a voiced sound opposite the unvoiced h (Consonantisme, 280). The symmetry of the system benefited by this, but there is very little probability that hamza was voiced in Arabic. There was simply a mistake on the part of the Arab grammarians, who were unable to distinguish sufficiently the vowel articulated with the hamza and the unvoiced consonantal element which is aksa and which is a part of the common Semitic consonantal system. It was therefore an archaizing edition, makes good the alifs lacking in the text with a superscript upright alif (see ibid., 152-3). Even in current Arabic writing, alifis lacking in the dactyls of some words, for example, in līlah “but” and some demonstrative pronouns (J. Cantineau, Consonantisme, 288). It was therefore part of the common Semitic consonantal system. In Arabic, one modification of hamza which appears
to be unconditioned is the development of initial hamza into kān: the *an*ana of the Tamīm and the Kays (see Musharī', i, 221 end: C. Rubin, Anc. West-Asia, § 2 o, § 3, § 4). They said, for example, ʿudhūn for ʿudhūn "ear". More important modifications affected hamza in the Hijāz where it became very weak.

The Arab grammarians (Sibawayhi, ii, Ch. 417; al-Zāmakahsharī, Mufassal, 658-62) designated all the accidents which can befal hamza as tāhīfī al-hamza. This tāhīfī, literally "weakening", included (i) the simple substitution of a vowel for hamza; (ii) the change of hamza into another articulation; this is the ibdāl of hamza, which is properly a kālīb; (3) the suppression (kādhīf) of hamza. All this has been set out in detail in H. Fleisch, Traité, § 17 to 20, and by J. Cantineau in Cours, 77-84.

(1) The hamza bayna bayna. The 101th question discussed in the Kitāb al-Insāf by Ibn al-Anbārī demonstrates the difficulty which the Arabs found in explaining this; many authors have written of it (references in Traité, § 45 b). The European writers, G. Weil, A. Schaade (references ibid.), were no more successful in achieving a satisfactory explanation and J. Cantineau is not very clear in Cours, 77. The Arabs, as the existence of hamza in their language indicates, were a people who practised "the hard attack" on vowels (see J. Marouzeau, Lexique de la terminologie linguistique, s.v. attaque); that is to say, in the articulation of a vowel, there was first preception (closing) of the vocal cords; then their sudden opening produced the explosive glottal stop, the hamza; then came the vibrations of the vowel; and when the vowel was ended the vocal cords closed. This explains why they needed a hamza to pronounce an initial vowel and why they were unable to pronoun two vowels successively with a simple hiatus; when the first vowel was ended the vocal cords closed into the position for the hard attack on the second.

The hamza bayna bayna, according to the Arab grammarians, was produced inter vocally, when, after articulation of a vowel belonging to a preceding syllable, the following syllable had to be enunciated beginning with a hamza, as follows: -a'a- in sā'āla, -a'ā- in sā'āla, -a'ā- in sā'āla, -a'ā- in sā'āla, -a'ā- in sā'āla, -a'ā- in sā'āla, etc. After the articulation of the first vowel, the vocal cords closed, then opened for the hard attack on the second, but, after the closure of the vocal cords there was no explosive glottal stop: the hamza was reduced to the firm clear interruption established by the closure of the vocal cords. One passed from this closure, characterized by strong articulatory tension (since it begins the first part of the syllable, with increased tension) direct to the vocalic vibrations; this was sufficient to maintain the autonomy of the syllable. But it is apparent that, according to the extent to which the glottal stop was attenuated, many degrees of weakening of the hamza were possible, right up to its absence (hamza bayna bayna).

The Arab grammarians were unable to make this analysis. They lacked a proper notion of the vowel; their haraka is not a har and has no autonomy; they had to proceed by means of the detour of the harf al-madd, of which the haraka formed part. They recognized the weakness of the hamza bayna bayna, near the state of sākin, but still mutakharrir. In the expression of Sibawayhi hamza bayna bayna (ii, 452, l. 10) they saw the indication of an "intermediate" hamza, that is, one placed between two makhrajī (as is made clear in Mufassal, 165, l. 19-20): for (i)u, between the makhrajī of the aṣūf (of which the fathā is a part); for (i)u between the makhrajī of the hamza and the makhrajī of the ya' (sakhima) (of which the kāmā is a part), etc. These explanations remain obscure by reason of the deficiency of the means of analysis at the Arabs' command.

(2) The ibdāl (kālīb) of hamzas. This ibdāl was produced only in the middle of a word or in the conjunction of two different words. In both cases the standardizing activity of the Arab grammarians led to the acceptance of the sequences -i'y- > -rya-, -u'a- > -yatt-. They rejected the phonetic change of hamza into another articulation; this is the ibdāl of hamza, which is properly a kālīb; (3) the suppression (kādhīf) of hamza. All this has been set out in detail in H. Fleisch, Traité, § 17 to 20, and by J. Cantineau in Cours, 77-84.
For the repercussions of the weakness of hamza on the morphological system see J. Cantineau, *Cours, 81-3*, or Traité, § 21. The dissimilation *'ard > 'ard 'I see' may be noted. Dissimilation may also have been at work in *'asāla > 'asāla 'I ask'; *sa-lā* and its unaccomplished may have undergone various influences (see ibid., § 22 b and d).

For the treatment of the pause on hamza see J. Cantineau, *loc. cit., 50-1* or Traité, § 21.

The action of the Arab grammarians in the question of hamza may be summed up as an adherence to the tradition of the Tamim, their efforts at standardization were a reaction against the pronunciation of the Hijādā. As possible, but not obligatory, *ibid* they accepted only *'a* > *ya* and *u* > *wa*; as possible, but not obligatory *bâdî* they accepted cases like ra's > rās, *dâb* > *dâh*, *mus'm* > *muimin*. In the meeting of two *hamzas*, apart from cases like *'a* > *'a* given above, they set up as standard the weakening (*hamza bayna bayna*) of one of the two *hamzas*. But one thing remained outside the scope of their attack: the diversity in writing *hamza*.

**Orthography of hamza.** The very first rudimentary attempts to put the Kur'ān into writing were made according to the local pronunciation of the Hijādā, which subjected *hamza* to all the *tashâf* already described. The Kur'ānic orthography however was surrounded with a holy reverence which forbade any change in the traditional ductus of the words. When the Muslim community and its leaders wished to fill in the inadequacies of this orthography and pass from *scriptorium defectiva* to *scriptorium plena* (see R. Blachère, *Introduction, 4, 71, 78-98*) they had to give a sign to *hamza*, properly pronounced, in contrast to the usage of the Hijādā. They used a point, but of a colour different from that of the vowel points. The system lasted a long time; "it was still the current usage in the fifth-sixth century at the time of al-Dānī" (ibid. 97). The current sign appears to use a little *yayin* instead of the point. Placed over *alif*, the complementary sign indicated for *alif* the glottal occlusive pronunciation (*hamza*). When, by *ibdâl*, this glottal occlusive had become *w* or *y*, entailing *wâd* or *ya* in the ductus of the word, the sign of *hamza* was placed above this; this is the origin of *wâd* and *ya* of *hamza* as *kursî* of *hamza*. Where nothing remained in the spelling to recall the glottal occlusive, the *hamza* was put back in the empty space, so to say, that is, without *kursî*. These are, schematically, the principal lines of the story of writing *hamza*.

It was conditioned by the anxiety to preserve the glottal occlusive *hamza* in an unalterable text which had not made provision for it. But there remain obscurities in the orthography of verbs with *hamza* as 2nd radical, in the accomplished of the forms *sa-lâ*, *sa-lâ*, *sa-lâ*. See Traité, § 16; on the writing of *hamza*, *al-Zadidjadj*, *al-Diurnal*, 277-80; on the usage of the Cairo Vulgate, R. Blachère, *Introduction*, 151-2.

**Difficult cases.** According to Ibn al-Sikkīt (C. Rabin, *Anc. West-Ar., 14 s*), *hamzas* sometimes develops into *k* among the *Tayyï*, e.g., *hin* for *'in* "in". "It is but difficult to say whether we can speak here of a sound change," adds C. Rabin. For *'a* as initial, see Renan, *Histoire des Arabes*, 292 C) quotes the ancient dialect forms *hamâ* (= hadhâ + *alâ*) and *hadhâ-lâlîgh* for *hadhâ-lâlîgh* "Is this he who?" Is there development from *hamza* to *k*? G. Garbini, *Sull' alternanza k* 2 in *semitico* (in *AIUVOn*, sezione linguistica, i (1959), 47-52) on every occasion when he acknowledges an alternation *h* 3 , considers that the *k* must be regarded as primitive and the *hamza* as secondary, thus:

\[ h > k, \]

in accordance with the general tendency of "the laryngeals and the pharyngeals" to weaken.

"Matters are not so simple as that. But one point at contrast to the usage of the Hidjaz. They used a sign to *hamza*, partly pronounced, in relation to the spelling of the *hamzas,. But there remain obscurities in the orthography of verbs with *hamza* as 2nd radical, in the accomplished of the forms *sa-lâ*, *sa-lâ*, *sa-lâ*. See Traité, § 16; on the writing of *hamza*, *al-Zadidjadj*, *al-Diurnal*, 277-80; on the usage of the Cairo Vulgate, R. Blachère, *Introduction*, 151-2.

**Difficult cases.** According to Ibn al-Sikkīt (C. Rabin, *Anc. West-Ar., 14 s*), *hamzas* sometimes develops into *k* among the *Tayyï*, e.g., *hin* for *'in* "in". "It is but difficult to say whether we can speak here of a sound change," adds C. Rabin. For *'a* as initial, see Renan, *Histoire des Arabes*, 292 C) quotes the ancient dialect forms *hamâ* (= hadhâ + *alâ*) and *hadhâ-lâlîgh* for *hadhâ-lâlîgh* "Is this he who?" Is there development from *hamza* to *k*? G. Garbini, *Sull' alternanza k* 2 in *semitico* (in *AIUVOn*, sezione linguistica, i (1959), 47-52) on every occasion when he acknowledges an alternation *h* 3 , considers that the *k* must be regarded as primitive and the *hamza* as secondary, thus:

\[ h > k, \]

in accordance with the general tendency of "the laryngeals and the pharyngeals" to weaken.

"Matters are not so simple as that. But one point at contrast to the usage of the Hidjaz. They used a sign to *hamza*, partly pronounced, in relation to the spelling of the *hamzas,. But there remain obscurities in the orthography of verbs with *hamza* as 2nd radical, in the accomplished of the forms *sa-lâ*, *sa-lâ*, *sa-lâ*. See Traité, § 16; on the writing of *hamza*, *al-Zadidjadj*, *al-Diurnal*, 277-80; on the usage of the Cairo Vulgate, R. Blachère, *Introduction*, 151-2.

**Difficult cases.** According to Ibn al-Sikkīt (C. Rabin, *Anc. West-Ar., 14 s*), *hamzas* sometimes develops into *k* among the *Tayyï*, e.g., *hin* for *'in* "in". "It is but difficult to say whether we can speak here of a sound change," adds C. Rabin. For *'a* as initial, see Renan, *Histoire des Arabes*, 292 C) quotes the ancient dialect forms *hamâ* (= hadhâ + *alâ*) and *hadhâ-lâlîgh* for *hadhâ-lâlîgh* "Is this he who?" Is there development from *hamza* to *k*? G. Garbini, *Sull' alternanza k* 2 in *semitico* (in *AIUVOn*, sezione linguistica, i (1959), 47-52) on every occasion when he acknowledges an alternation *h* 3 , considers that the *k* must be regarded as primitive and the *hamza* as secondary, thus:

\[ h > k, \]
Like so many heroes, Hamza passed into the world of legend after his death and became the central figure of a popular romance to which countless later writers made additions or adaptations. These took place in lands which the real Hamza never visited—Ceylon, China, Central Asia and Rum. The explanation suggested by Bahār (Sabā-ghnāsī, i, 284-5) is that the source was a work, no longer extant, entitled Kīsā-i makhzā-i Ḥamza which is mentioned in the Ta‘rīkh-i Sūtān. This deals with the exploits of a Persian Kharidī leader, Hamza b. ‘Abd Allāh, who led an insurrectionary movement against Ḥārūn al-Rashīd and his successors. According to the Ta‘rīkh-i Sūtān, Ḥamza undertook expeditions to Sind, Hind and Sarandib (i.e., India and Ceylon). His boldness appealed to the Persian imagination long after the Kharidī movement had died down and, by identification with the Prophet’s uncle, he became an orthodox Muslim hero in popular literature, acceptable to all.

Before passing to the Romance of Amir Ḥamza, it is necessary to discuss the career of Hamza b. ‘Abd Allāh very briefly. His name is given in the Zayn al-akhbār of Gardīzī as Ḥamza b. ʿAḍhārak, which is spelt in the Arabic sources as Aḍrak or Atrak. ʿṬabarī gives only a brief outline of his life but a more detailed account occurs in the Persian sources. He was a native of Sīstān and the son of a dīkhār, tracing his genealogy to Zav, the son of Tāmhlāb. Since one of the Caliph’s agents had made insulting remarks about his lineage, he rebelled. ʿṬabarī and Ibn al-Aḍīr (whom Gardīzī follows) state that this took place in 179/795-6. In the Ta‘rīkh-i Bayḥaḵ, however, the date is given as 181/797-8, which is accepted by Mme Figuievskaya. Ḥamza successfully defied al-Rashīd and prevented the men of Sīstān from paying the kharāji. Against his growing power, ‘All b. ʿĪsā, the governor of Khurāsān, brought him to court in person to Sīstān in 192/807-8. Although the latter gave him a written promise of safe-conduct, Ḥamza refused to accept it and determined on further resistance. After the death of al-Rashīd, he led expeditions to Sind and Hind and died in 213/828-9.

Gardīzī says, on the other hand, that he was killed in battle in 210/825-6.

There is every indication that the Romance of Amir Ḥamza (called variously Dās’dān-i Amir Ḥamza, Ḥamza-nāma, Kīsā-i Amir Ḥamza, Asmā’-i Ḥamza or Rūmāz-i Ḥamza) was of Persian origin. The action centres around the Sāsānian court at Ctesiphon, and Van Konkel draws an interesting parallel between events in the Romance of Ḥamza and the adventures of Rustam in the Shāh-nāma. Earlier and simpler recensions reveal some traces of archaic phraseology which might easily be as early as the 5th/6th century. It is significant also that none of the Arabic sources makes any reference to the existence of a Romance of Amir Ḥamza before the 11th/17th century. At that time Ibn Taymiyya refers to stories current among the Turcomans of Syria about the mighty feats of Ḥamza (Mīnhādī al-sunnah, Bulāk 1322, iv, 12). In the Persian version the number of sections varies between 69 and 82. At least three different recensions can be recognized from the numerous lithographed editions and manuscripts (see BSOS, xxiv/3 (1959), 473-4). One of these is the archetype of all subsequent versions in various languages. The Romance was ascribed to Djalāl al-Balīgh, but in a manuscript at Dresden the author’s name appears as Shāh Ṣa’īr al-Dīn Muḥammad Abu ʿl-Ma‘ālī. An anonymous poetical version entitled Shābī-bīrān-nāma is mentioned by Dr. Saḥaf (Hamāsā-sarā’i dar Irān, 379). It is in 62 sections and was composed in 1073/1662-3.

There is a considerable difference between the Arabic Sīrat Ḥamza and the Persian Romance. In its most complete form the Arabic version is in ten parts, and many new names and episodes appear. The hero is not the well-known uncle of the Prophet as in the Persian version, but is an entirely different person who is, however, some relative of the Prophet. Copies of the Arabic version at Gotha and Paris are ascribed to Muḥammad Abu ʿl-Ma‘ālī al-Kūfī al-Dahlahwān who may be the same as the author of Ṣayy b. Dīy Yāsūn. To complicate further the vexed question of authorship, a copy of the Arabic version in the Ambrosiana Library at Milan is said to be by Shīhāb al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Dahhān.

From Persia the Romance of Ḥamza spread to India and achieved great popularity at the Mughal court. The story was much embroidered at this period and it became a favourite subject for the Mughal miniatures. The number of copies which, according to Garcin de Tassy, was written by a certain Ashk. The latter mentions a version in fourteen volumes prepared for Maḥmūd of Ghaznī—a statement of dubious authenticity. In the majority of Urdu versions the story has been divided into nineteen dāfārs, each of which has a title of its own. A partial English translation from the Urdu was published at Calcutta by Shāykh ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Husain in 1832. Translations were also made into Bengali and Tamil.

According to Köprüülü, the Ḥamza cycle became very popular among the Turks. Ewliya Celebi mentions a series of miniatures depicting the combat of Ḥamza with well-known champions and demons. The earliest Ottoman version was made by Ḥamzawi (d. 815/1412-3) in twenty-four volumes. It was in prose, freely interspersed with verses. Copies of Turkish versions are to be found in Vienna (Flügel, ii, 29-30), in Paris (Biblioth AF 352: S 632, 647-9, 654, 656), and in Milan (Ambrosiana, no. 226, 330). In the 10th/16th century, Ağhreminizade Hāşimī wrote, in the popular language of the story-tellers, a poem Er-bi pālād-dīl on the exploits of the son of Ḥamza, which is mentioned by ʿAshīk Celebi.
Among the adaptations and imitations of the Romance in other languages, the Georgian Romance cycle entitled Amiran-Darajianiani is important as one of the first made from the Persian. It is attributed to Mose Khoneli who is said to have lived in the 12th century. A full Georgian translation, however, was not made until the 19th century (Bodleian Library Ms. Wardrop c. 3). Other versions were made in Malay (Hikayat Amir Hamza), and Javanese (Menak) from which the Balinese and Sundanese translations originated.


HAMZA b. 'ALLI b. AHMAD, the founder of the Druze religious doctrine. He was of Persian origin from Zîran and a felt-maker.

Among the Ismâ'îlî followers of the Fâtimid caliph al-Hâkim (q.v.) there had been speculations encouraged by his strange conduct and predictions of earlier authorities that he might be the expected Kâ'im. While the leaders of the official propaganda organization tried to counteract these speculations, al-Hâkim early in 408/summer 1017 began to favour a movement led by al-Hasan al-Akhram proclaiming his divinity. Al-Akhram tried to win over prominent officials by sending them letters and was honoured in public by al-Hâkim. In Ramâdân 408/January-February 1018 he was murdered while riding in the retinue of al-Hâkim. The caliph punished the murderer but cut off entirely his connexion with the movement.

Hamza had participated in the proclamation of al-Hâkim's divinity and the end of the distinction between exoteric and esoteric Islam, but had remained in the background. After al-Akhram's death he resumed his promises. In May 1019 al-Hâkim again showed his favour to the movement. Now Hamza claimed the leadership as the Imân and khâ'im al-zamân and adopted the title Ḥâdi al-wustûdžîbîn. The centre of his activity was the Raydân mosque near the Bâb al-Nâyr outside the walls of Cairo. He met a prominent rival in the Turkish official al-Darazi (q.v.) who, after trying in vain to come to terms with Hamza, acknowledged, independently and attractively, many of Hamza's followers. On 12 Safar 410/June 1019 Hamza sent a delegation to the chief Kâfî in the Old Mosque with a letter demanding his conversion. Three of the men were killed by the mob and riots ensued. Al-Hâkim had the transgressors arrested and executed at various times. The Turkish troops were incensed by this and turned against their countryman al-Darazi, besieging him in his residence (darî). Forty of his followers were killed but he escaped to the palace. The Turks demanded his extradition from al-Hâkim, who put them off to the following day. On their return he informed them that al-Darazi had been killed. Now all the soldiers turned against hamza in the Raydân mosque and besieged him with twelve of his men. Hamza escaped and had to hide a short time but by Rabî' II 410/August 1019 regained al-Hâkim's favour. He now built up a strong missionary organization, attributing cosmic ranks to its leaders. The movement spread rapidly, particularly in Syria. When al-Hâkim disappeared in Shawwâl 411/January 1021, the adherents of the Hâkim-cult were persecuted and Hamza had to hide. In some letters (which appear to be genuine) he promised his followers his triumphant return. According to Yahyâ b. Sa'id he was killed some time after his flight. Babâ b. Din al-Mu'tanâ, who became the leader of the movement, pretended to be in touch with him and still in 430/1040 predicted his near reappearance.

For Hamza's religious doctrine see DURUZ.


HAMZA b. BâD AL-HANAFI AL-KUFI (the spelling Bîd is attested by a verse where this name rhymes with tanbîd; al-Dâhiyân, Bayân, ed. Hârûn, iv, 47), is one of those Arab poets, full of wit and verve,
who among the great men of the day did not take seriously but loaded with riches to gain their eulogies and escape their sarcasms, for they were quick to get the laugh on the slightest scuffles, did not hesitate to use blackmail. Hamza b. BID, who is treated by his biographers with indulgence and sympathy, is said to have succeeded in extracting from the great men whose company he frequented a million dirhams, and this figure does not appear exaggerated, if we are to judge by the sums which the slightest scraps of verse brought him. A childhood friend of BILB b. ABI BURDA (SARK, ABI BURDA) who did not, however, succeed in attaining him at Basra, he lived on familiar terms especially with the Umayyad princes and the sons of the Muham- 
lab b. ABU SUFRA whom he always approached with success, even when he went to see them in prison. The Aghani reproduces several anecdotes which show with what spontaneous audacity he managed, thanks to two or three verses, to provoke the hilarity of his friends and to make them loosen the oil from Kufta to Hulwan whence he brought groups in difficulty to make petitions on their behalf, for his tongue was feared because his predictions or maladictions had a curious tendency to come true. Verses addressed to Sulaymân b. ABD AL-MALIK, foretelling his accession to the throne, could still encourage Harûn al-Rashid, while yet heir presumptive; other anecdotes tell his libertinism (khali* mudîn), it is astonishing that his died in 116/734-5.

Bibliography: Dâhib, Hayawân, v, 454; idem, Bayân, index; Marzuban, Mu'tâbî, 10; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'ârif, 591; idem, 'Uyûn, index; Idem, K. xvi, 15-26 (Beirut ed., xxvi, 433-63); Yâkût, U'dâbî', x, 280-9; R. Blachère, HLA, iii, index. (Ch. Pellat)

Hamza B. BID, b. UMARA b. ISMA', ABU 'UMARA AL-TAYMI AL-KÔF AL-ZAYYAT, one of the "Seven Readers" of the Kur'an. A maudul of the family of 'Urîma b. RIB' AL-TAYMI, he was born in Hulwân in 80/699 and became a merchant; his surname al-Zayyât arises from the fact that he transported oil from Kufta to Hulwan whence he brought cheese and nuts. Having settled at Kufta, he became interested in hadîth and the farâ'id, on which he left a Kitâb al-Farâ'id which was probably collected by his pupils (Fihrist, 44). His fame, however, rests particularly upon his "reading". A pupil, in this field, of al-'AMâgh [g.v.] and of Humrân b. AS'YAN, both of whom followed Ibn Mas'ûd, of 'AS'IIN [g.v.] and of Ibn ABI Laylâ who founded his authority upon 'Ali, he established an independent school which became canonical and was put together in a Kitâb Kita'at al-Hamâ (Fihrist, 44); he was criticized, particularly by Ibn Hânbal and Ibn 'Ayyâsh, perhaps because of their insufficient knowledge of his "reading". Notable among his numerous pupils were Sufyân AL-ThawRî and al-Kâ'ÎT, but those who passed down his "reading" are his immediate disciples, Khalîf b. Hîshâm (150-229/767-843) at Baghdâd and Khalîf b. Hîshâm (d. 220/835) at Kufta. Hamza died in Hulwan in 153/770 where his "reading" was not unknown. Biblio.- Ibn KUTAYBA, Ma'ârif, 591; 'UKâSHA, 589; Fihrist, 44; Ibn Khâlîkîn, Cairo 1310, i, 167; Ibn al-'IMAD, Shi'dhârî, i; Ibn al-DJAZIAT KURRA', i, 261-4, no. 1190; idem, NâSHIR, i; Dâhib, Tasyîn, 6-7, 9 and passim; Ibn Hâdjar, Tahdîb al-Tahdîb, s.v.; Dâhibî, Mu'tân, s.v.; Yâkût, U'dâbî', x, 289-93; Nôldeke, Geschichte des Qur'an, iii, tables; R. Blachère, Introduction au Coran, Paris 1959, index. (Ch. Pellat)

Hamza b. BID - HAMZA AL-HARRANî, ancestor of the Banû Hamza who for several generations held the office of na'bit al-ashraf [see SHAIR] in Damascus, with the result that in the end the family was named Bayt al-Nabî. As early as 330/942 a representative of this house, ISMA'IL b. HUSAYN b. ABD AL-NATTI, was acting as na'bit. Several of his descendants distinguished themselves through their ability and learning. Two sons of 'AÏân al-Din 'ALI b. IBRÂHîM, the sayyid NâSîR al-Dîn MuHAMMAD and the sayyid SHIHAB al-Dîn left their names in the history of Damascus. The former, called al-ZurrâB on the west coast of Sumatra. He lived before Shams al-Dîn of Pasai (d. 1630) who cited his poems and commented on them, and before the doctrine of emanation in seven grades became popular in Indonesia through the influence of Muhammîd b. Fâdil (d. 1620) work al-Tâhfa al-mursala. His lifetime may thus have been the second half of the 10th/16th century. He belonged to the school of mysticism characterized by names like Ibnu al- 'Arabi and 'INâKI. Works: Asrâr al-sa'dîfîn, Shâb'd al-ustâfîn and poems (Rubâ'î) (ed. J. Doorenbos, De geschriften van Hamamah Pansoeri, 1933, uncritical, many poems clearly not by Hamza; see Drewes, TITLV, i, 391), Kitâb al-Muniâh (unpublished, see Voorhoeve, Twee Maleise geschriften, 25). His doctrine: H. Kraemer, Een Javansche prirbon, 1921, 24-44, in Djâd, iv, 29 ff.; A. Johns, in JMBAS, xxxvii/1, (1955), 74. (P. Voorhoeve)
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in the madrasa al-Hafiyya. He died in 1067/1657. His son ftusayn, born in 1031/1622, became a member of al-Madżlis al-Kabir. At the time of the massacres in 1860 he distinguished himself by protecting numerous Christians; seven years later he held the office of mufti of Syria.

He ranks as one of those scholars whose writings, especially on religion and law, are unusually voluminous. Part of his reputation he owes to his rare virtuosity in calligraphy: he was able to write the fātīha on a grain of rice and to engrave on the stone a signet-ring the names of the warriors who had fallen at Badr. He died in his native Isfahan in 1085/1672.

**Bibliography:** Brockelmann, I., 34, 496; S II, 31, 775; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīḫ, iii, 25-6; Muḥibbī, ʿArabi wa-ʿl-Adāmi), (cf. Biruni, Ḥaydūn, 1276, 1287, 1292, 1297; Sabāḥ, al-Dawla, in which, as is shown by numerous citations, the author was greatly concerned with finding—often far-fetched—Persian etymologies (for those, e.g., of asfālāb and audji, cf. Biruni, Ifrād al-makāl, 69, and Taʾrīḫ al-mustabarār, 17 [Rasāʿīl al-Biruni, Haydaraḏāb 1368/1949]), and (9) Taʾrīḫ al-ʿadāb wa-ʿl-ḥikāyāt, 1093-1096; cfr. Naṣīrī, ʿAbd al-Muḥsin, Muntahāb al-tawdīrī, li-Dimāḏī, 768-86; M. Kurdʿ All, Khāṭīb al-Shām, ii, 71; Khāṭīb al-Dīn al-Zarkāfī, al-ʿAṣm, viii, 63-4. (N. ELISSÉEFP)

HAMZA AL-ISFAHĀNĪ, (HAMEA B. ALSHANA, [INN] MUʾADDIB), philologist and historian of the 4th/10th century. Born about 280/893, he died after 350/961 (the year in which his Chronology of pre-Islamic and Islamic dynasties (Taʾrīḫ sinī mulāk al-ard wa-ʿl-ānbiyāʾ), a survey of world history which has been studied in the West since the eighteenth century and which was first published in its entirety with a Latin translation by I. M. E. Gottwaldt (St. Petersburg-Leipzig, 1944), is repeated, e.g., Beirut 1961; English trans. of part of the work by U. M. Daudpota, in Journal Cama Or. Inst., xxi (1932), 58-120.)

On poetry, (4) an edition of the Diwan of Abū Nuʿaym, which goes beyond being a mere collection of poems and contains much valuable literary information. Further, (6) a Kūtbī Mādhīṣ al-ʾaṣghār (cf. Ṣaḥāḫī, Thāʾalīb, 293-9) and (7) a Risā, al-ʾaṣghār al-sāfira fi ʿl-nāyār wa-ʿl-mīrāj ṣadāqān (cf. Brūnī, ʿĀṯīr, 31, 52; apparently identical with the work on "Persian Festivals" by All b. Hamza al-Iṣbāḥānī, summarily referred to in connexion with his chapter on the subject by Nuwayri, i, 185).

On lexicography, (8) the partly preserved Muntakhab dhāna (hawṣ al-ʿarbā wal-ʾaḥādīm), written for ʿAḥd al-Dawla, in which, as is shown by numerous citations, the title is an outstanding achievement in the field of cultural history (cf. P. Kraus, ʿĀṯīr, i, 171, 245, and idem, in al-Thālāfī, v (1943), reprinted in Ş. al-Munadiḏīḏ, Muntakāb, Cairo 1955, ii, 177-84).

A quotation dealing with the interpretation of sûra XXXV, i, supposedly from a R. al-Muʿribaʾ an gharaf al-ʾaʾrāf (7) (Kastallam, Irbād, Bālāk 1288, viii, 31) is doubtful. Other titles are mentioned in Fībrīr, 129.

Hamza is described, in particular by al-Kiftī, as a Persian nationalist with strong prejudices against the Arabs. This may well be a true description. We do find him greatly concerned with matters Persian, but he also shows himself fully aware of the importance of the cultural role of the Arabs. His works prove him to be a thorough and, to a degree, original scholar who always looks for the best sources and the most authentic information available, using, for instance, Jewish and Byzantine informants on Jewish and Greek-Roman chronology, who always probes deeply and intelligently, and who reports many unusual and highly interesting matters which give a greater insight into the immense variety and curiosity of Muslim intellectual life in the ninth and tenth centuries. His importance was acknowledged by later Muslim scholars through the wide use they made of his works, in particular, his chronological history and the collection of ʿaffāl proverbs.


HAMZA BEG, Prince of the ʿAk Koyunlu [q.v.] dynasty (the Kitāb-i Diyār-bahīriya mentioned in the Bibli. to that article has now been published by
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Hamza Beg (Imam), second imam of Dagestan, leader of the popular religio-political movement which disturbed the northern Caucasus from 1832 to 1859 and which is known as Muridism, from the religious ideology from which it arose. This movement was based on Muslim mystical influences which then coalesced in Bughara, in particular those propagated by the Nakhshbandis [q.v.], but made use of religious dogma for political ends and was closely linked with the practical conception of the Holy War. It was a consequence of the Russian punitive expeditions in the Caucasus and was directed at the same time against the Russians, their allies the Avar khans, and the mountain peoples who had submitted to their domination. After the death of the first imam, Gha'iz Muhammad, or Gha'iz Molla, who was surrounded and killed in the village of Gummi on 17 (29) October 1832 by a Russian detachment, Hamza Beg [q.v.] (called by the Russians Gamzat Bek) became imam of Dagestan. Although Hamza Beg belonged to the family of the Avar khans, being a khan, i.e., the son of the khan by a woman of humble birth, and consequently had no right to the succession, he nevertheless aspired to the khan's throne and made use of the movement for his own ends. On 13 August 1834, he defeated and massacred the Avar khans, on the River Tabor, near their capital Khunzak, which he occupied after driving out the Russians. This act cost him his life: he was assassinated on 19 September 1834 in the main mosque of the town by the brother of the famous Hajiidir Murad [see Murad], nd'ib of Shami [q.v.]. The latter replaced Hamza Beg as imam of Dagestan, and with him Muridism received its definitive form. It was to last until the surrender of the imam Shami on 25 August 1859.


HAMZA HAMD PASHA, Ottoman Grand Vizier, was the son of Sultan Mustafa III and was appointed Vizier under Sultan Mustafa III, was born at Develi Kara Hisar, named Ahmed Agha; born in Istanbul ca. 1110/1698-9 he entered upon his official career in the offices of the Sublime Porte. Owing to the protection of the celebrated Raghib Pasha [q.v.], whose pupil he was in the elaborate prose of the official style, he was nominated mukhtasíd (Secretary to the Grand Vizier) on 19 July 1755, (February 9) 1751, a position he held for many years. On 19 Muharram 1165/25 October 1755 he was appointed *reis* al-kuttab (Minister of Foreign Affairs), and, in addition to other high offices in the years following, three times filled the office of *kethib (Minister of Home Affairs) but only for short periods and without further distinguishing himself. After being appointed vizier in Rabî’ II 1174/September-October 1762 he took the place of the Grand Vizier Râghib Pasha on 9 Ramâdân 1176/24 March 1763, when the latter fell severely ill and on his death (24 Ramâdân/8 April) he succeeded him. But he was not a strong enough man for this position, for, as his biographers say, he was slow in coming to a decision and was too fond of ease and comfort. The only noteworthy event of his period of office was his sending Ahmed Resmi Efendi [q.v. to the court of Frederick II in response to Count Rezin's embassy (cf. Zinken, v, 597 f.). After less than seven months of office he was deposed on 25 Rabî’ II 1177/31 October 1763 and sent to Crete as governor, where he remained, except for a brief interval, till 1183/1769. In this year, on 16 Rabî‘ I, February 6, it is given that he was governor of Buda and Bâbek and died in Mecca in Dhu l-Hijjâda 1183/March-April 1770.


(J. H. MORDTMANN [E. KUHN])

HAMZA MIIRZA, Safavid prince, second son of Muhammad Khânsar (dates ca. 973/1565-6). In 985/1776 Shâh Ismâ‘îl II ordered that Hamza Mirza be put to death at Shîrâz, together with his father and brother, Abû Tâlib, but Ismâ‘îl II was assassinated before the order could be carried out. After the accession of his weak and purblind father, Sultan Muhammad Shah, in Dhu l-Hijjâda 985/February 1758, Hamza Mirza was made heir-apparent at the instance of his mother, Mahd-i ’Ulaya, who, until her murder by the *Beiibak* [q.v.] in 987/1779, was the real power behind the throne; he also had the support of the Turkman-Takkalu *Beiibak* faction, which then dominated the political scene in the capital, Kâzîm. In 985/1781 Hamza Mirza suppressed a revolt staged by the Shamlâl-Ustadîlî faction in *Khurâsân in support of his younger brother, Abbâs Mirza* [see *Abbâs I*], and thereafter he played an increasing part in state affairs. Though endowed with great personal bravery, he was proud, quick-tempered and impulsive, and lacked the maturity of judgement needed to steer a safe course between the rival *Beiibak* factions. In 992/1584-5, when the *amir al-umurâ* of A‘shâr, Amîr Khân Turkman, obstructed his efforts to identify those responsible for his mother’s murder, Hamza Mirza listened to the promptings of the Shamlâl-Ustadîlî faction, and put the Turkman-Takkalu faction to arrange the assassination of Hamza Mirza in the *Sa‘fawî camp near Gardia*. Their tool was Hamza Mirza’s personal barber who, on 24 Dhu l-Hijjâda 994/December 1586, stabbed the prince to death while he was in a drunken stupor.


SHINDAR HAMZA PASHA, Ottoman Grand Vizier, was born at Develi Kara Hisar ca. 1140/1728-9, the son of a landed agha named Mehmeh; he began his career in 1156/1743-4 in the *haicu-khané* (honey-bakery) of the *Kibdr-i humayûn* (Imperial Privy Commissariat), but his gifts soon won him a position among the pages of the *Enderûn* [q.v.].
where he won the favour of Muştafa III. When the latter came to the throne on 16 Safar 1171/30 October 1767 he reinstated him, and was finally driven out of the country by the Porte, in Yedikule (6 October); in consequence of this the disastrous war with Russia broke out, which had been avoided by the peace of Küülük Kurnardja (=q.v.). Hamza Pasha did not live to see the beginning of hostilities; he was suddenly put in order of the Kuran, and a short period of respite which had already been the subject of individual putative to other teachers, notably the teachers of the school of Hâfidz or that of Kürânan, like Mâlik b. Anas, Fudayl b. Jâli, ʿAbd Allâh b. al-Mahbûrâk or Ishaq b. Râhâwayh. They contributed towards the settling of Ḥanbali doctrine at a very early stage, without, however, ending in a very rigorous systematization, and at the same time allowing divergences from the thought of the founder of the school to survive.

Two of the sons of Ibn Ḥanbal played an important rôle in the transmission of his work. The elder of the two, Šâlih (d. 266/879-80), made his career in the service of the ʿAbbasid Caliphate at Kûdi at Šârûs and at Ḳurânan. The younger, ʿAbd Allâh (d. 290/903), in particular put in order the materials of the Musnad, to which he made a certain number of additions and to which his pupil Abû Bakr al-Kâti (b. 368/978-9) put the finishing touches. The additions of al-Kâti are, within the Ḥanbali school, quite often disputed (on the other compilers of Musnad, see Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, the Masʿûl).

Several other eminent traditionists reported the Masʿûl and may be regarded as true disciples of Ibn Ḥanbal. Thus Abû Dâwûd al-Sîjdâstânî (d. 275/888-9), was the author of the K. al-Sunah, and his K. al-Masʿûl (published in Cairo in 1533/1934) is the sole collection of responsum available today. Abû Ḥâtim al-Râzî (d. 277/980-1), who is sometimes compared with al-Ḥârî and with Abû Zubâr al-Râzî, followed the teaching of Ibn Ḥanbal and collected a large number of Musnad certain of which are considered rare; his 'alâda defends, on the basis of the nature of the faith and of the Kurânrân, and equally on the basis of the condemnation of kalâm, the most characteristic ideas of Ḥanbalism.

One name dominates the history of Ḥanbalism during this period; that of Abû Bakr al-Khâlîlî (d. 312/923-4), who was a pupil of Abû Bakr al-Marwazi, knew the Koran by heart, and was instructor of the Caliph al-Mahdî in the mosque of al-Mahdî. In his K. al-Diŷms, he collected and classified the responsum of Ibn Ḥanbal which had already been the subject of individual recensions. This enormous compilation was still used, in the 8th/14th century, by Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Kayyim. Still other works are attributed to Abû Bakr al-Khâlîlî, and enjoyed a great authority, in particular a K. al-Jûmî, a K. al-Sunnah, his K. al-ʿImâm, and a K. al-ʿIblî. In addition Abû Bakr al-Khâlîlî composed the first history of Ḥanbalism which is known to us. His work was finished by Abû al-ʿAzîz b. Diŷarfar (d. 363/973-4), known by the name of Ghabûl al-Khâlîlî (=q.v.).

Two other names are closely connected with the history of Ḥanbalism at the end of the 3rd/9th and at the beginning of the 4th/10th century. The first is Abû Bakr al-Sîjdâstânî (d. 316/928), a son of the traditionist Abû Dâwûd. From him we have a K. al-Masʿûlî (edited by A. Jeffery, Leiden 1937) and a short profession of faith in verse in the best Ḥanbali tradition. Several other works of exegesis or tradition are attributed to him. The second is Abû Muṣâ-mmâd al-Râzî (d. 327/938-9), whose work enjoyed a wide popularity. His K. al-Diŷrî wa ʿl-ʿIblî was considered
one of the most important works which had been written in this discipline. His Tafsir, in the judgment of Ibn Kathir, constituted the work par excellence of traditional exegesis and surpassed in its doctrinal value that of al-Tabari. His K. al-Ulul, on the subject of defects in hadith, demonstrates this tendency to follow the classifications (abid) of fikh. There is further attributed to Abū Maṣummad al-Rāzī a refutation of the Dāhmiyya and an eulogistic biographical biography of Abūd b. Ḥanbal.

The considerable rôle which Ḥanbalism played on the Islamic scene in the religious and political history of the Caliphate is illustrated by the activities of al-Barbahārī (d. 329/940-51) traditionally and jurisconsult, pupil of Abū Bakr al-Marwazi and of Sahh al-Tustari, a vigorous preacher who struggled bitterly against Shi'ism and Mu'tazilism for a reform of the Sunni Caliphate. The excess of his zeal led, in 323/935, to the condemnation of Ḥanbalism by a decree of the caliph al-Kādī. Abū Bakr al-Najdī, a disciple of Abū l-Kāsim al-Khirākī (d. 334/945-6), who left Baghdād to take refuge in Damascus with the advent of the Būyids, is the author of the first manual of Ḥanbalī fikh, the Mukhtasar, which was commented upon in turn by Ibn Ḥāmid (d. 403/1012-3), the kādī Abū Ya'la (d. 458/1066) and the ṭayyib Muwaffak al-Dīn b. Kudāma (d. 620/1223). The Mukhtasar, upon which, according to Yūsuf b. 'Abd al-Ḥādi (d. 909/1503-4), there were almost three hundred commentaries, still remains today an excellent introductory manual to Ḥanbalī doctrine in the sphere of fīrūd. 2. Ḥanbalism under the Būyids (334/945-6). From the moment of the installation of the Būyids in Baghdād Ḥanbalism was an active and numerically strong school which possessed a doctrinal literature comparable to that which the other schools were able to offer. The progress of Imāmī Shī'ism, encouraged by the Būyids, and of Ismā'īlī after the Fātimid conquest of Egypt in 358/969 and the foundation of Cairo, came into conflict with the Ḥanbalī theologians and preachers, who exercised a decisive influence on the beginnings of the Sunnī restoration which began to assert itself from the reign of al-Kādir (381-422/991-1021). Ḥanbalism then took the rôle of a politico-religious opposition party and was in the forefront of the defense of the Caliphate and Sunnism.

From among the numerous representatives of Ḥanbalism whose names have been preserved for us in bio-bibliographical works we shall here cite only those few teachers who appear to us to be, both for their work and their activities, most typical of the vitality and the internal diversity of the school. Abū Bakr al-Najdī (d. 340/954-5) held sessions of popular exhortation at Baghdād in the mosque of al-Mansūr. He compiled the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, and, apart from a treatise on fīrūd, a K. al-Ḥudūdī al-fukahād. 3. Ḥanbalism during the final two centuries (419-656/1028-1260). Abū l-Husayn b. Samʿūn (d. 387/997), through his Hadīth training and his inclination towards Shi'ism, was, as one of those many scholars whom it is difficult to place, with any degree of certainty, within the confines of one school. The kādī Abū l-Husayn (Tabāqāt, ii, 155-6) and Ibn 'Asākir (Ṭabyīn al-musāfār, 200-6) each lay claim to him. Ibn Ṣamʿūn, who commented upon the Mukhtasar of al-Khirākī, held sessions of religious and moral exhortation at Baghdād which acquired a widespread reputation.

His contemporary Ibn Baṭṭa al-Uḫbārī (d. 387/997), educated at Baghdād, retired when nearly forty, after travels to Mecca and Syria, to his native town. We owe to him several important works, in particular a renunciation of legal stratagems (hinay) which were employed in certain schools of fīrūd, and two professions of faith which were subsequently widely used: the Ibnāna bāhiya and the Ibnāna yaghīra. The Ibnāna yaghīra (cf. H. Laoust, Profession de foi d'Ibn Baṭṭa, PEFQ, 105) is primarily designed to be a profession of popular faith addressed more particularly to young people and to the non-Arabs. Its purpose was to lead back to the imitation of the Prophet all those who were tending to waver in their faith because of the proliferation of sects and doctrines.

Ibn Ḥāmid (d. 403/1012-3; Tabāqāt, ii, 171-7), one of the intimate circle of the caliph al-Kādir, was, as much first and foremost a teacher and a mufti. His most famous work is his K. al-Dāhmiyya fi ṭayyib al-fukahād, a renunciation of legal stratagems (fyiyāl) which are also often cited: a K. fi usul al-dīn and a K. fi usul al-fīkh. Ibn Ḥāmid, both by his teaching and his written works, contributed to the education of numerous Ḥanbalīs, whether natives of Baghdād or attracted to the 'ABBĀSID metropolis by the reputation of its learning.

One of his disciples was the kādī Abū Ya'la Ibn al-Farrāšt (d. 458/1066), who made his career at Baghdād in the service of the caliph al-Kādī. The work of the kādī Abū Ya'la, almost totally lost, is known to us through his Aḥāmū sulā'īnya (published Cairo 1356/1938) which would appear to have been copied from the treatise on public law of al-Mawardi (d. 456/1064), unless the two works both stem from a common source. Those of his works which were most frequently used were his commentaries upon al-Kādireh, a treatise on usul al-fīkh (K. al-Mudjiyārād), another on the divergent opinions of legal scholars (K. al-Iḥlālāfī), and finally an important treatise of dogmatic theology, the K. al-Mus'tamad, an abbreviated version of which has survived (ms. at the Zāhiriyā in Damascus). The K. al-Muṣṭamad, constructed in the fashion of contemporary treatises of kalām, devotes considerable space to the theory of the Caliphate. The kādī Abū Ya'la, who was present in 433/1041-2 and in 445/1053-4 at the formal reading of the Kādiriyā, was, as much through his official duties as through his scholarship and his teaching, closely associated with the policy of Sunnī restoration under al-Kādir.

4. Ḥanbalism during the final two centuries (419-656/1028-1260). The attempt of al-Basāṣīrī, in 451/1059, to re-establish Shī'ism in Baghdād had all the characteristics of a desperate and ephemeral action. In 459/1067 the Niẓāmiyya was inaugurated at Baghdād for the teaching of Shāfī'ī fīkh. The Sunnī reconquest of central and southern Syria followed. In
The 467/1074-5 the amir Atslz re-established the 'Abbâsid Mu'ta at Damascus. The political disruption of the first great Saljûqid empire began in 485/1092 with the death of Malik Shâh. A short time afterwards the Crusaders made their appearance in Syria and Palestine, occupying Antioch in 491/1098, Jerusalem in 492 and Tripoli in 503/1109-10. However, the momentum of the movement of Sunnî restoration continued, with the revival of the Caliphate beginning with al-Muqtâfi (530-35/1136-60), and with the constitution, in Syria, of the dynasty of the Zandîs and the Ayyûbîs. This period of two centuries was the golden age of Hanbalism which, however, great its attachment to the traditionalism of its credo, itself also appeared, through the personality of its principal representatives, as a movement of profound diversity.

The šarîf Abû Dja'far al-Ḥâshimi (d. 470/1077-8), a successor in spirit of al-Barbahârî and Ibn Baṭṭa, distinguished himself in particular by the energetic drive he brought to bear in support of the Hanbalî credo/1095-7. However, the restoration of the authority of the Caliphate in the Muntazam and of Sufism in the 5th/11th century, and with the death of Malik Shâh. A short time afterwards the Crusaders made their appearance in Syria and Palestine, occupying Antioch in 491/1098, Jerusalem in 492 and Tripoli in 503/1109-10. However, the momentum of the movement of Sunnî restoration continued, with the revival of the Caliphate beginning with al-Muqtâfi (530-35/1136-60), and with the constitution, in Syria, of the dynasty of the Zandîs and the Ayyûbîs. This period of two centuries was the golden age of Hanbalism which, however, great its attachment to the traditionalism of its credo, itself also appeared, through the personality of its principal representatives, as a movement of profound diversity.

Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb al-Kalwadhânî (d. 510/1116-7), in his youth he was interested in Mu'tazilism and Shi'ism; in 460/1068 against the teaching of Mu'tazilism at the Niẓâmiyya; in 461 against Ibn 'Aṣâ, who was condemned for his sympathies towards Mu'tazilism or al-Halâlî; in 464 against various forms of corruption; in 465 again against Ibn 'Aṣâ, who was forced to recant in public; finally in 469 against Ibn al-Kusayy, who, in his teaching at the Niẓâmiyya, had taken up again against Hanbalism the old charge of anthropomorphism (ṣâṭbîh). Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb al-Kalwadhânî (d. 510/1116-7), in his youth he was interested in Mu'tazilism and Shi'ism; in 460/1068 against the teaching of Mu'tazilism at the Niẓâmiyya; in 461 against Ibn 'Aṣâ, who was condemned for his sympathies towards Mu'tazilism or al-Halâlî; in 464 against various forms of corruption; in 465 again against Ibn 'Aṣâ, who was forced to recant in public; finally in 469 against Ibn al-Kusayy, who, in his teaching at the Niẓâmiyya, had taken up again against Hanbalism the old charge of anthropomorphism (ṣâṭbîh).

Abu 'l-Wafâ' Ibn 'Aṣâ (d. 513/1119-20) is not only one of the great scholars of Hanbalism but also one of the most famous Arab prose writers. Several of his works are frequently cited in the literature of the school: two treatises on ṣâḥiḥîf, another, more controversial, on the law of succession, and a short profession of faith in verse, the Dâlîyya, which was still learned by heart in the 8th/14th century and in the 19th century. Ibn 'Aṣâ was the standard guide to follow after the Prophet and his companions. Abu 'l-Wafâ' Ibn 'Aṣâ (d. 513/1119-20) is not only one of the great scholars of Hanbalism but also one of the most famous Arab prose writers. Several of his works are frequently cited in the literature of the school: two treatises on ṣâḥiḥîf, another, more controversial, on the law of succession, and a short profession of faith in verse, the Dâlîyya, which was still learned by heart in the 8th/14th century and in the 19th century. Ibn 'Aṣâ was the standard guide to follow after the Prophet and his companions.

Abu 'l-Farādî Ibn al-Djawzî (d. 597/1200), jurisconsult, traditionist, historian and above all preacher, was intimately connected with the political life of his time. He had, for teachers, Hanbali scholars many of whom were well-known, and owed the first successes of his career to the vizier Ibn Hubayra, during the caliphates of al-Muqtâfi and al-Mustâqîm. The outstanding period of his activity as an official preacher is set in the caliphate of al-Muqtâfi (556-74/1161-91). The advent of al-Nâṣir (575-622/1179-1225) did not immediately put an end to his activities but progressively marked the beginning of his decline. In 590/1194 he was arrested and held for five years under house arrest at Wâṣît; his death followed shortly after his release. His massive work (cf. Dhâhil, i, 158), his voluminous K. al-Fusûr, of which only one volume survives, is a treatise of adâb which was much used by Ibn al-Djawzî. His more technical works, however, should not be forgotten: the K. al-Fuşûl, also known by the name of Rıḍâyat al-mulfî; the K. al-İrshâd fî usûl al-dîn, his main treatise of dogmatic theology; the K. al-Wâdî fî usûl al-fikr, on the methodology of law; finally the K. al-Nâṣirî fî al-ḥarakat al-ṣâhibî, the title of which employed well enough the place that the study of tradition held with this author (G. Makdisi, Ibn 'Aṣâ et la résurgence de l'islam traditionalistes, PIFD, 1962).

In the century which preceded the fall of the Caliphate three names dominate the history of Hanbalism. The first is the vizier Ibn Hubayra (d. 560/1165) who, while still a youth, wandered through the markets of Baghdad with a Sûfî preacher to exhort the population to live according to the dictates of the Kurâ and the Sunna. Ibn Hubayra owed his career to the caliph al-Muqtâfi (in 555/1150) who, in 544/1149-50, appointed him vizier. Al-Mustâqîm (555-66/1160-71) retained him in office, though not without difficulties. In 557 Ibn Hubayra founded, in the quarter of Bâb al-Baqra, a madrasa destined for the purpose of teaching Hanbali tradition and fikr and for the benefit of which he made a waṣf of his valuable personal library. His political programme rested on two aims: the restoration of the Sunna and of the authority of the Caliphate. To succeed in this he tried, on the one hand, to free the Caliphate from Saljûqid control and to spur on Nûr al-Dîn to the conquest of Fâtimid Egypt; on the other hand he endeavoured to band together, around the Hanbali credo and opposed to Shi'ism, all the families of Sunnîs. His K. al-İfâd consists of a commentary upon the Şâhî of al-Buhârî and of Muslim; he included therein a treatise of ṣâḥiḥîf (published Aleppo 1280). The work, read and commented upon in the mosques at the request of the vizier, seems to have enjoyed, at least during his lifetime, a fairly wide-spread popularity (Dhâhil, i, 251-80).

The šarîf 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Djûli (d. 561/1166), the founder of the first great Sîûfî order, that of the Kâdiriya [q.v.]. His doctrinal position is difficult to ascertain, owing to the distortions to which his personality and his ideas were subjected by his principal biographer, al-Shatânawî (d. 713/1313-4), and the legends transmitted by his admirers. The šarîf 'Abd al-Kâdir belonged to Hanbalism not only by education but also by the very nature of his work. The K. al-Ghunya, edited many times, constitutes his principal treatise of dogmatic and moral theology. From the end of this work, he found, ground dogma in the profession of faith, a manual of adâb sharîjîyâ, a précis of the fundamental rules of fikr and elements of heresiography—the whole in the pious and militant tradition of Hanbalism.

Abu 'l-Farâdî Ibn al-Djawzî (d. 597/1200), jurisconsult, traditionist, historian and above all preacher, was intimately connected with the political life of his time. He had, for teachers, Hanbali scholars many of whom were well-known, and owed the first successes of his career to the vizier Ibn Hubayra, during the caliphates of al-Muqtâfi and al-Mustâqîm. The outstanding period of his activity as an official preacher is set in the caliphate of al-Muqtâfi (556-74/1161-91). The advent of al-Nâṣir (575-622/1179-1225) did not immediately put an end to his activities but progressively marked the beginning of his decline. In 590/1194 he was arrested and held for five years under house arrest at Wâṣît; his death followed shortly after his release. His massive work (cf. Dhâhil, i, 416-20) embraces, it might be said, all the types of Islamic literature. Strongly influenced by Ibn 'Aṣâ and by Ābu Nu'aym al-İsfâhânî, he is the historian of the Caliphate in the Muntazam and of Shi'ism in the
Sīfat al-safwa. His Talbis Iblis, directed against the bid'as introduced into Islam by Sufism, falsafa, the sector for the laws in the aggressive tradition of Hanbalism. But his best known works are the eulogistic biographies (mandāšīb) which he devotes to the religious and political personalities of the first centuries of Islam. An uncompromising critic, he also composed refutations of al-Hallāj, Abd al-Ḳādir al-Ḍiālī and the Caliph al-南京市.

In the following fifty years, Hanbalism still had several eminent representatives at Baghdad. Ibn al-Maḥsūṭīya (d. 500/1203), who was interested in the sciences inherited from Greek antiquity and composed a history of Baghdad, energetically defended the policy of Ibn Hubayra in the eulogistic monograph which he devoted to him (Ḍayl, i, 442-6). Muhammad b. Abd Allāh al-Samarrī (d. 600/1203-4), a traditionist whose family had sought refuge in Damascus in 666/1267-8 before the threat of a Mongol invasion. It was at Damascus that Ibn Taymiyya was educated, interested himself not only in Hanbalī literature but in all the Muslim schools, as well in the field of fiqh as in kalām or falsafa. Intimately concerned in the religious and political life of his time, Ibn Taymiyya very soon found himself, because of his polemical zeal, clashing with numerous opponents and was subjected to frequent persecutions. Sent to Cairo in 705/1305-6 he was imprisoned once for almost eighteen months until 707 (25 September 1307). Exiled to Alexandria for seven months, he was freed and taken back to Cairo by al-Malik al-南京市 after the fall of Baybars al-Dāshāhkīr. He returned to Damascus in 712/1312-13. Imprisoned once, in 720/ 1320, in the citadel for a period of about five months for holding, on the question of repudiation (talâh), a doctrine deemed to be heretical, he was imprisoned a second time in 726/1326 for his views on the visitation of tombs (ziyārat al-khāyā), which he denounced as heretical. It was in prison, in the citadel of Damascus, that he died on 20 Đu‘l-Ḳa‘da 728/26 September 1328. As much by his doctrinal works as by his teaching or his personal activities, Ahmad b. Taymiyya left a deep imprint on the history of Hanbalism.

His principal pupil, Ibn Ǧayyim al-Dāshīwāy (d. 751/1350-1; Ḍayl, ii, 447-53), who shared some of his later persecutions, was more a preacher than a polemist and commented on the Mandāšī of al-Anṣārī (3 vols., Cairo 1916). We owe to him also an important treatise on usūl al-fiqh, the Ilām al-mawālik (3 vols., Cairo 1915), a treatise of public law built around a theory of proof, the Ṭurūq fiqh-ismiya (Cairo 1317, and later eds.), and finally a profession of faith in verse, the Niʿmāniyya, principally directed against the Dāshīwāy and the Ittihādiyya (published several times in Cairo since 1902).

Abd al-ʿArabī b. Raḍājī (d. 795/1393), from a family which originated from Baghdad but which had settled in Damascus, was a pupil of Ibn al-Ǧayyim. Jurisconsult and traditionalist, he established himself, by his Ḍayl, as the trustworthy and precise historian of the Hanbalī school. Author of the Kawāʾid (Cairo 1933), deserves to be made the subject of a monograph. To Ibn Raḍājī are owed also several dissertations which endeavour to establish, on points of dogma, and not without a certain rigidity, the so-called position of the Ancients (salaf).

Under the Circassian Mamlūks (784-922/1382-1517) Hanbalism lost some of its importance in Syria and Palestine for reasons that are hard to ascertain, though doubtless its hostility to the school of Ibn ʿArabī and that of the Ittihādiyya, whose influence was increasing, contributes to the explanation of this relative decline. Though greatly weakened, however, Hanbalism did not disappear altogether. Represented by great families of jurisconsults who monopolized, along with the teaching, the official confess and the profits derived therefrom, it was distinguished by several theologians whose importance deserves emphasis. The list of them is found in the Muḥbars al-ḥanābila, the work of the venerable muftī of the Hanbalīs in Damascus, the Ṣayḥ Muhammad Dīmīl al-Shāṭī (published Damascus 1330/1921), which is based on al-Maḥṣūṭī al-Ṣāḥibī, still unpublished, of Muḍīr al-Dīn al-

Syria and Palestine under the Baḥrīyya Mamlūks. It then had as its most celebrated representative Ahmad b. Taymiyya, whose family had sought refuge in Damascus in 666/1267-8 before the threat of a Mongol invasion. It was at Damascus that Ibn Taymiyya was educated, interested himself not only in Hanbalī literature but in all the Muslim schools, as well in the field of fiqh as in kalām or falsafa. Intimately concerned in the religious and political life of his time, Ibn Taymiyya very soon found himself, because of his polemical zeal, clashing with numerous opponents and was subjected to frequent persecutions. Sent to Cairo in 705/1305-6 he was imprisoned once for almost eighteen months until 707 (25 September 1307). Exiled to Alexandria for seven months, he was freed and taken back to Cairo by al-Malik al-南京市 after the fall of Baybars al-Dāshāhkīr. He returned to Damascus in 712/1312-13. Imprisoned once, in 720/1320, in the citadel for a period of about five months for holding, on the question of repudiation (talâh), a doctrine deemed to be heretical, he was imprisoned a second time in 726/1326 for his views on the visitation of tombs (ziyārat al-khāyā), which he denounced as heretical. It was in prison, in the citadel of Damascus, that he died on 20 Đu‘l-Ḳa‘da 728/26 September 1328. As much by his doctrinal works as by his teaching or his personal activities, Ahmad b. Taymiyya left a deep imprint on the history of Hanbalism.

His principal pupil, Ibn Ǧayyim al-Dāshīwāy (d. 751/1350-1; Ḍayl, ii, 447-53), who shared some of his later persecutions, was more a preacher than a polemist and commented on the Mandāšī of al-Anṣārī (3 vols., Cairo 1916). We owe to him also an important treatise on usūl al-fiqh, the Ilām al-mawālik (3 vols., Cairo 1915), a treatise of public law built around a theory of proof, the Ṭurūq fiqh-imiya (Cairo 1317, and later eds.), and finally a profession of faith in verse, the Niʿmāniyya, principally directed against the Dāshīwāy and the Ittihādiyya (published several times in Cairo since 1902).

Abd al-ʿArabī b. Raḍājī (d. 795/1393), from a family which originated from Baghdad but which had settled in Damascus, was a pupil of Ibn al-Ǧayyim. Jurisconsult and traditionalist, he established himself, by his Ḍayl, as the trustworthy and precise historian of the Hanbalī school. Author of the Kawāʾid (Cairo 1933), deserves to be made the subject of a monograph. To Ibn Raḍājī are owed also several dissertations which endeavour to establish, on points of dogma, and not without a certain rigidity, the so-called position of the Ancients (salaf).

Under the Circassian Mamlūks (784-922/1382-1517) Hanbalism lost some of its importance in Syria and Palestine for reasons that are hard to ascertain, though doubtless its hostility to the school of Ibn ʿArabī and that of the Ittihādiyya, whose influence was increasing, contributes to the explanation of this relative decline. Though greatly weakened, however, Hanbalism did not disappear altogether. Represented by great families of jurisconsults who monopolized, along with the teaching, the official confess and the profits derived therefrom, it was distinguished by several theologians whose importance deserves emphasis. The list of them is found in the Muḥbars al-ḥanābila, the work of the venerable muftī of the Hanbalīs in Damascus, the Ṣayḥ Muhammad Dīmīl al-Shāṭī (published Damascus 1330/1921), which is based on al-Maḥṣūṭī al-Ṣāḥibī, still unpublished, of Muḍīr al-Dīn al-
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1141-2), himself also a preacher and author of a refutation of Ḡarîmus, founded at Damascus the first great Hanbalī madrasa (Ḍayl, i, 198-201).

Two other families of Hanbalī scholars were eminent at Damascus under the Zangīds and the Ayyubīs, in particular that of the Banū Ḡarîmus, natives of Palestine (cf. H. Laoust, Précis de droit d’Ibn Ku- damma, PIFD, 1950). To this last family belonged the Ṣayḥ Abū al-Ḥanālī (d. 600/1203-4), a traditionist of Ṣūfī tendencies hostile to Ḡarîmus and the Ṣayḥ Muwaffāk al-Dīn Ibn Ku-damma (d. 620/1223), to whom we owe a treatise of Hanbali law, the Mughni (12 vols., Cairo 1922-30), which has enjoyed and continues to enjoy a great reputation. The town of Harrān, on the other hand, was also from very early times an active centre of Hanbalism. The most renowned teacher of this school was Maḏīl al-Dīn Ibn Taymiyya (d. 652/1254-5), to whom is owed the Muntakāb (Cairo 1932) and the Muḥbarān (Cairo 1950).

4. Hanbalism under the Mamlūks and the Ottomans. Hanbalism remained very active in
of this author against the cult of saints and certain forms of Şifism (notably that of the İtîhişâyya). After Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn al-Kayyim is also often cited. But other authors, early or late, such as the kâdi Abû Ya‘ûq or al-Hujwîrî, are also used by the Wahhâbî writers.

Within Hanbalism, however, Wahhâbîsm did not gain the unanimous support of the doctors of the law; certain authors did not follow it or were even hostile to it. Such was the case with Ibn Ḥumayd al-Mâkî (d. 1295/1878; Brockelmann, S II, 812), the author of an important law book of Hanbali biographies, al-Suĥûb al-wadîbîa; an edition of this work would be a great contribution to a better understanding of modern and contemporary Islam.

Passionately discussed at the time of its appearance and at other periods of its history, Wahhâbîsm, which had bitter enemies in the Ottoman Empire, in Persia and in different Arab countries, exercised an influence more or less lasting and more or less profound in the Maghrib, India, and the Arabian peninsula. Its influence on the Syro-Egyptian Muslim reform movement made itself particularly felt with Rašîd Ridî (d. 1935) in the period after the first world war. It has sometimes been sought to establish an influence if not of Hanbalism, at least of the Mursad of Ibn Ḥanbal, in the birth of the movement of the İkhwân al-Muslimîn (cf. J. Heyworth-Dunne, Religious and political trends in modern Egypt, 1950, 16).

For the rest, Hanbali fîkh remains operative, in a large measure, in Sa‘ūdî Arabia. Numerous Hanbalî publications have also been brought out, in the course of the last century, not only in Arabia but also in India, Syria and Egypt.


**HANAFIYYA**

The Hanafi madhhab or school of religious law, named after Ābu Ḥanîfâ (q.v.) al-Nâmîn b. Thâbit. It grew out of the main body of the ancient school of Kûta (q.v.) which absorbed the ancient school of Başra, too. As early as the generation following Abû Ḥanîfa (d. 150/767), we find Abû Yusuf [q.v.] (d. 182/795) refer to him as the "prominent lawyer" (Kitâb al-Khârijî, 11), and al-Shâbîrî [q.v.] (d. 188/805) speak of the "followers of Abû Ḥanîfa". Shâhî [q.v.] (d. 204/820) refers repeatedly to the followers of Abû Ḥanîfa as a homogeneous group (Îhâdsî al-ḥadîqî, on the margin of Kitâb al-‘Um, vol. 1, 337, and elsewhere). The transformation of the bulk of the ancient school of Kûta into the school of the Hâfîs was helped by the extensive literary activity of Abû Yusuf and, above all, of al-Shâbîrî whose main works, the Kitâb al-‘Aṣî (edition begun by Shâfîk Shâhâta, Cairo 1954), the Dâ‘îl al-‘abîr (ed. Abu ‘l-Wafî al-Afghânî,
marks the transition to a more logical and systematic arrangement of the subject-matter within each chapter; it was followed by the Bodâ'î al-dâ'îrî of al-Kâsînî (d. 587/1191), which has a strictly systematic arrangement. These older works were, however, ousted by later handbooks and their commentaries in a process common to all schools of Islamic law.

One of the most important of these is the Hudâyâ of al-Marghûnîn [q.v.] (d. 593/1196; English transl. by Charles Hamilton, London 1792, reprinted Lahore 1957); it acquired numerous commentaries, and in the fourth Fatih (5th/11th century) produced a synopsis of it which he called Ishâ'î al-rûsûyâ. Another member of the literary family deriving from the Hudâyâ is the Dîmîm al-rumûs of al-Kuhûrîn (d. 950/1543) which enjoyed great authority in Transoxiana. The second important later work is the Kanz al-dâ'îrî of Abu l-Barâkât al-Nasâfî [q.v.] (d. 710/1310), again with numerous commentaries, e.g., the Tabyîn al-dâ'îrî of al-Zaylâî (d. 743/1343), and particularly the Bahâ' al-dâ'îrî of Ibn Nudaym [q.v.] (d. 970/1563). The same Ibn Nudaym wrote the Kitâb al-Ãûzû ân 'l-nâzir, a treatise on the systematic arrangement of positive law. In the Ottoman Empire, the Durur al-bukhâm of Mullah Khusraw (d. 885/1478), a commentary on his own 'Ugar al-akbâm, gained particular authority. Based on Kudrî's Muhkâmât, the Muhkâmât of al-Buladî (d. 685/1284), the Kanz al-dâ'îrî, and the Wâjây al-rûsûyâ is the Mutâlû 'l-abhur of Ibrahim al-Halâbî [q.v.] (d. 956/1549); this work soon became the authoritative handbook of the Hanafi school in the Ottoman Empire. The two most popular commentaries on it are the Madîma' al-anhar of Shâykh-zâde (d. 1078/1667), and the Durr al-muntakd of al-Hâshâfî (d. 1088/1777). This same al-Hâshâfî is the author of the Durr al-mughârîr, on which Ibn 'Abîdîn (d. 1252/1836) wrote a commentary called Râdî al-Muhtâr, a highly esteemed work which pays particular attention to the problems of the contemporary world. The latest great expositor of the Hanafi doctrine in the traditional style is the Hukûk illnessâyî ve tislâtahats fikhsyeye hamusu by Ömer Nasuhi Bilmen, muftî of Istanbul, 6 vols., first ed. Istanbul 1900-2 (Publications of the University of Istanbul, no. 402, of the Faculty of Law, no. 112 of the professorship of international law). These works are an attempt to codify the traditional Hanafi doctrine in India, after the Hudâyâ, is the so-called Fatâwâ al-'Âlamgîriyya [q.v.], not a collection of fatwâs but an enormous compilation of extracts from the authoritative works of the school, made by order of the Mu'âshar emperors Awrangzîb 'Âlamgîr (1067/1658-1118/1707). Parts of it were translated into English by N. B. E. Ballis and by Mohamed Ullah Ihsan ibn S. Judah.

Among the more important collections of Hanafi fatwâs are those of Burhân al-Dîn Ibn Mâza (d. about 570/1174), called Dâhîrât al-fatwâs, of Kâdî Khâm [q.v.] (d. 592/1196), of Sirîdî al-Dîn al-Sadîjî (end of the 6th/12th century), who also is the author of a very popular treatise on the law of inheritance, of al-Bazzâzî al-Kârdârî (d. 627/1234), of Abu 'Ishaq al-Âdà'î [q.v.] (d. 982/1574), and of al-Ankârî (d. 1092/1683).

Famous Hanafi works on usûl are the Kanz al-usâlûs of al-Pazdâlî (d. 482/1090), the Kitâb al-usâlûs of Shams al-'Âlimma al-Sarakshî [q.v.] (d. 483/1090), a commentary on the Kâfî of al-Ãûzî al-Shâhîd, in Turkey and the Mu'tahîdîn, an important intellectual center (above), the Mantar al-anwar of Abu l-Barâkât al-Nasâfî (see above), the Tawfîq of Ubayd Allah b. Mas'ud al-Muňâbbî, known as Šadr al-Shârî'â al-Thânî (d. 747/1346), on which the Shâfî author al-Tâfattâzî [q.v.] (d. 792/1391) wrote a commentary called Ta'lisb,
the Ta'khir of Ibn al-Humam (d. 861/1457), with its commentary called Ta'khir, by Ibn Amir al-Hadidi (d. 879/1474), and the Mirak al-anwil by Mullá Khan al-Nawari (d. 882/1477). (On the work of Ibn al-Humam, see R. Brunschvig, Théorie générale de la capacité chez les Hanafites médinaux, in Revue Intern. des Droits de l'Antiquité, ii (1949), 157-72.)


In British India, from 1772 onwards, Islamic law, as it was administered locally fell under the influence of English legal thought, and an independent legal system, substantially different from Islamic law according to Hanafi (and, for the Shi'a minority, according to Shi'i doctrine), came into being. This is properly called Anglo-Muhammadan law (see q. v.—India and Pakistan). There are numerous handbooks of Anglo-Muhammadan law, the most elementary but the most scholarly of which is A. A. A. Fynee, Outlines of Muhammadan Law, 3rd ed., London 1964, completed by his Cases in the Muhammadan Law of India and Pakistan, Oxford 1965.

For the Ottoman Empire, the actual legal system and the administration of justice at the end of the 18th century are described in I. Mouradgea d'Ohsson, Tableau général de l'Empire ottoman, Paris 1797-1820 in 3 vols., 1788-1824 in 7 vols. Then, in 1877, Ottoman Turkey enacted a codification of the law of contracts and obligations and of civil procedure, according to Hanafi doctrine, as the Ottoman Civil Code, or the Medjelle (q.v.). Traditional Islamic law cannot be adequately expressed in the form of a code, and the Medjelle, having been undertaken under the influence of European ideas, is not an Islamic but a secular code, however often modern lawyers may have ventured to debate (d. 884/1476) the works of some of the Hanafi doctrine. It also contains certain modifications of the strict doctrine of Islamic law, mostly by way of omission. But through the intermediary of the Medjelle, the Hanafi form of Islamic law has deeply influenced the "civil law" of several countries in the Near East. In Egypt, about the same time, Muhammad Kadri Pasha put the Hanafi law of family and inheritance, of property, and of usuk into the form of codes, but these efforts, only the first of which was officially sponsored, were never enacted as codes.

The only Western accounts of the strict Hanafi doctrine of Islamic law are L. Blasi, Istituzioni di diritto musulmano, Città di Castello 1914, and G. Bergsträsser's Grundzüge des islamischen Rechts, ed. J. Schacht, now replaced by J. Schacht, Introduction to Islamic Law, Oxford 1966; E. A. A. Hanefiller: J. Schacht, The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence, part I, chapter 2 (on the emergence of the Hanafi school), part IV, chapter 4 (on the reasoning of the early Hanafi authorities); idem, An Introduction to Islamic Law, chapter 9 (on the consolidation of the Hanafi school), chapter 13 (on the Hanafi school in the Ottoman Empire), chapter 14 (on the Hanafi school in Mughal India and on Anglo-Muhammadan Law), and chap. 15 (on the influence of the Hanafi school on the civil laws of the Near East).—On the spread of the Hanafi madhad, see A. Mes, Die Renaissance des Islam, Heidelberg 1922, 202-6 (Eng. tr., 210-5); Ahmad Taymur Pasha, Naframidhikya fi hustad al-madhadh al-arba'a, Cairo 1344, 8 ff.—On authoritative Hanafi works, see N. P. Aghnides, Mohammedan theories of finance, with a bibliography, New York 1916, 161 f., 173 ff., 177 ff. (reprinted Lahore 1961); J. H. Harington, Remarks upon the authorities of Mosulman law, in Asianic Researches: or Transactions of the Society Instituted in Bengal, x (Calcutta 1808), 475-512 (on Hanafi works used in India).

(W. Heffening—J. Schacht)
when Ibn Ziyad sent the fraddi Shurayli with assurances that Hani* was still alive. It is also asserted that Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Christian (III, 67/60; cf. Ibn Sa'd, i, 128; ii, 287). The form ta'famm" is used to mean “the adoption of Islam” (Kamil, 526, poem by Djark; LA, x, 404; cf. Tabari, i, 288). These ideas were sometimes employed in the elaboration of Sufi doctrines. Al-Hasan spoke of himself as “the least of the community of Muhammad” (Mas-siagon, A'zbab 3, 161; and Al-Antaki and Al-Bisti spoke of the basic form of monotheism as al-hanifyya (Massiagon, Passion, 607; Essai 8, 282; etc.). The general Islamic usage underlies the question in Kamil, 244, “What is a hanif? ala 'l-fitra ... ?” (cf. Deyr al-Basrī, 177). In the verses quoted by Yakkit, ii, 51, and other authors, which contrast the hanif with the Christian priest and Jewish rabbi, the word almost certainly means Muslim; and the same may be true of the verse of Sayyid al-Shahid Mu'amim b. 'Afril, (quoted by Ibn Khallikan-De Slane, iv, 338). Most usage. This name presumably belongs to the years immediately following the hizira, especially after the break with the Jews. The technical use of muslim and islam is said not to be before the end of 2 A.H. (R. Bell, Introduction to the Qur'an, Edinburgh 1953, 108), and may be later.

2. Later Islamic usage. The apologetic position associated with the Kur'anic conception of hanif is maintained. Hanif is occasionally used as the equivalent of muslim (Ibn Hisham, 293, 995; cf. 571). More frequent is the use of hanifyya for the 'religion of Abraham' or for Islam (Ibn Hisham, 143, 147; Ibn Sa'd, i, 128; ii, 287). The form tabarrum is said not to be before the end of 2 A.H. (R. Bell, Introduction to the Qur'an, Edinburgh 1953, 108), and may be later.

2. Later Islamic usage. The apologetic position associated with the Kur'anic conception of hanif is maintained. Hanif is occasionally used as the equivalent of muslim (Ibn Hisham, 293, 995; cf. 571). More frequent is the use of hanifyya for the 'religion of Abraham' or for Islam (Ibn Hisham, 143, 147; Ibn Sa'd, i, 128; ii, 287). The form tabarrum is said not to be before the end of 2 A.H. (R. Bell, Introduction to the Qur'an, Edinburgh 1953, 108), and may be later.

2. Later Islamic usage. The apologetic position associated with the Kur'anic conception of hanif is maintained. Hanif is occasionally used as the equivalent of muslim (Ibn Hisham, 293, 995; cf. 571). More frequent is the use of hanifyya for the 'religion of Abraham' or for Islam (Ibn Hisham, 143, 147; Ibn Sa'd, i, 128; ii, 287). The form tabarrum is said not to be before the end of 2 A.H. (R. Bell, Introduction to the Qur'an, Edinburgh 1953, 108), and may be later.

3. Christian usage. The word hanifyya is more frequently used for Muslim by Christian writers than by Muslims (JSS, ii (1957), 360, n. 4; in Euchtychus, Burhan, 1, the rendering "Muslims" is almost certain). The word occurs in a letter written about 590/1194 by a Spanish Christian king to the Almohad ruler (quoted by Ibn Khallikan-De Slane, iv, 58). Most revealing, however, is a passage in the Khamis, a poem by Ibn Sa'd, ii, 595) is Islam, and that al-Sidib al-muhtanifin who observes his prayers (salat) (poem by a Naqdi pagan, Djark 1, 404; cf. Khamisat, iv, 198) is a Muslim. Another possible interpretation of the last two passages is considered below.

3. Christian usage. The word hanifyya is more frequently used for Muslim by Christian writers than by Muslims (JSS, ii (1957), 360, n. 4; in Euchtychus, Burhan, 1, the rendering "Muslims" is almost certain). The word occurs in a letter written about 590/1194 by a Spanish Christian king to the Almohad ruler (quoted by Ibn Khallikan-De Slane, iv, 58). Most revealing, however, is a passage in the Khamis, a poem by Ibn Sa'd, ii, 595) is Islam, and that al-Sidib al-muhtanifin who observes his prayers (salat) (poem by a Naqdi pagan, Djark 1, 404; cf. Khamisat, iv, 198) is a Muslim. Another possible interpretation of the last two passages is considered below.

3. Christian usage. The word hanifyya is more frequently used for Muslim by Christian writers than by Muslims (JSS, ii (1957), 360, n. 4; in Euchtychus, Burhan, 1, the rendering "Muslims" is almost certain). The word occurs in a letter written about 590/1194 by a Spanish Christian king to the Almohad ruler (quoted by Ibn Khallikan-De Slane, iv, 58). Most revealing, however, is a passage in the Khamis, a poem by Ibn Sa'd, ii, 595) is Islam, and that al-Sidib al-muhtanifin who observes his prayers (salat) (poem by a Naqdi pagan, Djark 1, 404; cf. Khamisat, iv, 198) is a Muslim. Another possible interpretation of the last two passages is considered below.

3. Christian usage. The word hanifyya is more frequently used for Muslim by Christian writers than by Muslims (JSS, ii (1957), 360, n. 4; in Euchtychus, Burhan, 1, the rendering "Muslims" is almost certain). The word occurs in a letter written about 590/1194 by a Spanish Christian king to the Almohad ruler (quoted by Ibn Khallikan-De Slane, iv, 58). Most revealing, however, is a passage in the Khamis, a poem by Ibn Sa'd, ii, 595) is Islam, and that al-Sidib al-muhtanifin who observes his prayers (salat) (poem by a Naqdi pagan, Djark 1, 404; cf. Khamisat, iv, 198) is a Muslim. Another possible interpretation of the last two passages is considered below.

3. Christian usage. The word hanifyya is more frequently used for Muslim by Christian writers than by Muslims (JSS, ii (1957), 360, n. 4; in Euchtychus, Burhan, 1, the rendering "Muslims" is almost certain). The word occurs in a letter written about 590/1194 by a Spanish Christian king to the Almohad ruler (quoted by Ibn Khallikan-De Slane, iv, 58). Most revealing, however, is a passage in the Khamis, a poem by Ibn Sa'd, ii, 595) is Islam, and that al-Sidib al-muhtanifin who observes his prayers (salat) (poem by a Naqdi pagan, Djark 1, 404; cf. Khamisat, iv, 198) is a Muslim. Another possible interpretation of the last two passages is considered below.
ed in the interests of anti-Islamic polemic, but it has ample justification in earlier Syriac usages. It was probably because of Christian polemics that the Muslims in the main abandoned the word.

4. Pre-Islamic usage and religious practice. The fact that Muhammad was able to regard himself and the Muslims as following Abraham the hanif shows that there was no organized religious body in the early 6th century A.D. known as the hanifiyya. Since the whole conception, however, had a bearing in pre-Islamic history; that is, they tried to find corroborations of the Kur'anic conception of hanif. Their statements on such matters must therefore not be accepted without careful scrutiny. Thus, when men are said to have set out to seek "the hanifiyya, the religion of Abraham" (Ibn Hishām, 143, 147), it may be true that they set out on a religious quest, but it is practically certain that they did not use that phrase. The primary question, which has been much discussed by modern scholars, is whether there is any conclusive evidence that hanif was used before the revelation of the Kur'ān for a religious ascetic, Christian or otherwise. The suggestion of Ibn Hishām (152) that takāmmul and tahannuth are the same is an example of the attempt to find corroborations of the Kur'ānic conception of hanif, for takāmmul almost certainly is derived from Hebrew or in the sense of "pagan", since it is derived solely from the Arabic root or is derived from Hebrew or is used in the sense of "pagan", since it is therefore historically valueless.

5. Etymology. Suggestions that hanif is formed from the Arabic root or is derived from Hebrew or is etymology of "heathen" coming first. In some Aramaean circles, however, the primary meaning of "heathen" or "pagan" was overshadowed by secondary connotations, such as "of Hellenistic culture", so that the word could be applied to philosophically-minded persons. The movements and individuals exist, but any assertion that some one is a hanif (in the Islamic sense) is the work of a later Muslim apologist, or one under Islamic influence like Thabit b. Kurra, and is therefore historically valueless.

Bibliography: in the article. Earlier literature is summarized in Faris and Glidden, op. cit. (W. Montgomery Watt)

HANDA B. LUDJAYM, ancient Arab tribe, part of Bakr b. Wā'il [q.v.] on a level with Thālab and Ḥḍjīr. The chief subdivisions were al-Dūl (or al-Dūl), ʿAdi, ʿAmir, ʿSuḥaym. They were partly nomadic, partly agricultural (date-palms and cereals), and also partly pagan, partly Christian. The town of al-Hadīj, capital of al-Yamama, belonged chiefly to them, and they took the town of Ḥadīj from Dhu Karb. Other localities mentioned as belonging to them (and as chiefly occupied by them) include: the wādī of al-ʿIrād, al-ʿAwkā, Faysḥān, al-Kirs, Ḥurrān, al-Manṣūf (a fortified town), Ṭalaʿ b. ʿAtā, al-Thāq (or al-Nakb), ʿUdāb, Ḥūṭal. The Hanifa are said to have moved from al-Hijjār to al-Yamama after the termination of an older culture there [see Tays]. Their separation from the rest of Bakr apparently took place towards the end of the war of Basūs [q.v.], and they were absent from the battle of Dhu Kār [q.v.]. This absence may be connected with the fact that they recognized the suzerainty of the Lakhmids of al-Ḥira and were employed in conducting Persian caravans from the Yemen to ʿIrāk. In extending their influence over the region between al-Yamama and ʿIrāk they came into conflict with Tamīm, to whom they were subject. About 600 A.D. their leader about 600 A.D., Kāṭāda b. Maslama, was succeeded by Ḥawdha b. ʿAll, apparently a Christian, who on one occasion was well received at the Persian court and given a crown, in reward for his services in conducting caravans. With the decline of the Persian empire after 628, Ḥawdha began negotiations with Muhammad, but had not become a Muslim before his
death in 630. Thumama b. Uthal, who may have been Hawdha's successor, is said to have become a Muslim after being captured in a raid. He was leader of the royal Muslims of Hanifa in the wars of the ridda, when a large section of the tribe revolted against Medina under Musaylima [q.v.].

Bibliography: Ibn al-Kalbi, Djamhurat al-naub, ed. W. Caskel; al-Hamadani, see Index Historicus; al-Bakri, Mu'igungam, Cairo, index; Aghani, Tables; A. P. Caussin de Perceval, Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme, Paris 1847, index; Yakut, Mu'igungam, index; al-Tahari, i, 1205, 1737-9, 1748 f., 1929-57, etc.; Ibn Hisghan, 945 f., 965, etc.; Ibn Sa'd, ii, 1 25 f., 33 f.; Caentani, Annali, ii A.H., § 32A, 67-9A; W. Hoenerbach, in Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, No. 4, 1951, 253-67; Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina, Oxford 1956, 136-7. (W. Montgomery Watt)
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tr. Elliot and Dowson, History of India . . , ii, 140),
capturing it at his second . Two years later, however, the Dihl rādī Mahīpāl recaptured Ḥānsī, and it was strengthened by him and subsequent builders. Towards the end of the next century it was enlarged and further strengthened by Prithvi Rājī as a bulwark against the Ghūrī forces; but, after the defeat of the Ḥūnhī forces at Tarāwīrī by Muḥammad b. Sām, Ḥānsī also surrendered (588/1192). At the end of that year a Āwāhnī army invaded Ḥārīyānā, compelling the Muslim governor Nuṣrat al-Ḍīn to take refuge in the fort; but they were overcome by ʿUṯb b. ʿAḍīny Arābī (details incorrect in Wolseley Haig, Cambridge history of India, iii, 42, cf. Ḥodīvhā, Ṣawīdī, ed. Ḥaqqī, s.f., 181/1325). Within a few months, Ṭuba b. Ṭibālī made it the headquarters of Muslim power in India; the Muslim hold on Ḥānsī thereafter remained secure.

Ḥānsī frequently figures in the chronicles of the Dīhlī sultānate both as an important brain (for its strategic importance see Ḥārīyānā, of which it was the principal town) and as an imāmāt of numerous officials: doubtless a convenient one for the sultan to have at his disposal, for it was far enough from Dīhlī to make appointment—or banishment—to it a reality, but it was sufficiently close to the power of arms at the capital to prevent a rebel from easily asserting his independence. For example, it was the imāmāt of Ḥājīyāth al-Ḍīn Balbān [see Dīhlī Sultānate] in about 640/1242, to which he was banished in 650/1252-3 after the conspiracy against him; when he had gathered some local support there he was sent further, to Ṣawīrā, and Ḥānsī was nominally given to an infant son of the king but in practice was occupied by one of Balbān's opponents (Mihndājī Iṣārī Dijujīnī, Ṣabābūtāt-i Nāṣīrī, ed. Bb. Ind. 202; Eng. tr. Raverty, ii, 140); other princes bad held this imāmāt previously, for example Abu ʿl-ʿAṯār Muḥāmnūd, the son of Iltīmāṣ, who died in 626/1229, held Ḥānsī before 623/1226 (Ṭubabūlāt-i Nāṣīrī, 180) and there built the ṣāyidūn, for some time, for Ḥānsī in disorder until the British established direct rule over the region in 1818.

Monuments.—The old fort has already been mentioned; it was dismantled after the mutiny of 1857, but the gate of the Durbar and the arms at the capital that at Aḥsān pur. remain. The dargāḥ of Sayyīd Shāḥ Nūmān Allāḥ, who accompanied Muḥammad b. Sām in 588/1192 and was killed at the conquest of Ḥānsī, stands in the fort; Hindu materials were freely used in its construction, and if the date 588 in the inscription of the attached mosque is correct it must be the oldest mosque in India (some doubt; cf. Ḥorovitz, op. cit., 19). On the west of the town stand the mosque and tomb of Ḥūndūt, whose tomb was burnt alive by the king. Another important battle was on the “day of Kahbarah”, a few years later, when B. ʿĀmir b. Ṣaḥāṣa [q.v.] annoyed because Laktū b. Zūrārā had given hospitality to the killer of their chief, attacked a caravan of Ḥānsī and made some prisoners and took booty. An attempt by Laktū to revenge this defeat led to the more disastrous defeat
at Shi’b Djabala. Hanzala were part of the forces of Tamim on the second "day of Kulab", when they successfully repulsed an attack. Among the first of the tribe to become a Muslim was al-Akra' b. Habis [g.v.] of Dārim. It was among Tamim that the prophetess Sada'ith appeared in the "wars of the ridāda"; among those supporting her was Mālik b. Nuwayra (Yarbūt), who was put to death by Khālid b. al-Walid. To Hanzala belonged Ansām b. Mukharrama, mother of Abū Dā' īli [g.v.]. After the conquests many of the tribe settled in Baṣra and elsewhere in the Ḥijāz (cf. al-Diyāzī, [g.v.]); Sayyība [g.v.] became clients (Pellat, *Mīliu Bawirien*, 37, 41). Some Khāriḍī leaders came from Hanzala, notably Urwa b. Udayya who led the opposition to 'All at Ṣifīf and was executed in Baṣra about 58/676; also his brother, Abū Bālīl Mirdās (killed 61/681).


**HANZALA B. ṢAFWĀN**

One of the people of the Interval (*fatra* [q.v.]), regarded as a prophet sent to the Ashāb al-Rass [q.v.], who maltreated and killed him before being destroyed themselves. The formation of the legend apparently began in the 9th century (cf. al-Dīabhī, *Tarāb*, ed. Pellat, index) but Ibn Kūṭayba does not mention Hanzala among the prophets of the fatra, and the Maṣūdī, in the *Muruqji* (i, 123, 125, 195), devotes only a few lines to him. Later on, the necessity felt by the exegetists to explain the Qur'anic expression Ashāb al-Rass (XXV, 40/58, L, 12) brought about a widespread development of the legend, which finally attributed to Hanzala the role played by Khalid b. Sinan *[q.v.*] in the removal or destruction of the fabulous bird called *'ansūh* [q.v.], which was ravaging the Ashāb al-Rass (al-Ḳāzwait, *Aṣdhīd*, ed. Wūstendfeld, 367).

Furthermore, the verse (XXII, 44/45): "how many stone-built wells, how many powerful palaces ['Adid'īb, al-Rass (al-Kazwinī, ed. Wiistenfeld, 367)."

**HANZALA B. ṢAFWĀN**

The disturbances which resulted in the fall of the Umayyads had their repercussions in the Maghrib. A usurper, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥabīb al-Ṣafīrī, who was descended from Ḥubīb b. Naṭifī, returned from Spain, raised a revolt at Tunis, and called on Hanzala to hand over Khayrāwīn to him; because of religious scruples, the latter offered no resistance and left the capital (Pīrūmād I 127/February 745) to return to the East.


(R. Basset*)

**HĀRA,** "Quarter" or "ward of a town" [see *MAḌĪNA, MAḤALLA."

**HARĀFISH, HARĀFISHA** [see *HARFUSH."

**HARAKA WA-SUKUN** "motion and rest", a technical expression used, on the one hand, in philosophy and theology, and, on the other, in grammar.

I.—**Philosophy and Theology**

I.—The *Fādalīfa* take the Greek theories for their base. Thus al-Kindī exactly reproduces Aristotle’s thought when he writes, like him linking time and motion, that time is a duration...
number of motion). Furthermore, al-Kindi knows the famous formula: time is the number of motion; he identifies it with the preceding one (li-anina l-samand innamand hawwadadd al-’araka, an-nih annahu muadda tuwadduhu l-’araka). There is no motion without body and time; these three realities are simultaneous in existence. Motion presupposes something moveable that is a body; if there is neither motion nor time there is nothing that goes from . . .

Furthermore, al-Kindi knows the famous formula: time is the number of motion; he identifies it with the preceding one (li-anina l-samand innamand hawwawadd al-’araka, an-nih annahu muadda tuwadduhu l-’araka). There is no motion without body and time; these three realities are simultaneous in existence. Motion presupposes something moveable that is a body; if there is neither motion nor time there is nothing that goes from . . .

“Nature is the principle (ibtidat) of motion, and of rest after motion”. Al-Kindi defines the efficient cause thus: “the principle of motion of a thing of which it is the cause”. Nature is thus the way the efficient cause (al-’ibtidat) moves a body; if there is neither simultaneous in existence. Motion presupposes something moveable that is a body; if there is neither motion nor time there is nothing that goes from . . .

As for the efficient physical cause, it causes to exist the being (masdar al-tafrrik), realties, that which gives existence is the principle of existence. Such is the opinion of Ibn Sina; on the other hand, the notion of existence leads to rest after motion”. Al-Kindi defines the efficient cause thus: “the principle of motion of a thing of which it is the cause”. Nature is thus the way the efficient cause (al-’ibtidat) moves a body; if there is neither simultaneous in existence. Motion presupposes something moveable that is a body; if there is neither motion nor time there is nothing that goes from . . .

Thus al-Kindi defines the efficient cause thus: “the principle of motion of a thing of which it is the cause”. Nature is thus the way the efficient cause (al-’ibtidat) moves a body; if there is neither simultaneous in existence. Motion presupposes something moveable that is a body; if there is neither motion nor time there is nothing that goes from . . .

Thus al-Kindi defines the efficient cause thus: “the principle of motion of a thing of which it is the cause”. Nature is thus the way the efficient cause (al-’ibtidat) moves a body; if there is neither simultaneous in existence. Motion presupposes something moveable that is a body; if there is neither motion nor time there is nothing that goes from . . .

Since the gradual motion is a gradual transition of that which necessarily exists potentially with respect to its arrival at that place. But the orientation necessarily precedes the arrival; as long as the orientation exists actually, the arrival exists potentially. The orientation is, then, a first fulfilment for this body, which necessarily exists potentially with respect to its second fulfilment, that is to say, with respect to its arrival”. This passage shows that in the definition of time as the “measure” of motion confusion is caused by forgetting that time is not a number that counts but a number that is counted. It is this confusion that causes a vicious circle. Besides, tawaddul is not enough; it is potential motion, but not yet a real motion, the actuality of a potentiality. Al-Kindi’s tawaddul, because of its root meaning and the shade of meaning of the maqsadar of the Vth form, more accurately renders the reality.

Thus it is pointed out that quantitative (min kum ida kam akhar) motion affects both matter and form, and that rarefaction (talakhalkul) and condensation (talakhatyul) growth (numa) and shrinking (huzul), becoming fat (siman) and becoming thin (hursul) must be distinguished. Change of position is distinguished from movement on the spot (wadidyaya), in the motion of rotation (’ala ’l-tawaddul); “each part of the moveable object leaves each one of the places of its position—in a case where there is a position—, but the whole remains attached to its position. We add “in a case where there is a position”, in order to include in the definition of motion the encompassing Sphere (which, properly speaking, has no position)” (al-Tahhännawi).

The theory of motion is linked, as it is for the Greeks, with the organization of the cosmos. The circular motion of the celestial spheres, the most perfect motion, is eternal because its limit coincides with its origin, and there exists no time outside it; time cannot preexist the motion of the encompassing Sphere. The motion of the spheres determines the various motions in the time of the beings of the sublunary world, in particular that of the elements upwards (al-’araka al-s’ida) or downwards (al-kubah). The composition of the elements is considered as motion: a change in the manner of being of that which is not compound (al-takrib al-’araka, wa-in lam yakun ham lam yakun takrib) (al-Kindi). A distinction is also drawn between essential (dhalityya) motion, which moves a body without the intervention of the motion of another, and accidental
motion, like that of a man who is on a ship under way; and between natural motion and forced motion (şıq, al-harakah al-basiyya), in which the motive force is given to the body or to the object moved (al-mutahārika); this applies to artificial motions. A being can receive the principle of its motion from another (min ḥayrīhi: God, Nature), but have it in itself and move with a natural motion. Forced motion occurs when its principle remains external to the body: “When the principle of motion in a body comes from outside (min khādiri), min ḥayrīhi . . . , that which results from this motion is an artificial (ṣināda) principle of the same type as the art” (Shafīʾ, Ilāhiyyāt, 282). Motion is simple or compound. Simple (ḥaṣīta) motion is voluntary (bi-l-irda) —that of the stars, or involuntary—that of physical nature, that is to say, of the elements. Compound (muqākkabā) motion stems from animal (al-ḵuwās al-ḥayawndīyya) or non-animal force. In the latter case, we have vegetative (nabīsyya) motion; in the former, voluntary or animal (ṭaḥṣīyya basīyya) motion, if it is accompanied by localization in the same place. The initial force is taken into consideration only in the case of unnatural motions, that is, in their continuity. Most interesting too is this other problem: the point of departure at which the body is at rest and from which it is set in motion partakes at the same time of rest and motion; but then we cannot clearly distinguish between motion and rest; the object at rest, at the time when it is at rest, begins to tend (ṣahrī) towards motion. These speculations border on what we call dynamics, continuity and integration of motion. Unfortunately the solution offered is purely verbal and is expressed by rhetorical juggling which cannot be translated: al-harakah kawn awsal fi mahān ṭalūn, wa-l-suhkān kawn ṭalīr fi mahān awsal, that is to say that motion consists in being in a second place from the first, or this leads onwards, and that rest consists in being in the first place of origin at a second time. That is as it may, this rhetorical form meets as best it can the demands of the dialectic of motion (cf. al-Tahānāwī).

Rest is presented at the limit of motion as a second fulfilment, following the pattern of the immutability proper to that which is perfect. There is also a type of rest closer to the inertia of matter, from which motion emerges. The Rhādī idea is the one of an agent that acts “goes back to a cause which is the principle of a change (ṭaḥṣīr) following a state of stability (ṭabīl) and rest (ṣuhīn); this is what is called motion” (Tafṣīr, ii, 491). The commentator does not exactly follow Aristotle, who makes of the agent a principle of both change and stopping (Metaphys. 1013 a 29 and 1013 b 24). The idea of a rest before motion is clearly expressed by the Ilāhīwān al-Ṣafā. The body is not moveable because of its corporeity (disīmiyya), even though the Spheres exist only with their motion. The mover of the body is another substance, the soul (i, 228). The act of the universal soul is to impart to them their revolutions (iḍārāt), and to end this to keep at rest (tasbih) the individual centre of each of them. The soul is alive by itself. Thus motion is life. In certain bodies it is essential, as in fire; when its motion ceases and it is at rest, it is extinguished. Elsewhere it is accidental, as in water, air and earth, which continue to exist if their motion stops. Motion is a form which the soul puts into the body after having given it its shape (gabd). Rest is the absence (ṣadom) of this form; it is better suited (awlā) to the body than motion, since the body has dimensions and cannot be moved in all these directions at once. Its motion in one of these directions suits it no better than motion in another. It is itself a spiritual form which penetrates all parts of the body and withdraws from them instantaneously; in the same way light penetrates a translucent body in one instant. But once the motion of the body has penetrated it completely in one instant, it spreads little by little after the fashion of heat.
or in another. But this restriction (harf), which
consists in speaking of a motion or a rest of
what fundamentally defines them, the relation of
antecedent and posteriority, leads to
denying both motion and rest. Thus Abu l-Hujhayl
postulates, for the first moment when creatures
come into being, a situation intermediate (wādāṣa) be-
tween motion and rest. It is from similar problems
that Leibnitz's metaphysics sprang, in the West, as
the foundation of modern dynamics.

3.—Kurar và Tafsir.—The Kurān exhibits
no use of karas and sufūn that lend themselves to
a commentary on the physical reality of motion and
rest. The ingenuity of the commentators makes
up for this. Thus Faqîr al-Dîn al-Râzî, on XL, 61
("God has made for you the night that you may rest
in it"), writes: "Motions produce fatigue, because
they necessarily develop heat and dryness which
give rise to a disturbing irritation". Furthermore,
the great number of motions disperses the animal
physiology of the mouth during the emission of the
sounds to which they refer, notwithstanding the
legendary part in their creation attributed to Abu

The karas are deficient by their nature: as
regards their content, as we have just seen, they are
part of another, as regards their existence they cannot
maintain themselves by themselves, but need the sup-
port of a harf såbih or one acting as if it were såbih;
and their place on this support, fî l-muraba "accord-
ing to rank" (that is, in accordance with the natural
order), is "after the harf" (ibid., 32-7). But the latter
also needs the harf to exist. When there is a
karaha after the harf, it is a harf muṭaharrik, it
possesses its karaha; in iskān the harf is bereft of
its natural appurtenance. It can manage without this
if it can rely on the karaha of a preceding harf
muṭaharrik. But, without a karaha either after or
before it (which would be the case of the first con-
sonant in an initial group), iskān, for the Arab
grammarians, is inconceivable in the Arabic language.
Thus there is a necessary association between harf
and karaha. Thus the karaha continues to be conceived
within syllabism. This may be called "implicit
syllabism" (as in the case of the Canaanite alphabet),
in contrast to the "explicit syllabism" of Akkadian
cuneiform and the Ethiopic script.

The diphthongs exist in Arabic: aw and ay (see
H. Fleisch, Traité, § 7), but it has no name in Arabic
grammatical nomenclature, extensive though this is.
Nowhere else is it discussed. Now in Arab phono-
etical theory it comes in here quite naturally, as Ibn
Djinni shows (ibid., 21-30) that, in the manner in
which the harf såbih, alif, awd, yd, may come after a
karaha. Every harf såbih, whether muṭaharrik or såbih
(including waw muṭaharika and yd muṭaharika),
can come after any karaha. But it is not so with these
two bu'af. There are impossible cases: these are alif after kasra.
There are cases of difficulty or repugnance which
demand a corrective; these are waw after kasra or yd
after damma, that is, w, u; in the first case the
waw is made by kâb into yd, and in the second, the
ya is made by kâb into waw, that is, y, i, as in
misân, and w > i, as in mükin. But waw or yd after "the weak", the harf muṭaharrik
that presents no difficulty for the language. This is
the case of the diphthongs aw and ay, which ought to
have deserved special attention, but, from the Arab
viewpoint, it was simply that waw and yd came after
fatha and remained unchanged—though this was in
contradiction with the theory of the karaha as a part
of the harf al-madd, its awd, which announces and
requires its completion, and Ibn Djinni's efforts were
directed to demonstrating that this theory held good.
Some authors reserved the name of harf al-lin for
the harf al-madd in this position; but this has re-
mained a special usage.

The name karaha cannot be dissociated from its
sub-divisions, fatha, kasra, damma. These latter terms
are purely Arabic, and have some relation to the
physiology of the mouth during the emission of the
sounds to which they refer, notwithstanding the
legendary part in their creation attributed to Abu
'l-Aswad al-Du'all (al-Sīrafi, Akhbdr al-nahwiyyin, 16, lines 8-10). As regards the term haraka "movement", i.e., the movement of the articulate organs, this only spread through a certain connected sound to which the term was transferred, a very simple observation might have led to the idea; and this would naturally lead to its opposite suḥān, "rest, quiescence". In our view, all these terms, haraka, suḥān, faṭha, kasra, damma, represent an Arab creation, expressing one of the first insights of the Arabs as they pondered over their language. Thus, it is only the moments of the grammar of the Arabs and there is no need to seek the origin of the concept of haraka in the philosophy and the musical science of the Greeks, as M. Bravmann seeks to do (Materialien, 12).

The signs representing the harakas and the suḥān belong to the supplementary elements added to the Kur'ānic script without affecting the ductus of the word, and constitute what is known as the scriptio plurim. Gradually (the 190s-200s). To denote the harakas a dot was used at first, above the harf for faṭha, below for kasra, and in the middle for damma, with two points in the case of tanwīn, not in black like the ductus of the word, but coloured, usually red, in order to distinguish them and to change nothing of the true body of the word (al-Dānī, K. al-nuṣūb, 134, line 1). R. Blachère (ibid., 93-6) describes this insertion of vowel-points, in which at first only the vocals of īrāb were indicated, the vocals of inflexion, which were especially important since they determined the function of the word in the sentence. He says nothing about suḥān. As al-Dānī reports (ibid., 137, lines 5-7) it was first marked by a little red horizontal line (dīrārā) above the harf. Other signs were subsequently employed before the current little circle came into use (see Wright, Ar.Gr., ii, 13C).

A particular case of suḥān is the gīzām, quiescence of the final harf of the mudārīn, which is then al-maḏdiqūn, the apocopated.

**Bibliography:** Dānī, Kūṭb al-nuṣūb, ed. G. Pretzl (Bibl. Islamica, iii, 1932), 132-7; Ibn Dīnīn, Sirr sinā'at al-īrāb, i, Cairo 1373/1954, 19-38; R. Blachère, Introduction au Coran, Paris 1959; M. Bravmann, Materialien und Untersuchungen zu den phonischen Lehren der Araber, München 1898; H. Fleisch, La conception phonétique des arabes d'après le Sirr sin'at al-īrāb d'Ibn Dīnīn, in ZDMG, civi (1958), 78-6, 81-8, 91-3, 98-100; ibid., Traité de philologie arabe, Beirut 1961, § 42, 49a-f. (H. Fleisch)

**HARAM (plur. aḥrām, aḥrāmā'), and in the popular dialect of Egypt, thvrām, the latter also used as a singular), a word of doubtful origin - pyramid. In Muslim literature, al-maḏforāt, which in the Malākid chapter on pyramids and Cheops, or sometimes also of Mycerinos, west of Dīzā (Giza). They have been mentioned and described times without number by the geographers, but as a rule their accounts have little value as original documents. The most important sources are collected in al-Maḏforāt, a work on pyramids in an Arabic manuscript. On this point, it is improbable for reasons already set forth by De Sacy that this Caliph could have undertaken this task himself, especially when we remember how brief his stay in Egypt was. We also know that the pyramids had already been broken into in ancient times. Nevertheless, it may be presumed that it was about that time that further progress into the interior of the Pyramid of Cheops was made for the first time in the Muslim period and that the tomb-chamber, of which we have numerous more or less clear accounts, was gradually reached. The belief generally current that rich treasures were concealed there was no doubt a stimulus to this work. In later times we learn of an unsuccessful attempt by al-Mallik al-Sa'dī to destroy the Little Pyramid (509/1169-7). Karakūq had previously by Saladin's orders removed a series of the smaller pyramids of Dīzā to use the stone to build walls and bridges at Dīzā (cf. also Khītāt, ii, 131). Furthermore, in all the stories about these colossal constructions, whose original significance was the object of the most fantastic speculations, the kernel of fact is enveloped in fairy-tales such as are associated with no other ancient monuments in Egypt. Some of them even go back to Herodotus, like the story of the woman, the spirit of the pyramid of Mycerinos, who destroys the reason of any one approximating it by her beauty and her smile; this is apparently a survival of the story of Rhodopis, the traditional builder of this pyramid (Wiedemann, 485 ff.). Herodotus likewise already mentions subterranean canals connecting the Nile and the pyramids (ibid., 466). In other cases, as Maspero has shown, distinct recollections of Old Egyptian ideas have survived; for example, in the description of the guardians of the western and eastern pyramids, there is reflected the impression made on later ages by the monuments of the period of the Pharaohs. But it is legends from the sphere of Coptic-gnostic ideas that have become most strongly associated with these buildings. The two great pyramids there became the tombs of the prophets Hermes and Agathodaimon, and with this was combined the tradition that they were built to conceal treasures and prevent the wisdom of the first generations of mankind from being destroyed by the inundation of the deluge prophesied by the astrologers. Another tradition is that which is associated with the legendary figure of Shaddāb b. 'Aḍ (p.q.v.).

**Bibliography:** The main Arabic sources as well as modern literature are quoted in E. Graefe, Das Pyramidenkapiel in al-Mastri's 'Bīja, 1911 (cf. the new edition by G. Wiet), and in G. Wiet's introduction to his new edition of Vattier, L'Égypte de Muradī, fès du Géphphé, 1953, 80 f.; ibn Baṭṭūṭa, i, 80 f. (tr. Gibb, i, 1958, 51-2); J. Ruska, Tabula Smaragdina, 1926, 61 f.; M. Flessner, in Stud. Islam., 1954, 45-60; De Sacy, Observations sur l'origine du Som platé par les Grecs et les Arabes aux Pyramides d'Egypte, in Magasin Encyclopédique, 1801, vi, 450-503; Wiedemann, Herodot's zweites Buch, passim; Ebers, Ägyptische Studien, 153 f., where further literature is given; Völlers, in ZDMG, x (1847), 654; Carra de Vaux, L'Abri des Merveilles (= Ps.-Mas'ūdī, Aḥbār al-samā'il, 1950) and M. L. Vorster remarks on it in Journal des Savants, 1899, 99 f., 154 f.; cf. the latter's Études de mythologie et d'archéologie égyptiennes, i; Berthelot, Les merveilles de l'Égypte et les savants Alexandrins, ibid., 241 f., 271 f.; von Bissing, Der Bericht des Diodor über die Pyramiden; Baedeker's Egypt.

(General Bibliography: M. Flessner)
after Mecca and Medina the acknowledged third holiest Muslim sanctuary, is located in the south-eastern part of the present Old (i.e., walled) City of Jerusalem. It is presumed to have been a Haram (a sacred enclosure) from the earliest times, and the significance of the Haram has been complicated by two factors: first, the contrast between an extreme paucity of early sources (written or archaeological) and a systematic explanation of the Haram's significance in the fata"u or holy guidebooks of the late Mamluk period; and, second, the lack of any complete archaeological survey of the area and the extreme paucity of more comprehensive information in Islamic sources.

A first group comprises monuments attached to the Haram, some of the later gates were entrances to institutions which bordered it. A second group commemorates Prophets whose lives were associated with Jerusalem: Abraham, Joseph, Jacob, Jesus. Finally there is a large number of sanctuaries on the Haram took several centuries and the number of gates, and monuments were obliterated during the Crusades. For earlier times we possess only lists (Ibn al-Fakih, al-Mukaddas, Ibn 'Abd Rabbih) of monuments. It seems, however, that the growth of individual small sanctuaries on the Haram took several centuries and that it was not before the Fatimid period that the whole area had acquired its full complement of religious associations and of monumental expressions of these associations. The reasons for this are to be found primarily in the peculiarities of the history of Muslim Jerusalem. The former Temple area became first of all the site of the Muslim congregational sanctuary, and its present shape in Umayyad times, although based on Herodian plans, Second, as the character and shape of the city changed, emphases on more or less significant gates shifted as well, but certain names of gates (Hitta, Nabî, Assâbî, etc.) had acquired a permanent religious value and shifted from one place to the other. Third, while all early gates were entrances to the Haram, some of the later ones (bâb al-Kaṭṭānantî, for instance) were entrances from the Haram to institutions which bordered it.

Approximately in its centre the Haram is a large trapezoidal platform (southern end: 281 metres; northern end: 310 metres; eastern end: 462 metres; western end: 491 metres), whose eastern border and parts of the southern one coincide with the walls of the present city. Its size remained constant throughout the Muslim Middle Ages, since an inscription to that effect (Max van Berchem, no. 163, with important commentaries) still exists and was seen as early as the 4th/10th century. This platform is totally artificial; its northern side was cut out of the natural rock, while its southern end was raised over rocks and valleys, including, in the southeastern corner, the Tyropoeon valley, now 28-50 metres below the surface. The underground parts of the Haram include 37 cisterns and, at the southern end, a vast complex known as Solomon’s Stables consisting of vaults on thick piers and the so-called Double Gate (mârâgha), this list is already found in Mudiir al-Din in the 9th/15th century and can be assumed to represent the last stage of major developments on the Haram, i.e., the Mamluk period. For earlier times, especially before the Crusades, the question of the gates is far less significant than the subject of numerous controversies (summary and bibliography in O. Grabar, A new inscription from the Haram, in Studies . . . in honour of Professor K. A. C. Creswell, London 1965). All problems concerning the gates have not yet been solved but the following points can be justified. First, from the Mamluk period onwards, only northern and western gates were open, but in Fatimid times southern ones were still used and both these and the Golden Gate (now blocked); South: Single, Double, and Triple Gates; West: bâb al-Mughârûba (on top of an older gate known as bâb al-Nâbi), bâb al-Silsila, bâb al-Muta-wâfâda, bâb al-Hadîd, bâb al-Nâzîr, bâb al-Sarây, bâb al-Qawânînî, etc. It is, however, certain that it was not before the Fatimid period that the whole area had acquired its full complement of religious associations and of monumental expressions of these associations. The reasons for this are to be found primarily in the peculiarities of the history of Muslim Jerusalem. The former Temple area became first of all the site of the Muslim congregational
mosque in the city, then that of the monumental Dome of the Rock expressing Umayyad power and ambitions, and only later a complete ensemble with prestigious Mamluk and Ottoman usage, to Jerusalem and Makkah, occasionally, in both terms (yazidii [q.v.]), canonic for Mecca only, the second one being more significant is proved by the vast literature which grew around it and by the facts that it contains the first masterpiece of Islamic architecture and that princes and laymen over many centuries lavished money and efforts on its beautification.

Bibliography: A full bibliography will be found in the articles AL-KUDS and KUBBAT AL-SAKHEIRA. In addition to references in the text, the most important guides to the problems of the Haram are Muğlis al-Din, Ta'rikh al-Kuds wa 'l-Kudsiyoon, 2 vols., Cairo 1283 (partial translation by H. Sauvage, Histoire de Jérusalem et d'Hébron, Paris 1876), and the second volume of Max van Berchem's Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum: Jérusalem, Cairo 1925.

(O. Grabar)

AL-HARAMAYN, the two holy places, usually referring to Mecca and Medina, occasionally, in both Muslim religious meanings and with some exception in the gdh/isth century were by popular usage rather than by full agreement on the unified holiness of the area. Still to-day a confusion exists between the Haram area as merely the "mosque" of the city of Jerusalem and the Haram as the unique place of a number of holy events. In spite of these confusions and of the complicated history of the area, the depth of its religious and symbolic significance is proved by the vast literature which around it and by the facts that it contains the first masterpiece of Islamic architecture and that princes and laymen over many centuries lavished money and efforts on its beautification.

Bibliography: A full bibliography will be found in the articles AL-KUDS and KUBBAT AL-SAKHEIRA. In addition to references in the text, the most important guides to the problems of the Haram are Muğlis al-Din, Ta'rikh al-Kuds wa 'l-Kudsiyoon, 2 vols., Cairo 1283 (partial translation by H. Sauvage, Histoire de Jérusalem et d'Hébron, Paris 1876), and the second volume of Max van Berchem's Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum: Jérusalem, Cairo 1925.

(O. Grabar)
HARAR, capital of Ethiopia's largest province, an important commercial centre, and one of the main Muslim cities in East Africa. Since the governorship of Ras Makonnen, Emperor Hayla Sellasse's father, Harar has played an increasingly important part in the life of Eastern Ethiopia and is at present the seat of the Imperial Military Academy and an agricultural college. Its famous market, favourable climate (with an annual mean temperature of 20°C), and history, together with its picturesque setting as a medieval walled city, have made Harar one of the principal tourist attractions of modern Ethiopia. Its cosmopolitan population, estimated at some 60,000, consists of Gallas, Somalians, Monophonic Amharas, Levantines, and Europeans, but somewhat less than half can be described as genuine Hararis and speakers of the indigenous Semitic language. The principal name associated with the study of the history, Islamization, and language of Harar is that of Enrico Cerulli.

The history of Harar is very largely identical with that of Islam in Ethiopia in general and has as such been discussed under AL-HARASI.

At a later period the Walasma sultans transferred their capital to Harar, possibly to extricate themselves from the pressure exerted by their generals who drew support from the Danakil [see DANAKIL] and Somalis [q.v.]. Chief among those forceful military commanders was Ahmad ibn Ibrahim (nicknamed Grañ [see Ahmad Grañ] 'the lefthanded'), who soon became the effective master of all the newly conquered Muslim possessions in Ethiopia and assumed the title of Imam. In the middle of the 11th/12th century a new Muslim state was established as the independent Emirate of Harar which continued until Menelik's conquests at the end of the 19th century when, in 1887, Harar was incorporated in the Christian Ethiopian Empire.

The Kadiriyya is the foremost Islamic order in East Africa and is particularly strong in the Harar region. In madghab, the people of Harar belong overwhelmingly to the Shafi\x27ite rite.

Harari (or Adare\xa0h\xa0a) is the Semitic language spoken in the town of Harar.

AL-HARASI [see KASR].

AL-HARASI (Harsus\i; in their own speech: Hars\hsrb (Hars\hsry)) a bilingual, nomadic Arabic tribe of 400 or fewer arms-bearing males, Shaf\i Sunnis in religion and Hin\\nh\v in regional political faction; identified as to dir\a with the barren steppe called Diiddat al-Harasis—below the south-east corner of al-Rim\al, "the Sands" (al-Rub\a; al-Kh\a\i [q.v.])—but usually ranging in the area of seaward-trending, forge-filled wadis towards the coasts of al-Ba\a\âir and the southern al-Djana\a (q.v.). Their eponymous tribal area, called by them and by al-Mahru [q.v.], extends east and west from the (inland) terminal basins of Wadi Muk\hsin and Wadi Ti\a\ra (q.v.—the latter in Haras\i and Mahru: ba-W\d\i\db\x20Œreh—to Sayh\a al-\ubaym\a (a smaller portion of the south-east Arabian steppe desert) and the rough north-south strip of al-H\hsf\ or al-H\\nh\x20Œif. From Ramlat al-Salama (a marginal district of "The Sands") it extends south across the small, læg\a\i\n\g\d\' mm\a\i\i\s\a\h\x20Œif and its terminal sand-district, a-Ba\hs\ht, to the group of wadis which, through Sayh\a al-D\j\\nh\a\kiz\x20Œir, enter Gubb\a\t\x20Œikirah of the Arabian Sea. (Of these the chief, north-east to south-west, are: Hayt\a (Hatt\a), Ar\b\nib, G\hsd\x20Œan (or the eastern G\hsd\x20Œan), W\\nh\o\f, and south of al-D\j\\nh\a\kiz\x20Œir, \"Ayn\a—"the upper portion of which, among multilingual southern Arabs, goes under variations, some of them with \hsrb, of the Djun\a\y\b (and Ba\hs\x20Œad\a\l) toponym ba-Rik\x20Œit, "the r\a\x20Œik (arak tree")).

The Haras\i country is touched to the north-east by a motor track from east coastal Ra\a\x20Œak\x20Œm, and is crossed from south-west to north-east by a motor track from southern coastal Salal\a (q.v.); Mahri, etc.: Ts\o\la\l\o\l; but Shahr\x20Œi-Karawi: Ts\o\l\i\l\i\l. The two joining and continuing north through the Say\a or steppe of al-Dur\a to \"I\b\r\i\n\g\d\' and al-Buraymi (q.v.—without a single permanent water source (except potential k\a\i\a\m\a\n\a\i\s\s\a\h\x20Œed and usually capped by oil explorers), al-Harasis at times, even in summer, pasture their animals without watering, while themselves subsisting on milk (\hsrb\x20Œa, yad\h\x20Œa\a)—see AL-DANHA\x20Œ).""

Bertram Thomas (Alarms and excursions—note typographical error on p. 183: "Haras\i") was much attracted by the intelligence and friendly spirit of those from the tribe who aided him as guides and linguistic informants. To this association is owed the first Western study of Haras\i speech. Like the other southern tribal tongues from old South Semitic which have long outlived the related Ancient South Arabian, this one deserves further investigation. For the oft-occurring b\s\l\l of Mahri and Haras\i (= Ar. ba\s\l, "lord or owner of; having, characterized by," located at a certain place) Haras\i has b\s\l\l (Cf. Bathari: ba\s\l\l, with \a\x20Œyn, and Shahr\x20Œi-Karawi: ba\s\l\l, with reduction to ka\s\l\l, with ka\s\l\l (beside occas. Shahr\x20Œi-Karawi: b\s\l\l). For fem., Ar. ba\s\l\l, Haras\i and Mahri have b\s\l\l, contra Bathari ba\s\l\l, Shahr\x20Œi-Karawi ba\s\l\l. For Ar. \d\h\s\i\l\h (rabb\a), Haras\i has a\-b\l\l, contra Mahri a-b\l\l, both doubly determined by definite article and by possessive pronoun.

Haras\i, with considerable speech variation between individuals, appears to be more deeply influenced by Arabic than the others of the "four strange tongues" of the tribes down-country (from \hsrb)—which is what Hadara, with \h, means, having despite Thomas nothing to do with Hadoram, with \hsrb, of Genesis, x, 27. Yet Haras\i staunchly retains many old and interesting vocabularies, which at the same time make it, if it be only a branch of Mahri, a quite distinctive one.

The tribe has these main sections (names in Arabic): (1) Bayt \a\k\s\l\l, (2) Bayt Mutiya\a, (3) Bayt \a\f\r\i\i, (4) Bayt Kakh\a\r\h\i\h, and (5) Bayt Barah\a, besides, as one of the largest groups, Bayt \hsrb\x20Œa, which is either a section or a subsection of (1) or of (2). The shykhal authority rests in (1), the principal leader (Haras\i muk\a\d\x20Œam, pl. mukad\a\d\x20Œam) in 1962 being Shahri b. \a\s\i (Haras\i...
the villagers of Shāhīdāns [q.v.].

Harat was a great trading centre strategically located on trade routes from the Mediterranean Sea to India or to China. The city was noted for its textiles during the "Abbāsid Caliphate, according to many references in the geographers. Harat also had many learned sons as one may see in al-Sam'ānī s.v. al-Harawī. The city is described by al-İṣṭaḥkīrī (263), and Ibn Hawkal (437) as having four gates, a strong inner citadel and extensive suburbs. There is much information in the Arabic and Persian geographers about the city from the 4th/10th century onwards. According to the account of Ham al-ṬāBH Mustawfi (152) Harat flourished especially under the Ghurid dynasty in the 6th/12th century. The great mosque of Harat was built by Ghiyāth al-Dīn al-Dīn the Ghurid in 598/1201. During the Ghaznavid and early Ghurid periods of the 9th/11th century the heretical sect of the Karāmiyya was strong in Harat, but Ghiyāth al-Dīn, after first supporting them, later turned to the Shī'ī rites of Ismā'īliyya.

Harat was captured by the Mongols in 618/1222 and the pillage and slaughter is described by Sayf al-Harawī (66-72, see bibl.). The city was destroyed a second time and remained in ruins from 639/1242 to about 634/1236, but people returned to the city, including some who had been captured by the Mongols, and much of the city was rebuilt. In 643/ 1244 a local prince Shams al-Dīn Kurī (or Kart) was named ruler of Harat by the Mongol governor of Khurāsān and in 653/1255 he was confirmed in his rule by the founder of the Il-Khan dynasty Hūlūgū. Shams al-Dīn founded a new dynasty and his successors, especially Fakhr al-Dīn al-Dīn, built many mosques and other buildings. The members of this dynasty were great patrons of literature and the arts. The history of the dynasty is given by Spuler (below).

The village of Gāzīrgāh, over two km northeast of Harat, contained a shrine which was enlarged and embellished under the Timurids. The tomb of the poet and mystic Khwāja ʿAbd al-ʿĀla Muḥammad Taḥmāsp (d. 48/1058), was first rebuilt by Shah Rukh about 829/1425, and other famous men were buried in the shrine area. In 913/1507 Harat was occupied by the Ozbekhs but after much fighting the city was taken by Shah Ismāʿīl al-Dīn the Timurids in 916/1510 and the Shāhī Khurramkhan assumed the governorship of the area. At the death of Shah Ismāʿīl the Ozbekhs again took Harat and held it until Shah Taḥmāsp retook it in 934/1528. Several times later for brief periods the Ozbekhs held the city but the Šafawīs ruled it most of the time until the revolt of the Abbāsid Afghans in 1720/1725. Several Šafawī expeditions to retake the city failed, and the Afghans remained in possession of the city until 1145/1732 when they submitted to Nādir Shāh. Another revolt of the Afghans was suppressed by Nādir Shāh in 1732. In 1160/1747 the nephew of Nādir Shāh, one of the Khil Inān al-Dīn, revolted in Harat but after Nādir's death in that year Harat fell under Afghan rule.
In 1837 the Persians laid siege to Harat but failed to take it. In 1856 they captured the city but were forced to evacuate it the next year as a result of a peace treaty in Paris between Great Britain and Persia. Since that time the city has been part of Afghanistan, the capital of a province.

The histories of Harat, both those preserved and those lost, are listed in Sayf al-Harawi (pp. vii-x; see below) and in Togan (442, Bibliografya). The present city has a population of ca. 100,000. The climate is mild, and in summer there is a west wind of "one hundred and twenty days".

On the pre-Islamic city see J. Markwart, A catalogue of the pre-Islamic capitals of Eranshahr, Rome 1931, 11 and 46.


For Harat under the Kūrt dynasty see B. Spuler, Mongolischer Kontinent, 1516-1526; The Timurid age in Harat is described by W. Barthold, Harat under Hūsein Baqāqara, trans. by W. Hinz (Leipzig 1938); Eng. tr. by V. and T. Minorsky in Four Studies on the History of Central Asia, iii, Leiden 1962, 1-72. For a plan of the city in Timurid times with photos of buildings see Z. V. Togan's article, Harat, in IA. For a description of the city and surroundings in the 9th/15th century see A. M. Belenitskii, Istoriya topografii Gerata XV v., in Aligher Nauoi, ed. A. K. Barovkov, Moscow 1946, 175-202.
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HARĀZ, a mountain complex and district in the Yemen, situated between the Wādī Surdūd and the Wādī Shāhām, with the Tihāma districts of Liṣān and the Banū Sa'd to the west and Ḥaymat al-Khārijiyya (q.v.) to the east. Apparently composed of rocks of the trap series (basalt) and of granite, it has the shape of an irregular star with Diabal Shībām or Harāz (2930 m.) at the centre. A northern projection consists of Diabal Banī Ṭayhir (2450 m.), Diabal Ḥuṣayn (2400 m.), Diabal Banī Lam (2400 m.), and Diabal Muhārība. To the west lie Diabal Masār (2800 m.) and Diabal ʿAbīn (2000 m.), to the south Diabal Lahāb (2400 m.), and to the southwest Diabal Hādād. Between Diabal Ḥaṣābān and Diabal Masār is the Wādī Shāhām, a tributary of the Wādī Surdūd, and between Diabal ʿAbīn and Diabal
Lahab the Wadi Birar or Ḥiḥām, whose steep course is followed by a branch of the Ṭarth al-Shibām between Ḥudayda and Ṣanʿāʾ ([q.v.], though it is not suitable for motor traffic. The massif is very steep and precipitous at its edges but the area on top, between 2200 and 2500 m., has the character of undulating hill land, split up by innumerable valleys and gullies and with the aforementioned peaks rising in isolation out of it. All of the upper reaches is inhabited and there are countless villages and castles, even to within a short distance of the summits of the mountains. The chief town of the district is Ṣanʿāʾ with 200-300 houses, lying at the northern east of Djabal Shibām and formerly the residence of the Kāṭimmaḵām of Ḥarāz, Ḥayma and Djabal ʿĀiniz (southeast of Ḥarāz). Manāḵa had become the main trading centre of Ḥarāz by Niebuhr’s day, having supplied al-Mawṣa on Djabal Lahab, which is noted by Hamdānī as the sūk of the area. Five miles west of Manāḵa lies al-ʿAttāra (1900 m.) where the Dāy of Yām (Nadārjan) [q.v.] uses to reside. Other peaks and gullies of the same name) in the Muslim period. At the beginning of the last century the Wahhabis succeeded only after

The climate of the district is unusually wet and subject to sudden temperature changes. Frequent rain storms associated with south-westerly winds and a mist, known locally, combine to make this one of the most fertile parts of Arabia with very varied flora and fauna. Agricultural activity is intense. After a belt of thorn bushes and myrrh trees, coffee cultivation begins at 1300 m. near Usil and continues to 2200 m., mainly on the western slopes. It is carried out on a fantastic system of terracing which covers almost all parts of the mountain slopes, often extending for 2000 feet or more without a break, irrigation being provided by a network of canals and cisterns. Above the coffee belt, khl is extensively grown and, in the vicinity of permanent water sources, there flourish many types of fruits, including pears, peaches, apricots, plums, figs and grapes, even bananas. Wheat, barley, and leguminous crops are also found. The broken terrain of the mountains, however, provides little opportunity for rearing live stock other than sheep and goats. Outlets for trade in these commodities are found in Ṣanʿāʾ, and also in the Ḥarāz through various markets, notably Ḥajdalya, Sūk al-Khamīs, Sūk al-Rabū, Sūk al-Ṭiḥayyan and Sūk al-Dijummuʾ. The inhabitants of Ḥarāz stand in marked contrast to those of the Ṣanʿāʾ in physical characteristics, religion, customs and practices. Most tribes are Ṣaʿdīs and but the divided nature of the mountain encourages the appearance of numerous sects. Thus there are Dāwūds among the Banū Mukkāṭil and on Djabal Ṣaʿfān, Sulaymāṁs on Djabal Ḍamārība, other Ismāʿils in Ḥawzan, Lahab and al-ʿAttāra. In Manāḵa there are Yāʾkābīs, while a few Ṣaʿdīs, more typical of the Ṣanʿāʾ, are to be found on Djabal Ṣaʿfān. There used to be many Jews also, particularly in Manāḵa, Ḥaḍra and Ḥawzan. In Manāḵa they owned land and virtually controlled the coffee trade. Tribal divisions are equally numerous, almost every valley forming the boundary between two tribes. Hamdānī described Ḥarāz and Ḥawzan as two Himyarite stocks. In the former there were also Ḥanṭalā, Luʾf and Nashū of the Banū Ḥamdān. According to Glaser (1885) the district was divided as follows: 1. Banū ʿArrāf on Ṣaʿfān; 2. Ṣaʿfān proper; 3. Masāʾr; 4. al-Maghārība; 5. Banū Ismāʾil northwestern of Masāʾr, 6. Ḥaṣābān; 7. Ḥawzan; 8. Thulūth east of Lahāb, 9. Lahāb; 10. Banū Muṣrūṭ; 11. al-Ŷaʿsīb south of Manāḵa; and 12. al-ʿUkwun between Manāḵa and Ḥayma.

The history of the district in ancient times is hardly known, though CIV 343 briefly alludes to Ḥarāz (Ḥawzan). Hamdānī’s description of the Mihlīḥār Ḥarāz agrees substantially with what we know today. He mentions its fertility, that it produced corn, honey and sesame (wars), and that its dialect was midway between good and bad Arabic. His data on the merchants of Ḥarāz is of great interest, especially in so far as they provided the means for trade in these commodities, and of bitter struggles between them and the Yemena. Bibliography: A. Deflers, Voyage au Yémen, Paris 1889, 37-48; E. Glaser, in Pet. Mitt., xxxii (1886), 33-37, 45; al-Hamdani, Dijari; H. C. Ray, Yaman, London 1892; C. Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien und anderen umliegenden Ländern, Copenhagen 1774; C. Rathjens and H. von Wissmann, Landeskundliche Ergebnisse, Hamburg 1934. 44-73; Yākūt, Muġājam; Ahmed Ṭaḥṣīd, Tāḥṣīl Yaman wa Ṣanʿāʾ, 2 vols., Istanbul 1290 A.H.; Yemen Sūlimanṣah, Ṣanʿāʾ 1308 A.H., 106 ff. (A. K. Irvine)
hard fighting in overcoming them. During Palgrave's stay in Nadjd, in 1862, the Shammar chief Falal b. Rashld ...ed. Fyzee, Cairo 1951; W. Heffening, Das Islamische Fremdenrecht, Hanover 1925; M. Hamidullah, Muslim conduct of state, Mecca.


[Owing to a misprint, the reference to the original article is the Supplement.]

Editors are unable to supply, as they had planned to do, a revised text of this article. For the convenience of readers they re-print the article which appeared in the first edition. A new article will, it is hoped, be included in the Supplement.]

HARB, war.

i. — Legal Aspect

Harb may mean either fighting (kidah) in the material sense or a "state of war" between two or more groups; both meanings were implied in the legal order of pre-Islamic Arabia. Owing to lack of organized authority, war became the basis of inter-tribal relationship. Peace reigned only when agreed upon between two or more tribes. Moreover, war fulfilled such purposes as vendetta and retaliation. The desert, adapted to distant raids and without natural frontiers, rendered the Arabs habituated to warfare and fighting became a function of society.

Islam, prohibiting the shedding of blood by one Muslim against another, prohibited all kinds of war (harb) except a holy war (djihdd [q.v.]). Only a war having an ultimate religious purpose, that is, to enforce the sacred law (shari'a) or to check transgression against it, was lawful. No other form was legal without the Islamic state.

Thus, Islam prohibited the inter-tribal warfare of the Arabs, because such wars were regarded as too ungodly and brutal, motivated by earthly interests, and permitted only a war which fulfilled a religious purpose. Thus, only one kind of war—the djihdd—invoiced for the purpose of expanding or consolidating the area of the validity of Islamic law.

As in the jus feudale, harb must be declared and prosecuted in accordance with certain prescribed rules. In the first place harb, in the sense of fighting, must be distinguished from such duties as prayer or fasting, defined as individual duties; harb is a collective duty (lard al-kifdya), binding on the community as a whole. Since a permanent state of war existed between the Islamic state (dar al-Islam) and other countries (dar al-barb), Muslims were permanently in a state of hostilities with non-Muslims. But in fulfilling the collective duty of war not all Muslims were under an obligation to fight; only a few were called upon to fulfill the duty on behalf of the community. If no one fulfilled the duty at all, the whole community was liable to punishment. Only when Islam was threatened by a sudden attack did the duty become obligatory on all, including women, children and slaves.

As a collective duty war was a state instrument. Thus, only the imam (or his deputies in the provinces) was charged with the duty of prosecuting the war. In order to be lawful war was not only declared by the imam, but he was also charged with calling the believers to battle. Since in legal theory a state of war was always in existence (except when a peace treaty was still binding), the declaration of war by the imam merely meant that the circumstances in which the believer can fulfill the duty of kidah had arisen. Calling the believers to battle was merely to summon to the duty of fighting those who were under an obligation to take up arms. However, Nor was the prosecution of war lawful unless preceded by an invitation addressed to the enemy to accept Islam. Since harb meant in theory the litigation between belief in Allah and His prophet and misbelief, the unbelievers were first offered Islam before fighting took place. Followers of the recognized revealed religions were given the choice between Islam, submitting to Muslim rule and payment of the jizya, and continuing in their faith. An invitation should be forwarded to the enemy, and only refusal to accept it rendered fighting lawful. This rule was based on the Kur'anic communication: "We never punish until we have first sent an apostle" (XVII, 18); and a hadith in which the Prophet said: "I have been ordered to fight the polytheists until they say there is no god but Allah; if they say it, they are secured in their blood and property." (Bukhari, Sahih, ii, 236.) The jurists differed as to whether the invitation should be renewed if war broke out again with an enemy. The Malik and Hanafi jurists maintained that renewal of the invitation was commendable (mandah); the Shafi'i jurists held that the imam to make a choice, depending on the merit of the situation; and the Hanballi jurists insisted that only those who had not received an invitation should be notified.

In the prosecution of war, the Muslim warriors were under an obligation to refrain from unnecessary shedding of blood or the destruction of property. Non-combatants, such as women, children, monks, the aged, blind and insane, unless they helped in the war, were excluded from molestation. If combatants were captured, they were liable to be killed or enslaved without property to be taken. However, the detailed rules concerning the treatment of enemy persons and property varied in accordance with the various schools of law (see corpus juris of each school of law under such headings as djihdd, siyar or qanums).

Hostilities came to an end either by Islam's victory over the enemy, agreement to submit to Muslim rule at the expense of paying the jizya in the case of dhimmis, or peace with the enemy for a limited period, if the imam decided that fighting was harmful to Islam. Such peace was of a limited duration, not exceeding ten years, until the imam could resume the war. The imam should not terminate the fighting if the number of Muslim warriors was not less than half the number of enemy warriors (Sira VIII, 66-7), until victory was attained.

We shall not provide here a history of wars nor even a study of the place of war in the life of Muslim societies. We shall merely give some notes on the art of war itself, which may be supplemented by the articles DAR AL-HARB (on the concept of the theoretical state of war between Islam and all neighbors), THAB (on the early Muslim land wars), and HIB (on sieges operations), in addition to other more specialized articles which will be mentioned in their place. In addition we shall not encroach on the period of fire-arms for which reference should be made to the article BAKR.

The theoretical literature on the art of war continues, despite a certain evolution in practice, the traditions of the early Arabs, the Greeks and above all the Sassanids. Translations of Greek, Persian and even (indirectly) Indian works had been made before the Fihrist, and there survives one part of the translation of the Tactica of Aelianus, the author of classical antiquity who also in Byzantium was the most consulted on these matters. But, in general, we have to deal with more popular traditions, accounts of the actions of early Arab heroes, of victorious generals and of the first caliphs, and especially of Alexander and of the great rulers of Persian history. These materials are incorporated in works of al-adab such as the 'Uyân al-akhbâr of Ibn Kutayba or al-Jâl al-farîd of Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, and the later encyclopaedias; and they are found more particularly in the literary genre of the Mirrors for Princes [see SIYASÂ] such as, for example, the Sirâdat al-mulik of al-Turûqî which, among many other instructive anecdotes for princes, include some concerning the conduct of armies and of war operations. The experience of later generations however is also added, and it is this which, though without any rupture with tradition, is the more direct inspiration for the works written under the influence of the reigning military aristocracies, in Central Asia. during the period of the Crusades, and later under the Mamlûks, from which last period a great number survive, written for the major part from the point of view of military exercises [lists in L. Mercier, La parure des armes, Fr. tr., 1924, 423-59; H. Ritter, in ISL., xvii (1929), 116-54, and George T. Scanlon, A Muslim manual of war, 1961, 6-20]. We shall mention here only the earliest which have survived: the Ghaza- wîd and Sharî'î Khâlîf al-Harîb wa'l-ghâlîî's published by I. and M. Shâfi'î in IC, 1957 (the military section of the treatise, belonging to the genre Mirror for Princes, entitled Ad-dal al-mulûk by Fâlîh-i Mudâbbîr. Mubârâkhîh, beginning of the 7th/13th century), and the Tadhkira fi 'l-hiyal al-harbiyya of 'All al-Harawi, ed. and Fr. tr. J. Sourdell-Thomine, in BEO, xvii (1962) (to be compared with a paragraph of the Traité d'Armurerie . . . pour Salladin, ed. and Fr. tr. O. Cahen, in BEO, xii (1948), 23-4, 145s); also the Tâbîrî and al-Tâdhrî of Sinâ'î al-Aksârî (in which are found the extracts from Aelianus), ed. and German tr. Wüstenfeld, Das Heerwesen der Muhammedaner, in Abb. d. K. Ges. d. Wiss. Göttingen, xxvi (1880), and the Tafsîrî al-kirîb fi tâdhrî l-harîbîr of 'Umar b. Ibrahim al-Awsî al-Ansârî, ed. and Eng. tr. George T. Scanlon in the recent work cited above. There is also some information in the Muhaddîma of Ibn Khaḍrûn and in the jurists such as al-Mawardi or al-Hasan b. 'Abbâd al-Asbâbit (Athâr al-wa'ad fi tartsî l-dawâl, beginning of the 8th/14th century), even in ordinary fîh (cf. the example given by M. Tabî in the Cahiers de Tunisie, iv (1956)). Naturally a history of war would begin primarily with the coming (which has never been done from this angle) of the chronicles and even of the popular romances of chivalry, which abound in accounts of battles, of varying precision and reliability. Finally there should be remembered the useful and instructive collection by Ibn Khâlid of the Taktikon of Leo VI and the Strategikon of Kekaumenos (beginning of the 10th and middle of the 11th century A.D. respectively).

In theory, war is justified only when it is for the faith, the djihâd, and ordinary war, harb, between Muslims is condemned, whereas the efforts made by rulers to represent their adversary as having at least in some respect contravened the commandments of the faith or infringed orthodoxy. However Ibn Khâlid, as a sociologist, considers war to have been an integral part of human society from the tribal state onwards—though he adds that according to the Law the Holy War and the suppression of revolts are the only form of war justified.

Except in cases of a formal djihâd against unbelievers, no regular and legally valid "declaration of war" is provided for but quite often two adversaries send each other challenges, announcing that the only solution possible between them is the sword, showing the judgement of Allah. Nor is there legally a state of war for any except the combatants, and although of course "civilians" may be pillaged, taken prisoner, etc., it can also happen, even in the djihâd, to the great scandal of the strict Muslims, that trading caravans pass unmolested between the armies, indifferent to the quarrels of the rulers (see, e.g., Ibn Djubayr, Rihla, 281).

Nowhere more than in these works is one conscious of the connexion between war and policy and of the fact that the success of the first depends in large part on the quality of the second. The Prince is therefore recommended to seek to gain the goodwill of his subjects, and more particularly of his troops, by his conduct towards them and especially by paying them regularly and well—which presupposes a sound financial situation; when troops are reviewed he must of course inform himself of their condition, or verify this personally. In addition, he must keep himself informed on the general situation of the enemy state, or the state which is virtually so, its material resources and the state of its morale, in order when possible to make contact with dissident elements, especially within the army itself. Hence the necessity of maintaining a system of espionage [see PIASÂ] in which use may be made of the entourage of ambassadors (who must be changed frequently to avoid the danger of their forming friendships in the enemy country), and also of merchants and pilgrims, real or pretended ("All al-Harawi was recommended to have his men 'arrange acquaintances with certain men who can do the same, it is necessary to have a system of counter-espionage, especially within the army, while avoiding taking measures against men who have received letters from the enemy so long as they have not actually succumbed to temptation. It is advisable the all same to make them renew their oath of loyalty. All this produced an atmosphere of petty and almost puerile ruses and of general suspicion which was typical of the warfare
and even of the whole of "political" life of that time.
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In the actual military operations morale is important. It is encouraged at first by gifts and promises on the hopes of bounty, and is renewed before battle is joined by accounts of the exploits of ancestors and, in the case of dīḥād, pious exhortations —the equivalent of those heard for example by the Christian enemies who followed the Cross.

Obviously the military teaching and practices of the classical Muslim armies have little in common with the raids and single combat of pre- and proto-Islamic times (on which see ḍayṣ and ḍaww). The specialists, as with fīdā, distinguish the ṣūrāt and ṣurā. The ṣūrāt are primarily the theoretical division of the army into five elements (ḥamās): the centre or heart (baḥl), the right wing (maymāna), and the left wing (mayṣara), the vanguard (muḥādāma) and the rear-guard (ṣāha), which, mutatis mutandis, apply when the army is on the march or in camp as well as in battle. The ṣurā are the operations by the irregulars, who do not form part of the army proper but who may play a part in the preliminaries and on the fringes of the battle.

When the campaign has been decided upon, the necessary forces are mustered, the arms are distributed (other than the individual weapons always carried by the soldiers) and the command is allotted, if the Prince is not leading the army himself. Women and children (who, among the nomads, go with the fighters and encourage them, risking capture in the case of defeat) are excluded from the regular armies of organized states. The baggage may be either at the head or the rear of the marching column. The route should have been studied with regard to the nature of the terrain, the provision of supplies and the enemy's movements; unless the safety of the situation is certain, the country must be explored from all sides by scouts and small reconnaissance parties and scouting off, by the enemy on his side has taken similar precautions, an attempt must be made to manoeuvre, so that as the battle develops the desired disposition may be achieved. Astrologers are often consulted on the most propitious time to give battle and some orders for the manoeuvre of one section for the benefit of the others or take from one group reinforcements for others. In principle each ḍamās forms a continuous line, although it may sometimes be divided into little groups, ḍarād (squadrons) plur. ḍarād (an innovation which is said to have been introduced, in imitation of Byzantine practice, by Marwân II). There are usually three ranks. The first consists of the archers and cross-bowmen, the second of infantry, protected by their shields and armed with lances or swords, the third of the heavy cavalry (light cavalry were normally found only among the irregulars). In the centre the leader's standard should be seen unfurled; battles have been lost because its fall had been taken as a signal of defeat. The battle consists basically of a cavalry charge, which may be repeated about three times if the enemy line has not been broken before this. The rôle of the infantry and archers consists of breaking from a distance, and then from close at hand, the enemy assault, which, however, may lead rapidly to the retreat of the enemy cavalry, producing disorder in the enemy ranks. In the case of great numerical or other inferiority, the lines may be replaced by a formation in solid squares to withstand the shock of attack. A charge is not usually made simultaneously in the centre and on the flanks, although there may be an attack from one section of the enemy at one point and from another elsewhere; as a result one part of the army may be defeated while another is victorious, and there have been cases when each side has thought itself to be victorious or to be vanquished. In general, however, one of the two cavalry detachments which have been victorious in their sectors proceeds before the other to fall upon the other sections of the enemy army. In fact the great danger is that as soon as victory seems certain they hurl themselves on the enemy's baggage etc. to seize booty and from then on are incapable of offering resistance if the enemy unexpectedly returns to the attack.

Frequently attempts are made to organize ambushes, either by taking advantage of a mountain pass on the route of the enemy army or by trying through manoeuvres during the course of the battle itself to lure the enemy into positions prepared in advance. This preparation of ambushes was often combined with cavalry action in the tactics of simulated flight, in which the Turks in particular excelled. Whereas the Arabs, although much lighter and more rapid than the Crusaders must have been (relying as they did on massive shock tactics), generally attacked in a single line, the Turks attacked, shooting as they went, in such a formation as to shower the enemy with arrows from all directions; they did not persist in an effort to break the enemy lines, but, having made contact, attempted to draw them in pursuit, thus disorganizing their lines, and then to make a sudden turn, with the eventual help of fresh forces who had been placed in ambush. It is strange that the successful semi-nomad peoples who had owed their success partly to these tactics, once they became more settled and in possession of empires whose armies were of the more traditional and heavier type, one by one forgot their primitive method of fighting and were beaten by newcomers who still practised it.

During the battle, the leader replaces as far as possible the soldiers' mounts which have been killed.
and arms which have been lost or rendered useless. Fikr debates, but in general disapproves of, the killing of non-combatants, women, children, old men and also men of religion. During sieges in particular, but occasionally also in battles in open country, individuals or groups may obtain amdn [q.v.] even from an ordinary individual. It is a great misfortune if the defeat is such as to prevent the burial of those killed, who are often left by the enemy lying where they are after having been robbed. But in general the aim is less to kill and capture and, once the battle has been fought and won, the enemy camp is pillaged [see GHANIMA]. In principle the Prince reserves for himself the legal fifth, but more often the pillage was completely unorganized, and during it the troops observed neither the basic rules concerning the sharing of booty nor indeed any discipline at all. In particular, each one seized for himself all the male and female prisoners he could capture and later either sold them as slaves (causing a fall in prices if they were numerous) or kept them for himself. The peasants, whenever possible, robbed the fugitives belonging to either side.

Once victory has been gained, the conqueror or his vizier sends letters of victory (usually faith) which as the centuries progress become increasingly the occasion for stylistic exercises by the heads of the armies [q.v.] (see, e.g., the correspondence written by the Al-Kalam of Saladin and the letters on the capture of Jerusalem). These "communications" naturally exaggerate the strength of the enemy and the importance of the victory won, and minimize the losses. In the case of war against infidels and heretics, a special report is submitted to the caliph, who sends congratulations and awards honours. The victorious general may also be awarded honours by his prince; and if it is the prince himself who has conducted the war, he provides celebrations, games, banquets and donatives, although these were neither regular nor obligatory.

The prisoners who were the Prince's share were employed by him on heavy work for which he would have had difficulty in finding native labour (the building of fortresses, etc.). For the wealthy prisoners of course a ransom (fadd) was expected, and often received, less to kill than to have the prince's pay limit set for the enemy prince. There might also take place an exchange of prisoners if there was a peace treaty or a truce. Finally—but especially in the case of war against infidels—money was given or bequeathed by devout persons to be used for the freeing of Muslim prisoners (and correspondingly on the other side for the ransoming of Christian prisoners). When, in a town for example, civilians were captured who might not be Muslims, they were ransomed by their co-religionists, and the documents of the Geniza [q.v.] for example have preserved letters concerning the ransoming of Jews. The ransom of an ordinary prisoner naturally corresponded roughly with the price of a slave.

Muslim law does not appear to have concerned itself with the condition of prisoners as such while in Islamic territory; it did on the other hand consider the way in which Muslims who had fallen into the hands of unbelievers in foreign lands should behave in order to safeguard their faith (Erwin Graef, Religione und rechtliche Vorstellung uber Kriegsgefangenen in Islam und Christentum, in W7, viii (1963), 89-139).

A war, especially if there was no siege, rarely lasted for long, and there were seldom more than a few thousand actual fighting troops engaged, even though the total army of the state in question consisted of more than this. This was because it was difficult to obtain food supplies while on a campaign. Furthermore, because of the climate, it was not possible in general to plan a campaign in winter and, after the officers had become farmers or tax-collectors, it was no longer possible to detain them on a campaign during the time of the harvest; in any case they were reluctant to remain under arms for more than a few weeks, their ordinary means being insufficient to support themselves. Fikr also disliked the absence from their family. Very often the war is decided in a single battle, which may be followed by several sieges of strongholds.

War is often ended by a peace in the form of a capitulation or a treaty negotiated after an exchange of embassies; on other occasions, especially in wars with infidels, the peace is limited to a truce of a set time and over a limited area; often also the war can cease without there being any official peace.

The above remarks do not apply indifferently to all periods, to all peoples (the exception of the Turks has already been pointed out), or to all places. The semi-heavy cavalry, which at first played only an insignificant rôle, increased in importance from the 8th/9th century onwards. The tactics of classical warfare are impossible in mountain fighting, in which cavalry can play only a minor part, and in which the ruses practised by nomads in open country; to the terror inspired by their appearance, their distant and unknown origin, their exceptional readiness to

The resounding victories of the Mongols raise the question whether they possessed a clear technical superiority over their adversaries. The matter has not been sufficiently studied, and it seems that this was not so. Their successes appear to have been due to their discipline; to the speed of their movements and to the art of concealing them; to the excellence of their system of espionage and intelligence; to the combined use on a large scale of traditional siege weapons, transported by means of prisoners, and of the ruses practiced by nomads in open country; to the terror inspired by their appearance, their distant and unknown origin, their exceptional readiness to
The army's departure from Cairo to the nearby place of assembly was called tābūrīa. The Sultan and amīrs went there one after the other, each heading his jihād (see below). Usually this procedure lasted from morning till noon. Only very rarely did it take several days (for two typical instances of such departure see Ibn al-Furāt, ix, 14, 133; Bada'i', v, 37).

The expeditionary force was called tādirīd (pl. tādjārīd). When the Sultan himself went to battle he was always the commander of the tādirīd. Otherwise it was the highest ranking amīr taking part, i.e., the amīr who, by his high rank and office, was entitled to precede the Sultan in the army and conduct all ceremonies. The usual title of this commander, up to about the middle of the 9th-/10th-century, was muṣḥadām al-asqar (or al-asāhirī). Very rarely he was called muṣḥadām al-dîyāy (or al-dîyāq). Sometimes his title was abbreviated to muṣḥadām (g.v.). In campaigns entailing sea voyages, two commanders were sometimes appointed, one on sea (muṣḥadām al-ṣasqar fi l-bahr) and one on land (muṣḥadām al-ṣasqar fi l-harr). In religious functions accompanying the army, see kādī al-ṣāskar.

The place of the army's assembly. With the exception of the first few years of their rule the Mamluks always assembled their campaigning armies near Cairo. Sultan al-Ṣāliḥ Naṣr al-Dīn Ayyūb (657/1250-649/1259) built in 676/1278 the town of al-Ṣāliḥiyya, in the north-eastern part of Lower Egypt, with a double purpose: to serve as a resting place for the incoming armies after their crossing of the Sinai desert and as a point of concentration for the outgoing armies before starting their organized march into Syria. The second of these functions was discarded by the Mamluks shortly after their coming to power. Sultan Kūtūz, on his march to 'Ayn Djalūt, was probably the last to use it for this purpose (Subb, i, 338-4, 373n-17, 384n-19, 382n-16, 411n-6, 429n-14; al-Nahshīj ad-ṣaddīq, xx, 282; Ḫīlah, i, 184n-4, 232n-11). Therefore the Mamluks used to assemble their armies near Cairo. At first the place of assembly was Masjīd al-Tibr (frequently distorted into al-Tūbīn), but from the end of the 7th/13th century onwards it was al-Raysūnīya (g.v.) which served in the same capacity (the pilgrims' Caravan would also use this place). The Sultan at al-Raysūnīya. The focal point of the army's camp at al-Raysūnīya was, quite naturally, the Sultan's tent. It was placed at the end of the row of the amīrs' tents, which were arranged according to the principle that the less important ones came first, while the more important ones came last (Zähirl, Ṭūdūb, 156-7) (see māzaya, muddawara). The system of guarding the Sultan's tent was according to the Mamluk source, very similar to that employed in the Cairo citadel, especially the guarding inside the tent (Ṣubb, iv, 48-49a, 56n-11; Dāru al-siyāb, 255n-1; Ḫīlah, ii, 210n-11; Ḫaswa'dī, 680n-11). The whole of the Sultan's cortège was called al-riḥāb al-ṣarīf (or al-salāḥīn).

The army in the field did not carry with it any special structures for performing the daily prayers. This might imply that when in the field the army prayed under the open sky, i.e. just open sky, which seems to have been that of Baybars I, who, in 661/1263-3, ordered the making of a tent-mosque (dījāmī al-ṣība), which had to be pitched on the right of the Royal tent. This mosque had mihrāb and a māqṣūra in it (Ibn 'Abd al-Ẓāhir, ed. Sadequ, pp. 89-90; British Museum, MS Add. 23,331, fols. 71b-1). In all probability Baybars followed here, as in other...
matters, the example of the Mongols. Of their employment of tent-churches we are informed by William of Rubruck (Long 1900, xxxix, xxxi, 29). Berke Khan, the ruler of the Golden Horde and Baybars' ally, had tent mosques (masjid 'khâmil), where the five daily prayers were performed (Yunûdî, ii, 365s). Ibn Batûtâ (ii, 380 = Gibb, ii, 482) saw these mosques in the Golden Horde at a much later date. For the strict performance of the prayers by soldiers on campaign, as a habit, under Baybars I, see Ibn Abd al-Zahir, fol. 639a-18.

From al-Raydâniyya to Damascus (or Aleppo). The army always departed from al-Raydâniyya in separate groups, and entered the Syrian capital in the same way (arâslân, afwâdjan, 'âld dafa'âli). Thus the expeditionary force stretched over a long distance during its advance. On some occasions we are told that the left wing (al-maysara), the right wing (al-maysara), and the centre (al-bâl) of the Egyptian army entered Damascus on three successive days (al-Nâhâj al-sâlid), xx, 222s. Ibn al-Dawâdûrâ, Kans al-duwar (ed. Römer), ix, 32is-1a. Only further evidence will show whether the Mamlûk army always was advanced in the same formations which it used in the field of battle.

One of the most common measures of protection taken by the advancing army was the sending out of special scouts (baghdâfi) in various directions.

The military expedition was accompanied by a very large camel caravan, which carried its baggage (thâbâl, pl. athâbâl). Each Mamlûk participating in a campaign received at least one camel. Sometimes the Mamlûk received two camels, while the non-Mamlûk soldiers of the balqa (g.v.) received 3 camels per two men (see D. Alyon, in JESHO, i (1958), 270-1). Sultan Barkûk gave his Mamlûks 7,000 camels and 5,000 horses when he planned in 796/1394 his expedition against Timûrlâng (Ibn al-Furât, 380-1s; Nûdâjmî, v, 562s). In the biggest baghdidas 800 to 1,000 camels were needed to carry the light armament alone (Ibn al-Furât, 371s-111. Ibn Kâdî Shubba), fol. 994s-1s. Mules were very rarely employed for carrying the baggage. They were used in 691/1292 by the Sultan's army in the region of Aleppo because most of the camels died in an epidemic (Baybars al-Mâlîki, 542s). The employment of wheeled vehicles (tâqâlî), mainly for carrying siege machines, was also extremely rare.

Though the advancing army was always accompanied by numerous physicians, surgeons, chemists and great quantities of drugs (see, e.g., Shibh, iv, 49s-1), it would appear that its numerical strength was often reduced as a result of maladies which attacked its members during the march (this is quite apart from epidemics, which always took a heavy toll of the Mamlûks, and particularly of the younger ones amongst them; see D. Alyon, in JRASt, 1946, 62-73). The sources do not inform us how and where the sick were treated. The weak and those who lagged behind were often sent back to Egypt.

The Mamlûk sources furnish rich and reliable information on the time-table of the army along its main route of advance from Cairo to Damascus. A detailed list of the stations along this route see W. Popper, Egypt and Syria under the Circassian Sultans, 47, 48-9. This information is not spread, however, evenly over the whole Mamlûk period, for the sources mention the time-table only when the Sultan himself headed the military expedition. Data on regions lying outside the line Cairo-Aleppo, viz., the Delta area, Central and Upper Egypt and the Hijâz is sparse.

The march from Cairo to Aleppo took 30 to 40 days; from Cairo to Damascus 20 to 25 days; from Cairo to Gaza 7 to 10 days; from Gaza to Damascus 3 to 4 days; from Damascus to Hims 2 to 3 days; from Hámâ to Aleppo 2 to 3 days. The above figures sometimes include the resting days in the intermediate stations and sometimes not. The average lengths of rests in the main stations were: in Gaza—3 to 5 days; in Bâyân—2 to 3 days; in Damascus—5 to 7 days; in Hámâ—2 to 3 days. The length of the resting time and the length of time needed to cover the distance between Hims and Hámâ has not been established.

A fundamental aspect of the Mamlûk military expedition was that, at least for most of the period, there was, in effect, no fixed ratio of officers to men. True, according to rule, the Âmir of a Thousand had to have under his command a thousand balqa soldiers and an unspecified number of Âmiris of Forty and Âmiris of Ten, while the mukaddâm balqa had to command forty balqa soldiers during a campaign (see D. Alyon, in BSOAS, xv (1953), 450-1). It is not clear how far this was in fact applied in the early Mamlûk period, when the balqa was still strong and numerous. But for most of the period the balqa was in steady decline, and under the Circassians had stopped going to battle almost completely. When the balqa did go to war, their numbers never exceeded a few hundred. The very name mukaddâm balqa, which was frequent in the Babri period, disappears altogether under the Circassians (see BSOAS, xv, 448 ff. and Balâka). This implies that the above-mentioned proportion between the simple soldiers and their superiors in the campaign had only paper value.

As for the Royal Mamlûks (al-mamâlik al-sultânîyya, see BSOAS, xv, 204 ff), who constituted the backbone of the army, and who bore the brunt of the fighting, we do not know even the theoretical ratio of their officers and men in the campaign. It is stated that during the cadastral survey (al-rawâk al-Nâsîrî) of 715/1315 the number of the Royal Mamlûks was 2,000 and the number of their commanders (mukaddâm al-mamâlik al-sultânîyya) was 40. But we do not know whether the same proportion existed before or after that year, and especially whether it had ever existed in its ideal form.

In the present state of our knowledge there is only one formation participating in battle which can be adequately described. This formation, which was called tulb (pl. atlâb), and which is mentioned most frequently in the sources, was of a very loose character and the number of soldiers included in it might vary considerably. The formation which went out to war under the command of an âmir constituted a tulb. At the same time, all the Royal Mamlûks taking part in a campaign, whose number far exceeded that of the soldiers of all the other atlâb put together, formed only one tulb (for further details see tulb).

Secrecy and military ruses. Little or no attempt was made to hide or disguise the preparations for a Mamlûk campaign. The hoisting of the war-flags, the mustering of the Documentation, and the departure of the expeditionary force gave ample warning to the enemy of the impending attack. Since the Mamlûks hardly ever used the sea-route in order to transport their armies or equipment to Syria, they had to confine themselves to a single land-route from Cairo to Gaza, a fact which greatly facilitated the enemy's task of watching their movements. In Syria the situation, though somewhat better, was not fundamentally different. Though there were two
routes from Gaza to Damascus, the one following the coast, then turning right through the valley of Esdraelon to Baysan, and the other passing through Karak in Transjordan, it was the first route which he mainly used, because it was far better than the second. Besides, the supplies prepared along the army’s route of advance long before its departure, without any attempt of disguise, told the enemy from exactly what quarter to expect the attack.

One can find, however, some instances of attempts to mislead the enemy. Once, when Baybars I set out at the head of a group of horsemen, he forbade his men to buy food and fodder in order to conceal their identity (Șulâk, i, 598). Sultan Taṣar (824/1421) was considered one of the greatest experts among the Mamlûk Sultans in the employment of ruses. When he set out against his rival amirs in Syria he did not hoist the nafāfa (Nudjm, vi, 490-8). He also cut all communications between Egypt and Syria. These acts, which are called “the concealment of news” (la‘muyyad al-akhlâq) (Nudjm, vi, 494-5; Ibn al-Furâṭ, ix, 724; Nudjm (Cairo), viii, 152-3), are praised by the historian, who says that in this respect Taṣar followed the example of the early Mamlûk Sultans (Nudjm, vi, 494-6). There are other instances of cutting the communications between various parts of the realm in order to disguise the army’s movements.

Other ruses employed by the Mamlûk Sultans are recounted. Sultan Barsâbî distributed the nafāfa al-safâr to make Șarâ Yulûk believe that he (i.e., Barsâbî) intended to attack him. Fearing, however, that he would not be able to get his money back, he distributed the nafāfa to the amirs only and not to the Royal banners (Nudjm, vi, 685-7). Sultan al-Mu‘âyyad Șahyûk employed many ruses against the amir Nawruz al-Ḥâfiz (Nudjm, vi, 336-7). One of these was lighting many fires in the camp which he had already left, thus making Nawruz believe that his adversary was still there together with his army (ibid., 1474). In their battles against the Mongols, soldiers of the Mamlûk army sometimes wore sarābdîkî hats in order to mislead their enemy about their identity. Armenian soldiers in the Mongol camp also wore the same head-gear so as to pass as Mongols (Sulûk, I, 511411, 7831415; ibid. (Quatremer’s translation), ii, 235; Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir, fol. 780-; Bolton, 3rd cent. S.V.; L. A. Mayer, Mamlûk Costume, index, s.v. sarābdî). When these did occur they were severely punished. The deserters usually came back secretly and in hiding, until the Sultan’s wrath subsided, but it did happen that they entered Cairo openly and impudently demanded additional pay. The Sultan never succeeded in sending them back to the front which they deserted (Nudjm, vii, 4874-9; Hawâldîn, 602413, 6274-31: Badâ‘în, iii, 88-141, 89-2, 2276-18-5, 2529-16, 2543-16, 2551-3, 2691-16, iv, 116-8, 437-5, v, 68-11-1). One of the main reasons for the Mamlûk’s failure to maintain their hold over Cyprus was that the garrison stationed there frequently returned to Cairo, in utter disregard of the orders of the Sultan, whose attempts to send them back usually ended in complete failure (Nudjm, vii, 724-1; Hawâldîn, 43575, 4485-16, 4544). A legal release from a campaign was called dûstâr. This term, very frequent in the Ayyûbid period, gradually died out in the period of the Mamlûks.

The battle order in the field. The arrangement of the main bodies when they faced each other, was that the left wing was always the centre. It included the choicest men to buy food and fodder in order to conceal their identity. Sometimes the members of the expedition, having gathered at the place of assembly, set out for the field of battle without waiting for the order to move (Nudjm, vi, 253-16, vii, 266-4). When a certain expedition did go to war with determination and without being prodded, the historian considers it to be “a very great thing” (shay‘a fasim ila l-rûyya) (Nudjm, vii, 408). A unique case of real enthusiasm for war which seized the whole Mamlûk army in the Circuitian period was the expedition against Cyprus in 892/1426 (Nudjm, vii, 600).

Another form of desertion was the return of big sections of the expeditionary force, or even the whole of it, from the battlefield or from one of the stations en route to Cairo without the Sultan’s permission. This phenomenon became common from the start of the long series of battles between the Mamlûks and the Turkoman chieftain Shâh Swâr and his Ottoman allies during the reign of Sultan Râhîbî, but the first signs of it had already appeared at an earlier date (Ibn Khânîr, v, 683-16). The number of soldiers returning to Cairo against orders was particularly great when the campaign was long and hard. Scarcity of food and fodder and high prices forced many of them to sell their horses, arms and field-dresses (on the field-dress of the mamlûk, see L. A. Mayer, Mamlûk Costume, 19-20) and return home. The Sultan’s anger was of no avail, for “his only choice was to keep silent”. The deserters usually came back secretly and in hiding, until the Sultan’s wrath subsided, but it did happen that they entered Cairo openly and impudently demanded additional pay. The Sultan never succeeded in sending them back to the front which they deserted (Nudjm, vii, 4874-9; Hawâldîn, 602413, 6274-31: Badâ‘în, iii, 88-141-1, 89-2, 2276-18-5, 2529-16, 2543-16, 2551-3, 2691-16, iv, 116-8, 437-5, v, 68-11-1). One of the main reasons for the Mamlûk’s failure to maintain their hold over Cyprus was that the garrison stationed there frequently returned to Cairo, in utter disregard of the orders of the Sultan, whose attempts to send them back usually ended in complete failure (Nudjm, vii, 724-1; Hawâldîn, 43575, 4485-16, 4544). A legal release from a campaign was called dûstâr. This term, very frequent in the Ayyûbid period, gradually died out in the period of the Mamlûks.

The battle order in the field. The arrangement of the main bodies when they faced each other, was that the left wing was always the centre. It included the choicest men to buy food and fodder in order to conceal their identity. Sometimes the members of the expedition, having gathered at the place of assembly, set out for the field of battle without waiting for the order to move (Nudjm, vi, 253-16, vii, 266-4). When a certain expedition did go to war with determination and without being prodded, the historian considers it to be “a very great thing” (shay‘a fasim ila l-rûyya) (Nudjm, vii, 408). A unique case of real enthusiasm for war which seized the whole Mamlûk army in the Circuitian period was the expedition against Cyprus in 892/1426 (Nudjm, vii, 600).

Another form of desertion was the return of big sections of the expeditionary force, or even the whole of it, from the battlefield or from one of the stations en route to Cairo without the Sultan’s permission. This phenomenon became common from the start of the long series of battles between the Mamlûks and the Turkoman chieftain Shâh Swâr and his Ottoman allies during the reign of Sultan Râhîbî, but the first signs of it had already appeared at an earlier date (Ibn Khânîr, v, 683-16). The number of soldiers returning to Cairo against orders was particularly great when the campaign was long and hard. Scarcity of food and fodder and high prices forced many of them to sell their horses, arms and field-dresses (on the field-dress of the mamlûk, see L. A. Mayer, Mamlûk Costume, 19-20) and return home. The Sultan’s anger was of no avail, for “his only choice was to keep silent”. The deserters usually came back secretly and in hiding, until the Sultan’s wrath subsided, but it did happen that they entered Cairo openly and impudently demanded additional pay. The Sultan never succeeded in sending them back to the front which they deserted (Nudjm, vii, 4874-9; Hawâldîn, 602413, 6274-31: Badâ‘în, iii, 88-141-1, 89-2, 2276-18-5, 2529-16, 2543-16, 2551-3, 2691-16, iv, 116-8, 437-5, v, 68-11-1). One of the main reasons for the Mamlûk’s failure to maintain their hold over Cyprus was that the garrison stationed there frequently returned to Cairo, in utter disregard of the orders of the Sultan, whose attempts to send them back usually ended in complete failure (Nudjm, vii, 724-1; Hawâldîn, 43575, 4485-16, 4544). A legal release from a campaign was called dûstâr. This term, very frequent in the Ayyûbid period, gradually died out in the period of the Mamlûks.
same spot (Manhal, i, 154b2). On the Royal Banners see also Ibn Khaldun, Mukaddima (ed. Quatremère), ii, 46 - tr. Rosenthal, ii, 52.

Close by the two wings were placed the auxiliary forces (the Bedouin horsemen near one wing, and the Turcoman horsemen near the other). Occasionally infantriesmen (msdāt, radjīdīla) were posted in front of the battle-array described above (Ibn Tyās, iv, 445, 451, v, 8). The use of infantry seems to have increased in the later years of Mamlūk rule (see Ibn Tūlūn, ed. R. Hartmann; al-Margūrī, Ha’uddiyy al-furūsīyya [Cairo], vii, 46-53). This may have been the result of the growing use of fire-arms. The infantriesmen employed in the field of battle were mainly recruited from amongst the peasants and semi-nomads of Diābal Nābulus and other parts of Syria (Zettersteen, Beiträge, 81; Nuddīm [Cairo], vii, 303s; Sulāk, i, 308s; ii, 93s; Ibn al-Furūt, vii, 41, 169s; Ha’uddīth, 701-1s; Badā‘īs, iii, 54s; iv, 408s, 445s, 511s, 451s-16; v, 84s, 63s).

Sometimes the battle-array was rather more elaborate. Amir Minṭāsh, in his fight against Barkūk, arranged his army thus: kalb, maymana, maysara, and two additional wings (djandāhn). In addition, he posted at the rear of both the maymana and maysara a reserve unit or rearguard (radif). Barkūk could not do the same, because his army was too small (Nuddīm, v, 493a13). In 607/1210 the army of Sultan Farādī, which numbered 5,000 horsemen and 6,000 infantriesmen, was arranged in his battle against Amir Tānām between Ramla and Gaza in the following manner: right wing, left wing and ‘centre within a centre within a centre’ (kalb fī kalb fī kalb); each of these formations had its own rearguard (radif) (Nuddīm, vi, 351s-13). In 830/1427 al-Mu’ayyad Shāykh, who was stated to have been a great military reformer and an expert in warfare and in the arrangement of troops in the field of battle (nea-bāna imāṣmā fī . . . mārizat ta’biyat al-‘asādīr) paraded his army in battle array by Tall al-Sūlān (near Aleppo). He decided not to leave the arrangement of the tulfūs of the amirs to anybody else, but to do it himself. He arranged them not according to the order in which the amirs used to sit in the Sultan’s presence during official ceremonies, but according to their offices or functions (fāsiqūn, marāhīl, Lībī, MS QD, fol. 15s; QD, fol. 11s). See also Manhal, iii, 168s; Badā‘īs, ii, 84s; JAS, 1949, 142; SBOAS, xv, 454s-5.) This would seem to imply that the order of the amirs’ tulfūs in the battlefield was then normally an exact copy of the order of their sitting at official ceremonies. In 642/1243 the amir ʿAbdāl-Ḥādī al-Timrāzī arrayed Sultan Diākānī’s army against amir Kurkūmās as follows: maymana, maysara, kalb, djandāhn. This battle array was called ta’biyat al-mudjīannah (Nuddīm, vii, 46s). A vanguard place before the centre was called dijīlās al-kalb (Abu ʿl-Fīdā‘ī, iv, 154s). Occasionally the centre itself seems to have been divided into several sections, including wings, as may be deduced from the expression dijālīd al-kalb al-ayyās (Nuddīm, C, vii, 303s-16).

The sources furnish very little information about the armies occupied by the armies of the various Egyptian amirs and the governors of the various provinces within the left and right wings and the centre. Concerning the amiy of the province of Ḥamāt, it is explicitly stated that it had customarily been placed at the hand of the right wing since the days of Salādin (Sulāk, i, 201s; Abu ʿl-Fīdā‘ī, iv, 241s-16).

The actual fighting. A recurrent phenomenon in the main battles fought out between the Mamlūk and their adversaries was that the wings were usually defeated first, sometimes at the very start of the fighting, whereas the centre held out much longer. Very shortly after the opening of the fighting, the whole elaborate array would be greatly upset, for a wing of one of the opposing armies would soon crumble under the impact of the enemy’s onslaught, and its soldiers take to flight, while the victorious wing on the opposite side would pursue it at full speed. It is noteworthy that even the side that was ultimately defeated succeeded quite often, during the initial stages of the fighting, in routing one of the enemy’s wings and pursuing it. Both the pursued and the pursuing wings would get very far away from the main scene of the battle, and thus would be kept in complete ignorance of the progress of the fighting (this occurs in the battle of Gaza against the Franks in 642/1244 (Sibt, 494s-16) in the battle of al-Nāṣīr Yūsuf against Aybak in 648/1251 (Makhn, 53s; Sulāk, i, 324). This was also the case in the battle of Battle of Ayn Diālūt and in the battle of Barkūk against his rivals at Shākhb in 792/1390 (Ibn al-Furūt, ix, 18s; Ibn Kādī Shubba, fol. 598s-11; Manhal, fol. 47v-14). It happened more than once that the pursuing wing, on returning to the field of battle, discovered that the army to which it belonged had already been utterly routed.

The great field battles which the Mamlūk fought were usually short, and only rarely lasted more than one day. One of their most protracted battles was against Timurlang, but this was a combination of a field battle and a siege of the town of Damascus, and sieges were usually very long in the Middle Ages. In those very few cases when the battle continued into the next day, fighting would stop during the intervening night. The Mamlūk never fought a night battle against a foreign enemy.

One of the classical tactics employed by the Turkish and Mongol tribes in the field of battle was, as is well known, the encirclement of the enemy, and his annihilation within the tightening ring. The making of a ring (halba) around the opponent is mentioned very frequently in the furūṣīyya (q.v.) training-books composed during the Mamlūk period, and very rarely in actual military exercises. The same tactics were also very common in hunting (darb halbaqat), especially those very few cases when the battle continued into the very next day. In 701/1302 the Mamlūk quelled a great rising by the Bedouins in Upper Egypt by encircling them in a “halba like the hunting halba”-al-Manṣūrī, fol. 231a-232a). Another possible explanation is that the Mamlūk art of war might have gradually diverged from that of their Turco-Mongol nomad brethren under the influence both of sedentary
living and of Muslim military precedent. The same might be true, though to a lesser degree, of the Mongol armies of Iran. As is well known, hunting was one of the main means of training for real war of the nomads of the steppe. In the reign of Daybars I the use of bahtat payd is mentioned much more frequently than in the reigns of later sultans. This might indicate the deterioration of nomad war usages amongst the Mamluks with the passing of time (for Mamluk military training see D. Ayalon, Notes on the Furtunyya exercises and games in the Mamluk Sultanate, in Sources for the History of the Arabs, ed. T. Scallon, A Muslim Manual of War, Cairo 1961).

Of the practices employed in Mamluk battles, the two following are worthy of note.

(a) In the battle of Abulustayn (675/April 1277) the Mongols disembowled from their horses and fought "to the death" (Nahawand, 424; Ibn Khârîth, xii, 271-2; Nadîm, C, vii, 168). This kind of warfare seems to have been quite common with the Mongols (for its repeated use in their war against the Jûrâbârshah see Sibî' ibn al-Djawral, 443a444). The Mamluks do not seem to have used it at all. In the early Muslim period, however, this practice is often mentioned in the sources as having been employed in critical or desperate conditions (see, e.g., Dinawari, al-Àfîqî, al-tawil, 288; Ibn Sa'd, Taba'âtî, iii, 934; Tâbarî, i, 16441; iii, 835a-54; Ibn Khâlid, 'Tabarî, iii, 338).

(b) Authors of Mamluk military treatises mention the employment of a tremendous noise as a means of frightening the enemy, and indeed the Mamluks did use this method quite frequently, and with considerable success. According to Mamluk sources it was particularly successful in the siege of Acre (690/1291). During the final assault on the town the Mamluks used a huge quantity of drums (kâdîq) carried on the backs of 300 camels, which produced a terrible thunder, so that "the world turned upside down". The Bedouin adversaries of the Mamluks were particularly sensitive to the use of drums (Duwal al-Islâm, ii, 1475; Ibn Khârîth, xiii, 321; Nadîm (Cairo), vii, 614; Sulîk, i, 705; i, 102; Ibn al-Furat, viii, 1228).

When the Mamluks were forced to fight their major battles on Egyptian soil, they usually preferred the plains to the desert. The Mamluks were allowed to march their main forces to the plain in the middle of the desert. On several occasions the boundary between the Sinai desert and Egypt proper, which was called "the head (or the beginning) of the sand" (ra's al-rami or awwal al-rami) was recommended as more suitable for the defender, on the ground that the attacker would be exhausted immediately after crossing the desert. Both Barkûk, when he fought Mû'addî and Yalbugha al-Nâsîrî, and Tûmanî, when he fought the Ottomans, rejected the suggestion, and chose the vicinity of Cairo instead (Nadîm, v, 409; 411; Ibn Kâdî Shubba, fol. 38b; Ibn al-Furat, vii, 124; i, 804; Nadîm, v, 1256; iv, 139). Apparently the fact that Sultan Ayyub b. Ansâr al-Nâsîr Yusuf al-'ABBâsî (648/February 1251) soon after the last-named had crossed the desert, thus removing for ever the Ayyûbid menace to Mamluk rule, did not induce his successors to follow in his footsteps. The Kerchief of Safe Conduct. When one of the rival parties wanted to negotiate a truce, a peace or a surrender, an envoy or envoys would be sent to the enemy's camp carrying a special cloak or kerchief called "the kerchief of safe conduct" (mandîl al-àmîn). This kerchief, the colour of which is not specified, was usually worn round the neck, or put on the head (it was rarely tied round the waist or held in the hand). Such a kerchief could also be sent by the victorious side as a sign of acceptance of the offer of negotiations (Suluk, vi, 613; ibid., vi, 603). But while both of them criticize the figures pertaining to the sizes of the armies, only Ibn Taghribirdi includes in his criticism the figures of those killed in action. The same author, who states on several occasions that the numbers quoted in the sources of those carried off by the plague are extremely exaggerated, adds on one of these occasions that the same is true of those killed in earlier battles (al-wâhâdî al-muta'âdîm, amma), where the sources spoke of one hundred thousand persons, or less, down to one thousand or even to one hundred, slain in a single battle. Our historian argues that even when the number of the slain does not exceed one thousand, their bodies are scattered over a wide area, and in order to count them one has to engage many thousands of those who remained alive, and even then it would take a long time to establish the exact number of the dead. Then he adds: "And we have not seen and we have not heard that any king had ever appointed anybody to count the numbers of those killed in any battle conducted between himself and his enemy, unless the number of the slain was one thousand or less. As for those killed in the battles of Hûlûkû, Ghabân and Timur, the establishment of their exact numbers is impossible, for no one believes in these numbers is nothing but a madman". Then our chronicler concludes that he mentioned the battles of these three Khânâns specifically only because they lived nearer his own time, but he meant any battle which took place either in the Muslim period or before it (Hawâlâdî, 35718; 511). For the author's view of the exaggerations of the historian concerning the sizes of expeditionary forces, etc., see Nadîm, vi, 603; and also Nadîm (Cairo), viii, 1345; vii, 294.

In spite of the quite numerous great battles of the Bahârî period and the constant expeditions against the Bedouins in the Circassian period, Mamluk sources do not furnish very rich information about the numbers of the wounded are scant. Very meagre are the data about the prisoners of war. The figures quoted by the Mamluk historians (for its repeated use in their war against the Khâns in the 9th/15th century were, in most cases, slight, if their exact numbers is the very few Muslim historians who question the veracity of figures mentioned in the historical sources. But while both of them criticize the figures pertaining to the sizes of the armies, only Ibn Taghribirdi includes in his criticism the figures of those killed in action. The same author, who states on several occasions that the numbers quoted in the sources of those carried off by the plague are extremely exaggerated, adds on one of these occasions that the same is true of those killed in earlier battles (al-wâhâdî al-muta'âdîm, amma), where the sources spoke of one hundred thousand persons, or less, down to one thousand or even to one hundred, slain in a single battle. Our historian argues that even when the number of the slain does not exceed one thousand, their bodies are scattered over a wide area, and in order to count them one has to engage many thousands of those who remained alive, and even then it would take a long time to establish the exact number of the dead. Then he adds: "And we have not seen and we have not heard that any king had ever appointed anybody to count the numbers of those killed in any battle conducted between himself and his enemy, unless the number of the slain was one thousand or less. As for those killed in the battles of Hûlûkû, Ghabân and Timur, the establishment of their exact numbers is impossible, for no one believes in these numbers is nothing but a madman". Then our chronicler concludes that he mentioned the battles of these three Khânâns specifically only because they lived nearer his own time, but he meant any battle which took place either in the Muslim period or before it (Hawâlâdî, 35718; 511). For the author's view of the exaggerations of the historian concerning the sizes of expeditionary forces, etc., see Nadîm, vi, 603; and also Nadîm (Cairo), viii, 1345; vii, 294. For his carelessness in quoting the numbers of Mamluks cf. ibid., vi, 687-10.

In spite of the quite numerous great battles of the Bahârî period and the constant expeditions against the Bedouins in the Circassian period, Mamluk sources do not furnish very rich information about the numbers of the wounded are scant. Very meagre are the data about the prisoners of war. The casualties suffered by the Mamluks in the 9th/15th century were, in most cases, slight, if their encounters with Timur at the opening of this century and with the Turkoman Shâh Suwar and the Ottomans in its closing decades are excepted. The small number of casualties resulted from the lack of real fighting in this period, a fact which, amongst other causes,
greatly contributed to the accelerated decline of the Mamluk army. Two statements by Ibn Taghribirdi, the greatest authority on Circassian Mamluk military society, about the intimate connexion between the scarcity of fighting, the lightness of casualties and the degeneration of the army, are of great importance (the author, who died in 874/1470, knew only of the very first battles against Shah Shuwar). In his first statement he says that the Mamluks of his time “are a people who eat unearned bread”, for they owe everything they now have to the feats of the Mamluks of past generations. There were no real wars in the 9th century A.H. after the war against Timur. The battles fought during the reigns of Al-Nâṣir Farâqî, Al-Mu'ayyad Shâykh and Al-'Azîz Yûsuf were only substitutes for war. The greatest battle of the century was that of Shaḵbab (792/1390), yet the number of those killed on both sides was under 50. After Shaḵbab there were battles in which not a single soldier lost his life (Nudûm, vi, 608). In his second statement, which he makes on summing up Sultan Kalaün’s rule, our author says that had Kalaün’s only positive act been the good upbringing he gave his Mamluks, this alone would have justified his claim to greatness. Their good behaviour and discipline were in complete contrast to those of the Mamluks of his own time. This should be coupled with the fact that, except for the war with Timur, there was no real war in the 12th century. The biggest military operation of that century was the conquest of Cyprus, but even this operation did not constitute a real battle, for the Cypriots surrendered to a small contingent, before the main body of the Mamluk army reached the battlefield. The rest of the Mamluk naval campaigns were no more than “sea voyages there and back” (safar fi ‘l-bahร� wa-aydb, wa-aydb). This, according to Ibn Taghribirdi, is in glaring contrast to the big and constant battles and to the fighting fervour which marked the period between the reigns of Salâh al-Dîn and al-Ashraf Khâllî. It is remarkable, he adds, that the Mamluk soldiers of earlier generations were modest and shy, in spite of their victories and achievements. They effaced themselves in the presence of the great and of the veterans, and did not despise those who occupied lower positions than themselves. The Mamluks of his own time were, in contrast, holding “their buttocks in the water and their nose in the sky (ist fi ‘l-mâ‘ wa-anf fi ‘l-samā‘)”. None of them is capable of holding the horse’s rein properly. They are experts in overcoming the weak and the powerless. Their ghişâd is the humiliation of their commander. Their gharâmûn are the looting of the hay and the dried clover (“Nudûm” [Cairo], vii, 328-329). On the breakdown of the discipline of the Mamlûks under the Circassians, see BSOAS, xv, 206-13. There is a marked tendency in the Circassian period to idealize the Bahri period, but this tendency is by no means without solid foundation).

The dead soldier’s inheritance. The death of a soldier during a campaign often caused serious complications. One of the greatest difficulties was to obtain reliable testimony concerning the deceased. The law made before the death of the deceased fellow-soldiers was not considered good enough. In the meantime the deceased’s property would be squandered. In order to safeguard the interests of the deceased’s legal heirs, Sultan Baybars I decreed in Sha‘bân 663/ May 1265, with the approval of the Chief Kâdî, that every field commander would appoint a certain number of upright and devout persons, who would be authorized to testify to the dead soldier’s last will. This decree had a welcome from the army. Earlier, in Râjîb 662/April 1264, Baybars promulgated another decree safeguarding the interests of the deceased soldier’s orphans. This one does not seem to have been confined to soldiers participating in a campaign (Suluk, i, 512-17, 535-61; Kalaün, ii, 206-12, 19-22).

The return of the victorious army to the capital. The announcement of a victory in the capital was accompanied by the playing of bands and particularly the beating of drums in the Cairo citadel and at the gates of the houses of the Amirs of a Thousand. This way of announcing the victory was called dukht al-bahร�’îr (or al-hâsît, etc.). Sometimes the drums would not stop beating for seven days running. The town was decorated for many days. The decoration usually included the construction of wooden “towers” (hilâd) in the streets, the repainting of the city’s gates and the drawing of gilt coats of arms (rumûk, sing. rank) on them. The returning army used to march through Cairo (shaḵkha al-Kâhir) in a magnificent procession. Shackled prisoners, severed heads, torn, broken and reversed banners, clefts and sometimes also reversed drums formed part of the procession. The chief commanders of the expeditionary force received sumptuous robes of honour (khiṣâs, sing. khiṣâ) and other gifts.

The behaviour of the Mamluk army during a defeat. The behaviour of an army in a defeat or during a retreat is one of the best criteria for judging its efficiency and morale. Judged by this criterion alone, the Mamluk army would not have justified its great reputation. That it would be easily dispirited as a result of a military setback in the years of its decline is to be expected. The extraordinary thing is that, as far as one can judge from a single important instance, its behaviour was not fundamentally different when it was at, or near, the peak of its power. The only major defeat suffered by this army in the Bahri period was in the first battle against Ilkhan Ghazan (699/1299). The retreat soon turned into a panic flight. Even the grand amirs abandoned the soldiers under their command and fled for their lives. In order to facilitate their flight the soldiers threw away their helmets and wore kerchiefs instead. Many of them took off their field-dresses and left their swords to hiding in the woods. There was nothing to hide from the wrath of the mob. Others tried to disguise their identity by cutting their beards. Both the Egyptian and Syrian armies withdrew to Egypt. Their soldiers reached Cairo in tiny isolated groups or even singly (muṭal‘arḫin farrā‘a?), most of them half-naked and horseless. According to one historian the number of those killed in the actual fighting was quite small; many found their death during the flight. It took several months to re-organize and re-equip the army, but Sultan al-Nâṣir Muhammad rose to the occasion in spite of his youth. The maintenance and reorganization of such huge armies could be carried out in Egypt because of the great prosperity of that country in that time, as explicitly stated by the sources (Nudûm [Cairo], vii, 122-13, 124, 1-15; 128-9; Al-Nâṣîr al-sâdîd in Patrologia Orientalis, xiv, 637-83, 670-71; Zetterstênén, Beiträge, 606-61, 80-81; Ibn al-Dawâdârî, ix, 17-18, 37-40).

In the battle against Timurlang (Diwâmâdī I 803/ January 1401) the Mamlûk defeat was not severe, and therefore the retreat was very orderly at the beginning; but as soon as the amirs learnt of Sultan Farâqî’s defeat, they also departed hastily without taking leave, and each of them reached Egypt with not more than one or two Mamlûks.
A most striking proof of the deterioration of the Mamluk army's discipline early in the 9th/10th century is afforded by its attitude immediately after Sultan Barsbāy raised the siege of the fortress of Àmid in 836/1433. Failing to capture it, Sultan Barsbāy decided to make a treaty with its defender, Karā Yuluk, and return to Egypt. The besieging army remained intact throughout the long siege, and suffered only few losses. There was, of course, no question of any defeat. Yet as soon as the news of the treaty reached the camp, the whole army did not bother to wait for the order of retreat, but turned its back on the fort and started a headlong stampede towards Egypt. In this chaotic flight each made his own way, and the huge army soon disintegrated into tiny groups which rushed towards Egypt in different ways, unbecknown to one another. The āmiris fled in one direction, whereas their Mamlûks, together with their fulûbs, ran away in another. The Sultan himself was left with a few followers, and was exposed during the whole night to great danger. The contemporary historian believes that Karā Yuluk could have inflicted heavy losses on the retreating army had he possessed sufficient courage to pursue it (Nudjûm, vi, 206–9).

In the numerous defeats which the Mamlûk army suffered at later dates all its retreats were most disorderly. The soldiers returned home hungry, naked and barefoot. Some of them came back on foot, others riding donkeys and yet others riding camels (see e.g., Baddâyî, ii, 112-4; iii, 124, 345-14; v, 72-4; 128-11). Battles within Mamlûk military society. Whereas the Mamlûks fought against their external enemies with considerable zeal and determination, at least until the early decades of Circassian rule, their internal battles were in most cases conducted with little determination and ferocity, and in a rather leisurely manner. The number of casualties was usually very small. The expression "insignificant fighting" (ḥāštî ḥayyim) is very frequent in connexion with this kind of warfare. It was almost impossible to foresee the results of these battles, for the two rival camps were always in a fluctuating state, with Mamlûks constantly going over from one side to the other. When the scales were definitely tipped in favour of one rival, it often happened that most of the Mamlûks of the losing side would go over en bloc to the winning side (see e.g., Nakdî, xiv, 579-80; Manhâl, iv, fol. 216a-11; Nudjûm, vi, 35-6). Even in the battles between Barkûk and his rivals, which were much fiercer than the ordinary Mamlûk skirmishes, and later in the battles which these rivals conducted among themselves, there was a constant flow of Mamlûks from one camp to the other. Because of this flow and because the combatants on both sides were more or less the same dress, the supporters of one rival had sometimes to bear distinguishing marks (see e.g., Ibn al-Furâṭ, vii, 170-11). Only the battles between Sultan Faradî and his Circassians were distinguished by their particular ferocity (seeJAOS, ix (1939), 141-6).

The Cairo citadel (fral'at al-diabal) occupied a most central place in the Mamlûk internal strife. In spite of its being strongly fortified, its sieges usually were of short duration, for it passed from hand to hand without much struggle. Sieges which lasted seven days were quite rare (Sulûk, i, 800-3; Hawâdîth, 17911-11, 333-1; Ibn al-Furâṭ, vii, 147, 181-11; Baddâyî'ii, iii, 455-3). The longest siege of the citadel under the Mamlûks lasted 37 days (Baddâyî'ii, iii, 561-563).

The Madrasat al-Sultan Hasan, which is situated opposite the citadel, always played an important rôle in these sieges.

Though inter-Mamlûk fighting caused considerable damage to the civilian population, many inhabitants of the capital enjoyed witnessing it in the same way that they enjoyed witnessing the spectacle of the mahmal procession. Sometimes the spectators suffered heavier casualties than the Mamlûks (Hawâdîth, 17111-11; Nudjûm, vii, 405, 417-18). It was only very rarely that the Mamlûk rival factions called the Egyptian Bedouins to help them against each other. When in 902/1497 they did call them, the Mamlûks fought the Mamlûks, while the Bedouins fought the Bedouins (Baddâyî', iii, 356-11, 357l5-58). A few years later, in 906/1501, the Mamlûk factions again contemplated calling the Bedouins for help, but then discarded the idea on the grounds that such a step was too humiliating (Baddâyî', iii, 450-11). As for the Bedouins, they showed little enthusiasm for a trial of arms with the Mamlûks, as long as they were not attacked by them. Once Barkûk asked the Bedouins to help him against his rivals, but they excused themselves, saying that they were not able to fight the Mamlûks (Ibn al-Furâṭ, ix, 72111-11).

See further the articles on the individual battles—CAV AH DLYÖT, HIJÊJ, MARGI DÂNÎX, SAWJAB, WÂDÎ al-MAZINDAR etc.; for siege-warfare see ÜÇÂR.

(D. Ayalon)

IV. OTTOMAN EMPIRE.

A major field campaign was performed for enterprise involving the Ottomans in a long and complicated process of preparation. News from abroad—espionage reports, in fact—had an obvious relevance to operations in the field and the Ottomans strove to be well informed about the international scene (e.g., through Ragusa: cf. N. H. Biegen in Belleten, xxvii (1963), 237-55; on Jewish spies in the Ottoman service see A. Arce, Espionage y última aventura de José Nasi . . ., in Seferad, xiii (1953), 257-86). Routes followed in earlier wars sometimes came under renewed consideration at a later date—Meşemmed II would seem to have studied some of the campaigns of Bayazîd I and Murâd II as a guide to his own action (cf. H. Inalcik, in X. Isanis Taba'ti Bir Kongres Təblîleri, Istanbul 1957, 220). Moreover, advice about the best routes available might also be sought from soldiers and officials well acquainted with a particular theatre of war (cf. Hurmuzaki, Documente, îfi, 521).

The great campaigns stood in close relation to a number of geographical zones. In time of war against Persia, Erzurum (reached from Istanbul either along the sea route to Trebizond or overland) was a base area of vast importance for the Ottoman armies. So, too, the region of Diyarbekir, Van and Mosul, with Aleppo as a rear base—fortress towns which also fulfilled a similar rôle in relation to 'îrak, when that land was the theatre of war. Against Russia the Ottomans made much use of the sea routes from Istanbul to the Crimea and to the fortresses located on the rivers flowing into the Black Sea—e.g., Azov and Yeni Kale (Don and the Strait of Kertch) (cf. Ruschuk and Kilburn (Doner and Bug), Akkerman (Dnestre) and Killya, Ismail, Tulcea, Braïla, Silistra and Rouschuk (Danube), to all of which must be added the fortresses guarding Moldavia (e.g., Bender, Iasi, Kaminiec and Khotin). As for campaigns on the middle Danube, here the main line of advance was from Istanbul through Edirne, Plovdiv, Sofia and Nish towards Belgrade, beyond which the
Danube itself and the Tisza offered access into the Hungarian lands, the Sava and the Drava into the regions of Herzegovina, Dalmatia and Bosnia. The greatest number of these obligations was taken as a base area for operations directed against Greece and Albania (cf., on communications in the Ottoman Empire, the works of Jireček and Taeuschner). The vast extent of the empire, the great distances to be overcome meant that full mobilization was, in general, a slow and laborious affair. It was the custom to send out in December orders calling the sipáhs, e.g., the "feudal" horsemen in the provinces, to a campaign envisaged for the following year (cf. Huruzmuzki, Documente, ii/i, 521; J. Cuspinianus, De Turcorum origini, 635-v; I. Dujčev, Avosi, 43; Sutton, ed. A. N. Kurat, 35-7, 90-1, 153-3). Marsigli (Stato militare, ii, 106) indicates how, for a campaign in Europe, the troops from Asia Minor and the Arab lands passed over into the Balkans at Istanbul and Gallipoli or straight to Salonika from the ports of Syria and Egypt, the various contingents joining the main line of march thereafter at Philippopolis (Filibe [q.v.]), Sofia and Nish. Of the troops from Europe the Bosnians made for Eszék, the Albanians for Nish, the men of Transylvania for Pest via Szolnok and the Wallachians, Moldavians and Krim Tatars for Belgrante via Temesvár (Marsigli, op. cit., ii, 106). It was seldom possible, in time of conflict with Austria or Persia, to concentrate the imperial forces in the actual theatre of war until the summer was far advanced, with the result that major field operations often had to be compressed into the months of August, September and October. The diminution, in the late summer, of natural sources of fodder in the area of operations tended to restrict the length of the campaign season, since the Ottomans took with them to war—and therefore had to feed—a large number of transport animals (cf. de Warnery, Remarques, 37-8). With the onset of winter (often harsh in the Balkans and as a rule severe in Armenia and the adjacent regions) the time for withdrawal to winter-quarters was almost at hand.

The preparations for a new campaign included the bringing together of vast supplies of war material. Orders would go out to the cannon foundries (Top-khané) at Istanbul and elsewhere for the casting of new guns and to the mines of the empire for supplies of iron, e.g., cramps, shovels, scythes, sickles, anvil, bellows, iron, lead, horse-shoes, nails, slow-match, linseed-oil, resin, pitch, cauldrons, camel-hair and horse-hair, ropes, cord and cables, cotton-wool, sacks, sheep-skins, grease, tallow, waggon-jacks, etc. (cf. art. Barúd, 1063; also J. Grzegorzewski, in Archivum Naumoue, vi (1912), passim; Gökhilgin, Yurükler, 169). Austrian accounts of material captured from the Ottomans during the long war of 1094/1683-1100/1699 embrace a wide range of articles and equipment, e.g., fire-arms and other weapons taken from the Ottomans and, in addition, list the amounts of captured gun-powder, sulphur and saltpetre (essential items that the Porte drew both from inside the empire and from foreign sources: cf. the references in Barúd iv (1063) and ĝiýva ii).

Of the first importance also was the obligation to make available adequate supplies of food for the troops in the field. The Ottomans, on campaign, led a frugal and sober life, a little bread (or biscuit), mutton and rice (pilav), dried beef, onions and the like formed their diet. It was well known that the main ingredients of their diet. This temperate approach to eating and drinking tended, as some of the Western sources indicate, to make the Ottoman soldier more resistant to disease and of greater endurance than his Christian foe (cf. Menavino, in Sansovino, Historia Universale, 731; Georgievitz, Epitome, 52-3; A. Arvieux, Mémoires, iv, 518; de Courmenin, Voiage, 261; de Warnery, Remarques, 23). The central government, therefore, took elaborate measures to meet the need for supplies and provisions. Large herds of cattle and flocks of sheep accompanied the Ottomans to war as sustenance for the troops in the field (cf. Magni, Turchia, i, 290). On the local population dwelling close to the line of advance would fall the burden—against payment, however—of bringing to the troops on the march grain and victuals of various kinds (cf. de Lassé, Historia Turchica, 48-9; Spandugino, in Sathas, Documents Indiatis, ix, 230-1; de Courmenin, Voiage, 255-6). At times, indeed, when a major campaign was in view, an edict might be issued, forbidding the export of supplies from a given area (cf. Huruzmuzki, Documente, ii/i, 525). The government—with the armed forces in mind—promoted the cultivation of rice in the Balkan lands, e.g., along the rivers Maritsa and Vardar (cf. Fišika iv, 907).

A great campaign meant the gathering together of vast numbers of transport animals, waggons and carts. Oxen and buffalo (some of them bred under government control, e.g., in Cilicia: cf. Ewliya Celebi, Seyyed-ı nâmâ, iii, 40) hauled the large guns, while camels (drawn from Asia Minor and the Fertile Crescent), mules and draught horses ("bârgir"), levied from the lands along the lower Danube acted as beasts of burden. The sipáhs, i.e., the "feudal" warriors, and also the "Altı béliük", or mounted regiments of the imperial household, came to war with their own horses, more swift and more light in physique than the heavier "bârgir". It was, in addition, the custom, for purposes of transport, to requisition waggons and animals, together with personal labour service, from the rural population on or near the line of march (cf. Menavino, in Sansovino, Historia Universale, 435; also (for Peterwardein, 1716) Mon. Hung. Hist., Scriptores, xxvii, 583). These inventories from the Ottomans and, in addition, list the amounts of captured gun-powder, sulphur and saltpetre (essential items that the Porte drew both from inside the empire and from foreign sources: cf. the references in Barúd iv (1063) and ĝiýva ii).
later the Janissaries and, in succession after them, the other corps and regiments of the central government moved to the camp, where the Grand Vizier, as Serdar, or commander-in-chief, now joined them, having formal leave of the Sultan (cf. I. Dujˇev, Avowi, 215; Galland, Journal, i, 177 ff.; de la Croix, Mémoires, i, 266 ff., 295 ff.; Kéralio, Histoire, i, 52 ff., ii, 73 ff., 82 ff., 88 ff.; de Warnery, Remarques, 21 ff.; Montecuculi-Crisse, iii, 289; d’Onisso, Tableau général, vii, 387 ff.; Hammer-Purgstall, Staatsverfassung, i, 403 ff.).

Much depended on the line of march, at least within the confines of the empire, as smooth and as practicable as possible. Orders would be sent to the authorities in the provinces, bidding them repair the relevant routes in order to facilitate the passage of waggons and guns. Piles of stones and wooden stakes served to mark out the actual line of advance that the troops had to follow (cf. Trésor politique, iii, 861; I. Dujˇev, Avowi, 69, 264; Magni, Turchia, i, 288; Auer, ed. Lukinich, 501; I. Barbier, op. cit., 22, 27, 28). The crossing of rivers (e.g., in Europe, the Sava, the Drava, the Danube or the Tisza) was a problem of particular importance. Supplies of tools, chains, timber, cables, nails, etc. had to be assembled for the building of great pontoon bridges. Sometimes pre-fabricated parts of the structure would be carried to the designated site in boats or on waggons and carts. Moreover, to ensure that the work went ahead with despatch, orders might be issued requisitioning the services of local skilled craftsmen, e.g., carpenters and smiths (cf. Barovius, De robus Ungariciis, 134-5; Szamoskózy, Történelmi Maradványai, 147-8; Hurnuzaki, Documente, i1/1, 521, 525, 543; Auer, ed. Lukinich, 80; Magni, Turchia, 391-3; de la Croix, Mémoires, 295-300; Mohar, in Mužeckotörténeti Értesítő, viii/4, 259-63).

The Ottomans, in the time of their splendour, observed a strict discipline on the march. Even the slightest damage to orchards, gardens and cultivated fields along the route was visited with severe punishment (cf. Menavino, in Sansovino, Historia Universale, 735; Georgiev, Épitome, 53-4; Chesneau, Voyage, 108-9). Such discipline seems, however, to have been far less strong when the camp was in decline (cf. de Warnery, Remarques, 89). Written commands transmitted from the serdar, through the Çavuş-şâhi and his subordinates, to the various corps and regiments made known the order of march, the chief elements of which—in the actual theatre of war—included an advanced screen of baggage and reconnaissance horsemen (e.g., akınıllar and Tatars), a vanguard of picked cavalry under the Carhındaş-şâhi, a main force embracing the Janissaries, the Allı bılık, the specialist troops (e.g., armourers, artilleryists, etc.), together with the mass of the “feudal” sipahi on either flank, and a rearguard covering the baggage and supplies (cf. de Promontorio-de Campis, ed. Babinger, 49, 61; Ordo Portae, ed. Şerif Baštav, 8-11; Marsigli, op. cit., i, 112-7; Hammer-Purgstall, Staatsverfassung, i, 493 ff.).

The main care was taken on changing site to the next began in the small hours of the morning. It was now that the personnel entrusted with the choice and delimitation of a new site went forward, under suitable escort and with tents, baggage and equipment, to fulfil their duties. Access to pasture for the animals and to water for beasts and men alike was a factor of much importance in the selection of the next site. Experience from earlier campaigns, expert local advice and careful reconnaissance meant of course that the choice could often be made, in principle at least, well before the actual moment of need. With the forward movement of the various corps and regiments set out in succession, marching until about the hour of noon, when the new camp, in normal circumstances, would be at hand. The centre of the encampment was reserved for the tents of the Sultan, the Grand Vizier and the high dignitaries of the Porte. Around them would lie the Janissaries, the Allı bılık, the artilleryists with their cannon—in short, the troops belonging to the imperial household. The main nucleus stood the Beşlerbegs, the Sandjak bęgs and the sipahi of the provinces, each corps having its own quarters. Much colourful detail can be gleaned about such encampments from the European sources—e.g., on the lanterns used for marching in the hours of darkness, the water-carrier (sabbdlı) with his buffalo skins, the “baraques” of the artisans and craftsmen (each with a small pennant above it, pointing to a particular trade or occupation), the enclosure where stray animals waited for their owners to reclaim them or the canvas barriers erected around the quarters of the Sultan and painted to look like walls. The deepest impressions left on the Christian mind would seem to have come, however, from the frugal and sober habits of the Ottoman soldier, the absence of drunkenness, the wonderful silence prevailing in such encampments and from the care taken to maintain a high standard of personal and public cleanliness amongst the troops (e.g., regular visits to the barber, frequent washing of clothes, lavish provision of latrines both within the quarters of each individual unit and within the camp as a whole)—all of which stood in marked and favourable contrast to the practices normal in the armies of Christendom (cf. Spandugino, in Sathas, Documenti Inéditi, ix, 230; Trésor politique, iii, 856 ff.; de Courmenin, Voyage, 258-9; de la Croix, Mémoires, i, 289 ff., 301 ff.; Galland, Journal, i, 113 ff.; ii, 113 ff.; d’Arvieux, Mémoires, iv, 516 ff.; Magni, Turchia, i, 288 ff., 301 ff., 336-7, 348-9; Guilleragues, Ambassades, 335 ff.; Benaglia, Relations, 101 ff.; Marsigli, op. cit., i, 81, ii, 561 ff.; de La Motraye, Voyages, ii, 5 ff.; Villars, ed. Vogüé, i, 777 ff.; de Tasso, Opera, 135 ff.). The latter is often mentioned, too, of the position and circumstance of Ottoman warfare—e.g., of the uniform and equipment of the Janissaries, of the respect accorded to meritorious conduct in the field (the granting of aigrettes, of honorific robes and of gratifications in cash) or of the brilliant-hued pennants used to distinguish one from the other the various regiments and corps and also the personal retinues of the great dignitaries (cf. Trésor politique, iii, 841, 843, 855; de Germigny, in L’Illustré Orbisandale, i, 1003 Hurnuzaki, Documente, Supl. I, 1, 86-7; Benaglia, Relations, 234; Magni, Turchia, i, 339; Brue, Journal, 24, 27, 58-9; Perry, View of the Levant, 42).

An assessment of Ottoman tactics in the field demands some degree of caution. The rôle, in warfare, of the Janissaries, the Allı bılık and the specialist corps of the imperial household was a most important one, but it can be given too much emphasis. The main weight of the Ottoman forces—and this fact determined in large measure their system of tactics—was to be found in the sipahi, the “feudal” warriors from the provinces, who far outnumbered the troops of the central government. On the battle-field, subject of course to variations imposed by the terrain, the normal order consisted of a firm centre embracing the Janissaries and other élite elements
with trenches, cannon and waggons as protection (in short, a “Wagenburg” arrangement) and on each side a powerful wing of sipahis horsemen. The tactics appropriate to such forces aligned in such an order are not hard to define: harassment of the foe, skirmishes, sudden thrusts, feigned retreats, infiltration toward the flank and rear of the opposing troops and at last a general onset of horsemen, with the foe, should all go well, overrun and cut down in flight and relentless pursuit. To considerations of this kind must be added factors of a strategic nature: the size of the forces (much greater than those of the Ottomans during the 18th centuries), for instance, and the incompetency of the Ottoman generals, the tactics of the sipahis, the skill of the Ottomans with the sabre, the use of smoke signals to launch an attack, the wild rush of the Janissaries towards the foe and on the unwieldiness of the Ottoman guns (cf. Villars, ed. Vogüé, i, 367, 368; Vauban, ii, 283; Eugen, Feldziege, ii, 157 ff.; Röder von Diersburg, ii, 107 ff.; Poniatowski, Remarques, 104-5; de Warnery, Remarques, 24, 60 ff., 77-78, 114; Kéralio, Histoire, i, 113 ff.; Smitt, Suworow, 162 ff.; Criste, Kriege, 273 ff.).

The resultant picture—even when all allowances have been made—is of a war machine outmoded beyond hope of renovation. Soldiers of such great reputation as Lorraine and Villars and authors of genuine insight like de Warnery and Kéralio underline the basic defects of Ottoman warfare—inefficiency in the high command, lack of an efficient artillery, ignorance of tactics and of the art of manoeuvre (cf. Villars, ed. Vogüé, i, 79-80, 368, 380; de Warnery, Remarques, 114; Kéralio, Histoire, i, 114-5). Reform on European lines had in fact become for the Ottomans a most urgent and unavoidable need. The last word on their traditional style of warfare can be left to Maurice de Saxe, who wrote that neither valour, nor number, nor wealth was lacking to them—but order, discipline and “la manière de combattre” (Rivieres, i, 87).

The conduct of war in the early centuries of Islamic Persia was based essentially on the military heritage of earlier Persian empires, but it also contained elements from the Arab desert tradition of warfare and the Turkish steppe tradition of raiding. We first hear of Persian military methods in the Islamic period from the accounts of the Arab conquest of al-'Irāq and Persia under Abū Bakr and 'Umar. The mailed cavalryman, armed with sword, lance, mace or bow, was characteristic of the Sāsānīd army, and the deployment and tactics of such cavalrymen must have been similar to the type of army, and the deployment and tactics of such

Rustum's troops (allegedly numbering 120,000, of whom a large proportion must have been infantry conscripts and camp followers) advanced on the first day of battle in thirteen ranks, each behind the other, and rained arrows on the Arabs. Being without adequate protective clothing or helmets, the latter suffered considerably, but nevertheless stood firm and were able to advance and use their lances and swords at close quarters (Ṭabar, in Sir W. Muir, *The Caliphate, its rise, decline and fall*, Edinburgh 1915, 104 ff., and R. Levy, *The social structure of Islam*, Cambridge 1954). With the decline of direct Caliphal authority in Persia and the rise of virtually independent dynasties (sc. in the 3rd/9th century and after), two trends of military significance may be noted. Firstly, the emphasis on the cavalry arm increased with the popularity in armies of Turkish military slaves (ğulîms [q.v.]), for these were primarily cavalrymen, using the weapon of the steppes, the bow. Secondly, multi-national, professional armies became the norm, and the supreme commander or ruler had a problem in wielding together for action the disparate elements composing his forces. According to Niẓām al-Mulk, Maḥmūd of Ghazna drew advantage from this diversity. He kept the various nationalities, Turks, Indians, Khurāsānīs, Arabs, etc., in their ethnic groups, and encamped thus when the army was on the march; on the battlefield, the spirit of emulation spurred them all on to prodigies of valour (Ṣiyāsāt-nāma, ch. xxiv). But on more than one occasion, the Great Saldījūk had difficulty in holding their forces together on the battlefield. In 465/1073, for instance, Malik Shāh had to defend his throne against his uncle Kawurd, the representative of conservative Turkmen feeling. In a battle outside Hamadān, Malik Shāh’s own Turkish troops turned against the Kurdish and Arab contingents of his army, because these last had played the decisive rôle in crumpling and routing Kawurd’s right wing and had thus outraged the feelings of Turkish solidarity amongst the Sultan’s own Turks (Bundarlī, *Zubdat al-nasra*, 48). However, where the ruler or commander had at his disposal a force of dependable ğulîms, these could be moved along the front for mutual reinforcement and watching (cf. Bayhaḵī, Taḫīt-i Maṣū‘ī, cited in C. E. Bosworth, *Ghaznavid military organisation*, in *Isl., xxxvi/1-2* (1960), 47).

The Arab raiders, like the Turkmen marauders from the steppes in later centuries, had travelled with a minimum of baggage. But in a settled land like Persia, the large-scale movement of troops was bound to be a complicated affair. The reduction of fortresses and walled towns demanded siege machinery; if agriculture was to flourish and the taxable capacity of the land to be maintained, an army could not expect to live off the countryside, so supplies had to be taken along; and such non-combatant bodies as the court and harem and the adwāns of the administration frequently accompanied the army on its campaigns. When in 420/1029 Maḥmūd of Ghazna marched against the Buyids of Ray and Diḫbal, he brought far more baggage than is mentioned as wearing oiled cotton coats (hârâqīs yā nīrâbâṣīn) (Bayhaḵī, 134, 534). Thus when an army was campaigning outside its normal sphere of action, local conditions had to be provided for if the army was to function at optimum efficiency; the sources often note the effect of the damp climate of the Caspian coast region in rusting weapons, and the Turkish archers of Ibn Rāq’s general Baykând were in 326/938 routed in Khūzestān by the Bûyûd Muʿīzz al-Dawla because continuous rain had ruined their bowstrings (Ibn al-ʿAthīr, viii, 254-5). The plundering of the countryside by a passing army was an age-old custom in Persia (cf. Christensen, *L’Iram sous les Sassanides*, 213, on the scorched-earth tactics of Sāsānid troops). Certain troops and commanders acquired particularly bad reputations for their plunderings and excesses against the civilian populations, such as the Daylamlās of Mâdarwâdī b. Ziyâr (Masʿūdī, Muʿāqīsī, 22-24), and the Turkmen—many of them fresh from the Kipčâk steppes and still pagan—of the Khârîzim-Shâh ʿAlâʾ al-Dîn Muḥammad. A Ghaznavid commander in Khūrāsān cut down all the pistachio-nut trees in the Bayhaḵ oasis and sent some of the trunks off to Ghazna, where they were fuel (Taḵīt-i Bayhaḵ, 273). Other commanders had good reputations among which they kept over their soldiers whilst on the march, e.g., Yaḵūb b. Layth (Muʿāqīsī, viii, 46 ff.). It was recognised that violent behaviour was morally indefensible and contrary to the Šahrīfī, but it was sometimes excused on the grounds of necessity (see the apologia of Sulaymān b. Kutalmīş for his ravaging of the region of Aleppo in 477/1084-5, in Ibn al-ʿAthīr, x, 90). Not infrequently the civilian population of a whole region might be evacuated in face of an advancing army, as is said to have been done by ʿAlâʾ al-Dîn Muḥammad in the Sîr Dârîy valley when the Mongols were approaching (ibid., xii, 179).

The commander of an advancing army had to plan his strategy with regard to such considerations as the availability of supplies, the manœuvrability of his communications and the type of terrain and natural conditions which he would have to face when giving battle. In a land of hydraulic constructions like Persia, it was often possible to divert rivers and irrigation channels to flood the land in face of an approaching enemy. In 456/1064 Kutalmīş b. Arslān Ṣarīḵ rebelled against Alp Arslān; he shut himself up in Ray and made the roads thither impassable by diverting water over the salt flats and
into the wilāyāt (Ibn al-Athir, x, 23-4). But the locus classicus for this tactic was Khwarizm, where an army advancing north-westwards along the Oxus could be halted by the flooding of the very complex irrigation system of that region (for examples from the 6th/12th century, see Barthold, Turkestän, 154, 325, 337, 339, 349). On the other hand, such a decision to flood territory might affect both sides. When the Ghurid 'Alāʾ al-Dīn Ḥusayn faced Sandījar at Nāb in the Hari Rūd valley in 547/1152, he decided to flood his own rear to prevent his soldiers yielding; this manoeuvre recouped upon him disastrously, for the Turkish troops in the Ghurid army deserted to the Sālджūqs, and the Ghurids were pushed back into the flooded lands and swamps (Džuzdžani, Taḥbālī-n Naṣīrī, tr. Raverty, 358-60).

When the army halted and prepared for battle, guards were posted and scouts sent out to investigate the terrain and the enemy positions (Fakhr-i Mudabbir, Aḏāb al-mušaṭḥ, ch. xx; on this work, see Bibliography). According to this author, the Ārid or head of the military branch of the administration then inspected the whole of the army, from the officers downwards, their weapons and their mounts, and passed them as fit for battle. Commanders exhorted their troops, often promising special rewards for outstanding feats of bravery (cf. Bosworth, in Isl., xxxvi/i-2, 69-70, 74). If the enemy were infidels, religious enthusiasm could be roused, and Fakhr-i Mudabbir has a section on the lāṣkhar-i ṣalāk “those who support the soldiers by their prayers and intercessions” (ch. xxxiv). During Alp Arslan’s Anatolian campaign of 493/1071, the Caliph al-Ḳāʾīm composed special prayers for the Muslim forces; copies were sent to the mḥāṭīkh attached to the Salджūq army and the prayers were read out before the battle of Malāṣqūrd (Mantsktir) (Ḥusayn, Aḏḥīr al-dawla al-Salʤūqīyya, 47-8; Cahen, La campagne de Mantsktir d’après les sources musulmanes, in Byzantion, ix (1934), 633). The armies which campaigned against the Greeks and Georgians in eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus usually included religious elements, to be equated here with the gūlāṣīs [q.v.], who not only exhorted the faithful ghdzis [q.v.,] but who might themselves join in the fray. For the Turkish troops in the Ghurid army advancing north-westwards along the Oxus, attached to the army of Khwāna the Amir Khwāna the Amir--Ala al-Dīn Muḥammad at Dmawar. Both sides employed this formation and, like Mḥmūd of Ghazna, Sandījar placed a protective screen of elephants before his lines. Mḥsūd b. Mḥmūd took the centre himself, placing the Amir Karāča Sāḵḵī and Kfīl on his left and the Amir Yūrünkūḵ Bzāḏār and Yūsuf Cāfūḵ on his right. Facing him, Sandījar held his own centre on the ground (as at al-Kūnīn, 762), but Džalāl al-Dīn stood firm, and the two armies disengaged when night fell (Džuzdžani, tr. 268-70; for details, see vIl). It was possible in battle, however, for one wing of each army to push back the opposing wing so that a circular formation resulted. This occurred during the first engagement of the Khāridzm-Shāh Aṭṣūz and other commanders were on the right. Mḥsūd’s army was defeated by a tactic frequently practised on such occasions and reminiscent of the classic enveloping movement employed with such success by Hannibal against the Romans at Cannae: Karāḵa Sāḵḵī drove into Sandījar’s centre, but Toghrūl and Aṭṣūz dropped back from the wings and enveloped and annihilated Karāḵa’s forces (Ibn al-Athir, x, 476). It was possible in battle, however, for one wing of each army to push back the opposing wing so that a circular formation resulted. This occurred during the first engagement of the Khāridzm-Shāh Aṭṣūz al-Dīn Mḥmūd and his son Džalāl al-Dīn with the Mongol Džeti. The only way out of this impasse for the Mongols was for the Mḥmūd’s army to turn and run, retreat the enemy (as at al-Kūnīn, 762), but Džalāl al-Dīn stood firm, and the two armies disengaged when night fell (Džuzdžani, tr. 268-70; other examples of this pattern of battle in Djwainy-Boyle, 351-2, 360).

The use of elephants to form a screen before the front ranks of the taʾbīya was especially favoured by such dynasties as the Ghaznavids, Sālджūqs and Ghurids (for details, see vIl), but other means might be used to protect the front line. At the battle of HARB
Bazimdja near Baghdad in 549/1154 between the Caliph al-Muktafi and a Turkish army under the Amir Mascud... fought on foot (Husayni, 80). The Ghurids of central Afghanistan were, like the Daylamids, a race of mountaineers and were famed as infantrymen. Džaždži Ć mentions a peculiar tactic of theirs, the use of the kara, a protective screen of cowhide padded with cotton; this was placed over the shoulders and formed a defence for advancing soldiers (Tabakdž-i Nāṣīrī, tr. 352-3; according to Raverty, the kara was used in Afghanistan until the introduction of firearms).

Since Persia is a land of predominantly landlocked rivers, few of which are in any case perennial, amphibious operations are only rarely mentioned in the sources. The Oxus was unsuitable for large-scale navigation, and armies attacking Khārizm marched along its banks rather than sailed down it. Only on the edge of the Persian world, in the Indus valley, do we hear of extensive river warfare. In 428/1037 Mahmud of Ghazna led an expedition against the pagan DJats of the lower Indus region, employing 4,200 ships armed with spikes and carrying fighting men. When battle was joined, the Muslim troops rammed the DJats' ships and hurled nafīt at them; soldiers waiting on the river banks then finished off the undrowned survivors (Gardizī, Zayn al-ašbāh, ed. Nazim, Berlin 1928, 88-9; M. Nāṣīm, The life and times of Sulaimān  Māhūm  Ghana, Cambridge 1931, 121-2).

The conventions of warfare included the ones that quarter, amān, should be freely given and that prisoners-of-war should not be slaughtered or ill-treated (Adāb al-mulūk, ch. xxiv). The sources usually therefore mention breaches of these conventions, as in Kirmān during the time of the Saldjuks of Ghazna, Shāh b. Toghrī Shāh (d. 572/1176-7), when inexperienced soldiers and ghulāms of his killed captives from an invading army (Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, a 1200 of mamlukīs and were found in 406). It was not, however, regarded as unethical to masquerade in the characteristic dress of the enemy; it is recorded that the Khārizm-Shāh ‘Ali’ al-Din Muhammad was fond of the tactic of donning in battle the distinguishing garb of the enemy in order to confuse him (Diuwaiy-Boyle, 352).

During the Indian campaigns, Sebiiktigin is said to have used a technique of successive attacks. He separated his ghulāms, who were armed with clubs and maces, into groups of 500 men, and each group attacked in turn, falling back to allow another group to move up ('Utbī-Manīnī, Yāmīnī, i, 85-6).

Whilst the flexibility of cavalry made it very useful in open conditions, where the opposing forces might be spread over a wide front, infantry often came into its own in broken or precipitous terrain or where the fighting was close and confused. The Daylamids were famed as tough infantrymen, and at times their impetuousness as a raiding-point. Under the Ghurids, a 700 of mamlukīs and were found in 406). It was not, however, regarded as unethical to masquerade in the characteristic dress of the enemy; it is recorded that the Khārizm-Shāh ‘Ali’ al-Din Muhammad was fond of the tactic of donning in battle the distinguishing garb of the enemy in order to confuse him (Diuwaiy-Boyle, 352).

After the battle, the victorious army divided up the captured booty [see Ghana]. In the absence of the ruler himself, the Ārid often supervised this procedure, taking out the ruler's fifth and those items specifically reserved for him, such as precious metals, weapons and elephants. The remainder was then divided out amongst the fighting personnel. Though not, according to the Adāb al-mulūk, ch. xxxii, amongst the camp following (cf. Bosworth in Isl., xxxvi/1-2, 62, 74).

The Mongol invaders and Timurids brought into the Persian world fresh military ways. During the period of their dominance (cf. the 7th-9th/13th-15th centuries), the older techniques of warfare, based essentially on slow-moving, heavily-armed professional armies, were temporarily eclipsed; they re-emerged under the Sāfawids and their successors, but were then revolutionised by the introduction of firearms. The Mongol armies were composed almost...
wholly of cavalrymen, with the bow as their basic weapon; these armies have therefore been cited by military historians as showing that cavalry need not be restricted to earlier times in the classical and Near Eastern worlds. The Mongol army, in earlier conquerors and commanders. Spies would be sent out, and before the Manchurian campaign of 1211 and the Khārīzīmīnian one of 616/1219, Čingiz obtained information on local conditions from traders and others familiar with those lands. According to Sāyfī Ḥarawī, Čingiz had maps of Afghanistan prepared for himself, and Ibn ʿArabshāh likewise mentions Čimūr’s interest in maps. By such means as these, Čingiz learnt about the topography of Sīstān and Ghazāra (Martin, op. cit., 90-76) to send the minimum force necessary with his son Čaghatay to Afghanistan and eastern Iran 994-1040, Edinburgh 1963, 241 ff., and there exists a study of the battle of Andānsan, based on Bayhaḵ’s account, by B. N. Zakhōder in Rusiyyī ʿIstūrīlīsī Ẓūnārī, 1943, Turkish tr. in Bleyl, xi (1954), 581-7. There is a general survey of the art of war in Persia up to the coming of the Sālīdūkhs by Spuler in his Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit, 494-9; in his bibliography (Nos. 365 and 366) are cited two general works on the military history of Persia, Dī, Kūzānī, Tārīḵ-i niṣāmīyā-yi Irān, Tehran 1310/1932, and Gh. H. Muktādār, Tārīḵ-i niṣāmī-yi Irān, Tehran 1319/1940. The Mongols as soldiers have attracted rather more attention; see Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, 413-6, and D. Martin, The Mongol army, in J.R.A.S., 1943, 46-85 (the same author’s article Činghiz Khan’s first invasion of the Chin empire, in Ibid., 182-216, illustrates Mongol strategy and tactics but in a non-Persian context). Quatremère’s notes to his Histoire des Mongols de la Perse, I, Paris 1836, still contain valuable material on the art of war in this period. Of the Persian Mirrors for Princes, chs. xx and xii of the Kaḏāb-nāma of Ka’y Rā’ūs are relevant, but of outstanding value is the Āḏāb al-muṣāḥa wa ḵafṣāyat al-maḥāl or Āḏāb al-karb wa lḡāḏāya of Fakhr-i Mubābīr Mubāhārāshāh, written under Sultan Iltuṣnay of Delhi in the early 713/1313 century. The greater part of it deals specifically with the art of war, and its information seems to be based primarily on Ghaznavid and Ghūrid practice (see on it I. M. Shafi, Fresh light on the Ghaznavids, in I.C., xii (1938), 189-234, and Bosworth, Early sources for the history of the first four Ghaznavid Sultans 977-1044, in I.Q., vii (1963), 16; Č. Čeben has used material from it for his appendix on the weapons of the Ghūrids in Un traité d’armurerie composé pour Saladin, in BÉt.Ori., xii (1947-8), 160-2.

(C. E. Bosworth)

VI. — INDIA

1. General.—The army in India (for its composition, organisation, training and parts, see Laghūt) was distributed in various places of a ruler’s dominions according to their strategic importance, in order to avoid difficulties of transport; for example, the north-west frontier provinces, where there was the continual threat of Mughul raids, were always well provided with experienced troops under able and loyal commanders during the Dīlī sultanate period. The main army was concentrated in the capital, or

greatest trust stationed on the extremities of the two wings (Bābūr-nāma, tr. Beveridge, 154-5). The army of the Turksmen At with some of the army was divided in the Turko-Mongol fashion into three divisions of a centre (called by the Mongol term mankalay “forehead”, “front”), a left wing (soul) and a right wing (sagh) (Minoreskij, A civil and military review in Fars in 881/1476, in B.S.O.S., x (1939-42), 154 ff.).

With the advent of the Šafawīs, artillery and firearms came into prominence and were said to have revolutionised the art of war; for a consideration of military techniques in this later period see Bārūdī, The Šafawīs.

Biography: (in addition to the references given in the text): There has been little systematic study of the military history of mediaeval Persia. Some of the strategic and tactical aspects of the Ghaznavid-Sālīdūk fighting are considered in Bosworth, The Ghaznavids: their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 994-1040, Stirling 1922, 48-9; in his JRAS, 1943, 46-85 (the same author’s article Chinghiz Khan’s first invasion of the Chin empire, in Ibid., 182-216, illustrates Mongol strategy and tactics but in a non-Persian context). Quatremère’s notes to his Histoire des Mongols de la Perse, i, Paris 1836, still contain valuable material on the art of war in this period. Of the Persian Mirrors for Princes, chs. xx and xii of the Kādāb-nāma of Ka’y Rā’ū’s are relevant, but of outstanding value is the Āḏāb al-muṣāḥa wa ḵafṣāyat al-maḥāl or Āḏāb al-karb wa lḡāḏāya of Fakhr-i Mubābīr Mubāhārāshāh, written under Sultan Iltuṣnay of Delhi in the early 713/1313 century. The greater part of it deals specifically with the art of war, and its information seems to be based primarily on Ghaznavid and Ghūrid practice (see on it I. M. Shafi, Fresh light on the Ghaznavids, in I.C., xii (1938), 189-234, and Bosworth, Early sources for the history of the first four Ghaznavid Sultans 977-1044, in I.Q., vii (1963), 16; Č. Čeben has used material from it for his appendix on the weapons of the Ghūrids in Un traité d’armurerie composé pour Saladin, in BÉt.Ori., xii (1947-8), 160-2.

(C. E. Bosworth)
in a city or camp where the ruler was residing, with detachments and garrisons at many provincial headquarters under the command of khodras [q.v.].

The garrison system, which the Indian sultans seem to have inherited from the 'Abbasids through the Ghaznavids, was always well maintained, many rulers attaching great importance to keeping old forts in good repair and building others as the dominions were enlarged, modifying them for artillery as this became available [see युद्ध]. When the need for war arose, the first attempts to meet the situation would be made by local troops; if these were inadequate, reinforcements would be called for from neighbouring areas before aid was requested from the capital. The forces at the capital (haqsh-i kalb) had as their main component the cavalry, well accoutred and mounted on Arab or Turkoman horses; and this branch was of course fully mobile and could easily be sent to a distant part of the dominions. The other fighting branches, however, the elephants and the infantry, were less mobile; elephants were maintained especially in the capital, since possession of them was a royal prerogative and no sultan would permit them to be concentrated in a town away from the capital, where they might be used against him in the event of rebellion. The infantry (pâyak) maintained in the capital were employed as bodyguards and for local defence; Diyâ' al-Din Barani comments on their skill with the bow, and mentions that the best pâyaks came from Bengal. Obviously they were not readily transportable on distant campaigns, although on major expeditions they could march with the baggage train, for which they would provide a continual escort; but a class of infantry (pâyak ba asp) is mentioned which seems to have been provided with horses maintained by the government. On remote campaigns infantry could be drawn from standing local troops, locally conscripted, or provided by feudal rulers; and local arrangements were similarly necessary to facilitate the passage of the army on its line of march.

2.—The army on the march. Armies would commence the march at an auspicious moment fixed by the astrologers, and before leaving, rulers, commanders and troops would visit saints and shrines for protection and blessing—indeed, holy men were called as such. The army would be led by an advance party, including the scouts, standard bearers and musicians—importance was given to the spectacular side, cf. Amir Khusraw, Khasâ'în al-fiûsh, 'Alîga'h 1297, 101-2; Shams-i Sirâdî 'Affî, Ta'rîkh-i Firûz Shâhî, Bibli. Ind., 1890, 269-70—and officers of the commissariat who would ensure that adequate stores were available along the route. The army was divided, in the accompanying party, on major expeditions by the 'ulama and the karam—a practice continued by the Mughals, in Humâyûn's time the Mughal camp assuming the dimensions of a city under canvas moving from place to place, while by the time of Awrangzîb the march had become very cumbrous, with its heavy artillery, baggage train, the imperial treasure on several hundred camels, the imperial archives, fresh water for the court (Ganges water was favoured) as well as transport and boats—often, in deeper water, to break the force of the current to supply grain as well as transport and boats—often, indeed, also to join the marching army or to supply some member of their family for that purpose. Grain was also brought to the army, on the march or on the battlefield, by corn-merchants (bandjârîs), often nomads, who were encouraged by good prices (Diyâ' al-Din Barani, Ta'rîkh-i Firûz Shâhî, Bibli. Ind., 1892, 304 ff.); it was often provided by the local population on payment—the kodwâl of the imperial camp ensured that grain was available at reasonable rates—or, in the last resort, was obtained by plunder; but since this alienated the local population, who might flee, in which case supplies would of course fail, this was seldom resorted to. In any case, compensation would later be paid for stores taken or for land or crops damaged, the rate being assessed by the local amin (called also munshî, munshîf in the Sûfî period); cf. 'Abbasî Sarâwânî, Tahâ-yi 'Abhar Shâhî, B.M. Or. 164, 73 v.

Although rapidity of movement sometimes permitted little halting—forced marches were not unknown—the army on the march generally encamped at night. The site was when possible carefully chosen, as adequate water, forage and firewood had to be available, and for preference a locality defended by river or hill was selected. The fighting arms were naturally well-nigh always employed, and the local arrangements were in accordance with their order of battle (see below), the sultan's personal party was in the middle of the camp, and behind were the armours, transport and camp-followers. If the camp was in the vicinity of the enemy's forces, and hence in danger of attack by skirmingish parties or patrols, it would be defended by a ditch and parapet, certainly from Khâlidî times (cf. Barani, op. cit., 301); in Tarbh's campaign against Mahmûd Tughluf from the 7th/13th century, see Fakhr al-Din Mubarak, Afd al-muluk wa 'Išâyat al-mamlûk, India Office MS 647, f. 87 v.; in the battle between Humâyûn and Sultan Bahâdur of Gujûrât in 1642/1655 gun-carriages were so used by both sides); and a little later, in the time of Shîr Shâh Sûr, the parapets were formed of sand-bags. The same defences were applied to the last
camping-ground, i.e., the camp at the battlefield, with such additional protection as the exigencies of the campaign seemed to call for. This was certainly continued until late in the Mughal period, for in the campaign of Dāhāndār Shāh's son ʿIzz al-Dīn against Farrukhsīyār in 1722/1722 we read of his throwing up a parapet about 2 m. high inside a wide ditch around his camp, on which he mounted guns and mortars (Khāfi Kāhn, Muntakhab al-lubāb, Bibl. Ind., 1869, ii, 699).

3. The camping-ground. In addition to the requirements of the encamped army (see above) the actual terrain of combat was selected with great care: the presence of a hill or some other natural defence at the rear or on the flanks would relieve the commander from making extensive arrangements for the protection of that quarter. The ideal ground had, in addition to these natural defences, an extensive plain of hard or smooth ground—stony ground was when possible avoided as it damaged the horses' hoofs—free from dust, sand or mire, neither too near nor too remote from habitation, and with an independent water-supply. The battle-field itself might be further defended by entrenchment, abatis or stockade, as in the case of the camp; in later periods such defence might be provided also for individual pieces of artillery.

These requisites seem to have been sought at all periods of the Muslim power in India. Timūr thoughtfully added (Tāṣuk, 191) that the sun should not be in front of the battle-ground, lest the eyes of the troops be dazzled.

4. Order of battle.—The general order of filing an army in the field—vanguard, right wing, left wing, centre and rear—persisted in Muslim India with little variation, but with bewildering changes of terminology, from the days of the Ghaznawids; the composition of the various elements was, however, never firmly established, and at different times places were found for elephants or for artillery in one or more of these traditional elements. The main arm in terms of which all dispositions were conceived was invariably the cavalry.

In advance of the vanguard were the scouts and skirmishers (tašya, muḥaddama-i ʿīn, yashk in Sultanate times under Timūr and Bābur hadval; under the later Mughals muḥaddamat al-dīyaṣṣ, manbala and ṣalāf were used besides tašya), light squadrons trained to reconnoitre the roads and the enemy's positions and to bring back quick information; they were instructed not to move in a body yet to maintain touch with one another, not to engage the enemy unless they were attacked, and to retreat with caution lest their withdrawal be interpreted as flight and thus cause a general stampede (Addā al-mulāḥ, fols. 8a v.-86 v.). They might be divided into left and right sections (Kārīval-i dast-i ṣaf, kārīval-i dast-i ṣaf), as with Timūr.

The vanguard proper was called muḥaddama under the Dīlū sultans, ḫāṣval under Timūr and the Mughals. With Timūr the ḫāṣval had its own van, the ḫāṣval-i ḫāṣval, the main body being the ḫāṣval-i ḥarīval, and from the ḫāṣval-i ḥarīval Timūr added to this a vanguard reserve, ṣarḥ-i ḫāṣval.

The wings (dīnād < Ar. dīnād) were in Sultanate times called māṣara (left) and māṣmāna (right), each divisible into left and right sections; under Timūr the right and left wings were called baranghar and dīnāhar respectively, with the possibility of much subdivision: e.g., for the right wing the ḥarīval-i baranghar (van of the right wing), ṣaṣpāval-i baranghar (left section of the right wing), and ṣaṣpāval-i baranghar (right section of the right wing), and so similarly for the left wing. Bābur's army was disposed in much the same way, the terms yamin-i baranghar and yasār-i baranghar being used for the right and left sides of the right wing (corresponding terms also for the left wing); each wing had in addition a flanking party (tuḥṣuma, tuḥṣuma) of light cavalry to encircle the enemy's flank and take him in the rear; and each wing had its own reserve (taṣaf).

The centre was known in Sultanate times as ḥalb, with its two sections, dast-i ṣaf-i ḥalb and dast-i ṣaf-i ḥalb, to left and right respectively; it was followed by the rearguard, ṣukka or ḥalī. In Timūr's accounts the centre is kūl or gōl, the rearguard ʿṣab; Bābur uses similar terms, though the later Mughals sometimes reverted to the earlier terms, and used in addition tandīval or ṣaṣhūl for the rearguard. The term šalīmāsh is used in the accounts of Akbar's campaigns for units filed between vanguard and centre, but apparently sometimes posted on the flanks of the centre just clear of the rear of the right and left wings, or in front of them; in such cases their function must have been similar to that of the tuḥṣuma.

At all times the centre was where the ruler or his deputy took his station, accompanied by the ʿulāmā', physicians, astrologers, etc., and the personal bodyguard; and this was the usual station for the elephants, certainly at least the ceremonial elephants carrying the standards and the ḍhatra and those carrying bands of musicians. Wives or favourite children not infrequently accompanied the royal commander in the taqva of his elephant, although Awrangzīb deprecated this practice, declaring that unnecessary persons round the commander hindered efficient leadership and organization. The chain of command was passed from the commander to all branches of the army through adjutants (taqūli, yasāwal, šabdwal, ṣabdwal), who were also responsible for ensuring that proper battle array and battle discipline were maintained; the orders might be communicated through flag signals, drum-beat or trumpet-blast, as well as by couriers.

The composition of reserve divisions of the army varied greatly throughout the Muslim period, except perhaps for the rearguard, which at all times comprised the kitchens, armouries, wardrobes, treasury, spare animals, prisoners, wounded, and a fighting contingent for the defence of the centre from any attack from behind. For the rest, at least a few general principles can be enumerated. In Sultanate times there were three ways of drawing up: infantry, cavalry or elephants could form the front line, according to the exigencies of the situation. When the infantry led, four lines of foot-soldiers, their accoutrements somewhat different for each line, were arrayed with wide gaps left in their ranks so that the cavalry behind them could observe the situation, and charge or retreat through them. A mobile cavalry force was kept on the right wing, a company of māṣānīn and ʿarrādas [g.v., see also ʿūlān] were placed on the right of the centre, archers and naphtha-throwers on the left of the centre. These conventional dispositions were in fact no impediment to the battle-situation, as there was also a conventional and disciplined order of the use of these auxiliary forces (see below, Strategy and tactics).

When the cavalry led, their front rank was drawn up similarly to the method described above for the
front line of infantry; the foot-soldiers would then form the second line, and, as was the case also when the infantry led, the elephants would for the most part be stationed in the centre, although selected beasts might be deployed to support either flank.

The third possible order was when the elephants led, followed immediately by the cavalry, as in Ghiyāḥ b. Dīn Tuglugh's battle against the usurper Khusrav Khān in 750/1350 (Amīr Khusrav, Tuglugh-nāma, Hidayādārāb 1352/1935, 92-3); or when they were placed in front of each wing, as in 'Allā' b. Dīn Khuldūb's battle against the Mongols at Kūk in 699/1299. The usual place of the elephants, however, was in the centre protecting the king. They were armoured with iron sheets, and carried ḥa'edās in the form of armoured turrets in which sat archers, naphtha-throwers and operators of projectile engines—an Indian device adopted by the Persians which goes back in time to the 4th or 3rd century B.C. (cf. Sarvā Daman Singh, Ancient Indian warfare, London 1965, 82 ff.) and persisted certainly into Mughal times, cf. Barbosa, Travels, tr. and ed. M. L. Dames, Hakluyt Socy. London 1918, i, 178.

It is less easy to determine the manner of drawing up under the Mughals. Artillery became increasingly important, and often occupied the first line of the vanguard on heavy carts chained or roped together, so that they might serve also as a barrier to a sudden enemy onslaught; between the carts goblins and mantlets formed a protection for the supporting matchlockmen; and in front of them an entrenchment might be formed. Lighter pieces of ordnance followed, swivel-guns (sanbūrak, shurtardzd) on camels, and small cannon (gaḍāndzd, khuda) in the ḥa'edās of elephants. The cavalry followed. In the vanguard there were also mortarmen (di'andzd), grenadiers (ra'andzd) and rocketmen (lubbadandzd). Artillery might be stationed also in the front rank of the two wings and of the centre, with elephants also in front of each body of troops.

The size of the various branches of the field force is also difficult to ascertain in most periods; but in a Mughal account of a force of 40,000 cavalry the vanguard is said to have 8,000, the centre 12,000, the two wings 11,000 between them, the reserves 4,500, and the rearguard 4,500. If, say, 40 elephants were available for a particular campaign, seven were placed in front of the vanguard, fifteen in front of the centre, six in front of each of the two reserves, two in front of each wing, and two in the rearguard.

The field force was under the command of the ruler or his deputy—a prince of the royal blood, or the waṣṭr, or some other favoured noble—who as sar-i lākhor took command of the centre also. In the army of the Dīnī sultānate, the vanguard was commanded by the muḥaddaḍm or sar-i lākhar-i muḥaddaḍm, and the left and right wings by the sar-i faṣq-i maysara and sar-i faṣq-i maymāna respectively. The ruler's special cavalry contingent in the right and left wings of the centre (the khāṣṣa-i khāl) was commanded by the sar-i ḥaḍār, with its two divisions under a sar-i ḥaḍār-i maysara and sar-i ḥaḍār-i maymāna respectively (Yahyā b. Aḥmād, Tuglugh-nāma, 245, 562; Sarvā Daman Singh, Ancient Indian warfare, 62). These officers were mostly in command of the cavalry; the terms for commanders of infantry are uncertain, although the saḥm al-ḥaṣām, nāʿīb saḥm al-ḥaṣām and shīmla al-ḥaṣām all seem to be concerned particularly with infantry (Yahyā b. Aḥmād, ibid.; Baranī, op. cit., 30). The horses were under the supervision of an ḥāṣar bāḥ, the elephants under a ḡaḥnasūr, the camels under a ḡaḥna-yi nafar (Baranī, op. cit., 24), while the armours were in charge of the sar-i saḥbādār. The Mughal terms seem less stereotyped, and the force commanders are often called by their offices in the static army establishment [see ḠAṢHAK] with its decimal organization. In the time of Akbar the mansābādār [q.v.] were deputed to various commands, and in his multiracial army a Rāḍjpūt section would be commanded by a Rāḍjpūt mansābādār, the Afghan section by an Afghan mansābādār, etc. The horses were under the supervision of an āḥlabegī, the artillery and other fire-arms under a fawdūr, and the other arms under a mukaddam. Under the—standards, under a dārōgga-yi burkhāna.

5. Strategy and tactics.—The following account does not include the tactics of siegework, for which see Yisār.

Before a battle took place an appreciation of the situation was made by the ruler, the sar-i lākhor, generals of wide experience, and officials of the dinān-i 'ārād, and the campaign was carefully planned. This war council was usual in the Sultanate period (e.g., Amīr Khusrav, Tuglugh-nāma, 48, 84; Ḥaḍīmī, Futūḥ al-salāfīn, ed. Mahdis Husain, Agra 1938, 254), and was considered equally valuable by Timūr (Tāsūk, 5 ff.) and by the Mughals (e.g., Nīzām al-Dīn Aḥmad, Tābākṣīt, Akbarī, Bibl. Ind., 1935, iii, 25 ff.); Abu 'l-Fadl 'Allāmī, Akbar-nāma, Bibl. Ind., 1886, ii, 48, 482). An impassioned oration by the ruler or commander-in-chief to his subordinates was often a feature of such an andāman, and this was extended into a direct appeal to the soliderly by Shīr Shāh, Akbar and the later Mughals, usually on the eve of battle but on occasions during its course.

A battle was usually begun in the morning and would be suspended in the evening, although the defenders endeavoured to delay engagement as long as possible so that they could retreat under cover of darkness if necessary. The commencement was signalled by drum-beat and by the war-horns blown by tāwāshes, and engagement would begin to the accompaniment of war-cries; secret passwords were also in use to establish identities in the event of hand-to-hand fighting.

In the usual pattern of the assault, in the Sultanate period, battle was first joined by the vanguard (cf. Baranī, op. cit., 260), followed by the movement of the right wing and the centre, then with the left wing and finally the left wing. A force would aim to create panic among its opponents first by an incessant rain of arrows, from cavalry, infantry, and from the ḡu'edās of the elephants; these included poisoned and incendiary arrows. Manjīnās carried in the ḡu'edās were similarly used to discharge large stones and naphtha-containers at the enemy. An early elephant-charge was also employed with the intention of spreading panic, after which the other arms would engage. The chief target was always the enemy centre where their commander would be stationed. In the event of the vanguard or a wing suffering a reverse it would receive reinforcements from reserves or from other wings—but with caution, lest the enemy seeing a wing being reinforced by troops moving from the centre should conclude that the centre also was broken.

Timūr's keen tactical insight is reflected in a long and detailed statement of the principles of field engagement in different situations in the Tāsūk (Bombay ed., 191-207), emphasizing the need for continual appreciations of the situation throughout the course of a battle. He advocates delaying the attack until the enemy has begun the aggression, then—with a force of between 9000 and 12,000—
moving first the vanguard against them, followed by the van of the right wing in support, closely followed by the second corps of the right wing, and then the first corps of the left wing; if the assault from none of these units resulted in victory, further action—presumably by the centre—was to await Timūr's order as commander. A more complicated order of attack is given for field forces of from 12,000 to 40,000.

Timūr's descendants profited from his scientific approach to warfare, and his principles were generally maintained, although of course the pattern of battles changed considerably after the introduction of artillery. Thus at the battle of Khanuwā, near Āgra, in 933/1527, the battle was commenced by the fire of small-calibre matchlocks and culverins from the right wing of Bābūr's army under Muṣṭafā Rūmī, after which the heavy artillery of the centre, under the mīr dādik Ūstad 'Allūd Kūlū, opened fire swiftly at the ironclad elephants of the enemy; when the artillery battle was well underway Bābūr ordered the charge of his flanking parties (tulghuma), the heavy artillery was moved forward, and the cavalry moved around the advanced light artillery (Bābūr-nāma, ed. Beveridge, 568-9). Generally, however, the heavy artillery was unable to move up after the cavalry had advanced beyond the forward entrenchments, and in the event of a retreat the guns could hardly be saved: they had to be spiked and abandoned. In Akbar's reign the guns were given greater mobility by being mounted on individual gun-carriages, instead of being manhandled from carts as before, drawn by bullocks and often pushed into position from behind by elephants. This increased mobility is seen, for example, in the battle of Dharmat, near Ugdāiyan, of 1068/1658 between Awarangzīb and Mahārdājī Djaswant Singh, which began with the usual long-range fire of rockets and cannons; the Rādjiwīlās, in spite of the casualties caused by Awarangzīb's forward guns, wheeled and attacked this artillery and temporarily silenced it, but the gunners managed to recover, and mounted their guns on high ground where it was less prone to attack and could more easily bombard the enemy's centre. The artillery barrage might, however, be withheld, as in the battle of Sāmogāf late the same year when Darā Shikōh was misled by the silence of Awarangzīb's heavy ordnance and launched a premature attack; at last Awarangzīb's heavy guns replied, causing appalling carnage.

The cavalry was still a paramount arm even after the great improvement in small arms and artillery—often handled by European mercenaries—in the 17th century. After the initial softening-up by fire, the cavalry would attack, discharging arrows as they did so, eventually coming to close quarters and fighting with the sword (the principal weapon of the Mughal cavalryman) or lance (the favoured weapon of Rādjiwīlā cavalry). The cavalry appear not to have used firearms from horseback until the Durānīs [g.v.] troops did so in the late 18th/19th century. In the thick of battle Indian horsemen, especially the Rādjiwīlās, would often dismount, bind themselves together by their shirt-tails, and fight to the death with maces, clubs, axes and daggers [for the weapons in use see sīlān, India].

The fiercest fighting took place around the elephant of the rival commander, who considered it dishonourable to retreat if merely wounded by arrows. The death or disappearance of the leader usually meant the loss of the campaign; thus in the battle of Tukārō 3, the battle of Tukarō 3, the Mughal right wing counterattacked strongly, and Darā lost the day after the hawda of his elephant had been struck by a rocket and he mounted a horse instead: his troops saw the empty hawda and believed their commander to have fallen. The importance attached by both sides to the death of the commander is shown earlier in the suppression of Kishlū Khān's revolt by Muḥammad b. Tughlūk in 728/1328: Muḥammad placed one Shaykh ʿImād al-Dīn, who resembled him in appearance, in the centre, and in the event that the Mughals despised this form of warfare and did not employ it. Also despised by the Mughals, and never carried

These tactics were suited in particular to the plains of northern India, and the northern powers—the rulers of the Dīhil sultanate and the imperial Mughals alike—found it difficult in devising others suitable to the swamps of Bengal or the broken ravines of the Deccan. The Marāthās under Śivādē and his successors had brought guerilla warfare to a fine art, and on many occasions used it to harass the armies of the Mughals and of the Deccan sultanates. The qualities of Marāthā warfare were appreciated by Malīk ʿAnbar [q.v.], who organized a corps of guerilla fighters for the Nīpām Shāhī [q.v.] sultanate. It was long before the rulers of Muslim India realized the potentialities of naval warfare, although individual men-of-war were certainly commissioned as escorts for the pilgrim traffic by sea; after the Mughal conquest of Gudjaṟāt and the Konkan coast, however, they came to appreciate the possibilities of sea and land cooperation, as in some battles fought along these coasts, and eventually the hereditary admirals of Dijāndīra [see Ṛabdī] were appointed as admirals of the Mughal fleet. For the navies of Muslim powers in India, and their naval strategy and tactics, see bāriyya, India (in Supplement).

6. Tricks and stratagems.—One device to deceive the enemy as to the strength of the attacking army was the simulated arrival of fresh reinforcements: squadrons of the army would be sent away under cover of night to return in the morning, beating drums and flying colours as though they were a new army approaching; similarly, Muḥammad b. Tughlūk is reported as sending 1000 men to receive a mere force of 100 joining his army. A simulated flight often won an advantage, as in Frīrū Shāh Tughlūk's battle against Shams al-Dīn Iyās Shāh of Bengal in 754/1353 near Lakhnawī: the Bengali forces, thinking Frīrū to be in full retreat, emerged from their stronghold in pursuit, and in consequence suffered a severe reverse (5Aff. p. 9, cit., 114). But the device was a familiar one, and mistakes arose: thus in the battle of Tukārō [g.v.; see also Dāwūd Khān Karabārī] in 982/1574, Dāwūd put to flight Akbar's vanguard, slāmāz, and centre, but did not follow up, thinking their flight to be a ruse; but the Mughal right wing counterattacked strongly, and Dāwūd lost the day. This simulated flight was often the occasion for ambushes (kamin) by a detachment of the army drawn up in a carefully chosen position near the rear-guard; although the kamin might be posted for other purposes, for surprise marauding raids on the enemy or his line of communications, or merely to keep fresh in case of being needed at any point for reinforcement. The Mughal armies, however, despised this form of warfare and did not employ it. Also despised by the Mughals, and never carried
out with much enthusiasm even in Sultanate times, was the night attack (shab-khun), which Abu 'l-Fa<jl prescribed the division of the camp into four groups for the purpose: foot-soldiers, well accoutred, were to guard all entrances, the right wing and centre remained alert in their proper positions with lights extinguished, or lighted in different places to mislead the invaders, while a fourth group left the camp in order to guard and patrol the approaches. The attackers would have blocked the roads to the camp, and might cry out deliberately that such-and-such a general had been captured or killed, in order to spread despondency among those encamped.

Not indeed part of the army in the field, although vital to its commanders, were the spies—from whom their intelligence was valued at all stages of the campaign. See further pýsós.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the text, see S. Sabahuddin, Conduct of strategy and tactics of war during the Muslim rule in India, in IC, xx (1946), 154-6, 291-6, 345-52; xxi (1947), 7-15, 123-4: extended treatment with constant reference to and quotation of campaigns. Almost all the Indian historical chronicles give descriptions of battles in detail; for these see Bibliographies to articles on the major Indian dynasties, especially Dhlí Sultána and Mugháls, also Storey, 92-157, 433-780. For the Mughal period see especially W. Irvine, The army of the Indian Moguls, London 1903, and references quoted there; also Abdul Aziz, The mansabdari system and the Mughal army, Lahore 1946. Some useful information on ḥarb in the Dhlí Sultanate period, as well as information on the Sultanate army and its administration, in I. H. Qureshi, The administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, Lahore 1942 (Karachi 1958), ch. VII 'The Army'.

Sources in manuscript: Muhammad b. Mansîr Kurrásyî, known as Fârîb-i Mubâddîr, Ādâb al-harb wa l-badî'dîBA', British Museum, Rieu, CPM, 497-8; another version known as Ādâb al-munâṣibîn, in which Fârîb-i Mubâddîr figures, Edinb. 1877-6; Khayy Allâh, Dustûr-i ḥâkâm-bughh, Edinb. University; Sayyid Amin Al-Din, Kulliyât al-râmi, Calcutta, Buhâr Lib. MS 234; Sayyid Mîr 'Alâwî, Hidâyât al-râmi, British Museum, Rieu, CPM, 488; Anon., Risdâ-i tir-andâzî, Bombay Lib. MS 100; Mîr Muhammad Nîshâpûrî, Risdâ-i tir-andâzî, British Museum, Rieu, CPM, 797; Anon., Risdâ-i tir-andâzî, As. Soc. Bengal, MS Ivanow 1610; Anon., Dîbâla-i imkâni i râh-raftan-i swâdir, As. Soc. Bengal, MS Ivanow 1645; Ḥûhm-nâma, As. Soc. Bengal, MS Ivanow 1648; Zayn al-'Abbîdn, Fâlît al-mudâjidîn, As. Soc. Bengal, MS Ivanow 1650; Anon., Tâmûl al-bâṣâra, As. Soc. Bengal, MS Curzon 623; Ahmad b. Mâhu'mûn, Barâkîn al-jâwârim, As. Soc. Bengal, MS Curzon 634.

See further the bibliography to Lâshkâr.

HABR b. UMAYYA b. 'ABD SHAMS, the father of Abû Sufyân and father-in-law of Abû Lahb [qa.v.], one of the leading figures of Mecca in his day. He is said to have been the first to use Arabic writing, and one of the first to renounce the wine. A companion of 'Abd al-Mu'talib, he succeeded him as war-leader, and led the clan of 'Abd Shams and, according to some traditions, all Kuraysh in the so-called sacrilegious war [see FIDJAR]. After his death the leadership is said to have passed to the Banî Hâshim. The story of his contest of merits and subsequent quarrel with 'Abd al-Mu'talib is no doubt a projection backwards of the later conflict between the houses of Umayya and Hâshim.

Bibliography: Caetani, Annali, index; Ibn Ḥâfîz, Mubâddîr, index; Ibn Išâq, Sîra, 82. (Ed.)

HARB, spear [see 'ANAZA, yâlî, kadîb, bi'lî].

HARBA', a ruined city in 'Irâq, pre-Muslim (and possibly Babylonian) in origin, and situated southwest of Balad on the west bank of the Ṣuṭâṭ which is a former bed of the river Tigris: 34° 3' N., 44° 10' E. It was known to the Sâsânis and their Arab successors in 'Irâq, as also to the Arab geographers—Ya'qûbî, Masûdî, Yûkî—and to Tabârî. The crossing of the Tigris by troops of the Khârîjî leader Shâhîb in 976/65, operating against al-Hâshimî, was near this spot. The city at that period or later was known for its textile and (probably) pottery manufacture. A great irrigation or river-reclamation work was carried out here by the caliph al-Mustanîr in 629/1232, and the existing Dûjlâyî channel, and the great four-arch Harbî brîdge, 24 m. long and 12 m. broad, (from which the place is now called Dîlar Harbî) survive from this enterprise. The 90-metre-long inscription on the bridge gives details of the construction, and heaps praise on its builder. The remains are rendered conspicuous by the cupola of the tomb of a Shâykh (or Sayyid) Sa'd, which is visible from far off.

E. HERZFELD-[S. H. LONGRIGG]

HARBI [see AMAN, Dâr al-harb, Musta'mîn].

HARBIYYA, (< Ar. harbiyya) the Ottoman and Turkish war college. Ottoman reforms in the 12th/18th century included some innovations in military training, notably the opening of the Hendeşhâne by the Comte de Bounéval in 1734 and the opening of the Mûhendîshkâmîe-i Berîr-i Hûmâyûn in 1791-95. A number of military training centres for Maḥmut II's new army were set up in various parts of Istanbul in the 1830's, including the Alay Mektebi Harbîyesi (Rami, 1832), the Mektebi Harbîyesi (Atâ'î, 1832), the Mektebi Harbîyesi Nâzîrî, at Iâzîm in 1834, the Topkâhpâhî-i 'Amire Mektebi, and the Mektebi Harbîyesi-i Şâhîne (Selimiye barracks, Iâzîm, 1835). In 1846, these were centralized in a single Mektebi Harbîye-i Pangâltî quarter of Istanbul, which drew most of its students from a network of military secondary schools founded during the same period in Istanbul and other towns, mainly in the European parts of the empire. The Harbîye emphasized mathematics and foreign languages (at first French, from the 1880's also German) in addition to technical military subjects. In 1848, the two-year course was supplemented with a second two-year course for general staff officers, extended to three years in 1881. Colmar von der Goltz-Pasha, inspector of imperial military schools from 1884 to 1885, added participation in manoeuvres and later to classroom instruction. In 1909, the Harbîye's teaching staff consisted of nine Germans, eight Turks, and two Armenians. From 1909, staff officers were trained in a separate military staff college (Erkân-ı Harbîye Mektebi) located at Yıldız Palace, to which lieutenants and captains were competitively admitted after a regular tour of troop service. With
the outbreak of the First World War, the staff and students of both schools were transferred to active service, and the schools therefore ceased to function; their reopening after the armistice was impeded by the successive requisitioning by the Allied authorities of suitable buildings. A temporary military school was opened under the aegis of Muştafa Kemâl at Djebedî near Ankara in 1920. In 1923 the Harbiye reopened at Pangaltı, and in 1936 (now renamed Harp Okulu) it was transferred to a new building in the government quarter of Ankara. The staff college reopened as Akademî Erkân [Harp Akademisi] at Bayezîd in 1923, and as Harb Akademisi back at Yıldız in 1927. Between 1847 and 1945, the Harbiye graduated 32,759 lieutenants, the yearly average rising from about 25 to about 100 in the 1870's, and over 500 at the turn of the century, and from 114 under the early Republic to nearly 1,000 in the 1940's. Between 1851 and 1930, a total of 607 of these graduated from the staff course or staff college as staff captains. Even during the Ottoman period most of the officers were Turks—a majority of them from Istanbul and the European provinces; the proportion of Syrians and Iraqis among the staff officers, for example, was about 6% before 1900 and 14% between 1900 and 1914.

The fou ding of the Harbiye was one of the first durable Ottoman measures of Westernizing reform, preceded by that of the Mûkiye [q.v.] by twenty-five years, and almost from the start, its students and graduates have been in the forefront of political change. The Ittihat ve Terakki [q.v.] Djemîyêeti was secretly founded in 1889 at the separate military medical college, but in 1897 a special court martial held a mass trial of Harbiye students for subversive activities, of whom 78 were deported to Libya. In 1920, 250 Harbiye students made their way from Salonica on 17 April 1909, under the command of Mahmûd Shewket Pasha, but it is important because of the use of the word hadd, “limit.” The LA contains a long article on harf (x, 385/ix, 41a). It retains as the primary meaning of harf: al-taraf wa-l-djinîb, “the extremity, the side”, whence it derives the name harf for the letters of the alphabet. Ibn Hîghâm al-Anşârî, in the Sharh of his Shûdhâr el-dhahab (Cairo 1951/1371) indicates only (p. 14, l. 13): taraf al-djinîb. With regard to the ancient Semitic languages, Arabic harf “extremity, side” is related to Syriac harpû and herpû “edge, point” (Payne Smith, Thesaurus syriacus, s.v.). In Hebrew, the relation is more remote: herpû “invective, reviling”, which can be explained by “stinging, sharp words” (see Koehler-Baumgartner, Lexicon, under ḫ r f.).

The Kitâb of Sîbawayh begins with the broad tripartite division: “isms, fîl, harf, the last meaning what is neither ism nor fîl.” This division came to the Arabs from Aristotelian logic (see ṣīl’l). Fr. Pratorius (in ZDMG, lxiii (1909), 504-5) has related harf to the term hûros which is used in Aristotelian logic. M. Bravmann (Materialien, s-g) accepted this and rejected the criticism of J. Weiss (in ZDMG, lxiv (1910), 349-82). Hûros, too, signified “limit”, thence, among its derived meanings, “determination of the meaning of a word”, whence, “definition”. In Arabic, hadd, “limit, definition”, has followed the same path; as for harf, it has three derived meanings: (1) “word”, (2) “letter of the alphabet”, (3) the designation of the third term in the broad tripartite division.

It is difficult fully to clear up the processes by which these meanings are derived; for if, on the one hand, there was Greek influence on the development of meanings of an Arabic term (harf), the primary meaning of which corresponded with that of the Greek term (hûros), the Arab world, on the other hand, offered for the possibilities of semantic derivation a completely different milieu of thought. The following is a possible explanation: from harf, “extremity, side” (LA), “limit” (Ibn Djinnî), might have derived the meaning of “word” (recorded in Lane’s Lexicon, s.v.). Then, in a very simple analysis of the phonic components of the word, it was enough for the first specialists on the Arabic language to pronounce a word slowly in order to divide it into what we call syllables and where they found “limits”, i.e., hûros. The short vowel gave them no difficulty, since for them it had no autonomy but was a sort of accident of the stable element [see HAKA WA-SUKÔN]. The harf of the hûros al-hîdaj was taking shape. Finally, in that which was neither ism nor fîl, it was easy to notice that many of these units, and some of the most common of them, had only one harf: one has only to think of ṣâl the very common conjunction, fa-, bi- “in”, li- (conj. and prep.), the interrogative
The Dic. of Tech. Terms (i, 320-4) mentions 18 separate meanings of the term *hurf*. Two (2 and 3) concern the usage of the *ahl al-dirfr* (see *DzAFr*).

Three refer to the script: nos. 1, 4, 5; no. 1 is useful to recall: *mušdjama* — *muhlama* [see *huruf al-

The others (apart from the last one) repeat phonetic divisions: they are to be found, as far as they are worth mentioning (except no. 6), under *huruf al-

The last one refers to *hurf* — *asaṣyya* — *saṣa̱n* [see *huruf*]. No. 6: *muṣnas* — *sāmati*; comprises two groups: *al-madd wa l-a'in*, and the other *huruf*, *mutharraka* or *sahīn* respectively. This division is useful, for it can provide the means of expressing 'vowel' and 'consonant' in Arabic. The first term is already ancient: in fact al-muṣawwaḍīl occurs in the *Fihrist* of Ibn al-

Naṣirī (compiled in 377/987, 16, line 12, to designate the vowels of the Arabic alphabet. After these 18 divi-

The Arab grammarians tried to find a precise definition of *hurf*, the third term in the division given in the *Kust of Sībawayhi, and in its comprehen-

This presentation has the advantage of following a natural order in the analysis of the primary linguistic datum: the sentence. But it reduces heavily the extent of Greek influence: it takes it back to the suggestion of a point of departure, the choice of a word (huruf) meaning, like the Greek *hóros*, "limit".

The two hurufs: min and furū. The grammarians tried to find a precise definition of *huruf*, the third term in the division given in the *Kust of Sībawayhi, and in its comprehen-

Bibliography: Butrus al-Bustani, *Dd'irat al-

Maṣdrif*, vii, 9; Iṣa Ḣiskandar al-Maṣūf, *Doumi*

(K. S. Salibi)

HARFÚSH (A.; sometimes also Kهاfosh), "va-gabond, ne'er-do-well", often used in the sense of "tuffians, rascals, scamps"; plural haráfush, haráfusha.

From the 7th/i3th to the 10th/i6th century the term appears in chronicles and other works dealing with the Mamluk domains of Egypt and Syria. The last author to make relatively frequent use of the term seems to be the chronicler Ibn Iyás (d. 930/1524), who bears the title sultan al-hardfish.

After the transfer of the Protectorate capital from Gabond, ne'er-do-well", often, used in the sense of seer do. Albutuf fi ta*rikh bant al-Ma'luf, Baabda 1907-8, 155, 159, 213, 217, 228, 231; A. N. Poliak, Feudalism in Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon, 1250-2000, London 1939, 59; Tannús al-Sijdýák, Abhár al-ayán fi djabal Lubbár, Beirut 1859.

(K. S. Salibi)

HARFÚSH (A.; sometimes also Kهاfosh), "va-gabond, ne'er-do-well", often used in the sense of "tuffians, rascals, scamps"; plural haráfush, haráfusha.

From the 7th/i3th to the 10th/i6th century the term appears in chronicles and other works dealing with the Mamluk domains of Egypt and Syria. The last author to make relatively frequent use of the term seems to be the chronicler Ibn Iyás (d. 930/1524), who bears the title sultan al-hardfish.

After the transfer of the Protectorate capital from Gabond, ne'er-do-well", often, used in the sense of seer do. Albutuf fi ta*rikh bant al-Ma'luf, Baabda 1907-8, 155, 159, 213, 217, 228, 231; A. N. Poliak, Feudalism in Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon, 1250-2000, London 1939, 59; Tannús al-Sijdýák, Abhár al-ayán fi djabal Lubbár, Beirut 1859.

(K. S. Salibi)

The haráfush represent the lowest element in the strata of Mamlûk society, forming groups in the urban centres of Cairo and Damascus and, at least temporarily, also in Homs, Hama, and Aleppo. Made up of professional beggars, able-bodied as well as infirm, street-entertainers, and the unemployed, the haráfush seem to have developed a guild-like organization headed by a šaykh who bore the title sultan al-hardfish. Often attacked by the orthodox writers for their barbarous speech and dress as well as for their heretical religious tendencies, the haráfush were despised and feared group given to robbing and plundering on occasion. To pacify and control this unruly but organized element, the sultan and the chief amirs gave them alms and, in times of famine, numbers of haráfush were assigned to the more affluent amirs and to wealthy merchants and other non-governmental figures, who then became responsible for feeding them.

The development of the organization of the group (called a ḍā'īya by some contemporary writers) is seen in the rise of the office of the sultan al-hardfish, which first appears in the late 8th/i4th century and persists until the end of the Mamlûk rule. The "sultan", who was the head of the guild-like organization, was responsible to the state for the discipline of his followers. Ibn Iyás (Die Chronik des Ibn Iyás, Bibliotheca Islamica, Band 5, 1923) mentions the sultan al-hardfish along with the heads of artisan guilds who accompanied the last Mamlûk sultan in the ceremonial procession on his departure for Syria to fight the Ottoman Turks.

During the Ottoman period the term disappears and is replaced by ḍūṣaydi as a general term for "vagabond, beggar". However, in a notice regarding the head of the artisan guilds in Damascus, the šaykh al-masha'ikha, in the 11th/i7th century, we are told that he was "formerly known as sultan al-hardfish, then he was called, out of respect, šaykh al-masha'ikha" (al-Muḥibbi, Khulqat al-athar, i, 144). From the 10th/i6th century until it fell into disuse at the end of the 19th century, the title of šaykh al-masha'ikha was handed down in the Damascene family of the Bani 'Aǧlān.

The connexion between the lowly haráfush or the one hand the respectable guild organizations on the other is not clear. Nor is the connexion with Sufism—its folk manifestations—easily explicable. The clearest indication of a relationship of the latter sort is in the figure of a popular saint known as 'Ubayd al-Harraf or al-Hurayfîsh (d. 801/1399) whose work of pious devotions al-Raʿi al-fā'il is still printed, most recently in 1949 (cf. Brockelmann, S., 119). In a verse cited by al-Sakhawî (al-Tîr al-maslûb, 349), 'Ubayd wrote that the haráfush, although poor, subsisting on a morsel and in rags, having no fixed abode, will be forgiven their sins because they are neither liars nor hypocrites.

Undoubtedly the haráfush represent one of those urban groups in the Muslim world that appeared periodically under different names, made up of impoverished, uprooted former artisans and peasants as well as professional beggars, who robbed and looted as well as begged for a livelihood, and who, in different periods, managed to live as elements in the government—at times with the sultan, at others with the amirs. They should be compared—for differences as well as similarities—with the earlier 'ayyûrûn [q.v.] and aḥdhîq [q.v.], as well as with the later zwar.

A single literary reference to this group occurs in the Alif layla in the story of "The Harfush and the Cook" (cf. Habicht, Tausend und eine Nacht, iv, 138-40, translated in Payne, Tales from the Arabic, i, 9; R. Burton, A Thousand and One Nights' entertainment, Suppl. i, 4).

Bibliography: For a discussion of the word itself cf. TA, iv, 297 (hr n f g) and ibid., 305 (hr f g); Dozy, i, 374; Quatremère, Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks, i, b, 195-7. Additional material, both on the term and on the history of the group will be found in the article by W. M. Brinner, The significance of the Harfush and their "Sultan", in JESHO, vi (1965), 190-215. A study by Ira M. Lapidus, The Muslim city in Mamlûk times (in the press), adds further citations and discussion of the haráfush. (W. M. Brinner)

HARGEISA, administrative headquarters and capital of the former British Somaliland Protectorate, now of the northern region of the Somali Republic, lying in 9°35' N. lat. and 44°04' E. long. With a population of some 35,000 Somali and lying in territory normally grazed by the Habar Awal clan, the town is of recent formation. It has developed from the cultivating tarîba community (of the Ka-Diriya) established by Shaykh Madjar (Habar Awal, Hüseyin Abokor, Rêh Hoğh, 1242-1336/1825-1918) in the second half of the nineteenth century. Under the Shaykh, who enjoyed a considerable reputation for piety and for his miraculous works, the lower classes were uplifted and prospered, attracting members of many different Somali clans. The main crop was sorghum, which straddled the caravan routes from Harar and the Ogaden was well-placed to be an important trading centre. Swayne, who visited the tarîba at the end of the nineteenth century, describes it as comprising a few hundred mud and wattle huts surrounded by a high mat fence enclosing a square mile or two of cultivated fields and subject to attack from surrounding Somali and Ethiopian raiders. During their rule on the coast, the Egyptians gave the Shaykh arms; and under the British he at first received a stipend. Later, after his death, and the development of Hargeisa as an administrative centre, especially when the town became the capital of the Protectorate, the tarîba declined and is no longer the tightly-knit administrative unit which it was formerly. Shaykh Madjar is buried beside the stone house given him by Lord Delamere in recognition of the Shaykh's kindness on a hunting expedition and his shrine is frequently visited, especially by women in search of blessing. The Shaykh's staunch support of British interests was recognized by the appointment of the local Kàgl from amongst his descendants.

After the transfer of the Protectorate capital from
Berbera, Hargeisa began to assume its present character. As befits the main centre of trade in the interior of northern Somaliland it now boasts a modern hospital, some cinemas, a power station and broadcasting service, an aerodrome and most of the appurtenances of modern government. A local government council was opened in 1953, and a legislative council in 1957. The latter merged with the Somali legislative assembly at Magadhe during the Protecorate and U.N. Trust Territory of Somalia joined to form the independent Somali Republic on 1 July 1960.


**HARGHA,** the Arabic form of the Berber name of the tribe to which Ibn Tumart [q.v.] belonged, the Arghen (the prosthetic *ha* is general in Arabic transcriptions of the names of Berber tribes, and the suffix a[<a] in the plural has been substituted for the -m of the Berber plural). The original home of this tribe is not known with any certainty. H. Basset and H. Terrasse (*Sanctuaires et forteresses almohades*, in *Hespéris*, 1944, 19) identify the Hargha with the Gheghaya (Arghen, who are also referred to by historians as belonging to the confederation of the Hargha. But E. Lévi-Provençal (*Doc. indé. d'histoire almohade*, Paris 1928, 55, n. 2) and R. Montagne (*Les Berbères et le Mahkhem*, 64) consider on the contrary that the latter were natives of the Anti-Atlas, southeast of Taroudant, where some of the Arghen still exist, surrounded by other tribes bearing the names of particular elements of the confederation of the Hargha, as given by al-Baydhaq. A little above Tinmel there still exists a village with the name Arghan, whose inhabitants maintain that their ancestors came from Sūs (E. Doutté, *En tribu*, 120-1). It is therefore possible that one fraction of the Arghen, whose original home was in the Anti-Atlas, may have settled on the northern slopes of the Great Atlas. E. Lévi-Provençal (*Six fragments indéits*, 8) records among the Hargha a ribāḥ (rebba) which Ibn Tumart had built, and gives its name as Iglīz (Iglīz in al-Baydhaq); now, among the Gheghaya (see E. Laoust, *Contribution à une étude de la toponymie du Haut Atlas, in REI*, 1944, 117) there still exists a village named Iglīz which must be the same one; at the foot of the mountain a number of grottoes had been excavated, and one of them which the Almohads had venerated was called in Arabic al-drūr al-mukaddas because Ibn Tumart was accustomed to retreat there to pray and meditate. (It is perhaps not by chance that ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn gave the name Iglīz to the obdiscal town which he founded to the north of Almoravid Marrākush, the modern Gilīz).

Before the appearance of Ibn Tumart, the Hargha were a branch of the main confederation of the Maḥrūdī [q.v.], from among whom seven fractions in all had achieved the mahkham iratably after his return to the Atlas—the Hargha, Hīntātā, Tinnel[el], Gedniwa, Genfis, Urīka and Hazraga (Ibn Khaldūn, *Ibar*, Bulāk, vi, 225; H. Basset and H. Terrasse, *op. cit.*, 16-9).

After the recognition of Ibn Tumart by the Hargha, the Almoravids tried to seize the Mahdī while he was in Iglīz, by taking the tribe from the rear, but their attempt failed (518/1122): after a second attempt by the Almoravids against Iglīz (517/1123), Ibn Tumart finally abandoned his ribāḥ in order to settle at Tinnel[el] [q.v.] which he made the capital and bastion of his movement (518/1124). Thenceforward, Iglīz was no more than a sanctuary and place of pilgrimage which the Almohad caliphs visited from time to time, until the day when the Mahdī was officially repudiated by Idrīs al-Maghārin, the ninth Almohad caliph (620/1220-629/1230).

The Hargha comprised one of the least powerful fractions, but Ibn Tumart had endeavoured to bring them into prominence. On the one hand he had incorporated with them the members of the tribes who came from the Anti-Atlas (see R. Montagne, *op. cit.*, 64), on the other hand he had attached several of his principal companions, especially ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn [q.v.], Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Muṣiṣūn al-Baṣhrī and others to them; but the Hargha, fearing to be dispossessed of their rights as relatives and heirs of Ibn Tumart, were utterly opposed to all such adoptions, and from the times of the Mahdī’s death tried to reject them. The members of his family, led by his two brothers, did not indeed approve of the nomination of ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn as caliph; on being condemned to live under surveillance in Marrākush they escaped and tried to rebel, but failed and were executed. In this way the part played by the Hargha in the history of the Almohads came to an end, and they sank back into obscurity.


**HARI RŪD,** the river of Harāt, which flows for almost 350 miles from the Dai Zangī mountains, running west of the Kūh-i-Babā range in central Afghanistan to the oasis of Marw. The river flows south of Harāt, and some thirty miles west of the city it changes direction and flows north. For about sixty miles it forms the boundary between Iran and Afghanistan before flowing into the Soviet Union. It irrigates the Taghād oasis and then is lost in the sands. In the early spring the river is swift and deep at Harāt but in the late autumn it is low and passable.


**HARIB,** a district of South Arabia on the wādī of the same name and lying immediately to the west of Baybānī [q.v.]. The Wādī Harib rises under the name of Wādī ‘Ayn in Bīlād Al-Djārābī in the highlands of Murād [q.v.] and runs northeastwards for about 30 miles through rugged and barren hills to disappear into the desert of Ramlat Sabatayn. About halfway along its course it is joined from the east by the Wādī Mablakah and widens into a broad silt plain. Some ten miles further north it unites
with the Wadi Mukbal which runs almost parallel to it a short distance to the west. Finally, just before its entry into the desert, it receives, also from the west, the Wadi Ablah, which is separated from the main area of Harib by the Karan mountains and an isolated spur thereof, Djabal Hasafs. At present the boundary between the Yemen and Bayhan traverses Harib so that the upper reaches of Wadi 'Ayn and the plain at its confluence with Wadi Mablaqah belong to Bayhan, while Wadi Harib proper lies in the Yemen, coming under the jurisdiction of the Governor of Marib [q.v.]. It is interesting to note in this context that at some time in antiquity Harib may have constituted the westernmost region of Kataban [q.v.], for across the gap between Djabal Karan and Djabal Hasafs there is found an ancient stone wall, al-Kayd, whose defence-works are directed westwards. Just west of Harib lie the lands of Muradh which may have been independent or belonged to Saba' [q.v.] before being incorporated into Kataban. In the 6th century A.D. Harib became part of Hadramawt [q.v.].

At present the chief town of the district is Darb 'AI 'All which is situated within the Yemen between Wadi Mukbal and Wadi Harib. Landberg described it as inhabited by about 250 asgrim, drawn from four families, who own most of the land of Harib. The most important was the AI 'Ali b. Talib, the family of the Amir of Harib. There were also resident there several families of merchants and artisans (harrun, pl. hurun), each with its own hereditary profession. About five miles further north, at the confluence of the two wadin, lies Darb Bū Tuḥayt, which belongs to the AI Abū Tuḥayf who claim descent from the Hālij [q.v.]. The Banū 'Abd (of Muradh) occupy parts of the wadin, including the town of Darb 'AI 'Amr in Wadi 'Ayn and the hills of Djabal Karan. On the latter is the tomb of a saint, Abū 'Amir Uways b. al-Murādī al-Karani, a contemporary of the Prophet. The village of al-Saḥa, near Darb 'AI 'Amr, also belongs to a clan of Banū 'Abd, the AI Ghuraym, who are noted locksmiths. Some members of this clan emigrated to San'a' [q.v.] and practised their profession there. Hamdānī also gives the inhabitants of Harib as the Murādī tribes of Rabī, Khalaf and 'Udhra. The AI Rabī, who are masakhīn, still lead a nomadic life in Harib, Bayhan, and also in al-Djabal al-Qānī. It is interesting to note in this area of northern Arabia, many of the towns are occupied by ra'iyya or dependent classes, while their patrons live outside the towns in tents.

The identification of Harib with Pliny's Caripeta can no longer be regarded as sound. Nevertheless the area is covered with evidence of ancient occupation in the form of ruined towns and the remains of irrigational systems. A particularly important site is found 3 km. south of Harib, just across the frontier from Darb 'AI 'All and north of the isolated Djabal Kār b. Ubayd. It was briefly visited by an American archaeological mission in 1951, though not excavated, and is reported as having several buildings still largely intact and many inscriptions. According to tradition it was named after one al-Zarir b. Sā'āq, who once ruled there, and inhabited by smiths who were ra'iyya of the Hāmirītes. There may be some truth in this tradition since we have abundant evidence of the existence of an iron-smelting industry in the general area. Landberg also mentions a site called Timnā, with associated ruins, in the plain of al-Djurra on Wadi Ablah, which he supposed to have been the ancient capital of Kataban, but it has now been demonstrated that the latter actually lies elsewhere [see BAYHAN]. There are also reports of a ruin field called Ḥadjar Harīm north of Darb Bū Tuḥayf but little information is available on it.

Although the main caravan route from Bayhan to Marib by-passes Harib to the north, there is an alternative road from Wadi Bayhan which takes advantage of an impressive stepped pass leading through the mountains into Wadi Mablaqah. Traditionally cut by a certain Bārgāh, it is called MBLQT in a Katabanian inscription at the pass, which records that it was built by a mukarrab of Kataban, Yada' al-Dibuyb b. Shār, who probably took over the site the road runs past Darb 'AI 'All and through the wall, al-Kayd, whereafter there is a choice of three mountain roads into the Wadi al-Djūba.

Several other places with the name of Harib or BRB are known from Hamdānī and the inscriptions. 

Bibliography: 
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(S. Owy)

HARIM (also *haramgah, sandlama*, etc.), a term applied to those parts of a house to which access is forbidden, and hence more particularly to the women's quarters. In ancient Arabia women seem to have enjoyed some measure of personal freedom, though the use of the veil was not unknown, especially in towns. It became commoner after the advent of Islam, with the adoption, on the one hand of a stricter code of sexual morality, on the other of a more urban way of life. The provisions of the Korān on the veiling and seclusion of women (XXXIII, 53-9) were elaborated and made severer by jurists and commentators, and used to justify a system that owed more to the earlier city civilizations of the Middle East than to Islam. In the great houses, in the cities of the Islamic Empire, the free Arab lady, so familiar to us from early poetry disappears. While the lower and middle classes seem generally to have practiced a form of monogamy, the wealthier classes maintained elaborate gynaecae, in which, besides their legal quota of wives, there were establishments of concubines, attendants, eunuchs and guards. So normal did this become in medieval Muslim society that the Muslim traveler is shocked when they visit other societies in which women enjoy greater social freedom. The system survived into comparatively modern times, and has not entirely died out even at the present day. In its Turkish form, *harem*, the word has passed into many European languages.


On the psychology of harems we refer, see E. F. Gautier, *Mœurs et coutumes des Musulmans*, Paris 1934, 56 ff.

See further *łabd* (on slavery); *żains* (on sexual life); *żilas* (on the veil); *żlaim, żlaiś* (on eunuchs); *żayná* (on slave singing-girls); *żmar' (on women in general); *żikār* (on marriage); *żarā' (on the palace, including the imperial harem).

(En.)

HARIR, silk. The etymology of the word is obscure; its synonyms *ibrism* and *bazz*, as well as *dıbāj*, which more particularly denotes silk brocade, are Persian loanwords; *bazz*, properly speaking a mixture of silk and wool, but sometimes also used for silk, is etymologically isolated in Arabic, and perhaps connected with *bazz*. *Harir* occurs in the Korān, sūras XXII, 23 = XXXV, 33, and LXXVI, 12, where it is said that the raiment of the people of Paradise will be silk. A group of traditions which, together with others, express an ascetic tendency in early Islam, forbids the use of silk to men but allows it to women. The prohibition is often expressed in the form that he who wears silk in this world, shall not wear it in the next. (Another version forbids it to men only if it is worn for ostentation. On the other hand, the wearing of silk is occasionally not recommended even for women.) The use of silk in garments by men is allowed only as appliqué work, as a border not more than two fingers broad, etc. When the Prophet was presented with a silken robe, he wore it once during the ritual prayer, but then expressed strong repugnance for it. The traditions declare that the use of silk for upholstery is like its use for clothing, and they explicitly forbid its use in the harem. On the other hand, the Prophet allowed that a red silk robe be used even in the harem, however, may use silk garments, and the Prophet allowed their use to 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Āwfi and al-Zubayr b. al-'Awwām, who complained of lice. A contrary tendency is attested by traditions according to which some ancient authorities used to wear silk, and by counter-traditions which threaten those who regard silk and *bazz* as allowed, with punishment. On the details of the traditions, see A. J. Wensinck, *Handbook*, s. v. clothes; the same, *Concordance*, s. v. *harir*. As a result of these traditions, all schools of religious law forbid to men the wearing of garments made completely of silk next to the skin, and they differ on many questions of detail which do not fall exactly under this close definition. The Şafi'is and the Hanbalis, in addition, forbid sitting or leaning on silks (as a.b. and the hanbalis, etc.), or using it as hangings on walls, except for the Ka'ba, but they allow the wearing of garments made partly of silk if its quantity is not greater than that of the other material. The Mālikis forbid the use of silk garments even to sufferers from itch, lice, etc.; they also forbid sitting on silk but allow its use for hangings. The Ḥanafis permit lying or sleeping on silk, also the use of silk cushions and of silk prayer mats; according to Abū ʿAbdārān (against the muqāddar
of the school) it is permitted to wear outer garments of silk provided they do not touch the body. All these prohibitions apply to men only. If a man performs the ritual prayer in a garment of silk, he commits a sin but his prayer does not become invalid. Different from the question of wearing silk garments is the question of wearing silk material in order to fulfil the minimum requirement of covering one's "nakedness" (*awra), particularly during the ritual prayer; in this last case, if one must choose between silk and material which has become ritually unclean, the use of silk is generally preferred. The unlawful use of silk at a wedding-dinner party (wulima) cancels the religious obligation of accepting a personal invitation to it [see *wulima]. The works of *fikح treat of the rules regarding the use of silk either in a special section on clothing or in the chapters on ritual prayer and/or on the wulima; the doctrines of the four sunni schools of religious law are conveniently set out in 'Abd al-Rahān al-Dżaffār, K. al-śul 'alā 'l-mahbāh al-arba'a, ii (bism al-muˈsamā'īt), 2nd ed., Cairo 1933, 12 ff. See also Juynboll, Handleiding 4, 157; Guidi and Sanitlana, Sommario del diritto malechita, i, 57 ff., ii, 63; A. Querry, Droit musulman, i, 60 f. (for the Şahīfs, the Mālikīs, and the "Twelver" Šīfs respectively).

Circumstances beyond our control have obliged us to refer the reader to the Supplement for articles on the silk trade and industry in mediaeval Islam and post-Mongol Persia. What follows here is divided into four sections:

i. A brief general survey of the silk industry and trade, especially with Europe, from the point of view of the European economic historian;

ii. A detailed examination of the Ottoman silk industry;

iii. A survey of the silk industry in the Arab lands;

iv. A contribution by an art historian, reviewing the products of the Islamic silk industry particularly as they are represented in the museum collections of the Western world.

For some information on silk cultivation and the mediaeval silk trade, see *fīlāra, tīdāra, tītā. (Ed.)

i. — SURVEY OF THE TRADE AND INDUSTRY

In the mediaeval and early modern period silk ranked among the three or four most important commodities of intercontinental trade. At least until the beginning of the 15th century silk and silk textiles were the most important exports from Muslim countries. Within this long period the most striking fact is the gradual transfer of silk culture from east to west. While Muslim demand and technique remained static in the centuries following the Mongol invasions, silk weaving and the breeding of silkworms were steadily spreading in Europe.

The growth of the European silk industry influenced Muslim production in two ways, negatively by increasing the competition in the highly specialized field of silk weaving, positively by raising the demand for raw silk. The mechanization of European sericulture and the increase in the 15th century was the final blow to the traditional Muslim crafts; it is clear, however, that this was not a completely new point of departure, but the result of a development that had begun several centuries before.

It is at present impossible to point to any decisive moment in this long development. In the 7th/13th century the near monopoly of the Muslim weavers on the European market had first been broken by the weavers of Lucca. In the 9th/15th century Italian silk fabrics were the chief export article to the Levant, and at the time of the Portuguese discoveries they had reached the Central Asian and Indian markets. In the factories of the Levant they were met by a counter-current of Muslim silk fabrics on their way to Europe, but this counter-current grew steadily weaker. What once had constituted the bulk of Muslim exports to Europe had, by the middle of the 11th/17th century, become limited to a few specialized qualities. It was not a question of quantity and price only. As early as 979/1571 a Venetian traveller in Persia noted that the finish of the Persian smooth stuffs and damask was inferior to the Italian. Around 1753/1740 an English merchant (J. Hanway) stated that Persia in good years would be a promising market for "rich silks, gold and silver lace, velvets and other rich manufactures". Even at that time it might seem like carrying coals to Newcastle, but a century later the German expert, Blau, found that the Persian weavers were working for the home market only, their products being too coarse to be exported. In 1889 some 15% of the total imports into Persia were English, Austrian, French and Russian silk fabrics (Curzon).

The towns which were admired by the mediaeval and early modern travellers for their flourishing silk industry, Yazd, Kāshān, Iṣfahān, Damascus and others, maintained their traditional crafts into the present century. Without statistical data it is impossible to decide when they passed from stagnation to decline. It is interesting to note, however, that the movement towards the west took place within Islam as well as from Islam to Europe. In Bursa, conveniently situated both in relation to the caravan routes from Persia and to the important market constituted by the Ottoman court, silk weaving expanded spectacularly in the 9th/15th century and maintained its prosperity at least to the end of the 12th/18th century. The prosperity of the silk industry in Izmir and on Chios belongs to an even later date and reached its highest level at the end of the 12th/18th century, when the fabrics of Izmir competed successfully with local products in the market of Bursa. In this case, at least, decline did not begin until before the industrialization of European production.

These developments in the weaving industry necessarily influenced the localization of sericulture. Until ca. 900/1500 the Caspian provinces, Māzandārān, Gīlān, and Śīrwān, were by far the most important districts from the point of view of international trade. The production of other regions, such as Syria or Kūhrāsān, was mostly manufactured locally. The earliest reasonably reliable estimates of the production of raw silk in Persia date from the first half of the 11th/17th century, when the firm rule and active commercial policy of 'Abbās I [96] had brought the sericulture of the Caspian provinces to a peak of prosperity. The often quoted estimate of Olearius from 1047/1637, who put the average "harvest" at 20,000 bales (roughly 2,000 tons), was, however, considerably higher than the contemporary estimates of Dutch and English merchants, who presumably had a better knowledge of local conditions. Though the estimates which were sent to the Dutch and English East India Companies vary, 1,000 tons would probably be a realistic figure for the annual production of raw silk in Persia at the death of 'Abbās I. Two-thirds of the annual production was exported to Europe, and the most important district
was Gflan, which alone accounted for half the total production.

The 12th/13th century was to all appearances a prosperous one for the Persian producers and for their middlemen, the Armenian merchants. This prosperity came to a sudden end with the political break-down of the early 12th/18th century. Around 1153/1740, according to Hanway, the production of Gflan had fallen to ca. 160 tons annually, while the breeding of silkworms had come to a complete stop in Shıhwan.

Prosperity in the second half of the 12th/18th century brought renewed prosperity to Gflan, which from this time on completely overshadowed the other Persian silk-producing regions. The highest production figures in the whole history of Gflan were probably reached shortly after the middle of the 19th century, when the mechanization of the European silk industry and better means of access to the Caspian provinces brought the demand to unprecedented heights. As late as 1850 Blau estimated the annual production of Gflan at 350-420 tons; in 1864 it was more than 1,000 tons. This was the peak, however. The same year disease (pebrine) appeared among the silkworms, probably (as in France) the result of unlimited expansion without change of technique.

Persian sericulture never recovered fully from this blow. At the very moment when heavy investments were necessary to exterminate the pebrine and to mechanize silk-winding, prices of raw silk took a downward turn, partly as a result of the long depression in Europe, partly because of Japanese competition. After 1890 conditions improved to some extent, but the highest production figure reached before 1914 was ca. 550 tons.

Syrian silk appears among the European imports from Syria in the middle ages, but primarily it was manufactured locally, particularly in Damascus. It was probably during the wars between the Ottoman Empire and Persia in the late 10th/16th and early 11th/17th centuries that it first came into prominence as a substitute for the Persian raw silk. The French specialized in the silk of Lebanon, while the other nations seem to have preferred the qualities from northern Syria.

With the advent of some expansion, mostly in Lebanon, the Syrian production of raw silk was much smaller than the production of Persia until the last decades of the 19th century. The earliest reliable statistics show an annual average of ca. 110 tons between 1861 and 1870. The Syrian silkworms were hit by disease like those of Persia, but the consequences were less serious. The more intimate connections with Europe and a considerable import of French capital facilitated a rapid change of technique. The pebrine was exterminated within a few years and the mechanization of silk-winding got under way. Before the first world war the production of Syria and Lebanon equalled that of Persia.

The prosperity of the sericulture of western Anatolia dates from the beginning of the 11th/17th century. Before the 19th century it produced mainly for the silkweavers of Izmir, Chios and Bursa, but as early as 1837 steam-power was used in the winding of silk in Bursa. This is probably the main reason why this region was able to expand far beyond the older producers of Persia and Syria in the late 13th/19th century. On the eve of the first world war production had reached 1000 tons annually [see Bursa].

With a total of a little more than 2000 tons annually around 1914 the Muslim countries accounted for less than 10% of the world production of raw silk. The war caused a serious decline and recovery was delayed by the low prices of raw silk during the depression and later by the introduction of artificial fibres. At present the economic importance of sericulture in the Muslim countries is negligible. Including exported fresh cocoons the production amounted in 1962 to ca. 320 tons of raw silk, or little more than 1% of the world production.


—THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

The word for "silk" in Ottoman Turkish is ipeh, in Kipchak Turkish işe; in Eastern Turkish the word lorku, lorgu means silk or silk stuff; the word aşığı, found in the inscription of Kültegin (5/5) means rich silk stuff, valuable goods (see Mahmûd Kâshghalî, *Dvdn Lughât el-Turk*, s.v.); in old Ottoman the expression a hundâş is occasionally found for silk stuff.

Aydın, so that silk for local needs was apparently produced here. A document of the reign of Mehmed II shows that silk was produced in the Tokat-Âmesa region in the 16th/17th century (see R. Anhegger and H. Inalcik, Kânûnîname-i sûltânî, Ankara 1956, p. 41, no. 31). The 9th/11th century registers of the kâbûd of Bursa contain no indication that silk was then made there or that Anatolian silk was used. The silk production and export of the Morea, on the other hand, had been famous since Byzantine times (see F. Thiriet, Régies des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant le commerce avec l’Orient, ii, Paris 1955, docs. 671, 672, 1971, 2022; iii, Paris 1956, docs. 2448, 2508). Although the silk of the Morea was not so esteemed as that of Persia, a kâbûd’s record shows that it was coming to Bursa in 906/1500 (Bursa Seire Tarihi, no. 18/17). Silk produced in Albania was exported to Bursa and to Europe in the 11th/12th century (see H. Inalcik, Sâret-i defteri Sancak-i Arwani, Ankara 1954, 126; F. Dalsar, Bursa’dâ sęhekili, Istanbul 1960, 207; and, in a defter-i defteri of the reign of Selim I, Başvekâlet Arşivi, tapu no. 80, Defter-i resmi-i hari-i wilâyet-i Mora).

All the same, in both the Selçuk and the Ottoman periods, the raw material for international trade and for local silk manufacture in Anatolia came mainly from the districts south of the Caspian Sea. In the time of the İkhâns, the Persian silk caravans followed the Şükâr-i Şahrb, which led via Sultâniyye, Erzurum, Erzindjan and Sivas to Konya; two minor routes branched off at Sivas for Constantinople (Z. V. Togan, in İkt. Fak. Mecm., xv (1954), 45). With the establishment of the Ottoman state, some of these caravans began to come by these routes to Bursa, instead of continuing to Constantinople or Foça; yet even in the 8th/14th century a shorter route, Erzurum—Erzindjan—Tokat—Amasya—Bursa, had surpassed them in importance, and the old sea-route from Trebizond to Constantinople, formerly very active, thenceforward declined. At Bursa, now a Muslim city, Persian merchants could easily and safely establish direct contacts with Italian merchants. Orkhan granted trading concessions to the Genoese and built a bezasâin at Bursa; later references in waâf registers to this bezasâin indicate its continued importance for the Ottoman trade.

It may justly be claimed that the Ottomans consciously followed a policy of making their new capital a principal entrepôt for Persian silk, of gaining control of the silk-routes, and, in the 10th/ 11th century, of occupying the Persian centres of silk-production. The factors prompting this policy were the rich revenues which silk brought to the Treasury, the great demand for silk stuffs in the palace and among the wealthy classes, and the increasing dependence of the fortunes of the industry on such a policy (see H. Inalcik, Türkiye’nin ihtisâdî tarihi, Belleten, xvi/60 (1951), 664-75; the acquisition of silk and silk-stuffs was also regarded as a means of amassing wealth (see H. Inalcik, 25. âsr Türkiye ihtisâdî ve şâmilâr tarihi kaynakları, in İkt. Fak. Mecm., xv (1953-4), 55-66).

As early as the reign of Bayezid I, Ottoman conquest expanded over the silk-routes, in the north towards Amasya, Tokat and Erzindjan, and in the south towards Malatya. When the attempts in the 10th/11th century to control Tabriz and to establish close relations with Gilân and Şirvan were being considered, the economic motive must not be overlooked; from the time of the submission of Amir Dâvidi (Muğâfûr Sultan) to Sâlemdin I in 940/1533, the Ottomans regarded the rulers of Gilân as their vassals (Ferdûn, Münghâdî, ii, 163).

The Persian silk exported to Anatolia came principally from Mâzândarân, Gilân and Şirwân. The products of the first two districts were collected first at Sultâniyye and, in later years mainly at Tabriz; as early as 741/1340, the tâmâhâ [q.v.] on silk at Tabriz amounted to 300,000 dinârs (‘Abd Allâh al-Mâzândarânî, Resâlât-ye Falakîyyât, ed. W. Hinz, Wiesbaden 1952, p. 59). Here the silk was bought by the great merchants and the caravans were assembled; these caravans reached Erzurum by the middle valley of the Aras, known as Çukûr-i Şâ‘ûd (or Şâ‘ûn). The caravans of silk from Shirwân and Gandja reached Erzurum via Shamkhab and Tiflis. The caravans bound for Aleppo, also an international silk-market, went via Tabriz, Van, Bîdîl and Diyarbakr, or along the valley of the Euphrates via Erzindjan and Kemâlk. The sea-route from Trebizond was also used (Dalsar, op. cit., p. 195, doc. 81, of 1016/1607). From the 8th/14th century onwards, Bursa began to rival Aleppo as a destination for Persian silk-caravans (the statement of W. H. Eyd, ii, 673, that the Ottomans obstructed the silk-routes is baseless). The caravans depended largely on the supply of horses and camels by the Türkmen nomads; at the end of the 9th/15th century a horse was hired for the journey Tabriz-Bursa-Tabriz at 400 akâbûs (about 9 ducats). Several caravans came to Bursa each year; an average caravan consisted of 300-400 beasts and carried 200 âles of silk (a âles consisted of 400 gr—according to another note—550 lid)es; the lid of silk was 120 dirhams, so that one âles was the equivalent of ca. 154 Kg.; a caravan of 919/1513 brought 400 âles of silk (Dalsar, p. 168, doc. 41). The Persian silk-merchants resident at Bursa in the 9th/15th century were mainly from Tabriz, Gilân, Çukûr-i Şâ‘ûn and Şirwân (on them see İkt. Fak. Mecm., xv (1953-4), 62-64). At this period Armenian merchants were in the minority. Most of the silk brought to Bursa was the highly-prized fine silk of Astârâbâd (sella straviu). The kâbûd’s registers of Bursa contain records that silk was sold there on behalf of the Aşık-Koyunlu ruler Ya‘kûb and the Şafawid şâns Ismâ‘îl, Ta‘ânîsî and ‘Abdâbâs (Dalsar, docs. 40, 64, 67, 240). Of these merchants, called in- discriminate by the Ottomans, some were certainly Âdâlbî Turks; the records distinguish the ‘resident’ (mutamakkîn) from the ‘travelling’ (saffâr) merchants.

Government regulations provided that the silk must be unloaded at the bezasâin (R. Anhegger and H. Inalcik, Kânûnîname-i sûltânî, p. 41, no. 31). There the silk was weighed on a scales (midân) set aside for it (in the 11th/12th century the midân at Bursa was in the Âğâm kânîn, later called the Koça kânîn, see Ewîyâ Celebi, Seyyâhîname, ii, 19). The dues on it were collected, and the owner was given a teqâhidî ‘charging the weight of the silk and certifying that the dues had been paid: these details were also entered in the midân defter. In the 11th/17th century, on every waâzûn (waâzem), that is 30 lid (450 gr.), of silk a midân resmi or teqâhidî resmi of 52 akâbes each was collected from seller and buyer (see H. Inalcik, in Belleten, xxv/139 (1960), 46). Mehemmed I introduced another midân resmi on the frontier at Tokat. This second tax annoyed the Persians, and in 877/1472 Uzun Hasan took and sacked Tokat. Silk in transit through Uzun Hasan’s realm paid fairly high dues at Erzindjan and Kârput or (on the other route) at Diyarbakr and Mardin (W. Hinz, Das Steuerwesen Ostanatoliens im 23. und 26. Jahrhundert, in ZDMG, c (1950), 197). The Ottomans later
established another mizān at Erzurum (on measures to counter-act tax-avoidance see below, p. 214). Whatever its destination, all imported silk had to be brought to the Bursa mizān. Sales were carried out in the bezāzīsān, after the mizān resmi had been paid, by brokers (dellāl) under the control of the sim̱ār [q.v.]. The broker took a fixed due (dellāliyye) (see Anhegger and Inalcik, op. cit., 41-3; for a kāmān controlling brokers, op. cit., 57-9; for their malpractices, Dalsar, op. cit., pp. 935-5, 224, 285). The activities of the sim̱ār were supervised by the sultan’s kādīya kethbūsāli in Bursa, who took charge of the revenues raised. Silk-merchants could not leave the kḥān before obtaining the permission of its supervisor and the sim̱ār’s attestation that the dues had been paid. The following table gives the amounts for which at various dates the three-year farm of the Bursa kārīs mizānī was leased:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount (m. akbēs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>892/1487</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907/1501</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918/1512</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928/1521</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930/1523</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947/1540</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950/1543</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965/1557</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015/1606</td>
<td>5.2 (including gisīmāl-jaqarğīl and ḫāṣābiyye)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The silk trade developed considerably during the reign of Bāyazīd II, who built at Bursa two great kūltān khanās, those popularly known as the Kōza khanā (or ʿAdjem khanā) and the Pirîn khanā. Under Selīm, there was a great regression; only towards the end of the reign of Śūleymān I do the figures for the silk-trade approach again those of the reign of Bāyazīd II. For comparison it may be noted that the silk mizān mukhdar asl of Aleppo under Selīm II amounted only to 400,000 akbēs. It has been calculated that in 978/1570 the total annual silk production of Persia was 22,000 yūks, of which 3,000 were exported to Turkey (P. Masson, Hist. du commerce français dans le Levant au XVIIe siècle, Paris 1897, 416). In about 950/1500, the Bursa silk industry needed a daily supply of 5 fardellos (1250 Bursa silk merchants of Bursa would gather at the bezb dzi-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount (m. akbēs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>907/1501</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918/1512</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928/1521</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930/1523</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947/1540</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950/1543</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965/1557</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015/1606</td>
<td>5.2 (including gisīmāl-jaqarğīl and ḫāṣābiyye)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wars with Persia in the 10th/16th century seriously affected the silk trade and had profound repercussions upon the economies and finances of the two countries. The first stage begins with Selīm I’s imposition, as a weapon of war, of a commercial blockade. His intention was to prevent the Persians from acquiring war materials, silver and iron, and, by forbidding the trade in silk, to reduce the Shāh’s income from dues (bāḏī), one of his main sources of revenue (see Sa’d al-Dīn, ii, 257). But the blockade had no effect, since most of the merchants began to use the routes through Aleppo and Iskandarūn. Therewith Selīm resorted to more violent measures: Arab, Persian or Ottoman merchants with stocks of Persian goods had their goods confiscated (letter to the sultan of Egypt, in Ferīdūn, i, 425). The silks and cloths of all the Persians at Bursa were confiscated and listed, and the merchants themselves were transported to Rumeli and Istanbul (921/1515; see Dalsar, p. 198, doc. 86). The import and sale of Persian silk was forbidden. Anyone proved to have sold silk was fined its value (Dalsar, pp. 195-208, docs. 83-118). When Śūleymān came to the throne he released the merchants, and restored their goods or paid them compensation. Nevertheless the ban on the import and trade in silk by Persian merchants was maintained for a time. This blockade had important effects: firstly, it increased the state control of the sale and distribution of silk; the scarcity and high price of silk obliged many merchants and weavers to go out of business; instead of the Persian and Adhari Turkish merchants, known collectively as ʿAdjem, Armenians began to gain control of the
trade; and finally the government encouraged the production of silk within the Ottoman empire—it is at this period that silk from Albania and Rumeli is mentioned on the Bursa market. Nevertheless when the silk-routes were re-opened under Süleyman, the industry again became dependent on Persian silk and there was a new expansion in the trade and manufacture of silk. Yet in this reign too, during the wars with Persia (for example in 953/1546), the Ottoman government imposed restrictions on the movement of gold and silver currency into Persia: the consequent shortage of silk harmed the Bursa silk industry and led to a fall in the state-revenue derived from it (Dalsar, p. 171, doc. 48; p. 173, docs. 50-1; p. 219, doc. 149). In the ensuing period of peace the silk trade flourished again, and we find Şah Tahmâsî himself employing an agent in 983/1575 to buy cloth for him at Bursa from the proceeds of six yiiks of silk (Dalsar, p. 181, doc. 62). But in the long period of war from 986/1578 to 1049/1659, silk became an important political weapon for each side. As early as 987/1579 the Ottoman state revenue from the trade had been halved (Dalsar, p. 173), and the Ottomans again imposed a strict control on the export of gold and silver. In 994/1586 the shortage of silk had left three-quarters of the looms of Bursa idle, and the quality of the fabrics produced had begun to decline (Dalsar, p. 335, doc. 273). The peace of 998/1590 extended Ottoman sovereignty over the silk-producing regions of Gandja and Shirvân north of the river Kur (qq.v.). Next year the ruler of Gîlân, Ahmad, attempted to exchange Persian for Ottoman protection, but was later obliged to flee to Ottoman territory (Ferîdûn, ii, 162-4; Selânîklî, 250-2). One of the terms of peace was that the Şah should send to the Ottoman government 200 yiiks of silk annually, later reduced to 100 yiiks (Ferîdûn, i, 172). The restrictions on the export of gold and silver caused an acute shortage of currency in Persia (CSP Col., East Indies. China and Japan 1617-1721, London 1870, doc. 446). Before Şah 'Abbâs [q.v.] launched his counter-attack in 1012/1603, he sought means (no doubt at the suggestion of the Sherley brothers) to export Persian silk direct to Europe, via the Indian Ocean; the English would thus escape the obstructions to their own caravan-trade, and the Şah would deprive his enemy of a rich source of revenue. In 1019/1609 he sent an embassy to Lisbon and exported 200 yiiks of silk by sea, hoping to prove that this route was cheaper. When the attempt to make an agreement with Spain failed, the Şah turned to England, and in 1026/1617 Sir Thomas Roe opened negotiations with the Şah. Of the 3.4 million gold pieces which Persian silk cost annually, England undertook to pay two-thirds in goods and one third in coin (see H. Inalçık, Türkiye‘nin ilkîsîdatı vaesi- yeti, 666). In order to maintain control of it, the Şah made the silk trade a state monopoly and forbade the export of silk to Turkey. The Ottomans and Venice—the two states most affected—watched these developments with anxiety. In 1026/1619 and 1031/1622 consignments of Persian silk were indeed sent to England by sea. The English were hoping also to establish another export route via Russia; this prompted the Ottomans to make threats to England (op. cit., 669-70). After the Ottoman-Persian peace of 1027/1618, Persian silk was again exported to Aleppo, Bursa and Focâ. Şâh 'Abbâs’s policy was not followed by his successor, who abolished the state monopoly of silk; and the use of the Indian Ocean route did not develop, mainly because England was reluctant to provide the gold and silver currency required for it. Nevertheless in 1043/1633 the Venetians were concerned at learning that English merchants were buying large quantities of silk at Bandar Abbâs (CSP, Venetian, xxiii, doc. 101). In 1075/1665 the French too were attempting to divert the Persian silk-trade through the Persian Gulf and Surat (P. Masson, op. cit., 326-7).

During the period 986/1578 to 1027/1628 some tendencies which had begun earlier became more apparent. Firstly, silk production within Turkey increased, the earliest records of silk-production at Bursa dating from 998/1587 (Dalsar, p. 386, docs. 290-301). In the second half of the nth/i7th century the import of cheaper silk-stuffs from Europe led to a decline in local silk-weaving
and that it became more profitable to produce raw silk for sale to Europe. This suggestion seems to be incorrect, the change not occurring until the 19th century, but that same time Europe imported 8,000,000 m. machines, 5,000,000 m., could no longer compete with the products woven at Damascus, Aleppo, Istanbul and Chios to suit Turkish taste, and imports from Europe remained at the earlier limited level. Even so late as 1202/1788, the value of all kinds of silk imports from France did not exceed 400,000 gold pounds. The silk-stuffs most appreciated in Turkey came from Venice (Masson, op. cit. ii, 446). Bursa and the surrounding region encompassed all other areas. In the 12th/18th century the demand in Europe for Bursa silk led to the danger that the Turkish weaving industry would be deprived of raw material, so that the government set limits to the quantity exported. According to a regulation (nişanname) of 1806, a quota of Bursa silk was set aside for sale at a fixed price to the tradesmen of Istanbul; the rest could be sold, when the Sultan had authorized it, to Europe (Dalsar, pp. 393-394, doc. 308). The annual demand of European merchants for Bursa silk was 21,750 okes (ca. 27,900 kgs.). Since they were ready to pay 29-30 kurush for 350 dirhams instead of the fixed price (nahr) of 21.5 kurush at Bursa or 23.5 at Istanbul, illegal sales could not be prevented.

In the 19th century, as the weaving industry declined with the spinning mills (see below), the production of raw silk expanded greatly. In order to assure the production of silk to the quality which the mechanized European industry demanded, from 1830 onwards the government published instruction manuals entitled Ta’limname-i harir (e.g., the Ta’limname-i harir, Istanbul 1269, written in Armenian by Khā ṣadīja Agob and translated into Turkish by him and Djeved). From 1838 onwards special steam-machines (Fr. filature, Turkish mandilb) were installed at Bursa for the extraction of silk from the cocoon; there were 3,000 of them by 1836, at which date it was estimated that there were, installed in the houses, 8,000,000 m. machines, 5,000,000 m., operated by pedal. According to Sandison’s Report on the trade of Brussa for the year 1846 (PRO, FO 78, 701), in that year 215,000 oks of silk (ca. 267,600 kgs.) were produced in Bursa; he writes also “Brusa silk and cotton stuffs are always falling more into disuse”. It is noticeable indeed that raw silk was increasingly being exported to Europe. In 1853 some four million kgs. of coarse silk were raised in the demand for raw silk in the West which accompanied the expansion of the silk industry there and the consequent rise in price had its effect upon the increase of silk production in Turkey. As early as the mid-11th/17th century, Bursa was famous for silk production (Ewliya Čelebi, Seyahatname-i, ii, 35). In 1091/1680 G. Wheler noted (A journey in Greece, London 1682, 209) that the plain of Bursa was covered with mulberry Orchards and that much silk was produced in the whole area between Bilecik, İzmid and Bandırma. Velvet was woven at Bilecik in 982/1574 (T. Dağlıoğlu, Osmanlı asırı Bursa, Bursa 1940, p. 83, doc. 115). Bursa silk was exported to the industrial centres of Aleppo, Damascus, Diyarbakr, Tokat and Istanbul (Dalsar, 387-9); Amsaya, an old centre of silk-weaving, later became important for silk manufacture for the exportation of a Swiss who established a spinning-mill here see G. Perrot, Souvenirs d’un voyage en Asie Mineure, Paris 1867, 449-51). In about 1040/1630, ʿAlāʾibīyya and Alasheqir are also mentioned as producing silk. That silk production continued in the Morea in the Ottoman period has been noted above: in the 12th/18th century raw silk was exported to Western Europe from the Morea (Masson, op. cit. ii, 626) and from the neighbourhood of Salonica (for the silk of Zagora see Akseray, Turkey to Europe in 1881 had originated in Persia, the Caucasus region and Turkey.

THE SILK-WEAVING INDUSTRY

A silk-weaving industry existed in Anatolia, before the period of the Ottomans, under the Seljūqs. Among the ‘gifts’ (multamasād) sent from Anatolia to Rashid al-Dīn [q.v.] as vizier of the Il-khanid sultans, were 2,000 rolls of kamkābī (T. kemkābī) and 10,000 cubits of velvet from Erizān and 4,000 rolls of kemkābī from other cities of Anatolia (Z. V. Togan, in İktisat Fakültesi Mecmua, xv (1934), 42, n. 5). The silk exported from the Il-khanid ruler in 657/1258 there figure nahr and kemkābī-i Anfāšī (i.e., of Antalya) see (see Akseray, Muṣūmarat al-akbāb, ed. O. Turan, Ankara 1944, 61). A few silk fabrics woven in Seljūq Anatolia are to be found in museum collections (a fragment bearing the name of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kaykābūd I is in the Musée des Tissus at Lyons, see E. Diez and O. Arslanapa, Türk sanats, Istanbul 1956, 259-60). Favourite types of material imported from Seldjuk Anatolia were naktb, sarḫābī-i Rāmī, various types of Rāmī dībī, Ṣuğlertexti and ʿAlṭābī garments, gold Iskandarānī brocades and kūnsı handkerchiefs (Ibn Bīrūnī, El-Estamirī n-lʿ-awlādīyye . . ., facs. of MS Aya Sofya 2985, Ankara 1956, 32, 49, 56, 155, 438). Al-ʿUmari (ca. 730/1330) says of Akhr, adjacent to the Ottoman principality, that “its silk is quite equal to Byzantine (Rāmī) brocade and cloth of Constantinople. Most of it is exported” (R. B. Serjeant, Material for a history of Islamic textiles up to the Mongol conquest, in Ars Islamica, xv-xvi (1951), 59). In the cenānname which he wrote for the Ottoman ruler Emir Süleymān (early 9th/15th century), Ahmad-i Dāʾī lists the following types of material: embroidered ḍubba-i Ṣuğlertext from which robes of honour [see KHIL A] were made for sovereigns, cloth of various types: ḍubba, ṭawāfi, ḍubba-i ḍubba, ʿAlṭābī of ʿAḍām (for this see R. B. Serjeant, op. cit., in Ars Isl., x (1943), 99, and A. U. Pope, A survey of Persian art, ii, London and New York 1937, 1956, n. 1), ḍubba, ḍubba, ḍubba, ḍubba of Iskandarānī for making ḍubbas (R. B. Serjeant, in Ars Isl., xii-xiii (1948), 100-6; Ṣalāde-yi Faltuhyya, ed. W. Hinz, Wiesbaden 1939, 14-5, 243-247, sündas (for
this green brocade made in Yazd, see Serjeant, op. cit., 87, 94, khāṣṣ al-khāṣṣ-i Kirrīmī (for khāṣṣ al-
khāṣṣ see T. Oz, doc. 3); Istanbul 1946, 62, khardj-e Shāmī and crimson wool of Yazd.

It is a point worthy of note that the silk industry of the Ottoman Empire developed in cities lying on the caravan-routes from Persia, i.e., Erzindjan, Tokat, Amasya and Bursa, on the one route, and Mardin, Marāš and Aleppo on the other. The silk industry of Istanbul was introduced from Bursa. As early as the end of the 8th/14th century, Bursa, the Ottoman capital, possessed an industry in silk fabrics, whose products were exported to Europe and to Eastern countries (H. Inalcık, Bursa . . . 50-1). This industry gradually expanded. At Bursa, Persian merchants who had brought in supplies of raw silk exchanged them mostly for European woollens and for Bursa silk fabrics. Under the names Bursa humāğh or Rāmī abmīqā, lāfīa, wālī, khamkha and khalīfa were imported into Įziran Hasān’s territories; and we have noticed the record of Šīḥ Shāhīmāch buying fabrics in Bursa. When Şehīn Isrā’īl seized Şīḥu’s treasury, he found in it 91 vestments of Bursa fabric (T. Öz, Tūrk kumaş ve kadiferleri, i, Istanbul 1946, 42). For the trade in Bursa fabrics in the bazaars of Tabrīz, see A narrative of Italian travels in Persia, ed. M. Grey, London (Hakluyt Soc.) 1873, 173. Bursa fabrics were prized also in Italy (G. R. B. Richards, op. cit., 88, 156). The customs’ registers for Kūstānai, Akkerman and Kefe of the end of the 9th/15th century show that Bursa fabrics were then being exported to Northern Europe; Russian merchants had bought silk and taffeta in Bursa in 981/1574 (Dalsar, docs. 36, 76); the kings of Poland had Turkish silk-stuffs bought for them at Bursa (Dağlı-
ğlu, doc. 46; Dalsar, docs. 73, 190; A. Refik, Osmanlı asrın İstanbul hayatı, Istanbul 1935, 108); and Turkish silk fabrics were used in Sweden for the making of ecclesiastical vestments (T. Öz, loc. cit.; A. J. B. Wace apud T. Öz, introd., p. 3). All the same, the products of the Bursa industry were mostly con-
sumed locally: the Bursa registers of the effects of deceased persons (tereke defterleri) show clearly that the rich used great quantities of silk fabrics for clothes and for house-furnished: from brocade and velvet were made khamkha (g.v.), doleleri (a kind of under-shirt), kardjh (skirts), kardjeh (shawls), lorgāfs and kerchiefs (see līrās), and pillows, bedspreads and cushions (see mafrūghār). Brocades and velvets also provided a means, like precious metals and stones, of accumulating wealth. The Palace bought extensive supplies of silk-stuffs from Bursa: the fabrics needed for clothing the personnel of the palace and for ceremonial occasions (made up by the palace tailors, who in 1018/1609 numbered 319) were ordered by the Chief Tailor (Terzi-bashi) and bought by the khāṣṣ khādījī emini at Bursa from private firms (R. Anhegger and H. Inalcık, Kānumāme-i sulāñi . . ., 35-6; Inalcık, Bursa . . . 64; Dalsar, pp. 226-33, doc. 160; T. Öz, Tūrk kumaş ve kadiferleri, i, Istanbul 1946, and ii, Istanbul 1953; idem, Turkish textiles and velvets, Ankara 1950 (with many illus-
trations of garments); the register of contents of the Inner Treasury (Enderūn khāmīsī), dated Şebānābād
910/January 1505, reproduced in Topkapı Sarayi Mülkvesi arşiv bilavası, ii, Istanbul 1940, no. 21; other sources on the ceremonial garments worn on special occasions are the tereke registers, the inām registers, and the Sūr-nāmes, especially the record of the wedding of Khađīja Sulān in 1085/1674: A. Bädd, Riyād-i belde-i Edirne, Edirne, MS Selimiye 2311, ii, 270-9; Sūr-nāme-i Wehbi, Istanbul, MS Ahmed III 3593). The cost of the various fabrics bought for the Palace in 954-5/1547-8 amounted to 12,000 gold pieces (Istanbul, MS Tarih Vesikalari, i/7 (1942), 30). The silk-weaving industry of Istanbul developed during the 10th/16th century; the num-
ber of looms producing various kinds of brocade (called serāser, şahkīneh, serbāf) rose from a hundred to 318 in 978/1570, at which date a firman was issued ordering their reduction to the former number; at an inspection made in 983/1577, 268 looms making the silver brocade serāser were found, and it was ordered that their number be reduced to 100 and that the others turn to making ordinary serenkh brocade (A. Refik, op. cit., 108, 116-8). According to Ewliyā Celebi (i, 613-8) there were in Istanbul (in about 1805/1840) 105 sellers of satin, 16 sellers of brocade, 70 weavers of velvet, 100 makers of velvet and serenkh pillows, 100 weavers of dāryāy, 5 makers of hūtās, 17 makers of sashes and 400 makers of bath-towels (peştemāl); silk fabrics were sold in the BezzāzĪstān-i Dīdīt, Chios fabrics at Ghalata. At Istanbul many new types of fabric, known as Istanbulbārī, began to be manufactured (T. Öz, op. cit., ii, 4, 44). In the first half of the 10th/16th century a silk factory attached to the palace was established at Istanbul: it is referred to as the Khāṣṣa Kārkhāne or the Kārkhāne-i ʿAmire (Dalsar, docs. 22, 23; T. Öz, op. cit., i, 47, with a plan); it employed kem harbāyā under the Kemhābd-Ībāl and ghasās under the Ghasās-Ībāl. According to the registers of the palace craftsmen (ehl-i bīr: see T. Öz, op. cit., ii, 21; H. Uzuncaşarlı, Osmanlı devletinin saray teşkilati, Ankara 1944, 453; R. M. Morie, Türk nahāb sani’si (arastırma araştırması) 1953), in 964/1557 145 weavers were employed, in 1047/1637 32, and in 1098/1687 only four; in the middle of the 12th/18th century, however, the number had risen to eight ghasās and three kem harbāyā. Of 268 silk looms functioning on the open market in Istanbul in 983/1577, 88 were run by slaves attached to the Palace (for slaves sent to Bursa in 936/1530 to be attached to master-craftsmen and learn the art of weaving various fabrics, see Dalsar, doc. 245). In 1171/1758, 40 pillow-making workshops, one silk-
spinner’s workshop and one guild-room were set up in Uskūdar as a wakf for the Ayzaman Dīmānī (T. Öz, i, 44). In the first half of the 19th century, there were 5000 weavers in Uskūdar, later left unemployed as a result of the competition of the products of Western mechanized industry (C. Hamlin, Among the Turks, New York 1878, 59). In 1843 the State founded a modern silk-factory at Hereke, but the Ottoman silk industry remained in general a field for private enter-
prise.

The numerous types of silk fabrics are classified in the ištābā regulation for Bursa (Tarih Vesikalari, i/7, 28-31) into three main groups: velvets (katife), brocades (khamkha) and satins (lāfīa, allās), the first being fabrics with a nap, the second those with a
design woven in, and the third smooth, light and brightly-coloured fabrics. The various types had different names according to the number of threads in the warp, the use of gold or silver threads, the degree of twisting of the threads, and the patterns woven in. (There is as yet no systematic classification of the very numerous types of Turkish fabrics; see, meanwhile, T. Öz, Türk kumaş ve kadijeleri, i-i, Istanbul 1946-51; A. J. B. Wace, The dating of Turkish selects, in Burlington Magazine, lxiv (1954); Brief guide to Turkish woven fabrics, Victoria and Albert Museum no. 3, London 1950; 2000 years of silk weaving, New York 1944; Nurettin Yatman, Türk kumasları, Ankara 1950; O. Ş. Uludag, Bursa kumasları, in Belleten, i3-4 (1937), 753-60. The principal collection of Turkish silk fabrics is in the museum of Topkapı Sarayı, Istanbul; others are in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, the Benaki Museum, Athens, the Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, the Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, the Etografía Müzesi, Ankara, and in the Kenan Öcal collection of the Ministry of Economics, Ankara.)

Specialists have reached the conclusion that in the fields of colour and design Ottoman Turkish fabrics blended diverse influences to create a characteristic style, and that this style had a profound influence in the Near East, in the Mediterranean countries, and in Western Europe (see A. J. B. Wace, apud T. Öz, i, 2-5, and idem, Turkish woven fabrics, 5-16). In this style are to be detected the influences not only of Persia, Byzantium and Italy, but also the Uygur tradition of Central Asia which was especially prevalent in Anatolia in the period of the Il-khâns (the "three circles", "tiger stripes" and Buddhist sun medallions commonly used in Ottoman designs are found also in Uygur pictures, op. cit., 10; for the dîbî-i Turkî sent to Harûn al-Rashîd and the changes in Persian textiles under the Seldûqs and the Il-khâns see P. Ackerman, in A. U. Pope, A survey of Persian art, iii, London and New York 1937, 2043-4, 2071, 2195); but there were peculiarities of style characteristic of the various Ottoman silk-weaving cities, such as the type connected with the name of Hâddiîlî Ali at Bursa in about 890/1485. In the 9th/15th century the great majority of the weavers at Bursa were local Muslim Turks. In 906/1501 an Italian weaver resident at Bursa, M. C. Cavieze, is mentioned, and in 920/1514 Selim 1 transported the best craftsmen from Tabriz to Istanbul (Ferîdûn, i, 405). In the 11th/17th century the number of Greek weavers at Bursa began to increase. The brocades of Europe, Kefe and Chios were imitated at Bursa.

Organization of the Industry

Those employed in the silk industry were organized into various hîrefet, trade guilds. The entrepreneurs were in two main groups, the khâmfîlis (dealers in raw silk) and the dôkmuçîlis (weavers). The khâmfîlis merchants would buy raw silk at the bezaasîtanî and have it spun by doldûfîlis into warp threads (masduda) and woof threads (pud). The warp threads, called masdûl because they were more tightly twisted, varied in the number of strands according to the type of fabric to be woven, from 1,800 ( tôpo) to 8,500 (gûnsîtanî kemkû); the doldûfîlis or tirkîm bûkûfûsî who performed the spinning worked for the khâmdîlis but constituted a separate hîrefet. The khâmdîlis then had the warp and woof threads dyed, by the boya-dîlis (sabbâgbûs). The following list of stock and tools recorded in the effects of a deceased boya-dîfî (Bursa, Şerîye sicilleri A6/6, of 893/1488) throws light on the technique of dyeing: vegetable dye, red dye, indigo, Hindi indigo, ala indigo, valonia, alum, cauldrons, ladies, trays, sieves, troughs, mallets, work-benches. The dyed silk was sold by the kâmîdîlis to the dôkmuçîlis (weavers), who were organized into different hîrefet: hâfitîlis, kemkâmîlis, wâledîlis, futâmîlis. For each type of fabric a distinct type of loom was used, with the appropriate number of teeth (a loom was valued at 3,000 akses, i.e., some 60 gold pieces, in about 893/1488).

The most numerous and influential hîrefet at Bursa was the kâmîdîlis, whose products were world famous; as an example, the organization of their hîrefet may be summarized in the following terms (ustiddâl, master-craftsmen) was limited; these chose from among themselves a council of control known as the 'Six' (Altflar: for the election see Dalsar, pp. 318, 330, 397-8), who were, in descending order, the şeyh, the kahyâ (hakkûdû), the yîgît-basghî, the ishdî-basghî, and two ahli-khibûra; the kahût would confirm this election, as being to an official body, and register the result. The principal duties of this council were to secure that regulations concerning quality and prices of manufactured goods were carried out; to carry out the examinations for promotion from apprentice (şâkîrd) to journeyman (kalfa) and from journeyman to master, and to issue licences (tidâsa); to investigate and settle disputes and malpractices in the guild; to represent the guild in dealings with the government, and most of all to prevent competition and underhand practices in the employment of workmen and in the buying of stocks. In the carrying out of these duties the kahyâ usually acted as the principal officer, the yigît-basghî, with his assistant the ishdî-basghî, would investigate complaints and make a report to the ahli-khibûra, on the basis of which they made the final decision (see Kânînâmîne-i ishtislî-i Bursa, p. 28). The şeyh was the spiritual head of the guild and presided at ceremonies. The guild co-operated closely with the government, and if there was any resistance to the decision of the Altflar the latter could call upon the local state officers to enforce it (Dalsar, pp. 111-7). The regulations of the guild were confirmed by the Sultan, so becoming an ishtislî kânînin; as such, their application became the responsibility of the kahût (see the Kânînâmîne cited, pp. 28-31). The shayk was the one who dyed the silk was under the control of the mîstên emini, the official of the guild; he was finished, of the mubasîs (see ibid.). The woven fabric was inspected for its dimensions by the tamgâha (dâmgha) emini, who stamped it, a tamgâha resmi being levied on each top (roll) of fabric.

The weaving was in general carried out on looms set up in private houses. According to the terhec disfîleri of the 9th/15th century, large numbers of slaves were used in the industry, being bought specifically for the purpose and employed on the principle of muskâta (g.v.) (see H. Inalcik, in Iktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, xv (1953-4), 57-9). At the same time there were quite big 'factories' (hârkhâne): in Istanbul, 400 peşammâmâlis were working in a single large hârkhîne near Khrîr-çeşme (Ewliya Celebi, i, 616-17. Hämmer, ii, 222); and in about 995/1587 there is a record of several 'big businessmen' in Bursa owning from 20 to 60 looms (Dalsar, doc. 273). Women, as well as men, were found among the masters and the workpeople (Dalsar, p. 320). The workpeople were divided into three main groups: kula, şâkîrd and egîrs (Dalsar, doc. 241), the last being the true employees, whose daily wage was calculated on the basis of the number of dîrisîw woven (Dalsar, doc. 242). The şâkîrd were the young apprentices
The Ottoman silk industry, under the pressure of economic factors, progressively expanded in output but declined in quality—a tendency already visible at the end of the 9th/10th century (see Kânanmâne-i iktisâb-i Bursa, 28-31). The widespread demand among the common people for cheaper goods forced the relaxation of the old guild standards of quality and the toleration of a more loosely woven guşistânı kemâlât, deemed suitable to their needs (ibid., 29). The establishment of new looms by untrained workers (called hâkim-desîl) without the authorization of the guild and the consequent increase in the number of looms working provoked violent resistance on the part of guild-members from the 11th/17th century onwards (Dalsar, docs. 3, 4, 21, 236-8, 240-1, 260), and the intervention of the authorities on behalf of the guilds was fruitless. A decline in quality resulted also from the occasional shortages of silk and of the crimson dye gum-lac (T. yok); the number of threads in the warp was reduced and poor dyes were used (in the 9th/15th century the warp was composed of 4500-5000 threads, in the 11th/17th century of only 2400; for the dyes used see N. Baylav, Türkiye'nin boya bitkileri, ..., in Türk Sanats Tarihi, i, Istanbul (Güzel Sanatlar Akademisi) 1963, 732-44). At the same time cotton or linen threads were increasingly used in the woof. The fall in quality was encouraged also by the import from Europe of lower-grade, cheap and showy materials, which induced the Turkish weavers to compete with them. From the 11th/17th century onwards there was increasing demand for silk-stuffs from Venice and Chios which copied the Ottoman designs. 

Bibliography: in the article. (H. İnalci)<br>iii.—The Arab Lands in the Post-Mongol Period.<br>The Mongol invasion of the Muslim world resulted in the displacement of many trades and the transfer of artisans, especially those engaged in the silk industry; yet only about one-tenth of Arab territory, including Baghâd and Mawsîl, was adversely affected by the Mongols. Moreover, even those once prosperous centres with thriving silk trades, supposedly destroyed by the Mongols, were reported half a century later by Marco Polo to have maintained or recovered their prosperity. Pedro Teixeira, like Marco Polo, was impressed by the flourishing silk industry in Baghâd and Mawsîl. The making of silk was almost confined to Syria and Tunisia, where the climate is especially suited to the breeding of silkworms and the growth of mulberry trees. Algeria and Morocco were also silk producing countries but on a limited scale. There was a mahkalât [silk] factory in Tîllûnân and a Jewish controlled industry in Fâs. The Arabs in North Africa introduced silk into Sicily and Spain and from there it was introduced into the Rhône Valley and Milan. Other Arab countries tried unsuccessfully to make silk; they managed, however, to maintain tirâş [sericulture] factories dependent upon imported raw silk. The tirâş factory in Cairo goes back to Fātimid times and functioned throughout the Mamlûk period. European travellers who visited Egypt in Ottoman times noted a silk industry making Syrian raw material. Muhammad AHI Pasha planted three million mulberry trees, which grew well, but the climate was not suitable for the breeding of the silkworm. Syrian silk deserves a more detailed study. Ottoman registers for Syria-Palestine compiled in the 10th/16th century show extensive silk cultivation and manufacture; there is similar evidence of silk exports. Alessandra and Damascus were not only famous for the manufacture of good locally reared silk, but were also great centres for trading in a lower-grade silk imported from Persia. European factors residing in Syria competed for raw silk, Syrian and Persian, to barter it for woollen cloth. Muslim merchants managed to strike hard bargains with the Europeans, forcing them to barter their woollens for large amounts of raw silk, the balance being paid by Europeans in cash-producing commodities such as dyes. Thus woollens were subsidiary to silk in Syria, while the contrary was true in Europe. Russian activities in north-western Persia cut off Persian silk from Syrian markets. Syrian locally-produced silk partly filled the gap, perhaps at the expense of local industry. The price of raw silk rose sharply, thus encouraging greater production in Syria. Volney noted the great number of new mulberry trees along the Syrian coast. Increasing in the nineteenth century, the production of raw silk fell later as a result of the competition of Far Eastern silk and artificial silk.

The silk industry in the Arab countries produced textiles for home consumption only. There seems to have been no appreciable foreign market for textiles, because many countries maintained their own industries. Descriptions of Arab dress in Ottoman times show that silk textiles were more commonly used than woollens, but less than linen or cotton.

The Arabs, for whom, with their nomadic origins, wool was the most important raw material for textiles, were also familiar with silk from the earliest times. Although the Prophet forbade the wearing of silk clothing as a luxury, because it threatened to lead to effeminacy, silk weaving flourished greatly in the Islamic world, and Islamic silk mills dominated world trade from the 9th to the 14th century A.D. The words Atlas (German for satin), damask (Damascus) and muslin (Mosul) are taken from Arabic, and taffeta from Persian. The development of the textile arts in Islam was linked with their last phases in the ancient world whose territories were occupied by the Arabs—those of the ancient
Orient in the time of the Sāsānids in Iran and Mesopotamia, and those of the late Greek and Byzantine civilizations in Syria, Egypt and Asia Minor. In the Carta Cornutiana, a document relating to the founding of a village church near Tivoli, not far from Rome, written in 471 A.D., the excellence of Persian textiles was praised, just as it had been by Herodotus and Xenophon. Under the Sasanid rulers Shapur II (310-379) and Kawadh I (488-531), Syrian weavers were transported to Persia. In the rock tomb of King Khusraw II (590-628) in Tāk-i-Bīstān, clothing woven of Iranian silk is represented. It is probable that in Alexandria, later in Cairo and Tyre, in Damascus and Ctesiphon, and later still in Baghdad, Rayy and many other places, the first Caliphs encouraged a new and fruitful development of silk mills and made possible the founding of new silk factories in the conquered territories from India and Turkestan in the east to Sicily and Spain in the west. Iran's key position under the Achaemenids and the Sāsānids, between Eastern Asia and Europe, was maintained by the Islamic peoples, and extended and strengthened by their expansion on the trade routes by land and sea. The costly raw material, the silk itself, was at first imported from its land of origin, China. Under the Byzantine Emperor Justinian (527-65) monks brought silk worm chrysalises to Byzantium in their pilgrims' staffs. At that time the breeding of silk worms was also started in the countries of the Near East, which gradually became independent of imports. Just as in Byzantium State factories for silk weaving had been set up in the gynaeceums, employing almost exclusively women, so too the caliphs and other Islamic rulers created court and state factories, the products of which were known as tīrāz [q.v.]. They are known particularly on account of the robes bestowed by the rulers upon those they wished to honour [see gušša], which were woven in these factories, generally of linen but sometimes also of silk; these often bore an inscription (figs. a and b), usually worked in silk, giving the name of the ruler, the place, the manager of the factory and the year of production. Many remains of such garments, with inscriptions, have come to light in Egyptian tombs, giving proof of how numerous the weaving mills were at that time (Pis. IIa, VIa). A particularly magnificent example is a robe of honour bestowed by the Būyid ruler depicting lions beside a tree of life, found their way, as coverings for relics, into the treasuries of Western churches, as at Rome, Aix, Sens (Pl. Ia) and Nancy. They are in fact early Islamic pictures, executed on a background of Sāsānīd silk, depicting the lion-hunts of the Persian Shahinshah (Berlin, formerly State Museums), and splendid fragments of these have also found their way into European church treasuries such as those of Passau (Pl. IVa), Trier, Cologne (St. Kunibert) (Pl. Ib), Milan (St. Ambrose) and Prague (Cathedral Treasury). There is one such piece with an Arabic inscription, another from Rayy in which the Kings are portrayed on horseback beside the trees of life and above the lions. Silk weaving flourished particularly in early and mid-mediaeval times in Rayy, where among other things double cloth was made, with different designs on the two sides (Pl. IVb, c). These were sometimes used as palls. There was a considerable exchange of ideas and inspiration between the Byzantine and Islamic weaving industries, just as had existed between Iran and Byzantium in Sāsānīd times. One group of Byzantine silk mills, which must be considered as the forerunners of the damask mills, was decisively influenced by the geometric style of stucco decorations at Sāmarrā, which led to the arabesque. These pseudo-damasks, as they are called, are now claimed by Sigrid Müller-Christensen, with some justification, to be Islamic work. The abstract leaf design of the arabesque became increasingly dominant in Islamic
textile ornamentation, and finally asserted itself completely at the same time as cursive Kufic was replaced. Chinese weavers brought new influences to bear in almost all the Islamic countries. Under the Mongol dynasties in Iran and Turkestan, Chinese motifs such as the Fonghoang, the Dragon, the Ky-lin and others were introduced into Islamic textile designs, even in places such as Egypt and Asia Minor where the Mongols did not penetrate. Chinese damasks encouraged a great flowering of damask weaving in Mamluk Egypt and in dynasties; this is clear from findings in many tombs, among which have been found a remarkably large number of pieces of material bearing inscriptions of the Mamluk Sultan Muhammad Nāṣir (Pi. VIc, e). In 1243/1244 this Sultan received from the embassy of a Mongol Khān 700 lengths of silk, in some of which his name was woven. A gold brocade of this kind is preserved in the vestments collection of the Marienkirche in Danzig.

In Andalusia, there were important silk mills from the time of the Umayyad dynasty, as can be seen from a fīrāda fabric bearing the name of Ḥīḍām II, after the model of the Egyptian fabrics. Attempts were made to imitate Baghādād silk textiles, and in at least one case a fabric which was certainly manufactured in Spain was given an Arabic inscription, which, for the sake of advertisement, falsely claimed that it was of Baghādād manufacture. The silk woven in Arabia was considered comparable with Persian textiles. As a result of the discoveries of silk garments in the tombs of Spanish princes in the Cistercian monastery of Las Huelgas near Burgos (Pl. VIIb), which are mainly of Spanish-Moorish silk material, our knowledge of Spanish-Moorish silk weaving has been extended and deepened. In Granada too, where the Alhambra style (Pl. VIIc) was taken over in the textile arts also, and in Murcia, Malaga and other places there were silk mills. In Sicily, at the court of Palermo, Byzantine factories were supplanted by Arab, which continued there even after the conquest by the Normans and under the rule of the Hohenstaufen (Pl. VIIa). The German coronation robe in Vienna bears impressive witness to the high standing of their silk weaving and embroidery.

As early as the end of the 7th/13th century, Marco Polo noticed that there were flourishing silk mills in the parts of Asia Minor, such as Konya, which were under the dominion of the Turks (Pl. VI d). In the Ottoman period, flowers such as carnations, tulips and hyacinths enriched the plant designs. Īskūdar velvet was prized throughout the then known world (Pl. VII d, e).

Islamic silk weaving and embroidery reached its highest fulfilment in Persia with the coming of the Šafawids. The chief factories were now in Tabriz, Ḵazvin and Isfahān. There were many exchanges of inspiration between textile designs (including those of knotted carpets) and china mosaic work and the flourishing art of miniature painting. The pictorial silk and velvet materials are unique. In Sānādī Iran the mythical big-game hunt of the Shāhānshāh had been depicted in the tombs of Ṭāq-e-Bīslānkān, on silver dishes, and on silk materials as well. Now it was figures from the Alexander legend, King Kuhsraw and the beautiful Shīrīn, the poor poet Madīnīn and the unattainable Princess Leylā, who found their place in the pictures woven in costly silk and velvet brocades. The names of artists, such as Šāh Muhammad Mīrzā al-Din and, above all, Ghīyāth al-Din, are known to us from their signatures (Pl. VIIia).

Of the silk textiles of the Near East had made their way into occidental church treasures, where they were used as wrappings for relics or as vestments, they now came to the courts of European princes; a delegation (1635-1639) led by Olearius was sent by Duke Frederick III of Holstein Gottorp to Shah Šaff (1629-1642) in Isfahān, and the velvet brocades which were among the presents Olearius brought back for his sovereign were used as tapestries in the Rosenborg Castle, in Copenhagen. Apart from the Spanish princes and the Kings of Sicily, whose cemeteries were sometimes of silk of Arab manufacture, it seems that European princes only occasionally used Arab silks for clothing; those who did included Canegrande VII della Scala (d. 1329) in Verona, the confidant of the Emperor Henry VI, and Duke Rudolf IV of Habsburg (1339-65) (Pl. Va). The inspiration given to European textile art by Arab silk materials, particularly apparent at first in Italy and in Spain, spread throughout Europe even in Italian, Spanish, French, German and Dutch paintings, which all reveal the influence of Islamic silk textiles in the garments of the people represented.

AL-HARIRI (sometimes Ibn al-Harîrî in Yağkût), Abû Muhammâd al-Kâsim b. ‘Ali b. Muhammâd b. ‘Uqâmân b. AL-HARûRî AL-BAŠRî, Arabic poet and philologist known principally for his makâmât. Born in 446/1054, probably to a landed family living at al-Mâshân, near Basra, where he spent his childhood, he commenced his studies at Basra; his biographers agree that he studied under al-Fâlîd al-Dîn al-IIsfahânî, that is chief of intelligence [see BARID, KHABAR], sîdyb al-khabar, b. Muhammad al-‘Easâbânî, but the latter is mentioned only in the works of Abu ‘1-Fath al-Iskandari. According to al-Harîrî himself (apud Yağkût, Udbâbî, xvi, 262-3) or his son (apud Ibn Khallîkân, i, 429), Abû Zayd al-Sarudî was a real person and may even on his appearance in Basra have inspired the first makâma of al-Harîrî, al-Harîmîyya, which is the 48th of the collection; however, his hero may perhaps be only identical with a Bohemian called Abû Zayd al-Sarudî, recalls Abu ‘1-‘Ufîdî al-Iskandarî. According to al-Harîrî himself (apud Yağkût, Udbâbî, xvi, 262-3) or his son (apud Ibn Khallîkân, i, 429), Abû Zayd al-Sarudî was a real person and may even on his appearance in Basra have inspired the first makâma of al-Harîrî, al-Harîmîyya, which is the 48th of the collection; however, his hero may perhaps be only identical with a Bohemian called Abû Zayd al-Sarudî. The dating 

The reasons for this extraordinary success, which gave rise to countless imitations in Arabic, in Persian, and even in Hebrew and in Syria [see MAKÂMA], are somewhat difficult to understand and must be accounted for by the decline of literary taste. Indeed, the makâmât of al-Harîrî are no more than a pale reflection of those of al-Hamadhânî; it is not merely the number of the sessions which shows the constant concern with imitation (for at the end of the 5th/11th century there survived probably only the 50 sessions of Bâdî al-Zamân, of the 400 which he wrote); this concern moreover is quite superficial, for al-Harîrî, by confining himself to relating the meetings of al-Harîrî b. Hammân and Abû Zayd al-Sarudî, restricts the scope of the sessions and, neglecting depth, puts all his effort into form. What he had in great measure certainly is an unequalled mastery of the Arabic language and a perfect command of its inexhaustible vocabulary; verbal exuberance leads to acrobatics which the followers of al-Harîrî, who regarded him as the most perfect representative of the genre, delighted in, whereas he merely set the style. The makâmât first known in the West through partial translations: in 1656, Latin tr. of the first makâmât by Golius (following on a new edition of Erpenius’s grammar); in 1731, edition of the first makâmât by Schultens, who in 1731 and 1740 translated six of them; in 1737, Reiske published the tr. of no. 26. The first extended tr. (extracts from 17 makâmât) is that of Venture de Paradis: made in between 1742 and 1757, it was begun in 495/1040, which seems to confirm the existence of Abû Zayd al-Sarudî, for he might have been driven from Sarudî when the town was taken by the Crusaders in 494/1000 [see SARUDJ] and have taken refuge in Basra. Al-Harîrî, whose duties brought him into contact with various high dignitaries of Baghâdâd, might have been encouraged in his enterprise by the future vizier of al-Mustarshid (517/1122-1128), Ibn Şâdakî [q.v.], to whom he dedicated his makâmât, at any rate if the dedication on the autograph manuscript that Ibn Khallîkân happened to see in Cairo in 656/1258 is to be believed; one must then, it seems, reject the version attested by the son of al-Harîrî, who wanted to curry favour with Anûshirrân b. Khâlid [q.v.], that it was dedicated to this latter, the minister only from 517/1122. The date of completion, 495-538/1040-1116, which sometimes laborious—is not known with certainty, but from 502/1108 the Andalusian Yûsuf b. ‘Ali al-Kûdî, who had studied them under the author, made them known in Spain and explained them some years later to Ibn Khâyr al-Igdiîli [q.v.]; from the beginning of the 6th/11th century they were part of the curriculum of literary Andalusians (see for example al-Rû’aynî, Barnâmâdî, Damascus 1962, 32, 33, 44, 51, 60, 79). They were already classics in the lifetime of the author, who died on 6 Ra’dâb 516/10 September 1122, and he himself boasts of having personally authorized 700 copies (Yağkût, Udbâbî, xvi, 267); they never afterwards ceased to be popular with the literary public, in spite of the criticisms of various detractors, such as Dîyû al-Dîn Ibn al-Atîr and the author of the Fâhîrî: (al-)Shumaym al-Hillî [q.v.] himself, who claimed to be able to surpass all literary works, admits that despite several attempts he did not succeed in writing makâmât better than those of al-Harîrî, which decided him to write a commentary, one of the twenty which are known and of which the most famous and the most complete is that of al-Sharîjî (d. 639/1242 [q.v.]).
Iran, 3rd/9th century; Sudarium of St. Victor, Sens Cathedral.

Iran, 1st/7th century; Erzbischöfliches Diözesanmuseum, Cologne.
Egypt, 4th/10th century; Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

'Zandanić' silk, 1st/7th or 2nd/8th century; Staatliche Museen, Berlin.
Khilca with inscription of Bahā al-Dawla, ca. 390/1000; Textile Museum, Washington.

Khurāsān, 4th/10th century; Louvre, Paris.
(a) Double-weaving, Baghdad, 6th/12th century; Cathedral Treasury, Passau.

(b) Double-weaving, Iran, 5th/11th or 6th/12th century; Textile Museum, Washington.

(c) Double-weaving, other side of b.
Funeral-gown of Rudolf IV of Habsburg; Dom und Diözesanmuseum, Vienna.

Silver-brocade, Iran, 8th/14th or 9th/15th century; Staatliche Museen, Berlin.

Gold-brocade, Iran, 9th/15th century; Staatliche Museen, Berlin.
(a) Egypt, 6th/12th century; Musée du Cinquantenaire, Brussels.
(b) Chasuble of silk-brocade, Syria, 8th/14th century; Church of St. Mary, Danzig.
(c) Fabric with the name of the Mamlûk sultan Muḥammad al-Ḍāhir; Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo.
(d) Gold-brocade with the name of Sultan Kaykobād, Asia Minor, 7th/13th century; Musée des tissus, Lyon.
(e) Silk-damask with the name of Muḥammad al-Ḍāhir; Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo.
(a) Sicily 7th/13th century; Chinon Cathedral.
(b) From the tomb of Maria of Almenar, Hispano-moresque, 7th/13th century; Cistercian Monastery, Las Huelgas.
(c) Hispano-moresque, 8th/14th century; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
(d) Velvet-brocade, Üsküdar, 10th/16th century; Staatliche Museen, Berlin.
(e) Kaftan of Bayezid II, late 9th/15th century; Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi, Istanbul.
(a) Silk-brocade, made by Ghiyath al-Din, Iran, 10th/16th century; Musée du Cinquantenaire, Brussels.

(b) Velvet-brocade, Iran, 10th/16th century; Textile Museum, Washington.

(c) Wall-carpet with the design of a mihrab, Iran, 11th/17th century; Mosque of Shaykh Safi, Ardabil.

(d) Silk-brocade, Iran, 12th/18th century; Staatliche Museen, Berlin.

His letters (nasâdîl) have been selected in his *Kharîda*, and Yakût has included in a few his biography of al-Harîrî; two among these in which all the contents contain a sin and a sha*î* respectively (hence their names of sinîyya and sha*î*yya) are typical examples of the opposite ends of al-Harîrî's taste for mere virtuosity without content.

He is also the author of a *Divân*, which has not survived, and of a didactic *urdjâna* on grammar, the *Mulhat al-urvb*, written at the prompting of Ibn al-ţîmîdî and accompanied by a commentary, of which Yakût gives some idea.

**Bibliography:** Yakût, *Udâdîl*, xvi, 261-93 = *Isâdîl* vi, 179-84; Ibn Khallîkân, i, 419 ff.; 'Imad al-Dîn al-İsľâhâni has preserved some in his *Kharîda*, and Yakût has included in a few his biography of al-Harîrî; two among these in which all the contents contain a sin and a sha*î* respectively (hence their names of sinîyya and sha*î*yya) are typical examples of the opposite ends of al-Harîrî's taste for mere virtuosity without content.

The information that we possess in respect of his life deserves no credence, and the poem that is the cause of his renown is in itself so suspect that Tâhâ ʻUsayn considers it to be totally apocryphal (cf. also al-Ḥâjîb, *Bayânîn*, iii, 49, on the questions of other verses). This *sîdâra* in *khâfrîf* metre and with *dârî* rhyme (with an *sâfî* in one verse in *-dâ*), is said by legendary tradition to have been improvised (though it has none of the signs of improvisation) in the following circumstances: after the king of al-Hira al-Mundhir b. Mâ‘ al-Sâmî had restored peace between the tribes of Bakr [*q.v.*] and Taghîbî [*q.v.*] which the war of al-Basîs [*q.v.*] had broken, hostages from the two tribes were compelled to remain with the sovereign; the war of al-Basîs being concluded, the sovereignty of Amr b. Hind [*q.v.*], which had suffered dying by accident, their tribe asked for recompense from the Bakr, who refused, and then complained to the king; it was then that al-Ḥâjîb, who had the task of pleading the case for the tribe against the Taghîbî (whose spokesman was ʻAmr b. Kûlîhûm [*q.v.*]), recited his poem in the *magâlis* of the king, who had ordered hangings to be set up to keep him apart from the poet, since the latter had been reduced to barbarity (barâsâr); overcome by al-Ḥâjîb’s talent, ʻAmr b. Hind is said to have had the hangings drawn up, one after another, and to have treated the poet with singular marks of esteem, although in general he inclined towards the Taghîbî.

The political aim of this *mu*îlalâba is undeniable; the section reserved for nasâdîl and descriptions is cut short, while the plea on behalf of the Bakr is more highly developed and is accompanied by criticisms of the Taghîbî who are invited to put an end to their recriminations. The poem, an eloquent fragment, would be of documentary interest if it could be regarded as authentic.

**Bibliography:** it is possible that the lines attributed to al-Ḥâjîb were put together by Sukkarî from the works of the Banu Yashkur (cf. Fîhrîs, *al-Hamaddîn*, *choix de maqâmad*, Paris 1957, 42-7. (D. S. Margoliouth-[Ch. Pellat])

al-Ḥârîth b. Dîjabâla, A.D. 529-569, the most famous of all the kings of Ghassân [*q.v.*] in the military annals of Arabia, and in the history of Byzantium and of Monophysitism in the sixth century.

As the phylarch and ally of Byzantium he led his mounted contingent against the Persians and their Arab allies, the Lakhmids, in the wars of Justinian’s reign and distinguished himself in two of its military operations: the battle of Callinicum, A.D. 537, and the Assyrian campaign, A.D. 541. At Yawm Hallîma [*q.v.*] in A.D. 554 he triumphed decisively over the Lakhmîd Mundhir.

As a believer in the One Nature of Christ, he vowed to remain with the sovereign; during the Assyrian campaign, A.D. 541. At Yawm Halima [*q.v.*], he was repudiated by Ibn al-Tîlîmîdî and accompanied by a commentary, of which Yakût gives some idea.


al-Ḥârîth b. Hîllîza al-Ŷâskurî, a pre-Islamic Arab poet to whom is attributed principally a *basîda* which mediaeval critics regarded as the seventh of the *mu*îlalâba [*q.v.*]. The information that we possess in respect of his life deserves no credence, and the poem that is the cause of his renown is in itself so suspect that Tâhâ ʻUsayn considers it to be totally apocryphal (cf. also al-Ḥâjîb, *Bayânîn*, iii, 49, on the questions of other verses). This *sîdâra* in *khâfrîf* metre and with *dârî* rhyme (with an *sâfî* in one verse in *-dâ*), is said by legendary tradition to have been improvised (though it has none of the signs of improvisation) in the following circumstances: after the king of al-Hira al-Mundhir b. Mâ‘ al-Sâmî had restored peace between the tribes of Bakr [*q.v.*] and Taghîbî [*q.v.*] which the war of al-Basîs [*q.v.*] had broken, hostages from the two tribes were compelled to remain with the sovereign; the war of al-Basîs being concluded, the sovereignty of Amr b. Hind [*q.v.*], which had suffered dying by accident, their tribe asked for recompense from the Bakr, who refused, and then complained to the king; it was then that al-Ḥâjîb, who had the task of pleading the case for the tribe against the Taghîbî (whose spokesman was ʻAmr b. Kûlîhûm [*q.v.*]), recited his poem in the *magâlis* of the king, who had ordered hangings to be set up to keep him apart from the poet, since the latter had been reduced to barbarity (barâsâr); overcome by al-Ḥâjîb’s talent, ʻAmr b. Hind is said to have had the hangings drawn up, one after another, and to have treated the poet with singular marks of esteem, although in general he inclined towards the Taghîbî.

The political aim of this *mu*îlalâba is undeniable; the section reserved for nasâdîl and descriptions is cut short, while the plea on behalf of the Bakr is more highly developed and is accompanied by criticisms of the Taghîbî who are invited to put an end to their recriminations. The poem, an eloquent fragment, would be of documentary interest if it could be regarded as authentic.

**Bibliography:** it is possible that the lines attributed to al-Ḥâjîb were put together by Sukkarî from the works of the Banu Yashkur (cf. Fîhrîs, *al-Hamaddîn*, *choix de maqâmad*, Paris 1957, 42-7. (D. S. Margoliouth-[Ch. Pellat])

al-Ḥârîth b. Dîjabâla, A.D. 529-569, the most famous of all the kings of Ghassân [*q.v.*] in the military annals of Arabia, and in the history of Byzantium and of Monophysitism in the sixth century.

As the phylarch and ally of Byzantium he led his mounted contingent against the Persians and their Arab allies, the Lakhmîds, in the wars of Justinian’s reign and distinguished himself in two of its military operations: the battle of Callinicum, A.D. 537, and the Assyrian campaign, A.D. 541. At Yawm Hallîma [*q.v.*] in A.D. 554 he triumphed decisively over the Lakhmîd Mundhir.

As a believer in the One Nature of Christ, he vowed to remain with the sovereign; during the Assyrian campaign, A.D. 541. At Yawm Halima [*q.v.*], he was repudiated by Ibn al-Tîlîmîdî and accompanied by a commentary, of which Yakût gives some idea.
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(Ch. Pellat)

Banu 'l-Harith b. ka'b, usually called Bahrari, an Arab tribe belonging to the Yemeni group. Their genealogy is: al-Harith b. ka'b b. 'Amr b. 'Ula b. 'Asim b. MADbudi (Maliq).

They lived in the district of Nadirjan [50], and were neighbours of the Baljarith. The following places amongst others belonged to them: al-'Arsh, al-'Adh, Bait al-Dhuhbah, Dhu 'l-Marrat, al-Furut (pl. Afrat, between Nadirjan and the Djawd, Hadura (Khadura), 'Ayyana, al-Khashaqa (between Hadzah and Tihama), Kurrah, Sabab, Sam al-Sudan or Sawbdan, Minan or Maynan, Shatib Ziyad (belonging to the clan Ziyad); wadies: 'Aynah Dibal, al-Bahrja, al-Djafr, al-Hasr, Hitm, al-Kawakab, Khatma (Khitma, a well in the sand), Khulayka, al-Malabaht, Mawa, al-Shallil (belonging to the clan D'ar), Shisah, Yamadat; mountains: Tukhtum.

Sections of the Bahrari lived also in Raydat al-Say'ar in Hadramawt, in the town of Rada (inhabited by the 'Ans and Khawlan), in the villages al-Šama and Hadakan, which belonged to the Bakil, and in al-Faladja near Damascus.

In the Dižilitiya a section of the Bahrari worshipped the idol Yaghuth. Another section professed Christianity. The 'Abd al-Madān b. al-Dayyān, a prominent family of the Bahrari, built a large church, Dayr Nādiran, also called the Ka'bah of Nādiran (according to many authorities, a tent composed of 300 pieces of hide).

Historical. The idol Yaghuth was the cause of a battle between the Bahrari and the Murra, who claimed Yaghuth for themselves, at al-Razm (in the south of Nadirjan, in the land of the Murra) on the same day as the battle of Badr (17, 19 or 21 Ramaḍān of the year 2). The Bahrari, allied with the Hamdān, inflicted a severe defeat on the Murra, and Yaghuth remained in their possession. On the "second day of Kulab" (in the Dhahna) the Bahrari (under Nu'mān b. 'Ansāfa) fought against the Tihama, the Dayyan, the Sai'd-Murra, and the Bahrari (under Kays b. 'Aṣim). On the side of the Bahrari were Hamdān, Kinda, Kud'a and other tribes, in all about 8000 strong, divided into four divisions, with four leaders, who all bore the name Yaghuth and were under the supreme command of 'Abd Yaghuth b. Šalāt. In this battle the Bahrari were defeated. The chiefs of the allied armies fell and 'Abd Yaghuth was wounded. Of other battles of the Bahrari we may mention that of Hijra (in Tihama) against the Daws, in which the Bahrari were again defeated, and that of Bait al-Dhahāb.

We find the Bahrari already in possession of Nadirjan when the 'Azd, with whom they had many disputes, left the Yemen under 'Amr b. 'Amir Mūsā b. 'Abd al-Malik, who summoned the Bahrari of Nadirjan to arrive at a treaty. When Muhammad's call had gone out through all Arabia, the Christians among the Bahrari (in about 6/630) sent a deputation to the Prophet in Medina, which consisted mainly of ecclesiastics, including a bishop, Abuga'ibah. They arranged an interview with the Prophet at a place near Medina, where they were to undergo a trial by the ordeal called mubdha'ta (ceremony of objuration). But when they were convinced of Muhammad's mission and feared a defeat, they begged the Prophet to cancel the arrangement. The Prophet agreed on condition that they paid tribute. In Rabii' I of the year 10/632 Muhammad sent Khaibāl b. Wālī with 480 men to the Bahrari to demand that they should adopt Islam. Those who were Heathen and a number of the Christians submitted and Khaibāl remained among them to instruct them in the Kur'an and the institutions of Islam. After some time Khaibāl returned with a deputation of the Bahrari (among them two members of the Christian family of 'Abd al-Madān) to the Prophet. Muhammad dismissed the deputation and appointed one of them, Kays b. al-Husayn, amir of the Bahrari. Then in 11/633 the false prophet al-Awasad al-Ansī [q.v.], appeared the Bahrari, influenced by his emissaries, followed him. They drove out the governor of Nadirjan (Amr b. Hāzm) and the al-Awasad entered the town in triumph. The Muslims remained faithful to Islam under Abū Bakr, and the Christians renewed the treaty.

Bibliography: Wüstenfeld, Genealog. Tabellen, table 8, 16, and Register, 210; Yaqūt, index s.v.; Hamdāni, Dižiartar, index s.v., and 55, 81 ff.; 83, 91 ff.; 93, 16 ff.; 169, 71 ff.; H. Ritter, Erdbünde, xii, 6; Tabari, Annales, i, 1724-7 and index s.v.; Aghāni, x, 82; xiv, 26; xv, 73 and index s.v.; Ibn Hāshim, 401, 958-62; (transl.) A. Guillaume, The Life of Muhammad, 270-7, 645-8; Ibn Sa'd, index (part iii) s.v.; Caesar in Perceval, 'Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme, index s.v. Hārith (Benou-l)-ibn-Cab; Caietani, Annali, year 10, §§ 4 ff.; Sprenger, Mohammad, iii, 512-19; W. M. Watt, Muhammad at Medina, index s.v.; O. Blau, Arabien im sechsten Jahrhundert, in ZDMG, xxii, 562.
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Allah al- Kasri [q.v.], succeeded by vigorous action in recapitulating Balgh and compelled al-Harith to cross the Oxus. Al-Harith, aided by the forces of the local leaders, laid siege to Tirmidh, but failed to conquer the city and was compelled to retreat to the fortress of Tabushkân in Turkhastân. A force sent by Asad under the command of Djuday al-Kirmâni besieged the fortress; the adherents of al-Harith insisted on leaving and surrendered to the besieging force. Some of them were decapitated; the women were sold as slaves (118/736).

Al-Harith with his force joined the Khabkân of the Turgesh [q.v.]. He fought valiantly on the Khabkán's side in the encounter of Kharistân and defended his retreat when his army was defeated (119/737). Al-Harith assisted the Khabkân in the preparations for a new expedition and received from the Khabkân 5000 horses. The Khabkân was, however, murdered and the power of the Turgesh collapsed. Asad died in 120/738.

The new governor, Naṣr b. Sayyâr, marched in 122/740 with an army against Shâsh, which served as a base for the forces of al-Harith. There was an encounter between the troops of Naṣr and al-Harith but the battle between the forces of Shâsh and the army of Naṣr was prevented by an agreement between them, by which the ruler of Shâsh would deport al-Harith to Farab. The assumption of the city and was compelled to retreat to the fortress of Shâsh (118/736).

The Khakan was, however, murdered and the power of the Turgesh collapsed. Asad died in 120/738.

The new governor, Naṣr b. Sayyâr, marched in 122/740 with an army against Shâsh, which served as a base for the forces of al-Harith. There was an encounter between the troops of Naṣr and al-Harith but the battle between the forces of Shâsh and the army of Naṣr was prevented by an agreement between them, by which the ruler of Shâsh would deport al-Harith to Farab. The assumption of the city and was compelled to retreat to the fortress of Shâsh (118/736).

Naṣr apprehended that the dangerous rebel might incite the Turkish rulers to lead a new expedition against him. These fears would seem to be reasonable in view of the instability of the central government after the death of Hishám, the tensions between the Muqarrab and the Yemenis in Khurásân, as well as the dissatisfaction of the native rulers with the power of Shâsh. This explains why Naṣr pleaded with the Caliph, Yazid b. al-Walîd, to pardon al-Harith. The letter of safe-conduct granted to al-Harith by the Caliph promised to return the confiscated property of the adherents of al-Harith and to act according to the ordinances of “The Book and the Sunna”.

When al-Harith came back to Marw in 127/745 he reiterated his request to act in accordance with the ordinances of “The Book and the Sunna”. He justified his struggle against the administration and his secession from the community by the statement that “the few who obey God are many and the many who disobey God are few”. He was welcomed by Naṣr and the people of Marw; his son Muhammad and his daughter al-Allâ, who were detained, were released. Naṣr offered to appoint him as governor of a district, but he refused. He divided the gifts given to him by Naṣr among his adherents. He demanded of Naṣr that he should appoint as officials only decent and righteous people.

Shortly after his arrival, al-Harith was joined by 3000 Tanûmls who gave him the oath of allegiance. He encamped outside Marw, and instructed Djahm b. Saqwân [q.v.] to read his “sûra”, setting himself up against Naṣr. Djuday al-Kirmâni joined al-Harith for a short time. However they fell out, their forces clashed and al-Harith was killed in 128/746.

Al-Harith is mentioned as a Murjî‘î. His secretary was Djahm b. Saqwân. In his political activity he followed in the steps of Abu ‘l-Sâyâdâ, who fought for the rights of the mawâlî; some of the companions of Abu ‘l-Sâyâdâ fought on the side of al-Harith. Al-Harith and his followers are the only group in early Islam which seceded from the community and aided the unbelievers against their brethren with the aim of establishing a government acting according to the ordinances of the Qur’ân and the Sunna. In the force of al-Harith are mentioned “abi al-basîr” people of a religious conviction, whom al-Harith used to consult. When al-Harith returned he came back with his šâhid. The black flags raised by al-Harith seem to have been an imitation of the sunna of the Prophet. A special feature of this peculiar group was the habit of appealing to the enemy during the battle to join them by using moral and religious arguments. Al-Harith seems to have had a feeling of inferiority, as he apparently lived an ascetic life and wanted to establish a just government resembling that of the Prophet and the first Caliphs. He demanded that the principle of election of the Sheikr [q.v.] should be followed. A satirical verse recited after his death claims that he hoped to be a Caliph: “The son of a saddle [Ibn Sard] hopes to be a Caliph: How remote are the means of the Caliphate from a saddle”.


HARITHA B. BADR AL-GHUĐANI, poet and notable of the Tamûni clan of the Banû Ghudâna, at Baṣra. Born probably soon before the Hidjarâ, he appears while still young to have been a follower of the poetess Sâdîqi [q.v.] and then, having settled in Baṣra, he fought at the battle of the Camel [see al-Djâmâlî] against ‘Ali, but afterwards joined his cause; however, as soon as Ziyâd arrived in ‘Irâk in 45/665 he became a fervent supporter of the new governor, who finally entered him on the tribal pay-roll of the Kuraysh to increase his emoluments. Some satirical verses of the poet whom Ziyâd matched against him, Anas b. Abî Unâs, reveal that at some point he was nominated ûmîl of Surrak, in Ahwâz, but it was chiefly during the disturbances which followed the death of Yazid I that he played some part in politics, although this is not made very clear in the sources which allude to it; however, he seems to have taken part in the struggle against the Khârijûs who were threatening Baṣra, and to have met his death by drowning during a campaign, in 64/668 or 66/668 (I. Goldzïher, Muh. St., ii, 158, wrongly gives the date 50).

Hâriţa is a picturesque figure of the first half of the nîth century. Though well known for his eloquence, wisdom and knowledge of historical traditions and genealogy, the reputation that he has left behind is principally that of an inveterate drinker, whose foibles Ziyâd tolerated, whilst his sons were not averse from keeping him company. He may be regarded as one of the first baccic poets of the Muslim period, but almost nothing of his work survives; some gnomic verses of his are still quoted, and also a funeral oration for Ziyâd, part of which has been preserved (see al-Djâbiş, Hayyâwân, vii, 159;
HARITHA B. BADR AL-GHADANI — HARKARN

HARIYANA, name given to the tract of country in the Indian Punjab to the north-west of Dillh, surrounding the towns of Hānṣāl [q.v.] and Ḥiṣār Fīruzā [q.v.]. In the present Hārīyana district and extending east and south of the Rohtā [q.v.] district; it lies south of the Ghaggar stream—which partly coincides with the ancient Saraswati river which once joined the Indus [see SİNDH], but little more than a monsoon drainage channel whose waters are lost in the Rādжаśtān sands—and is traversed by Fīrūz Shāh Tughlūk's West Dīmāna canal [for the history of this see references s.v. ΓΑΜΜΑ]. The name seems to mean "green tract", although the region is now semi-desert (for the modern condition see Regional Geography, London 1954, p. 154-6). A popular etymology connects the name with a legendary king called Hari Cand.

The region was of some strategic importance to the rulers of Dillh, as it lay on the more southerly route to that city from Khurāsān via Mūltān and the southern Pāndjāb (the northern approach to Dillh being through Sirhind [q.v.]). According to a Sanskrit inscription of the time of Ghiyāth al-Ďīn Balban, "Hārīyānaka" was ruled first by the Tomars, then by the Cahāns, then by the "Saka" kings Sāhavadāna (Shihāb al-Ďīn, i.q. Mu‘īz al-Ďīn Muhammad b. Sām), Ṣuduvadāna (Kūfī al-Ďīn Aybak); at this time the Sanskrit character Șa was generally pronounced in north India as kha, etc., down to Gaya-saddar. It passed naturally to the Mughals after their conquest of the conquered districts to the Sīkh in 1797-8 and a Bhattī chief was at one time appointed nāsīm of Ḥiṣār; but neither he nor subsequent governors of Hānṣāl and Ḥiṣār could stem Amar Singh's Sīkh forces, and the whole district fell into Sīkh hands until the Mughal-Sikh treaty of Dījind, in 1781, restored Hārīyana to the Mughal empire, Fāṭehābād and Sīrās to the Bhattīs, and assigned the remainder of the conquered districts to the Sīkhs. In 1797-8 the English adventurer George Thomas overran Hārīyana and established his capital at Hānṣāl; he was eventually overcome by Bourquin for Sīndhia, and in 1803 Hārīyana passed into Marāṭhā hands; in 1803 it was ceded to Sīndhia to the British government.

The district is well known for cattle breeding, and Sūnā cattle are much prized in India.

Bibliography: in addition to references in the article, see the Bibliographies to HANSI, HISAR, ḤIṢĀR FĪRŪZĀ, and ROHTĀK. (J. BURTON-PAGE)

HARKARN, b. MATHURĀDĀS, a Kaśībōh [q.v.] of Mūltān, known chiefly for his collection of letters (inşāb), entitled Irshād al-ṭalābīn but popularly called Inşāb-i Harkarn. Nothing is known about his early life or the teachers from whom he learnt Persia, the court language of the day. He was employed for some time as a secretary (mushāq) by Iṭībār Shāh khwānīdās-sardī, most probably a Hindu convert to Islam and an influential eunuch, who was from very early years a confidant and retainer of the Mughal emperor Diwāṅghūr [q.v.]. It is not exactly known when Harkarn entered the service of Iṭībār Shāh. In 1032/1622 Iṭībār Shāh was appointed governor of Āgra, where Harkarn got the chance to display his literary talents as an official secretary, as he had spent a lifetime in the exercise of that profession (cf. preamble to his Inşāb). After the death of Iṭībār Shāh, later called Muntāz Shāh, Harkarn left Āgra and while in Mathurā, probably on a pilgrimage, he compiled his Inşāb between 1034/1625 and 1040/1631 (cf. Ethē, 205x). Divided into seven bābd (sections) it contains model letters of appointment of state officials, besides various kinds of other official documents (ed. with English translation by Francis Balfour under the title Zahr, 914; Aghdnt, xxi, 20-44, and index; Ibn Durayd, Firdāshī, 160; Ibn ‘Abd Rabbīb, ‘Iltif, 1331/1913 ed., iv, 322-3; Ibn Ḥāḍjar, Isbāba, no. 1937; Ibn Abī ‘l-Hadīd, Shārkh Nāhūl al-balagha, i, 304-3; 385-4; H. Lammens, in RSO, iv, 120-1; idem, Ceylonvadās, Beirut 1935; passim; C. A. Nallina, Letteratura, 146 (Fr. tr., 224-5); Ch. Pellet, Mīsān, 154-6. (H. Lammens-Ch. Pellet)

HARIYANĀ, name given to the tract of country in the Indian Punjab to the north-west of Dillh, surrounding the towns of Hānṣāl [q.v.] and Ḥiṣār Fīruzā [q.v.]. In the present Hārīyana district and extending east and south of the Rohtā [q.v.] district; it lies south of the Ghaggar stream—which partly coincides with the ancient Saraswati river which once joined the Indus [see SİNDH], but little more than a monsoon drainage channel whose waters are lost in the Rādжаśtān sands—and is traversed by Fīrūz Shāh Tughlūk's West Dīmāna canal [for the history of this see references s.v. ΓΑΜΜΑ]. The name seems to mean "green tract", although the region is now semi-desert (for the modern condition see Regional Geography, London 1954, p. 154-6). A popular etymology connects the name with a legendary king called Hari Cand.

The region was of some strategic importance to the rulers of Dillh, as it lay on the more southerly route to that city from Khurāsān via Mūltān and the southern Pāndjāb (the northern approach to Dillh being through Sirhind [q.v.]). According to a Sanskrit inscription of the time of Ghiyāth al-Ďīn Balban, "Hārīyānaka" was ruled first by the Tomars, then by the Cahāns, then by the "Saka" kings Sāhavadāna (Shihāb al-Ďīn, i.q. Mu‘īz al-Ďīn Muhammad b. Sām), Ṣuduvadāna (Kūfī al-Ďīn Aybak); at this time the Sanskrit character Șa was generally pronounced in north India as kha, etc., down to Gaya-saddar. It passed naturally to the Mughals after their conquest of the conquered districts to the Sīkhs. In 1797-8 the English adventurer George Thomas overran Hārīyana and established his capital at Hānṣāl; he was eventually overcome by Bourquin for Sīndhia, and in 1803 Hārīyana passed into Marāṭhā hands; in 1803 it was ceded to Sīndhia to the British government.

The district is well known for cattle breeding, and Sūnā cattle are much prized in India.
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HARKARN — AL-HARRA

1831; lith. Lahore 1869, 1871). The Inshār of Harkarn was used by the British in India, during the days of the East India Company, as a model for diplomatic correspondence with the native princes and potentates. It was also extensively used in maktabs (primary schools) and madrasas in India to give a good grounding to students in Persian letter-writing. With the discontinuance of Persian as the court language this book fell into disuse.


HARRA, a basalt desert, "a district covered with black broken stones, which looks as if it had been burned by fire". Such harras, which owe their origin to subterranean volcanoes which have repeatedly covered the undulating desert with a bed of lava, are found particularly in the east of Hawrān and stretch from there to Medina. Al-Samhūl, Khuldsat al-wafa bi-akhbār ddr al-Mustafīd, Mecca ed., 1316, 38 gives a detailed description of a great earthquake at Medina which began on 5 Jumādā II 654/26 June 1256 and lasted several days (see also Wüstenfeld, Geschichte von Madynia). There is perhaps, as Wetzstein suggested, an allusion to these fearful stony wastes in Jeremiah xvi 6 (Dmnd). Yākūt, ii, 247 ff., details no less than 29 of these harras with their names (see ZDMG, xxli (1868), 385-6). An accurate map, with an index of names to the whole territory in which harras are found, is published in the Zeitschr. des Deutsch. Palästinaevers, xiii, in the narrative of A. Stübel's journey to Direk al-Tufil and Hawrān (1882). The same author has also discussed the supposed origin of such deserts of stones in Die Vulkanberge von Ecuador after v. Oppenheim, Vom Mittelemeer zum Pers. Golf, i, 90, note 5 (where also, i, 89 ff., bibliographical references are given). See also v. Oppenheim in Petermanns Mitteil., 1896 (Zur Routenakte ihrer Reise von Damaskus nach Baṣra in dem Jahre 1893); Doughty, Travels in Arabia Deserta, Cambridge 1888, 24, 419 f. and index; D. G. Hogarth, The penetrated of Arabia, London 1904, 4, 81, 168 f., 259, 284, 339; H. Lammens, Le berceau de VIslam, Rome 1914, 72. (Ed.)

AL-HARRA. Of all the harras dealt with in the preceding article, the one that stretches through the gardens of Medina on the northeastern side of the town, known as the Harrat Wākīm, became, thanks to a famous battle in 63/668, al-Harra par excellence.

The situation in Medina was seriously disturbed some time after the accession to the throne of Muʿāwiyah's son Yazid. It led to a rebellion provoked by the indignation felt by men of piety at Yazid's scandalous mode of life. Yazid's conduct and the conviction that it was impossible to obey an imām of such a type. Beneath the religious aspects of the movement, economic motives may have been concealed. For it is certainly possible that the interests of a great part of the local elements had been upset or threatened in a general way by Muʿāwiyah's fiscal reforms, which compelled the provinces to contribute towards the expenses of the State, and, in particular, by the reorganization of the system of pensions, which Muʿāwiyah had proposed to establish upon the basic principle that pensions must be the reward for services, especially military, rendered to the government (cf. Lammens, Le califat de Yazid Ier, 408-413); in the Holy Cities there was a group of individuals and families, their exact number difficult to define, who, under this principle, could no longer be on the pay-roll in their capacity as heirs of the first beneficiaries of pensions.

The governor of Medina, ʿUṯmān b. Muḥammad b. Abī Sufyān, appointed by Yazid (end of 62/668 or beginning of 63/669), was too young and inexperienced to control the situation (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 402). The caliph proposed (al-Balāḏūrī, 31) that a Medinese delegation should be sent to him in the hope of being reconciled with the malcontents by means of his generosity, but the delegates, though loaded with gifts and bounties, on their return to the Hijāz incited their fellow-citizens to revolt by their accounts of the caliph's scandalous mode of life.

Alarmed by the situation in the Hijāz, Yazid once again tried the method of conciliation: he sent, first to Medina, then to Mecca, a mission headed by al-Nuʿmān b. Baṣhir [q.v.], but it did not succeed in restoring calm. The Medinese malcontents found an opportunity to come out in open revolt when a mausil arrived to supervise the harvests from the lands (sawāfi) belonging to the caliph. A scene then took place in the chief mosque (beginning of 63/668) that is reminiscent of pre-Islamic customs: the rebels took off their sandals, turbans and burnous which had been used in the court-yard of Medina and which, on the other hand, lays stress on the Ansār. Yazid, they were dissatisfied with this choice, which gave predominance to the Ansār, they also nominated 'Abd Allāh b. Muṭṭī al-Adawī as commander of the group of the Medinans and Maʿṣūd, and Maʿṣūd b. Simān al-Aḥsāʾī commander of the non-Kurayshī Muḥājjirūn. (It should be noted here that the Tālibīs and the ʿAbbāsīs had refrained from joining the dissidents and continued to hold aloof when the revolt broke out.) Wellhausen observes, we think justly, that in this great revolt the Ansār did not fight for themselves as a separate party. Lammens, on the other hand, lays stress on the Ansār, the character of the movement itself and even if the Tālibīs were in majority in Medina and included the most active agitators there, the presence of groups of Kurayshī and non-Kurayshī Muḥājjirūn, exerting such pressure that it was decided to give them their own chiefs, contradicts his opinion.

After the scene in the mosque, the attitude of the rebels towards the Umayyads became so aggressive that the latter, with their maʿṣūdās, adherents and servants, gathered together inside the precincts of Marwān's houses (dār) outside the town and appealed to the caliph for immediate aid. Though disguised by their lack of initiative (for in fact they numbered about a thousand men), Yazid decided to send an army to the Hijāz; but the principal objective was to subdue Ibn al-Zubayr, since it was thought that a military demonstration would suffice to bring the Medinese to heel. The choice of a general presented difficulties. 'Amr b. Saʿīd al-Asḥāḏ [q.v.], a former governor of Medina, refused the mission since he was unwilling to shed the blood "of Kurayshī", and 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād [q.v.] certainly had no desire, after the slaughter of the 'Alīds at Karbala', to undertake a second equally odious campaign. Yazid then approached ʿUṯmān b. ʿUṯmān b. Merri [q.v.], an old soldier who was deeply devoted to the Umayyads and who did not strive in matters of discipline. Since
he was of great age and his infirmities had grown worse during the preparations for the expeditionary force. Muslim set off in a litter.

Although the exact numerical strength of his army cannot be given (estimates vary from 4,000 to 12,000 men), it is at least possible to say that it had been very well equipped, in anticipation of a difficult and detested campaign; each soldier received a bonus of 100 dinars, in addition to his ordinary full pay.

On the news of Muslim's advance, the rebels tightened their siege of the där; finally the Umayyads were forced to make a sortie. This sortie would not give any assistance to the Syrian army; they met Muslim at Wādī l-Kūrā; a number of them continued their journey towards Syria, but the greater part, with Marwān at their head, joined the expeditionary force.

Reaching the oasis of Medina, Muslim went to pitch his camp on the härta. The Medinees had had time to dig and fortify a trench, on the vulnerable side of the town (or to repair the one dug by the Prophet in 5/627), and it was there that a severe battle took place when the three days' respite allowed by Muslim for negotiation had elapsed and when a final appeal for unity had failed. The offer of two annual payments made by Muslim in the caliph's name, and the promise of a marked reduction in the price of corn (al-Bayyāqī, 65, etc.) provide further, and specific, proof that economic motives also had led the Medinees to revolt. Muslim controlled his troops' movements from the top of a platform (hursū) or stretcher (saris), but it seems that when the Medineese cavalry charged and reached their tent he mounted his horse and took an active part in the battle, at least during the critical moments (al-Tābari, ii, 414-6). At first, the battle went in favour of the rebels, but it ended in the defeat of the Medinees when Marwān obtained permission from the Banū Ḥāritha to pass through them with their quarter of a detachment of cavalry and took the defenders of the trench from the rear. The Medinees fled "like ostriches"; the Kurāyshīs were the first to take to flight and seek refuge in Mecca. Ibn Ḥaṣanla resisted bravely and fell with his eight sons (or most of them) and a handful of men as resolute as himself. Pursuing the fugitives into the town, the Syrians abandoned themselves to an appalling pillage which continued for three days and which drove out, after swearing that they would recognize themselves to be the slaves of the caliph, who was thus free to sell them and their possessions alike. Some individuals who refused to submit to this demand or who stipulated as a condition for their bay'a that Yazid should undertake to follow the Kurān and the Sunna of the Prophet (according to one account, also that of Abū Bakr and 'Umar) were executed. Among those whom Muslim did not spare was his old friend Maṣ'īl b. Sinān, leader of the Muḥājirūn during the revolt (but he had sworn that, if he met him, he would kill him). One of the caliph 'Uṯmān's sons, who was suspected of having wanted to play a double game, had his beard torn out.

For the pre-Islamic history of Harrān reference may be made to A. Mez's monograph (Die Stadt Harran bis zum Einfall der Araber, Strassburg 1892) and Weis-
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bach's article in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. xo$dcv (pp. 2009-21). Harran was peacefully occupied by the Arabs during the Caliphate of 'Umar in 19/640. At that time it was named Haran in Arabic. The town was built on the bank of the river Dîyâr Muşlar. According to Balâdhûrî, who gives a full account of the conquest of the Dîjâzra, Harran capitulated to 'Iyâdh ibn Ghânam (Balâdhûrî, Fûsûk, 174). Ibn Abî Usaybi'â states that the Umayyad Caliph 'Umar II transferred a school of medicine from Alexandria to Harran ("Uyûn al-andalû fi tabâbût al-âlîbî", ed. Müller, Cairo 1882, i, 170). Mayyâd ibn Mâdin Harrân in his Hâjmâ' of Harran is mentioned in the capital of the Umayyad Empire. Though information about his building activities is meagre, we may presume that the first mosque of Harran was constructed during his reign (see below). Ya'sûbî mentions that Marwân built his palace in a place called dobbâb al-bayyân and spent some 10 million dirhems on it (Ta'ârikh, ii, 405). Mez tried to identify the Citadel with Marwân's palace (op. cit., 11), but D. S. Rice refuted his theory (see D. S. Rice, Medieval Harran, in Anatolian Studies, ii (1952), 38). When the 'Abbâsids occupied Iran and the larger part of Mesopotamia, it was from Harran that Marwân set out at the head of an army of 14,000 to meet the 'Abbâsîd army. After his defeat the palace at Harran was looted and destroyed (Tabari, iii, 45).

During the 'Abbâsîd period Harrân is not mentioned until Hârûn al-Rashîd's time, when he constructed a canal from the river Dîjûlbâb to Harrân to assure the water supply of the city. Then in 213/828 the Caliph al-Ma'mûn passed through the town during his campaign against the Byzantines. It was at that time that al-Ma'mûn offered the heathen inhabitants the choice between the adoption of Islam, or of any one of the tolerated religions, or extermination. They claimed to be Sâbi'ans, which was one of the accepted religions, and that saved them from extermination (Ibn al-Nadîm al-Bâghdâdî, al-Fihrist, translated in Chwolson, Die Sabier und der Sabismus, St. Petersburg 1836, ii, 14-17). Harrân played an important part in the cultural field during the early 'Abbâsîd period. The town was the home of one of the most important schools of translators, and under the guidance of Thabit b. Qurra (q.v.) Sâbi'ân scholars translated Greek literature, as well as the works of the Saba'ïc mathematicians and astronomy into Arabic. The famous astronomer al-Battâni (q.v.), Albântenius in Latin, was a native of Harran and worked there. Harrân was also a Hânbal stronghold (Muhammad Dâmil al-Shâti, Mukhtâsar Tabâbût al-Ifandîâl, Damascus 1339/1920, 48). The Sâbi'ans did not enjoy religious freedom for very long; their persecution started in the early 5th/11th century, and the last Sâbi'ân temple was destroyed at that time.

Harrân subsequently came under the suzerainty of a nomad petty dynasty, the Numayrids (q.v.). The dynasty was founded by a certain Wâthibbâb (380-410/990-1019) (Rice, op. cit., 56-7, and 74-84). There is an inscription on the south-east gateway of the Citadel, which gives the name of Manî', the third Numayrid ruler. The inscription gives the date 451/1059, which means that he must have been the lord of Harrân by that time. He maintained the position until his death in 456/1063 (Rice, op. cit., 53 and 55). The Numayrids recognized the suzerainty of the Fatimid caliphs, who ruled over Harrân and the region until 474/1081. In that year the 'Ukayyîd Shârâf al-Dawla, an ally of the Sâbi'â'ât, occupied Harrân. Yahyâ b. al-Shâ'îrî was appointed governor of the city, but two years later the Harrânians rebelled against him and expelled the Sâbi'â'ât. The rebellion was quickly and cruelly suppressed. After the Crusaders occupied Edessa they cut off the water supply from Harrân in 1104 (Rice, in Anatolian Studies, ii (1952), 38). 'Ummâd al-Dîn Zangî founded the Zangid dynasty in Mosul and attached Harrân to his principality in 521/1127. Harrân flourished and was beautified by Nur al-Dîn, who took possession of the city in 544/1149, and later by Saladin. It became customary at about that time to appoint two governors of Harrân, one for the city and another for the citadel. By the end of the 6th/12th century, Muhammad al-Dîn Abâ Sa'id Gûkûbî was the lord of Harrân, having received the city as a fief in 557/1161 (Ibn al-Athir, xi, 37). It was in Gûkûbî's time, in 1184, that the famous Spanish-Arab traveller, Ibn Qûbays, visited Harran and gave a detailed account of its mosques and bazaars (see below). Muhammad al-Dîn recognized the suzerainty of Saladin. It was Saladin who enlarged and re-decorated the Great Mosque of the city. The enlargement was necessary since the number of Muslims had greatly increased. Later, in 587/1191, Saladin offered Harrân to his brother, al-Malîk al-'Adîl, who rebuilt the citadel (Ibn Shaddâd, al-A'zîbî fî mû'arrâ' al-Shâm wa 'l-dawrîs wa 'l-dajâsra, Bodleian Library MS, tr. in Rice, op. cit., 45). There were two great earthquakes in Harrân during the 6th/12th century, the first in 508/1114 and the second, the stronger, in 552/1161. Between 509 and 565/1103 and 1228-9, Hâdîbî 'Ali was governor of Harrân for the Ayyûbîd Sultan al-Malîk al-Asghaf (Ibn Shaddâd, Rice's tr., op. cit., 42). In 653/1237 the Khârizmians, fleeing from the Mongols, occupied the town of Harrân, and afterwards the citadel. Three years later, in 658/1220, the town and the citadel were re-taken by the Ayyûbîd al-Malîk al-Nâşir. Ayyûbîd rule in Harrân, and Harrân's history as a city, however, soon came to an end. Shortly after the Mongols appeared before its gates, first the city, and shortly afterwards the citadel, surrendered peacefully to them. Abu 'l-Kâsim, the grandson of the famous Shaykh Hayâtî, whose shrine still stands outside the city walls to the west (see below), negotiated with Hulagu over the surrender of the citadel (D. S. Rice, A Muslim shrine ..., 477). After the Mamlûk victory over the Mongols in 703/1303, the Dîjâzra, including Harrân, came under Mamlûk rule. The town, however, was never rebuilt. The citadel, it seems, fulfilled an important function in 715/1315, as is attested by an inscription on its south-west tower (see below). Today the whole town is in ruins, inhabited only by nomad Beduins who live in mud-brick bee-hive huts.

ii. — ARCHITECTURE

The town, which was oblong in shape, was surrounded by a stone wall surmounted by intermediate towers and intersected by eight gates (Pl. IX, nos. 5-12). The perimeter of the town is given in a manuscript as 7612 cubits, that is 3943 metres (Rice, in Anatolian Studies, ii (1952), 38). The ruins of Harrân in modern times were mentioned and its plan shown
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for the first time by E. Sachau (Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien, Leipzig 1883, 223) and a quick survey was carried out by C. Feurres in 1911 (Nordmesopotamische Baudenkmäler, Leipzig 1911, Tafeln 72-77). Our knowledge of the town and its monuments, however, is mainly derived from the full survey of the town carried out by Seton Lloyd and W. C. Brice in July 1950 (Harran, in Anatolian Studies, i (1951), 77-111, plan of the site on p. 85), and from the excavations of the late D. S. Rice. The following main monuments and ruins have been recorded: (a) the Great Mosque, or Djami al-Firdawis (no. 1 on Pl. IX); (b) the Citadel (no. 2); (c) a basilican church near the north-east corner of the site (not marked on the plate); (d) a large mound, south of the mosque, ca. 28 m. high (no. 3); (e) the Mausoleum of Shaykh Hayat (no. 4); and (f) traces of eight gates in the city wall (nos. 5-12), of which the Aleppo gate (no. 12) is particularly interesting as it has been fairly well preserved.

Rice worked at Harran in 1951-52, 1956 and 1959. In that year he traced the history of the Citadel, which can be dated to the 7th/8th century (see D. S. Rice, Mediaeval Harrân: Studies on its topography and monuments I, in Anatolian Studies, ii (1952), 36-84; idem, Unique Dog sculptures of Mediaeval Islam, in The Illustrated London News, cxxxi, 20 September 1952, 466-67). He carried out a two-week season in 1952 and a three-week season in 1956, on both occasions working in the Great Mosque (see From Sin to Saladin: Excavations in Harran’s Great Mosque . . ., in The Illustrated London News, cxxxi, September 1957, 466-9: also Seton Lloyd, Seeking the Temple of Sin, Moon-God of Harran, and light on the strange Saban sect through 1400 years, in The Illustrated London News, cxxxi, 21 February 1953, 288; the Director’s report in Anatolian Studies, vii (1957), 6); and a final excavation between 15 July and 7 September 1959. In that year the work in the Great Mosque was completed and the plan of the mosque established, a deep sounding having been made on the high mound south of the mosque (cf. Director’s report in Anatolian Studies, x (1960), 8).

(a) The Citadel (Pl. IX, no. 2) was mentioned for the first time by Mukaddasi in the 4th/10th century. Ibn Djugayr, who visited Harran in 1580/1184, describes it as a very strong fortress with a moat around it paved with stones (Ribl, ed. de Goeje, Leyden 1907, 257). Ibn Shaddâd remarked that the Citadel was called al-Mudawwar “the round one” (cf. Rice, in Anatolian Studies, ii, 37). Hâmid Allâh Mustawfî called it Kalât nadim, “the star citadel”, and gave its perimeter as 1350 paces and the height of the walls as 30 ells (cf. Nushat al-kuhbat, ed. G. Le Strange, London 1915, 103). Nearly all Arabic sources mention that there was a Sûrân temple inside the Citadel. The Citadel is in the southeast corner of the town. It is an irregular rectangle with an eleven-sided tower on three of its four corners. There must have been a fourth tower, but that has been destroyed. Lloyd and Brice gave the Citadel’s dimensions as 130 x 90 metres (Anatolian Studies, i, 97). It had three storied and about 150 chambers, some of them with brick vaulting. Lloyd and Brice recognized four building periods in the Citadel. They presumed that the first period elements, forming the nucleus of the structure, must have been erected well before Islam; the second and third periods they dated to Islamic times; and the fourth period they considered to be Crusader, by reason of an ornamental archway behind the west tower (op. cit., 79, 101, and 104). The Crusaders, however, never occupied Harran. Of the three surviving towers, the one in the West corner is the best preserved (Pl. Xa). There are two solid towers forming an entrance in the south-eastern side of the enclosure. That gateway deserves special attention, as Rice exposed it in 1952. The entrance has a horse-shoe arch springing from two moulded imposts decorated with guilloche patterns. Below the impost are two pairs of dogs in relief on either side, represented with their heads facing backwards and with collars on their necks (Rice, in Anatolian Studies, ii, fig. vii, 64). At the time of the survey Rice found fragments of a Kufic inscription giving the name of Mannî, the third ruler of the Numayrid dynasty, and the date of construction 451/1059. From the Kufic inscription and the glazed pottery excavated in the gateway, Rice concluded that this part of the Citadel dated from the 11th/12th century (Rice, in Anatolian Studies, ii, 42 f.; idem, in The Illustrated London News, ccxxi, September 1952, 466-7). The walls and towers represent the second building phase in its structural history as recognized and mentioned by Lloyd and Brice. The third phase of building can be explained by Ibn Shaddâd’s account, which states that the Citadel was rebuilt by al-Malik al-Adîd, to whom the town of Harran and the Citadel were given by his brother Saladin in 587/1193 (Rice, in Anatolian Studies, ii, 45). There is a second, undated, inscription on the wall of the south-western tower, which is Mamlûk in character. It refers to a restoration of the Citadel. Rice attributes it to al-Malik al-Nâṣîr, who sent an expedition to Malatya in 715/1315 (Rice, in Anatolian Studies, ii, fig. 1, pp. 46-7). That must have been the latest phase in the history of the Citadel. Finally, Rice mentioned that there were no pre-Islamic structures visible in the Citadel. Further excavations are required to establish its earlier history.

(b) The Great Mosque or Djamiâ‘ al-Firdaws (no. 1 on Plate IX and Plate Xa). Ibn Djugayr, who visited Harran in 580/1184, gave a detailed description of the Great Mosque and praised its beauty. He mentioned that it had a great courtyard, in which there was a domed structure, that there were three more domes in the building, and that the sanctuary had five aisles and 19 doors opening into it—nine doors on either side and ten on the 15th under a big central arch (Ribl, 245). The plan of the mosque was first drawn by Feurres in 1906 (Nordmesopotamische Baudenkmäler, Leipzig 1911, Tafel 73), and later by Creswell in 1919 and 1930 (plan published in Early Muslim architecture, i, fig. 489). The earliest history of the mosque is not known, as the historians are silent on the subject. Though there are no reports that Marwan II, when he made Harran his capital, erected a congregational mosque there, we may presume that he did so. The great square minaret in the northern part of its building, still preserved up to 26 m., is regarded as dating from the Umayyad period (Plate Xb). Creswell assumes that after 215/830, when the Caliph al-Ma’mûn forced the pagan inhabitants to choose between the adoption of Islam or any one of the tolerated religions, many of them became Muslims, and therefore the number of Muslims greatly increased. Therefore, the Congregational Mosque of Marwân II may have been enlarged (Creswell, op. cit., i, 409). There is no reference to such work, but it is known from an inscription that Nûr al-Dîn restored, embellished and enlarged the
mosque.

Rice's excavations in 1952, 1956 and 1959 established a plan of the mosque which differed from that of Creswell. (The new plan of the Great Mosque is to be published shortly in Creswell's new edition of Early Muslim Architecture, i.e. a monograph on the Great Mosque is under preparation by R. H. Pinder-Wilson, D. Strong and R. W. Hamilton.) The mosque is a square enclosure measuring 103 × 103 m. It had three entrances, one on each side except the kibla wall. There was a large court-yard surrounded by porticoes, one on the north side, one on the west, and two on the east. There were nineteen openings into the sanctuary, the central one being under a great arch, just as described by Ibn Djubayr. The ornamentation of this great arch betrays an Ayyubid origin. A capital near the east wall has an inscription giving the date of the completion of Nur al-Din's work as 570/1174 (Rice, in The Illustrated London News, ccxxi, September 1957, p. 467, fig. 13.) There were four aisles in the sanctuary (not five as mentioned by Ibn Djubayr), formed by three arches. The first arcade was formed by single columns, although its central arch was supported by two pairs of columns. The pavement of the first aisle is different from that of the other three, which, as Rice concluded, may indicate an addition of Nur al-Din (Rice, op. cit., 467). The arches of the facade of the sanctuary were supported by pilasters to which columns were attached. Inside the sanctuary the arcades differed from one another. The first arcade had double columns resting on rectangular bases; the second arcade was formed by single columns, although its central arch was supported by two pairs of columns. The third arcade, next to the kibla wall, was rather complicated, having pilasters alternating with pairs of columns, which may indicate a different building period. Rice has already suggested that there are indications that the mosque may once have contained only two aisles (Rice, op. cit., 468). The mihrab was semicircular, and was situated some 5 metres to the east of the axis of the building. There was also a flat-mikhrab on the kibla wall, west of the semicircular mihrab (Rice, op. cit., 468). The best preserved parts of the mosque are the eastern facade of the mosque and the square minaret which was attached to the Northern section of the building (Plate Xb). In each of the three entrances Rice found basalt slabs dating from the time of the Sassanids (6th century B.C.), incorporating relief figures, one of which represents the Moon-God Sin, the second one the Sun-God, Shamash, while the third figure has not yet been identified (Rice, op. cit., 468). Rice's excavations not only established the plan of the Great Mosque but also confirmed that the larger part of the building is visible to-day dates from the Ayyubid period.

The mausoleum of Shaykh Hayyân (no. 4 on Plate IX). This small mausoleum is outside the city walls to the east, close to the north-western corner of the town. According to Christian tradition, this was either the grave of Terah, Abraham's father (B. P. Badger, The Nestorians and their Rituals, London 1852, i, 342), or the ruins of St. John's church (Mez, op. cit., 15, and Rice, A Muslim Shrine . . . . 436). When Ibn Djubayr visited the place there was a small mosque there and the dwelling place of the Shaykh. In the published work of Ibn Djubayr the Shayh's name is given as Abu 'l-Baraka Hayyân b. 'Abd al-'Aziz (Ribla, 244). Rice studied and photographed the small enclosure and described it as consisting of a small mosque and a mausoleum or siyâra of the Shaykh. It is a domed building dating from the Ayyubid period. The building has been restored several times and there are some later additions (Rice, op. cit., 436). There is an inscription on the east wall of the building, first incorrectly interpreted and published by M. van Berchem. The correct interpretation, however, is provided by Rice. The inscription states that the shrine was erected by Shaykh Umar, son of Shaykh Hayyân, and gives the date as Dju màdá II 592/ May 1196 (Rice, op. cit., 437-8, Pl. IV). Rice points out that the Shaykh's name is missing from the manuscript of Ibn Djubayr, and that the name Hayyân was incorrectly inserted by the editor (Rice, op. cit., 439-40). This small building is used to-day as a mosque.

(d) The city gates (nos. 5-12 on Plate IX). Ibn Shaddâd enumerates eight city gates, starting in the south and proceeding clockwise: Báb al-Ra'qqa (no. 10 on Plate IX), Báb al-Kabîr (no. 11), Báb al-Niyyâr ("the Gate of the Fires"), Báb Yazid, Báb al-Faddân, Báb al-Šaghîr, Báb al-Sîrî, and Báb al-Mâ'sî (Rice, Medieval Harran, in The Illustrated London News, ccxxi, 1952, 467). The best preserved gate is the one north of the Great Mosque but also confirmed that the larger part of the building which is visible to-day dates from the Ayyubid period.

(e) The bazaars. Very little is known about the bazaars of Harrân. Ibn Djubayr mentions them, saying that they were very well arranged, that they were roofed, and that at every point where four roads met there was a great dome. He also states that the Djâmis Masqûd adjoins the markets (Ribla, 245). Ibn Djubayr's last sentence gives some clue to the whereabouts of the bazaars, though they are also visible on Strzygowski's photographs (Amida, Heidelberg 1910, figs. 269, 281). To obtain further knowledge of the bazaars and of some other monuments of Harrân, or to find the Sâbian temple, which must have been very close to the Great Mosque, the continuation of Rice's excavations is essential. Bibliography: in the text.

HARRÁNIANS [see Šâbî'â].
HARRAR [see HÂRAK].
HARSUSI [see Hârsâs].
HÂRTÂN [pl. HÂRÂTÎN], the name given, in north-west Africa, to certain elements of the population of the oases in the Saharan zone. From the ethnic point of view, they seem to have arisen from inter-breeding, perhaps at some very remote period, between white invaders and the indigenous negroid inhabitants (calling to mind the enigmatic Bâfîr in Mauritania). But the ethnic type of the Hârtân is markedly different from that of the Negros; those from Southern Morocco are sometimes even of a mongolid type. Rather than being a distinct race, they constitute, in the eyes of the other native inhabitants, above all a kind of caste, formed of men theoretically free but of an inferior status, ranking between the abdrâr "free men" and the abîd "slaves, captives": peasants.

A sedentary population, they cultivate the palm-groves on behalf of the landlords to whom they are "attached". In Mauritania, however, the nomads
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share. It was therefore a matter of course that the grateful Harun should bestow the right to govern on Yahya b. al-Aghlab, who thus became one of the two sons of al-Faḍl and Dja'far, remained in power for about 27 years. Their downfall in Muḥarram 187/January 803 marked, more or less, the end of the importance of the viziers as initiators of policies and not merely heads of the administration. Political necessity drew al-Raḥid to rely more and more on his maqādil and eunuchs, who were entirely dependent on the Caliph and the Abbasids. They, in fact, proved to be equal to their task in many decisive moments (Tabari, iii, 678, 682, 705, 716, etc.) and played an important rôle in controlling other political groupings.

Despite the glorious picture of the golden age, Harun’s reign was, in fact, a long sequence of political disturbances flaring up in the eastern parts as well as in the western parts of the empire. Syria, a province inhabited by unruly tribes with Umayyad sympathies, never ceased to be the bitter enemy of the Abbāsids. Frequent fights between the two rival factions, the Yamān and the Muṣṣarīf, eventually developed into a war with the Abbāsīd army, because governors used to take sides with one faction against the other. The feud continued with brief intervals until 180/796, when the situation became so serious that al-Raḥid had to send Dja'far b. Yahya, who succeeded in quietening the situation and dispersing the tribes. Al-Raḥid’s move to al-Raṣkā [q.v.] at about this time was partly due to the disturbances in Syria (Tabari, iii, 706). As to the Egyptian risings of 172/788 and 178/794-5, they were mainly due to maladministration and arbitrary taxation, as Egypt had to subsidise the Abbāsīd army fighting in Ifriqiya. But Harṭama b. Aʿyān was able to restore peace to Egypt. Instability in Ifriqiya started after the death of the competent governor Yazid b. Hāṭim al-Muhallabī [q.v.] in 170/786, and successive governors failed to restore order. Harṭama b. Aʿyān [q.v.] was able to subdue ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Djārīd’s rebellion in ʿAyārwānī in 178/794-5, but disturbances flared up again in 180/797 and al-Raḥid consented to bestow the governorship of Ifriqiya on Ibrahim b. al-Aghlab [q.v.] only in return for an annual payment of 40,000 dinars. The province, however, suffered heavily in Spain with the establishment of the Umayyad dynasty (158/775) and in al-Maḥrib with the foundation of the Idrisid dynasty (172/788), which was aggravated in Ifriqiya by the foundation of the Aḥlabīd [q.v.] dynasty (184/800), alleviated in the last case however by financial benefits to the central treasury.

Finally the Yemen was a place of unrest owing to the local risings due to the incompetence of the successive governors. The disturbances continued even in the western parts of the empire. Syria, a province inhabited by unruly tribes with Umayyad sympathies, never ceased to be the bitter enemy of the Abbāsids. The latter broke out in Sistan when Hamza occupied Harat in 179/795 and extended his authority to Kirmān and, in 180/796, al-Raḥid was unable to prevent the rebellion of the Sadīgīdīs, who were entirely dependant on the Caliph and his maqādil and eunuchs, who were entirely dependent on the Caliph and the Abbasids. They, in fact, proved to be equal to their task in many decisive moments (Tabari, iii, 678, 682, 705, 716, etc.) and played an important rôle in controlling other political groupings.
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trative unit called al-'Awasim [q.v.] with a centre in Mambid. In 181/797, al-Rashid profited by the Byzantine internal troubles as well as their conflict with the Bulgarians, and took the formation of al-Šaṣafī, while a division of his army penetrated as far as Ancyra. The empire Irene (better known in Muslim sources as Ughusta [i.e., Augusta]), then already the real ruler of the Byzantine State (797-802), demanded a peace treaty which al-Rashid first refused and subsequently accepted because of the Kaḫar menace. But when Nicephorus ascended the throne in 802, hostilities were renewed and al-Rashid himself led the Muslim army in 187/803 and 190/806. In the second expedition al-Rashid met with considerable success, taking Heraclea and Tyana. Nicephorus, threatened by the Bulgarians from the east, had to accept a very humiliating peace-treaty by which he had to pay personal poll tax on behalf of himself and his son.

Having chosen 'Irāk as their residence, the 'Abbasids had lost interest in the Mediterranean fleet. Al-Rashid was the first 'Abbasid Caliph to pay attention to naval power. Successful raids on Cyprus in 190/805 and Rhodes in 192/807 had no lasting effect. It might seem surprising that by the end of al-Rashid's reign the situation on the frontiers was virtually unchanged; the campaigns were, in fact, bedevilled by many problems such as difficulties of supply and the harshness of the weather. Encouraged by the weakness of the central government in Armenia, where a slow process of Arab colonization was in progress, the Khazars made occasional raids on Muslim territories. Only the efforts of Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī and Khuza'ayma b. Khāzīm succeeded in controlling the situation. An exchange of embassies and gifts is alleged to have taken place between Hārūn al-Rashid and Charlemagne, which resulted in giving Charlemagne rights of protection over Jerusalem. Nothing has yet been found in Arabic sources to substantiate this allegation, and although they may have had political interests in common, there seems to be no truth in it.

The later period of al-Rashid's reign reveals a certain lack of competence in him as a ruler. Some of his decisions, such as the covenant of the Ka'bā (186/802), make him at least partly responsible for the subsequent disintegration of the empire and the civil war and the disintegration of the empire. Mahan's misrule and contented himself with the success of the early 'Abbasids, but this can hardly have been the right approach. Economically, the commercial activities, which reached as far as China, made al-Rashid's name known to the whole world of the time, and increased the splendour of his court, which was a centre of art and culture.

Bibliography: The chief source is Tabarî, iii, 599-704; Ibn al-Athīr gives a summarized version of Tabarî's chronicles in his Al-mu'tafl al-kamil, vi, 65-152; Other sources are Yaḥṣūbī, ii, 497-524; Balādhurī, Fattāh, ed. al-Munajjīd, 1956 (index); Dākhīyārī, Cairo 1938, 177-288; Maṣūdī, Murādī, vi, 287-414; Iṣfahānī, Maḥātī, ed. Nadīf, 1934, 308-356; and Fragmenta Historiorum Arabiorum, ed. de Goeje, 1871, 278-80, 290-319. Information will be found in other later histories, and also in al-Dhahabī's Taʾrīh al-ʾIslām, MS. British Museum Add. 23738, with incomplete chronological sequence, fols. 36 a, 36b, 40a-70a; some local histories are useful in this respect such as al-Azaḫrī's Aḥbāb Maḥkā, 1850; Taʾrīkh-i Sistān, ed. Malik al-Shuʿarāʾ Bahār, Tehran 1314 (where the author's sympathies are strongly against the central regime); al-Nārshakhābī's Taʾrīh-i Bukhārā, Tehran 1339; Maḏrāzī's Rāʾīf, ed. 1935; and Kumān's Taʾrīh-i Kūm, ed. 1946. Modern works: Apart from the general works on the Caliphate: see E. H. Palmer, Harun al-Rashid, London 1881 (in many ways out of date); H. St. J. B. Philby, Harun al-Rashid, Edinburgh 1933 (dependant on secondary sources and intended for the general reader); N. Abbott, Two Queens of Baghdad, Chicago 1946 (exposing the role played by Khayyūzān and Zubayda on the political scene and at the court); A. Journard, Haroun al-Rashid, 2 vols, 1956 (an attempt to present the reign of al-Rashid as an ethnic struggle between Arabs and Persians); L. Bouvat, Les Barmécides, Paris 1912; F. Gabrieli, La successione di Harun al-Rashid e la guerra fra al-Amin e al-Maʾmun, in RSO, xi (1926-28), 341-97; D. Sourdel, La politique religieuse du califé 'Abbaside al-Maʾmun, in REI, xxx (1936), 25-30; On relations with the Byzantines: see Cambridge Medieval History, iv, 124-127; E. W. Brooks, The Byzantines and Arabs in the times of the early 'Abbasids, in EHR, xv (1900), 728-47, xvi (1901), 84-92; G. Ostrogorsky, tr. J. Hussey, History of the Byzantine Empire, 1961 (see index); Idem, Byzance et les Arabes (introduction). On the relations with Charlemagne see: F. F. Schmidt, Kari der Große und Harun al-Rashid, in Isl., iii (1912), 409-11; E. Jonanson, The alleged Frankish protectorate in Palestine, in AHR, 1927, 241-61; H. B. Bittermann, Ḥārūn al-Rashīd's gift of an organ to Charlemagne, in Speculum, iv (1929), 215-7; Buckler, Ḥārūn al-Rashīd and Charles the Great, 1932 (see Appendix and bibliography); S. Runciman, Charlemagne and Palestine, in EHR, 1935, 606-10; M. Khaḏārūfī, al-Sīlah al-dībāmāḏīkīyya baḥr al-Rashīd wa ʿShārālāmīn, Baghdad 1939. See also Le Strange, Baghdad during the 'Abbasids Caliphate, Oxford 1924. (F. Omar)

AL-HĀRŪNIYYA (in modern Turkish Hârûniyye) was in the Middle Ages a fortress town of the marches of the Dizira (al-thughur al-dizariyya) between Marash and 'Ayn Zarba, to the east of the middle
Djayhan (Ceyhan). It owes its name to Harun al-Rashid who founded it in 183/799 when he was organizing the defense of the frontiers, and fortified it, according to Ya'qūb, with two ramparts and iron gates. Ibn Ḥawkal stresses its prosperity and the valour shown by its inhabitants in their battles against the Byzantines, but he mentions that at the time when he was writing it had been captured by the Byzantines. It was finally conquered and destroyed on 23 Shawwal 348/27 December 959 by Leo Phocas, who took 1500 prisoners; rebuilt by Sayf al-Dawla, it was again ravaged by Seljuk Turks and annexed to the kingdom of Little Armenia. Ḥarūnīya is now a nahiya merkhis of the  baise of Bahe, in the mūḍy已 of Adana; pop. (1960), 4507.

Bibliography: Ibn Ḥawkal, tr. Kramers-Wiet, II, 179 and index; Ṣayyid, s.v.; Le Strange, 2:89-9; Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arabes, i, 95; M. Canard, Ch'âmndnâsî, 279, 799; I.A, s.v., Ḥarūnīya (addenda by Besim Darkot).

There was another place with the same name in Ṣirāk, not far from Daulâl; according to Ṣayyid, it had an old bridge, built by a Khosroes, of stones clamped together with lead.

Bibliography: Ṣayyid, s.v.; Le Strange, 62. (T. H. Weir)

ḤARŪRĀ (ḤARAWWĀ, according to Ṣayyid, ii, 246, but wrongly), a locality, village or district (kāra) near al-Kūf. During the pre-Islamic period and in the first century of Islam at least, Ḥarūrā stood on the banks of the Euphrates or one of its canals, for a line of al-ʿAshā (al-Ṭabarî, ii, 730) speaks of “ṣalāt Ḥarūrā”, but in the 3rd/9th century it was described as being in the desert (ṣabār) by the traditionist Ibn Dīnār al-Ḥamdânî (d. 283/896; see Ibn ʿAbī l-Ḥadīd, i, 275); the hydrographic system of the region had thus probably undergone a transformation.

Of no importance from the point of view of commerce or agriculture, Ḥarūrā owes its fame to an individual only had revealed their opposition at Ḥarūrā and in the first century of Islam at least, Ḥarūrā was a “shaft tfarūra”, but in the 3rd/9th century “al-ṣūrā al-Abd-twīla” and in the 1st/5th century or at the beginning of the 9th/15th, and the Ḥarūrā al-Kāshfi was ‘l-bayān, written before 1070/1659 by an Ḥāfiz theologian of ʿUmān, al-Kalhātî (see Brockelmann, S II, 568). While al-Ṭabarî says they were taken from a Kitâb al-Nabhrâa, probably the work of one ʿAbd Allâh b. Yazdī al-Fāzârî (1st-2nd/7th-8th centuries), al-Kalhātî is silent as to his sources; however, M. Kafafi, who has given a résumé, states that they go back to an ancient period. A comparison of the pages of al-Ṭabarî and the résumé of those of al-Kalhātî shows that the two authors have not drawn upon the same source; however, the subject-matter is substantially the same.

Evidently preoccupied with the secession of the Ḥarūrīs, ʿAll sent to Ḥarūrā, to parley on his behalf, his cousin ʿAbd Allâh b. ʿAbd-Allâh b. ʿAbd-Allâh, and then also went there himself to discuss the matter with the dissidents. The arguments which the Ḥarūrīs used in these discussions have not been reproduced in al-Ṭabarî or in the other Sunni sources or those favourable to ʿAll, while the arguments of the latter and of Ibn ʿAbd-Allâb are included. The rebels’ argument was, briefly, as follows: “When we had shed the blood of ʿUmayr, we were in the right path, because he had made innovations (abdâd); so, too, when we shed the blood of Talha, al-Zubayr and their adherents on the Day of the Camel [see AL-DJAMAL] because they were rebels; and also when these innovators of Muʿawwâya and ʿAmr, because they were rebels and transgressors against the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet. Has a command come down from heaven compelling ʿAll to change his attitude? No. He must therefore persevere in the line of conduct followed at the start, continue the war and refuse arbitration.” Ibn ʿAbd-Allâb vainly reminded his opponents of the verses in the Korâne (IV, 39/35, V, 1-5-2) on the nomination of arbitrators in certain cases; the Ḥarūrīs replied that any question for which a decision (ḥukm) on the part of God existed could not be submitted to arbitration; God had laid down the ruling to be followed in the case of a band of rebels (fīa bâqūya), for He said (XLIX, g): “If two parties of Believers fight against each other fight in the way of Allah, until one of them persists in rebellion against the other, fight against that party which is rebelling (al-latî tabghî) until it bows before Allâh’s command”. Are not Muʿawwâya, ʿAmr and their supporters a fīa bâqūya? And the Ḥarūrīs add that God said (VIII, 40/39): “Fight them, till there is no sedition (fitna) and the religion of God’s entirety”. Has Muʿawwâya returned to obedience to God? The answer could only be negative. Therefore Allâh had already made
236

HARORA' — HAROT WA-MAROT

known His hukm for a similar case and it must be
applied; it must be regarded as one of His hudud
[see HADD], like the hudud regarding the fornicator
and the robber. Men have no choice in a question on
which God has given His judgement (la hukm* ittd
li'lldh). In their discussions, the Harurls resorted to
still other arguments and other verses of the Korean
to justify then- secession, but those summarized
above were the most difficult to refute. Ibn cAbbas
was compelled to recognize their validity (even the
Sunn! sources and those that favour CA1! state that
he failed in his task); as for CA1I, he persuaded the
dissidents to abandon their secession, though how
he succeeded in doing so is not very clear. The
arguments that he put forward (and which differ
materially in the various sources) do not seem
sufficiently compelling to win over adversaries so
stubborn in their convictions. Must we then accept
the statement of al-Fazari in his K. al-Nahrawdn
that he promised to resume the war against Mucawiya
and backed up his promise with the firmest assurances? A sentence slipped into some sources: "we
shall levy taxes, we shall fatten the mules, then we
shall march towards them" (al-Baladhuri, 523V.;
cf. al-Jabari, i, 3353; Mubarrad, 558, etc.) suggests
that CA1I made concessions; even Jaha Husayn recognizes that there was a misunderstanding at that time.
In any case it is certain that when, some time after
his return to al-Kufa, CA11 clearly stated his intention
to respect the Siffin agreement, the Harurls, who
had returned to the town with him, became incensed.
It was as a result of this statement by CA11 that the
dissidents secretly held meetings, raising the question
whether to remain in a country where. injustice
ruled was compatible with the duties owed to God;
those who held that it was necessary to leave it went
away into hiding, invited the dissidents in al-Basra
to follow suit and gathered together at al-Nahrawan,
thus seceding for the second time. It is possible that,
at the beginning of the Kharidjl movement, a distinction was made between al-Muhakkima al-uld —
the first to have cried out at Siffin la Tiukm0 ilia li
'lldh, al-Ifaruriyya = those who had been present
at the gathering at Harura* but who, on returning to
c
Ali's ranks, did not feel obliged to enter into open
rebellion (while perhaps remaining attached to their
idea that the Siffin agreement was a sin for which
repentance must be shown), and al-Khawdridi —
those who left al-Kufa and al-Basra in order to
break every link with CA1I; but this is merely a hypothesis to justify these different terms, for it is to be
noted that the last two terms were used indiscriminately in the sources (in fact of a much later date).
At Harura5, or nearby, two battles took place, one
in 67/686, in which al-Mukhtar [q.v.] was defeated by
the army of Muscab [q.v.], the other on 9 Shawwal
315/8 December 927 when the Sadjid Yusuf b. Abi
'1-Sadi, fighting for the caliph al-Muktadir against
the Karmati sovereign of Bahrayn Abu Tahir
Sulayman, al-Djannabi, was defeated and captured
(it should, however, be observed that most of the
sources do not mention Harura3 in connexion with
this battle, merely saying that it took place outside
al-Kufa, or at the gates of that town).
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(L. VECCIA VAGLIERI)
HARCT WA-MARtfT. In one of Its admonitions
to the unbelieving Jews of Medina, the !Kur5an (II,
102/96) expresses itself thus (from A. J. Arberry's
translation): "[the children of Israel] follow what the
Satans recited over Solomon's Kingdom. Solomon
disbelieved not, but the Satans disbelieved, teaching
the people sorcery, and that which was sent down
upon Babylon's two angels Harut and Marut; they
taught not any man, without they said, "We are
but a temptation; do not disbelieve ...""<. The
Kur3anic narrative, linked somewhat artificially with
Solomon, whose relations with demons are wellknown [see SULAYMAN], thus reflects a legend concerning the fallen angels who made themselves
masters of the arts forbidden to men. The exegetic
tradition relating to this passage can explain how
the angels had come to that place from heaven. The
sight of men's sins had impelled the angels to make
derogatory remarks about mankind. When God


challenged them to do better if placed under the same conditions, they accepted a test, for which Hārūt and Mārūt were chosen. Having come down to the earth the immediate grave of idolatry, fornication, murder and the drinking of wine, they almost immediately were captivated by a wondrously beautiful woman. Being caught unawares at the very moment when she was granting them her favours, they killed the man who had witnessed their misconduct. God caused them to be watched while doing so by their brothers who had returned to earth earlier and who, consequently, could only say "Indeed Thou wast right". Left to choose between punishment in the world and the eternal pains of hell, the two guilty angels preferred to expiate their offence here below; they were then imprisoned and hung by the feet in a well in Babylon where they have been in torment ever since. In the final analysis, this theme derives from the account in Genesis, VI, 1-4 concerning the loves of the "sons of Elōhîm" and the daughters of men, expanded in the apochryphal books where there appears the supplementary theme of the fallen angels, masters of magic (Jubilees, V, 6; Enoch, Chaps. VI-VIII, etc.; allusion in the New Testament, 2nd Epistle of Peter, II, 4 and Epistle of Jude, 6); in the midrash Abkir, an Agadic Jewish work of a late period, but rich in traditions left aside by the great rabbinical texts, the guilty angels bear the names of Shemhazai, ʿUzza and ʿAzzaʾel. According to its version of the legend, which also recurs in more than one Muslim text, the angels who had fallen into sin lost the use of the ineffable Name of God which would have allowed them to return to heaven; the woman whom they had lusted after, having learned this Name from them, made use of it to escape from them and to make her way to heaven where, as a reward for her virtuous resistance, God changed her into a star. On this point, an astrological motif is grafted onto the legend, for the names given to this woman, Anāḥíd, Bidukht, Zuhra—in the Jewish version Naʾsamah—seem, with the possible exception of the last, to be firmly connected with the planet Venus. As regards the names Hārūt and Mārūt, it is hardly possible to discover any etymology (contrary to the opinion of A. J. Wensinck in EJ) other than Haurvatāt and Amuratūt, "integrity" and "immortality", two of the "archangels" (Amēsha Spenta) of Zoroastranism; it is still not clear how the synthesis of the Iranian features and the Jewish legend of the fallen angels took place, nor how the hypothetical version which had substituted Iranian names for the Semitic names of the heroes of the story came into Arabia as early as the beginning of the 7th century A.D.; yet traces of it have been found in the Manichaean texts. We can therefore conclude without being over-rash that the immediate source of the allusion in the Kurʾān and of certain elements in the later Muslim legend is to be found in the syncretistic beliefs developed on the fringe of the main Jewish, Christian and Māzdaean religions. Variations on the Kurʾānic theme which we have not touched upon here in detail have been severely criticised by more than one theologian: see al-Bāḍū wa ʾl-ʿaʾraʾith, i, 14 ff.; Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Maḏāfīt al-ghayb, ii, Cairo 1354/1935, 244; Ibn Kāhir, al-Bīdāya wa ʾl-nihāya, i, 37-8.

have been recorded in al-Hasa, some of them being used only as fodder [see TAMR]. Another item of economic importance for which the area has long been famous is the local breed of tall, white donkeys, which once were widely exported, in particular to Egypt and 'Irak. Dietary changes and the introduction of wheeled transport brought about a foreseeable decline in the economic importance of both dates and donkeys. On the other hand, the increased cash wages due largely to the development of the oil industry in Saudi Arabia's Eastern Province have given rise to a new form of light industry, as well as some other greater variety in agricultural produce. The manufacture of textiles to make the locally worn cloak (biğṭ) has long enjoyed a well-deserved reputation and is still an important part of the economic picture of al-Hasa.

History. The detailed study of the history of al-Hasa, particularly with regard to the earlier periods, is yet to be undertaken. It has been suggested that the region called At-Tamr, an antiquity might be the same as present-day al-Hasa, but no other references in old sources can be connected with the oasis. The area was certainly known as al-Hasa (or al-Ahsa') during the time of the Prophet. The majority of the people of the area accepted Islam at an early date, although they rebelled against the central power a number of times. Most notable among these rebellions was that of the Karmatis [q.v.], who, when they brought the Black Stone from Mecca, kept it in this area for about twenty years.

In mediaeval Arabic sources al-Hasa is said to be a fortress in al-Bahrayn [q.v.] not far from al-Hażarj, the ancient capital of the district. This fortress was founded by the famous Karmati leader Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Dāmmābī [q.v.] in 314/926 near a locality then called al-Hasa. He called the fortress al-Mu'miniyya, but both fortress and settlement continued to be known by the old name. In 443/1051, the area was visited and described by the Persian Nasir-i-Khusraw, whose account of the Karmati government is founded by the famous Karmati leader Abu Tahir al-Hāmidī. He called the fortress al-Mu'miniyya, which was certainly the same as present-day al-Hasa, particularly with regard to the earlier periods, is yet to be undertaken. It has been suggested that the region called At-Tamr, an antiquity might be the same as present-day al-Hasa, but no other references in old sources can be connected with the oasis. The area was certainly known as al-Hasa (or al-Ahsa') during the time of the Prophet. The majority of the people of the area accepted Islam at an early date, although they rebelled against the central power a number of times. Most notable among these rebellions was that of the Karmatis [q.v.], who, when they brought the Black Stone from Mecca, kept it in this area for about twenty years.

In mediaeval Arabic sources al-Hasa is said to be a fortress in al-Bahrayn [q.v.] not far from al-Hażarj, the ancient capital of the district. This fortress was founded by the famous Karmati leader Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Dāmmābī [q.v.] in 314/926 near a locality then called al-Hasa. He called the fortress al-Mu'miniyya, but both fortress and settlement continued to be known by the old name. In 443/1051, the area was visited and described by the Persian Nasir-i-Khusraw, whose account of the Karmati government is founded by the famous Karmati leader Abu Tahir al-Hāmidī. He called the fortress al-Mu'miniyya, which was certainly the same as present-day al-Hasa, particularly with regard to the earlier periods, is yet to be undertaken. It has been suggested that the region called At-Tamr, an antiquity might be the same as present-day al-Hasa, but no other references in old sources can be connected with the oasis. The area was certainly known as al-Hasa (or al-Ahsa') during the time of the Prophet. The majority of the people of the area accepted Islam at an early date, although they rebelled against the central power a number of times. Most notable among these rebellions was that of the Karmatis [q.v.], who, when they brought the Black Stone from Mecca, kept it in this area for about twenty years.

Remains of 'Abhābī pottery in the oasis suggest that the area has already densely populated during early Islamic times. It does not seem likely, however, that the Portuguese and the Persians, who ruled or occupied the island of al-Bahrayn in the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries respectively, extended their rule to the oasis. In later times, and by reason of its geographical location as well as its resources, the oasis was coveted by the Wahhabis [q.v.] from Nadjd in 1255/1839. The Turks occupied the oasis in 1289/1872 and made the area a sandiqah of the wilayet of Baṣra. During the Turkish occupation, al-Hasa was the administrative centre of the sandiqah and the residence of the Mutaṣarrifīīī Pāshā. The Turks were finally expelled from al-Hasa by 'Abd al-'Azīz Ibn Sa'īd in 1913.

The rule by Egyptians, Turks, and Wahhabis until 1332/1913 was not a secure one. Two powerful Bedouin tribes of eastern Arabia, the Banū Khālid and the 'Udīnān, continuously raidied the villages of al-Hasa and endangered the trade routes. The area was finally pacified under the rule of the present dynasty. From 1913 until 1952 al-Hasa continued to be the administrative centre of the entire area of eastern Saudi Arabia, which was then called the al-Hasa Province. The name of the oasis was also used to designate the oil concession (The Hasa Concession) obtained from Ibn Sa'ūd by Frank Holmes in the 1930s, which covered the lands lying between the sands of al-Dahmā to the west and the Gulf to the east, and between 'Irāq and Kuwait to the north and a line running due west from the base of the Kaṭar peninsula to the south.

In 1952 the capital of the province was moved from al-Hasa to the town of al-Dammām [q.v.] on the Gulf coast, and the province itself changed its name from al-Hasa Province to the Eastern Province. The amirate of al-Hasa has jurisdiction over only the oasis area and reports to the provincial government in al-Dammām. In the 1960's the Saudi Arabian Government undertook elaborate agricultural extension work in the oasis, including sand stabilization, drainage, and the establishment of experimental farms.


past and was stained by no dishonour; the slightest stain on the other hand was exploited. Thus, the hasab, according to the pre-Islamic conception of it, necessitated not only the existence of ancestors but the doing honour to them by performing memorable deeds of prowess or displaying outstanding virtues, in particular exemplary generosity. The memory of the great deeds performed in the past by members of the tribe was passed down from father to son to form a collective hasab of which all which could boast; the valour of the group was measured so to speak by the total of these exploits and virtues, which provided for all a model to imitate, an ideal moral standard to attain and a patrimony to safeguard; it was in fact a sort of tribal sunna.

In contrast to nasab, hasab could be acquired also by an individual by means of virtuous acts or brave exploits. Thus, the hasab was a person who either possessed a noble ancestry or had acquired nobility personally, without necessarily requiring an outstanding nasab, whereas the nasab had to be equipped with both nasab and hasab.

The appearance of Islam did not entirely banish these ideas, which remained very much alive among the Arab tribes (and even among the fuwakha, who had to know a woman's hasab in order to assess her mahr [see SADAK]), but the earlier ideas were in fact modified by the tendency to egalitarianism and by the preponderant place accorded to the Faith. The Kur'an makes no reference to them, but hadith, where it is authentic, reveals an abrupt change in conception which the numerous philological works and commentaries enable us to understand. While forbidding attacks on genealogies, the Prophet proclaimed: "Learn enough genealogy to know your and that of your predecessors imposed by family relationships" (here, asdab seems to be related to the etymological meaning of the root ksb "to count", that is "to know what you are worth collectively"), but there are also attributed to him the hadiths: hasab al-rajul khulukh "a man's hasab is his moral qualities" and: hasab al-rajul nasab thabawshy...it is the cleanness of his two garments", which some interpret as a sign of wealth. In fact one hadith announces unexpectedly: al-hasab al-mal tu't-haram al-takwa "hasab is wealth and generosity is religious piety". Thus the excellence of ancestors would be replaced by wealth, and the generosity which procures hasab by religion; there is nothing surprising in the fact that any Believer could acquire a nobility which formerly had been reserved for those with ancestors, and that hasab would not in theory be considered as an Islamic quality, but it is most extraordinary that wealth should take its place. The matter should not be exaggerated however, and the following commentary by Ibn al-Sikkit (in L.A, s.v. hasab) would serve to show the hadith in its true perspective, if it did not deviate from Islamic moral standards by taking no account of transient circumstances: "A man may possess hasab and generosity (haram) even if he has no ancestors of nobility (zharaui), whereas zharaui and glory (madid) exist only through the ancestors: the Prophet thus substituted wealth (mad) for the nobility of the individual (nasab) or of his ancestors, which means that the poor man with hasab is neither respected nor esteemed, whereas the rich man who is without it is respected".

**Bibliography:** B. Fares, L'honneur chez les Arabes avant l'Islam, Paris 1932, 81-8, 114 and references there given; see also Mas'udi, Muridi, iii, 107 ff. (tr. Pellat, §§ 955 ff.) and the theory of Ibn Khaldun, Maqadima, ed. Quatremere, 243 ff. (tr. de Slane, i, 280 ff., tr. Rosenthal, i, 273 ff.).

**HASAN, AL-MALIK AL-NASIR NASIR AL-DIN ABU 'L-MA'ALI, 15th Mamluk Sultan of Egypt, in the line known to contemporary chroniclers as Daqdad al-Turk. He was the most prominent of eight sons of the Sultan al-Malik al-Nasir Muhammad b. Kalånn who ruled in turn during the years 741/1340-763/1362 and who are frequently designated in European documents of the period as "Hasan and his brothers" (e.g., BSOAS, xxviii (1965), 492: "Nasser Hassan et son frater"), see Zambur, Manuvi, i, 103, 106, and Wiet, in Mém. Inst. Egypte, xix, genealogical tree p. 279). Owing to the sustained attempt at dynastic succession Hasan was very young (11 years) at his first accession to the Sultanate on 14 Ramadân 748/18 December 1347, and did not in fact rule during his first reign, which lasted for just under four years (until 17 March 1351). As happened frequently under the Mamluks, de facto power was divided among rival factions of amirs surviving from the period of a deceased sultan (hararis, see Ayalon, in BSOAS, xv (1953), 217 ff.), a struggle in this case coloured by the rise to a significant position of the Circassian elements, who had been favoured by his brother and predecessor al-Malik al-Mu'ayyafu(r, and who towards the end of the 8th/14th century were to emerge as the rulers of Mamluks Egypt and Syria [see Čerkes ii and BURDJÔUVA]. Nine months after attaining his majority Hasan is reported to have abdicated (Nudjâm, v, 91), owing to the pressure of the amirs Taz and Minkail. These arranged the succession of Hasan's brother Su'il, who was three years older and who, under the regnal name al-Malik al-Sâlih, managed to stay on the throne for about three years, until his deposition on 2 Shawâlw 755/20 October 1354; he remained imprisoned until his death seven years later. Instrumental in this act and in the immediate restoration of Hasan were the amirs Sarghitmish and Shaykhûn, the Alâbak al-Adâbîr [q.v.] and first bearer of the title al-Amir al-Kabîr [q.v.]. It was owing to the latter's intercession with Hasan that the amir Taz, instead of being condemned to death for his insurrection, was merely rusticated to Syria and the governorship of Aleppo. Soon after his second accession Hasan's position was weakened by the murder of Shaykhûn during a quarrel with a fellow mamlik. Further, and possibly as a result of this act, Sarghitmish acquired more power than pleased the Sultan and had to be incarcerated in Alexandria where he later died. Finally Hasan's second and last reign was brought to an end by one of his own ambitious mamlikâs, Yalbuqâh, who murdered the Sultan in the Citadel while he, having got word of the conspiracy, was Arranging an escape to Syria in bedouin dress, on 12 Dîumâd I 763/9 March 1362.

The periods of rule of Sultan Hasan are thus conspicuous neither for their length nor for evidence of his political competence. The major event of his first reign, whose cause can hardly be laid at the
door of the Sultan but whose repercussions must have made government in Egypt and Syria more difficult than usual, was the plague of 749/1348 (see 750/1350). The devastation of the Mamlûk dominions and decimation of their population which followed in its wake are described in some detail by the chronicler Ibn Taghrîbrîdî (Nugîjâm, v. 62-76). Of Hasan's foreign relations, however, there is documentary evidence sufficient to indicate sustained activity: with the Byzantine Empire (M. Canard, in AIEO, iii [1937]), the Sultan purchased weapons in Mt. Sinai (Ernst, Diplomatarium, Docs. XIII, XIV, XV), and with the Republic of Venice (Thomas-Predelli, Diplomatia, ii, Docs. XII, XIII, XLVII). Yet another trace of his reign is the madrasa of Sultan Hasan in Cairo, construction of which was begun in 757/1356 (Nugîjâm, v. 158).


(J. WANSBROUGH)

MAWLAY AL-HASAN, ABÛ 'ALI, sultan of Morocco from 12 September 1873 to 9 June 1894. He was the son of Sayyîd Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Râjkâm whom, at the age of 37, he succeeded without dispute. Soon after his accession, however, revolts broke out at several places: Azâmûr, against the local governor; Mknès, where an uncle rose as pretender to the throne; Fez, where the tanners rebelled in order to obtain the abolition of a local tax. The sultan repressed these risings quickly and without excessive cruelty. He passed a great part of his reign on expeditions aimed at maintaining the suzerainty over many Berber tribes. It was while returning from such a long campaign, which had taken him as far as Tâflîlât, that he died in the Tâdla region. His death remained secret until the army had arrived at Rabat, where his young son 'Abd al-'Azîz [q.v.] was proclaimed sultan.

Like his father and his grandfather Mâlûây al-Hasan understood the pressing necessity to modernize Morocco and thought that the first sector to be reformed was that of the army. He therefore created permanent and regular units, in which sundry renegades served, and invited foreign instructors, above all French and English, from 1877 onwards. Moreover, several groups of infantry were sent to Gibraltar to be trained with English troops. The sultan bought arms in Europe and installed a cartridge factory at Marrâkûsh and an arsenal at Fez, the Makina. He even established the nucleus of a national fleet. He occupied himself also with the technical training of the Moroccans and sent several to Europe, envisaging the modernization of certain Moroccan industries.

But relations with the European powers, more and more attracted by Morocco, absorbed a great part of his activity. He received a growing number of embassies, and it was on his initiative and that of Great Britain, that the first international conference concerned with Morocco was held at Madrid from 19 May to 3 July 1880. This conference dealt with the "protection" rights of the European powers in the Sharifian Empire. Pious and conservative in his internal policies, Mâlûây al-Hasan thus, without fully realizing the implications of his initiative, enmeshed Morocco in an international process which was to end in the Protectorate of 1912.


(R. LE TOURNAU)

HSAN, amir of the Cóbdâũd (g.v.) dynasty.

AL-HASAN b. 'ALI b. ABî ŢâLÎB, son of 'Ali and Fâtîma (g.v.), claimant to the caliphate until he renounced the office in favour of Muṣ'îsîya b. Abî Sufîyân, and, in the eyes of the Shî'is, the second imâm.

Early years. — He was born in 3624-5 (the month is uncertain; mid-Ramaḍân?) and given the name al-Hasan by Muḥammad, while his father wanted to call him Harb; he lived with the Prophet for only seven years, but was nevertheless able later to recollect some of his phrases and actions (for example that Muḥammad threw back into the heap of sadâba dates one which he had already put into his mouth, for he was unwilling to eat anything from the sadâba). Tradition, including also that preserved in Sunni collections, relates, as evidence of the love that Muḥammad felt for his grandchildren, not only the phrases he is said to have used concerning them, but also charming anecdotes that testify to his affection (e.g., Muḥammad descended from the minbar during one of his discourses in order to pick up al-Hasan who had stumbled over his long tunic and fallen down; "Alas", he said, "your riches and your children are a seduction"; he allowed his grandchildren to climb on his back while he was prostrating himself in prayer, etc.). More important for the deductions drawn from them by the Shî'is are certain phrases attributed to the Prophet (e.g., "They will be the sayyîds of the young in Paradise", a hadîth whose veracity was contested by Marwân b. al-Ḥakâm; see Ibn Abî l-Ḥadîd, iv, 5), and above all the fact that he took them, with their father and mother, under cover of his mantle and declared that they were People of the House free from all impurity [see AHL AL-KISÂ and FATIMA]. After their grandfather's death (which was followed soon by that of their mother), al-Hasan and his brother played no part in the important events of the caliphates and took up the cause of Ubâd Bakk, 'Umar and 'Uḥmân. They lived, says one source, in a state of obedience to their father; in fact, even if they followed him in some of his demonstrations of opposition to 'Uḥmân, they took an entirely passive part (in any case they were still very young). Their names are mentioned on the occasion of the siege of Ummân's house by Marwân b. al-Ḥakâm, for 'Ali, according to several traditions, sent
them to carry water to the caliph, who was dying of thirst, and ordered them to... by the Muslim community; from a letter of Muawiya, we may deduce that he represented the matter as being possible.

His caliphrate.—After the murder of 'Ali, 'Ubayd Allah b. 'Abbâs [q.v.] invited the people to nominate him as caliph ('Ali had not dared to give advice on the question of the succession), and al-Hasan made a speech, reported in many texts, for the purpose of praising the merits of his family and his father, and, finally, of himself, by insisting on the fact that he had lived in intimacy with the Prophet. Kays b. Sa'd b. 'Ubâda al-Ansâri was the first to do homage to him; however, he tried to impose a condition, that the bay'a should be "on the Book of God, the Sunna of the Prophet and the war (bittâj) against those who declared licit that which is illicit (al-mubîllân)", but al-Hasan succeeded in avoiding this condition. He was at war with al-Mu'awiyah during the campaign against Mu'awiyah, he took part in the battle of Siffin [q.v.].

The conditions of the agreement concerning al-Hasan's abdication.—On the matter of the conditions of the agreement, there are in the sources certain variants which it is impossible to correct and reconcile. According to some accounts, Mu'awiyah gave carte blanche (but in respect of what?) to al-Hasan, who later regretted not having asked for more. The compensation in money was the sum of one million dinars (annual appanage ? in addition to the single payment of 5 million to be taken from the treasury of Kufa?) and the revenue from a district in Persia (Dârbâdîr? Fasa? al-Ahwaz?), which al-Hasan was never able to collect since the people of Basra were hostile, maintaining that it was a dependency of their own. Some traditions add other conditions which, however, must be suspected of having been interpolated later, in order to reduce the criticism of al-Hasan, and it is possible that he had raised certain problems and held firm in regard to his own point of view. These are the conditions: power was to be restored to al-Hasan after his death, he was to be given an advance-guard of 12,000 men to meet him, under the command of 'Ubayd Allah b. 'Abbâs, whom he instructed to consult Kays b. Sa'd and Sa'd b. Kays al-Hamdân. His aim may have been to remove from his side this Kays, who represented the party for war to the death, because he was already intending to negotiate with his adversary; al-Tabarî at least says so expressly (i, r. f.). Then he too began to advance (two or three months after the election). At the Sâbab of al-Madâ'în he halted and made a speech which disturbed his followers, who probably foresaw that they were already surrounded by the army, and sent him reinforcements [see al-Dînawarî]; later, during the campaign against Mu'awiyah, he took part in the battle of Siffin [q.v.].
ible in the future, but without giving any undertak-
ing on his part); according to another source, Mu'āwiyah
pledged himself not to designate a successor, the choice
being referred to a committee (ṣūrah) (but if so Mu'āwiyah
did not and could not contemplate his son's succession); again,
Mu'āwiyah promised to follow "the Book of God, the Summa of the Prophet
and the conduct of the righteous caliphs" (but such a condition
was a delusion that 'Ali's party gave to it, it implied the condemnation of 'Uṯmān's policy;
could Mu'āwiyah accept that?); a general amnesty
was to be granted; two million dirhams were to be paid
to al-Ḥusayn (this condition to show that al-
Ḥasan had also thought of his brother?); preference
would be given to the Ḥāshimis ('Alids and 'Abbās-
ids) over the Banū 'Abd al-Ḡams (Umayyads) in
the granting of pensions (aš'ād) and awards (an
admisssible condition?).

During his halt at al-Āl̄hunīyya, face to face with
al-Ḥasan's advance guard, Mu'āwiyah informed
'Ubayd Allāh b.'Abbās that al-Ḥasan had asked him
to make peace, but he was not believed; he then negoti-
tated in secret with 'Ubayd Allāh through the inter-
medialy of a third party and offered him a million
dirhams if he would join him, and this 'Ubayd Allāh
didn't, unknown to his troops. This defection was
to lead to a split in the ranks of the advance guard;
it seems that 8,000 men followed the example of their
general. Kays b. Sa'd then took command of the 4,000
who had not left him and invited them to
choose between obedience to a misguided imām
(Mu'āwiyah) and war under the command of a leader
(himself) who was not an imām (a speech handed
down with certain variants); it seems that the sol-
diers preferred to fight, but soon the situation
changed, with the result that Kays consented to lay
down his arms. From Maskin, where he had gone,
Mu'āwiyah went on to Kūfah; al-Ḥasan rejoined him
and declared officially in the mosque that he had
renounced the caliphate.

Al-Ḥasan's abdication naturally provoked certain
reactions: Ḥuǧrī b. 'Adī (q.v.) told him that he would
rather have heard that he had died before that day;
the same Ḥuǧrī, another adherent, accused him of
having humiliated the Muslims; others suggested
that he should review his decision; some years later,
the Shi'is, gathering together, showed their dis-
approval of the fact that al-Ḥasan had not asked for
sufficient guarantees, for he had not secured an
undertaking in writing from Mu'āwiyah that the
latter would leave him the caliphate after his death.
Mu'āwiyah took various measures to prevent future
insurrections: some of the tribes that were devoted
to the 'Alids he transferred from Kūfah, replacing
them by others from Syria, Baṣra and Mesopotamia
(al-Ṭabarī, i, 1920).

What were the motives that led al-Ḥasan to abdi-
cate? We can accept those specified in the sources—
love of peace, distaste for politics and its dissensions,
the desire to avoid widespread bloodshed—but it is
also probable that he was aware that his cause was
lost; it is true that 'Allābally emptiyed the State
treasury (every week, it is said!) to share out the
contents, he must have been short of money; more-
over, defections had been frequent in the last years
of his father's caliphate and had even increased during
his own; thus he could not rely on soldiers who had
little desire to fight. The consequences of the abdi-
cation weighed heavily on the 'Alids who later
claimed the throne. In the polemics against them, the
argument that they had lost all claim on account of
al-Ḥasan's renunciation was not easy to rebut; a
hadīth (al-Bukhārī, ii, 169, Fr. tr. 238 f.) purported
to show al-Ḥasan's lack of resistance as a great merit:
Muḥammad is alleged to have said "This my son is
a lord by means of whom God will one day reunite
two great factions of Muslims".

After the abdication.—During the journey
back to Medina, at al-Kāṭībīyya, al-Ḥasan received
a letter from Mu'āwiyah asking him to take part in
the campaign against a Kharidī, Ibn al-Ḥassāb
al-Ṭāī, who had just started a revolt. Al-Ḥasan
replied that he had given up fighting against him in
order to bring peace to the people, and that he
would not fight at his side. Having settled in
 Medina, al-Ḥasan lived quietly, at least in appearance,
without engaging in politics; as before, he went from
one marriage to another, so earning for himself the
title of al-Muḏālah "the Divorcier". He had 60 or 70 or
90 wives and 300 or 400 concubines. This life of
sensual pleasures does not appear, however, to have
aroused much censure. In 49/669-70 (other dates:
50, 48, 58, 59), he died of a somewhat prolonged
illness, or else from poisoning, attributed by many
of the sources to one of his wives, by name al-Diḏa',
dughter of al-Aš'āḥ; Mu'āwiyah is said to have
suborned her with the promise of a large sum of
money and of marrying her to Yazid; but it should
be noted that al-Ḥasan was in no way anxious to
reveal his suspicions to his brother al-Ḥusayn, for
fear that vengeance for his death might be taken
against some innocent person; the Yemenī chief
al-Aš'āḥ was regarded by the Shi'is as a traitor, in
the pay of Mu'āwiyah, and it is quite possible that the
hated fett for him had been transferred to his
daughter. Al-Ḥasan had expressed the wish to be
buried beside his grandfather Muḥammad, but
Marwān b. al-Ḥakam and 'Aš'īṣa together agreed
to prevent al-Ḥusayn from carrying out this request
(another version: 'Aš'īṣa consented, but Marwān
was obdurate; Uṣd. 14 f.). They were on the point
of taking up arms, but al-Ḥasan had stated that, in
the event of opposition, he could be buried in the
Balq, and Abū Hurayra convinced al-Ḥusayn that
the best course would be to take this solution. As
we do not know the exact dates of the campaign
to which they refer the abdication or of the official
ceremony at Kūfah, the length of al-Ḥasan's caliphate
cannot be determined; the sources, confronted with
the same difficulty, give different periods—five months
and ten days, six months and a few days, eight months
and ten days.

Al-Ḥasan's physical and moral attributes.—This grandson
of Muḥammad resembles the one who resembled him most closely. According to Abū
'1-Faradj al-Īsfahānī, he had a defect of speech in-
ward (halīm), and Abu Hurayra convinced al-Ḥusayn that
the title of halīm), and Abu Hurayra convinced al-Ḥusayn that
the title of the first year's pilgrimage (halīm), and Abu Hurayra convinced al-Ḥusayn that
the title of halīm), and Abu Hurayra convinced al-Ḥusayn that
the title of halīm), and Abu Hurayra convinced al-Ḥusayn that
the title of halīm), and Abu Hurayra convinced al-Ḥusayn that
the title of halīm), and Abu Hurayra convinced al-Ḥusayn that
their lines (the differentiation of the lines starting with a later imam); thus the questions relating to impeccability, infallibility, etc. do not concern him personally.

The abdication of al-Hasan, so much criticized in his own time by many of his supporters, thus did not invalidate his position as imam; his conduct was justified as springing from his pious detachment from mundane matters. The gap left by the lack of extraordinary qualities was filled, in the Shi'ite texts, by accounts of his miracles, among which were the following; all agree that the last of his miracles was the raising of the sanctuary of Mecca into the air; he made his daughter a gift of the palace to the south of Baghdad, called al-Kasr al-Ilasani, which he owned and which was one of the principal characters of the Persian religious dramas (ta'ziya).

Before the creation of the world, the sending of light (ta'ziya). entered into Adam's loins and thereafter into the loins and self and al-Husayn, al-Hasan shared their prerogatives: creation as images of light thousands of years during

The Shi'i further maintain that al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i's further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson summarizes other accounts also, but he is mistaken when he says that the number of al-Hasan's miracles is limited to sixteen. The Shi'i further maintain that Mu'awiya tried to poison al-Hasan 70 times, but he revived a dead man, etc. After consulting other sources differing from our own, Donaldson sums
to become one of the caliph's palaces. He died at Fam al-§ilb in ... communicated
the views of his cAlid relatives and their dependants
to al-Mansur. In 150/767 al-Mansur made him gover-

In another connexion, this sect is in
itawaffiuf). [q.v.]

with the order, he forbade the celebration in Baghdad both
regard for the property of foreign merchants. His
administration there proved to be so successful that Baha? al-Dawla now entrusted
him with the administration of 'Irāk, which at that
time was racked by widespread disturbances (392/
1002); and despite setbacks in his struggle against
the lord of Qawm al-Suṣ, Ibn Wāṣif, and the Kurdish
prince Badr b. Ḥasanawayh (with whom he was later
reconciled), he retained this province until his death,
which took place unexpectedly in 401/1011, at the
age of 49 or 51. Though disagreeing about his birth,
the authors are unanimous in praising the impartial
energy of his administration, which restored order
and a sound financial system; for the sake of public
order, he forbade the celebration in Baghdad of two
different festivals which took place unexpectedly in 401/1011, at the
time he himself lived at the Caliph's court,

**Bibliography:** A. S. Tritton, *Muslim theology*, London 1947, 32. (CH. PELLAT)

AL-HASAN b. TIMūTAH [see also AL-ALI (tr.), AL-MANṣūR]

AL-HASAN b. USTĀDH-HUMRŪZ, Aṣb b. Aṭl, one of the leading figures of the Būyid regime at the end of the 8th/9th century. His father, Ustādh-

**Bibliography:** D. Sourdell, *Le visirat 'abbāsid*, Damascus 1959-60, index. (D. SOURDEL)

AL-HASAN b. SĀLIH b. ḤAYY al-KUFI, ABU ʿABBĀS ALLĀH, traditionist and Zaydī theologian of whose life little is known. It seems that he was born in 100/719 and, after giving his daughter in marriage to the son of Zayn al-Abīdīn, ʿĪsā b. Zayd b. ʿĀli, went into hiding and refused his son-in-law, so eluding S. Mansur's search until his death which occurred at Kufa in 168/784-5. According to the *Fihrist* (178; Cairo ed.,

253), he was the author of several works, among which are mentioned: *Kūtb al-Tawḥīd, Fihrist in* 168/784-5. According to the

the relations between the latter and the Muḥaddithun etc. (D. SOURDEL)

In regard to the μuḥaddithun al-Salih, as does also al-Djahiz, in a new revolt by Bakhtiyar's sons. Hasan then

and also of the Sunni counter-
'ashurd* *al-Radi, who wrote a

and Hilāl al-Sabī in Margoliouth, *The Eclipse of

Hiżb al-Sabī, His father, al-

and appealed neither to
ra'y nor to ig(h)thāḥ. In regard to the waṣl, they followed the Muṭṭalila, whom they respected more
deply than the masters of Shī'īsm, whilst, for the
furū', they adhered to the doctrine of Abū Ḥanīfa, except on certain points on which they followed al-Shī'ī and the Shī'a.

the formal text of the *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*, *Kitāb Imdamat
Fihrist* in 168/784-5. According to the

furu', index, s.v.; Baghdad!, *Fihrist*, index, s.v.; Ibn Hazm, *Muḥaddith*, v, 45). With regard to 'Uṯmān, the Šāhiyya do

the name al-Ḥasan among the number of the aṣghāl al-bādīth, and Ibn al-Nādim remarks that the majority of the muḥaddithūn are Zaydī; moreover, the

muhaddithun etc. (D. SOURDEL)

the name al-Ḥasan b. Hayy, as does also al-Djahiz, and also of the Sunni counter-
'ashurd* *al-Radi, who wrote a

Hiżb al-Sabī, His father, al-

and Hilāl al-Sabī in Margoliouth, *The Eclipse of

Hiżb al-Sabī, His father, al-

and Hilāl al-Sabī in Margoliouth, *The Eclipse of
nor of Medina, but in 253/772 he aroused the Caliph's wrath and was dismissed, imprisoned and had his property confiscated. But restitution was made to him by al-Manṣūr's successor, al-Mahdī, who gave him back all that he had lost, after al-Manṣūr's death. He died in 267/879 at al-Ḥājir, while on a pilgrimage to Mecca, and was buried there.

**Bibliography:** Tabari, iii, 144, 149, 228, 335 f., 377, 400, 453 f. and 2518; Ya‘qūbī, Historiae, ii, 456; Ibn Ḥamm, Nasab Kuraysh, 280; Ibn al-ʿArabī, V, 420, 454; vi, 4, 21 f., 53.

---

**AL-ḤASAN B. ZAYD B. MUḤAMMAD B. ISMĀ’IL B. AL-ḤASAN B. ZAYD,** a descendant of the preceding, founder of an ʿAlid dynasty in Tabaṣrīstān (q.v.). The high-handed rule of the ʿĀlīrids on the one hand and, on the other, the settlement of ʿAlid elements in the region led to a rising in favour of al-Ḥasan b. Zayd, al-ḍāʾir al-saghrī, in 250/864. Al-Ḥasan, who was living at Rayy, was proclaimed sovereign by a section of the population of Tabaṣrīstān and received the allegiance of Wāḥṣūdān b. Diṣṭān of Daylam (q.v.). He succeeded in defeating the ʿĀlīrids and seizing the towns of Āmul and Sāriya, while Diṣṭān II took Rayy, which he had to abandon in 253/867 before the threat of the army sent by al-Muʿtaẓim and commanded by Moḥammad b. Diṣṭān of Daylam. But he was able to return to Tabaristan till 316/928. Al-Ḥasan b. Zayd, who was living at Rayy, was called to Istanbul on 17 Rabi 1, 942/15 October 1535 by Khayr al-Dīn, who set him free and made him a eunuch and his confidant. While his master was in the train of Timūr, and was an ancestor of the historian Muḥammad b. Māṣūmī, who recorded his descent from the saint on an inscription on the Buland Darwaza of Fathpur Sikri. A variant tradition, however, collected by Cunningham (see Bibliography), makes one Kandahār saint of Bābā Wali and a Gūḍjar saint of Ḥasan ʿAbdal. The shrine of Bābā Wali stands high on a hill, and the spring at its base is enclosed by a Sikh gurdwārā, a tank copanied with mulberry-trees and filled with fish, and several tombs in ruins (one shown in Annual Report ASI 1929-30, Pl. I b), one of which is said to be that of a saint of the Khalsa. There are also references to the presence of the tomb of "Lalla Rokh" —the last poem in Moore's romance was recited by the disguised prince at Ḥasan ʿAbdal; but the historicity of the lady referred to is in doubt.

Historically Ḥasan ʿAbdal is of interest as having been a popular camping ground of the Mughal emperors on their way to and from Kashmir; from the ʿAfn-i Akbarī (tr. Blochmann, i, 446) it is apparent that the town bore the name Ḥasan ʿAbdal in Akbar's time, and that Akbar visited the tomb of Ḥakīm Abu'l-Fath there (= the tomb mentioned above as illustrated in ARASI, obviously a "Baghaddād October" and hence stylistically in the mid-10th/16th century tradition). Opposite the shrine and on the far side of its stream are the remains of a Mughal garden with parterres and fountains, and of a bath; the site is thus a pleasant prospect.

**Bibliography:** Abu l-ʿAfnī Akbarī, tr. Blochmann, i, 446, 515; Taʾrīkh-i Maʿṣūmī, tr. Elliot and Dowson, i, 239; M.S. Elphinstone, Account of the kingdom of Cabool, i, London 1839; A. Cunningham, ASI, ii, s.v.

---

**HASAN AGHA, successor of Khayr al-Dīn as governor of Algiers, when the latter was recalled to Istanbul on 17 Rabi I 942/15 October 1535 to become ḫupudan-pāsha.**

Ḥasan was of Sardinian origin; he was captured as a child by an Algerine pirate and made a slave of Khayr al-Dīn, who set him free and made him a eunuch and his confidant. While his master was in command at Algiers he performed various civil and military services, and was killed in a tank canopied with mulberry-trees and filled with fish, and several tombs in ruins (one shown in Annual Report ASI 1929-30, Pl. I b), one of which is said to be that of a saint of the Khalsa. There are also references to the presence of the tomb of "Lalla Rokh" —the last poem in Moore's romance was recited by the disguised prince at Ḥasan ʿAbdal; but the historicity of the lady referred to is in doubt.

Historically Ḥasan ʿAbdal is of interest as having been a popular camping ground of the Mughal emperors on their way to and from Kashmir; from the ʿAfn-i Akbarī (tr. Blochmann, i, 446) it is apparent that the town bore the name Ḥasan ʿAbdal in Akbar's time, and that Akbar visited the tomb of Ḥakīm Abu'l-Fath there (= the tomb mentioned above as illustrated in ARASI, obviously a "Baghaddād October" and hence stylistically in the mid-10th/16th century tradition). Opposite the shrine and on the far side of its stream are the remains of a Mughal garden with parterres and fountains, and of a bath; the site is thus a pleasant prospect.

**Bibliography:** Abu l-ʿAfnī Akbarī, tr. Blochmann, i, 446, 515; Taʾrīkh-i Maʿṣūmī, tr. Elliot and Dowson, i, 239; M.S. Elphinstone, Account of the kingdom of Cabool, i, London 1839; A. Cunningham, ASI, ii, s.v.

---

**HASNAD B., a small town about 40 km. east of Ṭāfik, Pākistān, 33°48' N., 72°44' E., which forms a part of the ruins around the ancient Taxila. It is known as the site of a spring which has attracted legends of sanctity from Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim and Sikh sources, and in its form of the sacred tank of the Serpent King Elīpatra was described by the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang in the 7th century A.D.**

It is now known by Muslims as the spring of Bābā Wali, and by the Sikhs as that of Pandjābī Ṣāhib (Pandjābī ṣāhib 'group of five (sc. fingers)', i.e., 'hand'), from the shape of a mark on a rock from underneath which the water flows. Sikh popular tradition ascribes the mark to the hand of their founder Guru Nānak, although the story is acknowledged by many including some devout Sikhs, to be an invention of the 12th/18th century; certainly there was no shrine of Sikh worship at Ḥasan ʿAbdal before the time of Randjīt Singh.

The 'Bābā Wali' mentioned seems to be the saint ʿHasan of Kandahār, called Abdāl, who came into India in the train of Timūr, and was an ancestor of the historian Muḥammad b. Māṣūmī, author of the Taʾrīkh-i Maʿṣūmī, who recorded his descent from the saint on an inscription on the Buland Darwaza of Fathpur Sikri. A variant tradition, however, collected by Cunningham (see Bibliography), makes one Kandahār saint of Bābā Wali and a Gūḍjar saint of Ḥasan ʿAbdal. The shrine of Bābā Wali stands high on a hill, and the spring at its base is enclosed by a Sikh gurdwārā, a tank copanied with mulberry-trees and filled with fish, and several tombs in ruins (one shown in Annual Report ASI 1929-30, Pl. I b), one of which is said to be that of a saint of the Khalsa. There are also references to the presence of the tomb of "Lalla Rokh" —the last poem in Moore's romance was recited by the disguised prince at Ḥasan ʿAbdal; but the historicity of the lady referred to is in doubt.

Historically Ḥasan ʿAbdal is of interest as having been a popular camping ground of the Mughal emperors on their way to and from Kashmir; from the ʿAfn-i Akbarī (tr. Blochmann, i, 446) it is apparent that the town bore the name Ḥasan ʿAbdal in Akbar's time, and that Akbar visited the tomb of Ḥakīm Abu'l-Fath there (= the tomb mentioned above as illustrated in ARASI, obviously a "Baghaddād October" and hence stylistically in the mid-10th/16th century tradition). Opposite the shrine and on the far side of its stream are the remains of a Mughal garden with parterres and fountains, and of a bath; the site is thus a pleasant prospect.

**Bibliography:** Abu l-ʿAfnī Akbarī, tr. Blochmann, i, 446, 515; Taʾrīkh-i Maʿṣūmī, tr. Elliot and Dowson, i, 239; M.S. Elphinstone, Account of the kingdom of Cabool, i, London 1839; A. Cunningham, ASI, ii, s.v.
Subsequently, Hasan led a victorious expedition against the Kabyle chief of Kuko in 355/967. It is noteworthy that the defeat was not a mere victory, but a decisive blow to the Kabyle chief, forcing him to retreat, and he returned to Tlemcen. However, the exact details of the battle and its consequences are not available in the sources.

In 359/970, Al-Hasan al-Asham probably regained command after the Fatimid conquest of Tlemcen, but this is doubtful. He gave up his duties and fought against the Ikhshidid governor. He fell into disfavor with the government and was again in command of the Karmatis and defeated by the Fatimid troops under the command of the son of al-Muizz, who had fled from Baghdad and seized Damascus. A Fatimid general Dja'far, holding collective power, and defeated by the Fatimid troops under the command of the Karmatis allied to Alptekin, after the death of their father in 254/868. The death of Hasan's brother, Muhammad, in the lifetime of their father gave rise to intrigues against him and his brother or cousin Dja'far, who, according to Ibn al-Dawadari, succeeded al-Asham in the command of the Karmatis and allied to Alptekin, after his death.

Al-Asham has sometimes been considered as the principal promotor of the change in the attitude of the Karmatis towards the Fatimids.


**HASAN AL-A’SHAR, ABU MUHAMMAD HASAN** (a very important work). (M. CANARD)

According to the Twelver Shi’i traditions, Hasan al-Ashami, born at al-Ashami, died at Ramla in 366/August 977. But the other sources make al-Ashami die at Ramla in Rajab 366/March 977, a few days after he arrived, already sick, in this town. If, as is probable, al-Ashami died in 366, there may have arisen a confusion between him and his brother or cousin Dja’far, who, according to Ibn al-Dawadari, succeeded al-Ashami in the command of the Karmatis and allied to Alptekin, after his death.

According to the Twelver Shi’i traditions, Hasan al-Ashami was nominated Imām by his father, the tenth Imām, soon after the death of the previously nominated Imām, his brother Muḥammad Abū Dja’far, and a few months before the death of their father in 254/868. The death of Hasan’s brother, Muḥammad, in the lifetime of their father gave rise
to sectarian dissent, on the ground that the tenth Imam was the last Imam, and owing to the claims of Dja'far to the Imamat.

The eleventh Imam fell ill on 1 Rabii I 260/25 December 873 and died seven days later. He was buried in his house beside his father. His Bâb was 'Ughmân b. Sa'id. Early Shi'i authorities (al-Kullînî, Usâl, 326; al-Mufid, al-Irkâd, 365) say that during the week of his illness, the caliph al-Mu'tamid sent his doctors and servants to attend the Imam, and that a considerable number of 'Alid and 'Abbâsid notables visited him. Later Shi'i sources accuse al-Mu'tamid of poisoning him.

At the death of the eleventh Imam, further dissension arose among the Shi'a on the question of his posternity [see MUHAMMAD AL-KA'IM]. Some believed that he left a child named Muhammad; other denied that he left a child; others regarded his childless death as a proof that he had borne a male child, and that a considerable number of 'Alid and 'Abbâsid authorities (al-Kulînî, Birûr al-anwdr, Tehran 1302, xii, 154-79. See also al-Mufid, Kitâb al-Irkâd, Tehran 1308, 365-8; Nawbahî, Firaq al-Shia, ed. Ritter, 78-89; Ibn Khallîkân (De Slane trans.), i, 390-1; Ibn al-Abbî, vii, 189; al-Khatîb, Ta'rîkh Baghdad, vii, 366; Ibn Tûlûn, Al-'Imma al-ihdâ'ashar, ed. Sâlih al-Dîn al-Munadjîdî, Beirut 1958, 113; Ibn al-'Imad, Shadhârat, ii, 141 ff.; Abu 'l-Mahâsin, Nû'djâm ( Cairo ed.), iii, 32.

In addition to the sources mentioned in the article, reference may also be made to Abbâs Iybâl, Khânâmân-i Nawbahî, Tehran 1311 solar, index; D. M. Donaldson, The Shi'ite Religion, London 1933, 217-25; and J. N. Hollister, The Shia in India, London 1933, 90-2.

(H. J. Elias)

HASAN BABA, dey of Algiers from the beginning of 1682 till 22 July 1683. He first exercised the functions of corsair-captain (ra'î) at Algiers; in this capacity he took part in the revolt of 1671 which replaced the powers of the agbas by that of the deys. Son-in-law of the first dey, Hâdîdî Muhammad Tîbî who was also a corsair, he already played an important part in the days of this timid old man. Thus, when Hâdîdî Muhammad fled to Tripoli on receiving news that a French fleet was coming to attack Algiers, Hasan Baba had no difficulty in seizing power (beginning of 1682). He engaged in a brief campaign to repulse the Moroccan troops threatening Tlemcen, but hurried back to Algiers, towards which Duquesnes's fleet was sailing. The fleet arrived there on 29 July, bombarding the town from 26 August to 12 September. During this time the dey exercised a rigid authority over the town.

Having on this occasion gained nothing, Duquesnes returned in 1683 and began to bombard the city afresh on 26 June. This time the dey agreed to negotiate and to hand over hostages, among whom was a ra'î whom he regarded as his rival, Hâdîdî Husayn nicknamed Mezzomorto. The latter succeeded in procuring his release by Duquesnes on 23 July and led the other corsairs to make an attack on Hasan Baba, who was murdered the same day.


(R. Le Tourneau)

HASAN AL-BAŞRî, Abu Sa'id b. Abi 'l-Hasan Yasâr al-BAŞRî (21/642-210/728), famous preacher of the Umayyad period in Basra, belonging to the class of the "successors" (labî'în). His father, whose name was originally Pêrûz, was made prisoner at the taking of Maysan in Irak, and is said to have been brought to Basra, where he was purchased by a certain man whose identity cannot be definitely established, and married Hasan's mother, Khayra. According to tradition, Hasan was born in Medina in 21/642 (for a critique of this tradition see Schaeder, op. cit. in bibl., 42-8). He grew up in Wâdi 'l-Kûrâ and, one year after the Battle of Siffin, went to Basra. As a young man he took part in the campaigns of conquest in eastern Iran (14/636 and the following years). Thereafter he lived in Basra until his death in 210/728. His fame rests on the sincerity and uprightness of his religious personality, which already made a deep impression on his contemporaries (Ritter, 14 ff., 33, n. 5), and above all on his famous sermons and pronouncements in which he not only warned his fellow citizens against committing sins, but commanded them to consider and to regulate their whole life sub specie aeternitatis, as he did himself. These sermons, of which only fragments have been preserved, are among the best surviving specimens of early Arabic prose. Their vivid images and striking antitheses place them in the class of great rhetoric. It was not without reason that anthologists such as Djahîs and Mubarrad quoted them together with the famous speeches of the political leaders of the Umayyad period as models of style, and many of his sermons have even found their way into the great dictionaries. Two famous examples are: hâdîthâ hâdîhi 'l-bulûba sa'immâh sari'su 'l-udsâr "Re-polish these hearts (the seats of religious feeling), for they very quickly grow rusty!" (Ritter 34, mistranslated); ida'il 'l-dunya ka 'l-hanârarti ta'djâsu 'alayhâ wâli ta'muruhî! "Make this world into a bridge over which you cross but on which you do not build!" (Mubarrad, Kâmî, ed. Wright, 158). It is natural that there is a place in the work of hortatory literature in which some of Hasan's sayings are not quoted. His political judgements of the earlier caliphs are not, as is usually the case, confessions of allegiance to a political party, but arise from his religious principles. He criticized fearlessly the rulers of his time, the governors of 'Irâq. When he went so far as to criticize the founding of Wâsit by Hâdîdîdî in 86/705, he incurred the displeasure of the governor and had to go into hiding until Hâdîdîdî's death (Schaeder, 55-63; Ritter, 53-5). Nevertheless Hasan disapproved of those who took part in attempts to remove by rebellion the evil governors (taghîyr al-munahar). When the followers of the rebel Ibn Ash'ârî (81/700) ordered him to join them, he explained that the violent actions of tyrants were a punishment sent by God which could not be opposed by the sword but must be endured with patience (Schaeder, 56-7; Ritter, 51). In his sermons he constantly warned against worldly attitudes and attachment to earthly possessions: men are already on the way to death and those who are already dead are only waiting for the others to follow (Ritter, 20). He was suspicious of those who amassed riches. He rejected a suitor for his daughter's hand who was famous for
his wealth simply because of his riches (Ritter, 25), and it did not occur to him ... least three (Nuruosmaniye 3106, Tarih Kurumu 517, Konya) have continuations to 1039 (=Solakzade, p. 749, see below), which was being distributed free: "If I concern, by the term mundfib, could have everything that lies between the two ... mundfik (Ritter, 42-4). He considered that the sinner was fully responsible for his actions. His own sayings were circulated as husnuwa and he did not protest (Ritter, 25-6). Hasan called the worldling, whose mundfik, 2

HASAN AL-BASRI — IIASAN BEY-ZADE

judged sins strictly (tashdld al-mu^dsi) and considered him, because of his riches (man^u^fik), which does not contain something concerning Hasan and hardly a work on ethics, exhortation, mysticism or adab which does not cite one of Hasan's sayings. The following may be mentioned: Ibn Sa'd, Tabakat, vil/1, 114 ff.; Fihrist, 183; Ibn al-Murtada, Tabakat al-Mu'tasias, ed. Susanna Wüscher Häfli, Is., 21, ff.; Ibn Katoiyba, U'tyan al-akhdar, Cairo 1925, index, which does not contain something concerning Hasan and hardly a work on ethics, exhortation, mysticism or adab which does not cite one of Hasan's sayings. The following may be mentioned: Ibn Sa'd, Tabakat, vil/1, 114 ff.; Fihrist, 183; Ibn al-Murtada, Tabakat al-Mu'tasias, ed. Susanna Wüscher Häfli, Is. 21, ff.; Ibn Katoiyba, U'tyan al-akhdar, Cairo 1925, index, which does not contain something concerning Hasan and hardly a work on ethics, exhortation, mysticism or adab which does not cite one of Hasan's sayings. The following may be mentioned: Ibn Sa'd, Tabakat, vil/1, 114 ff.; Fihrist, 183; Ibn al-Murtada, Tabakat al-Mu'tasias, ed. Susanna Wüscher Häfli, Is. 21, ff.; Ibn Katoiyba, U'tyan al-akhdar, Cairo 1925, index, which does not contain something concerning Hasan and hardly a work on ethics, exhor...
and two (Vienna 1049, Köpörü) to 1045/1636 (= Solakzade, 763). The work served as a main source for Pöntw (see Ta'rikh, i, 5 etc.), Kâtip Celebi (see Fa'iqiye, i, xi etc.) and Na'imi (perhaps indirectly), through Şahrî al-Makar-zade, see Ta'rikh, i, 10, and Na'imi); while Solakzade (q.v.) frequently follows it so slavishly that he reproduces verbatim Hasan Bey-zade's autobiographical references: thus at Ta'rikh, 610 and 635, for example, یک‌AUT یک‌SURAT and bu fażi refer to Hasan Bey-zade (Na'imi, e.g., at i, 309, occasionally does the same). It is not possible to be sure if a complete edition of the work is required or whether its essential information is in fact already available through these published texts.

Hasan Bey-zade is the author also of Usul al-bisham fi niyâm al-'ilam (MS: Istanbul, Belediye O.49), dedicated to Celebi 'Ali Paşa (Grand Vizier 1029-30/1620-21); it is a collection of maxims of government, abridged from the Rawd al-akhrâr and subsequently becoming an official in various commercial courts. While so employed he wrote for the newspapers Takwim-i Tîjânâ and Diwân-ı Hâsadî. In 1867 he became president of the first majlis of the Commercial Court, but after a more digression by those who spoke. The session over

HASAN BÜZURG, founder of the Dîlâyîrîd (q.v.) dynasty, ambassador of the Ottoman Empire, Bursa, niece of Mehemmed Tahir, Usul al-mâliîsî, i, 46; Babinger, 174; IA, a.v. Hasan-beyzade (by Orhan F. Köprülü); M. Cavid Baysun, Reis-ü kütûb Kûşkân Hasan Bey, in Ta'rikh Dergisi, i, 3-4, 100, n. 8 and Tarih Dergisi, ii, 17; Brockelmann, II, 429, itself based on the Rabî' al-abrâr of al-Zamakhshari. A medîmna in the possession of Prof. Cavid Baysun (for details see Tarîh Dergisi, i, 3-4, 100, n. 8 and TM, x, 322-3) contains some poems composed by Hasan Bey-zade (who used, besides his personal name Ahmed, the names Abd al-Hamîd and Hamîdî), as three fawwâdî (one incomplete) which he wrote for the capture of Kanigh (1000/1600). In the Public Record Office in London are preserved two letters informing Queen Elizabeth of this victory, one from the Sultan (SP 102/4, partial trans. in B. Lewis, Istanbul and the civilisation of the Ottoman Empire, Norman Okt. 1963, 166-8), the other from the Grand Vizier (SP 102/6): these were probably composed by Hasan Bey-zade.

Biographical: Bursa Mehmed, Usul al-mâliîsî, i, 46; Babinger, 174; IA, a.v. Hasan-beyzade (by Orhan F. Köprülü); M. Cavid Baysun, Reis-ü kütûb Kûşkân Hasan Bey, in Ta'rikh Dergisi, i, 3-4 (1952), 97-102; idem, Hasan-beyzade Ahmed Paşa, in TM, x (1953), 321-40. (J. H. MORDTMANN-[V. L. MENAGK])

HASAN FEHMÎ, Ottoman statesman, was born near Batum, the son of HâdidjI-oghlu Sherif Molla and grandson of one Mehmed Agha. After primary education there he went to Istanbul, where he studied Arabic, Persian, and French with private tutors, as well as law. He began government service as an employee of the Translation Bureau in 1858, subsequently becoming an official in various commercial courts. While he employed for the newspapers Ta'bir-î Tijânat and Diwân-î Hâsadî. In 1868 he became president of the first majlis of the Commercial Court, but was dismissed, probably in late 1871, during the Grand Vizierate of Mahmud Nedim Paşa (q.v.). For some years thereafter he practised law privately.

Upon the institution of the constitutional regime by Midhat Paşa (q.v.) and Abd al-Hamîd II (q.v.), Hasan Fehmi, then chief clerk of the Translation Bureau, was elected a deputy by the Istanbul electors on the fourth ballot, on 1 March 1877. When the chamber met on 21 March, it elected him one of the four secretaries for the first session. On the closing day of that session, 28 June 1877, Hasan Fehmi made the major speech, pointing with pride to the chamber's free discussion and to its beneficial actions, even though in his view it had not accomplished all it should have done.

Chosen again on 12 November 1877 as an Istanbul deputy for the second session of the parliament, Hasan Fehmi became president of the chamber by election on the third ballot, taking office on 31 December. As president he was more moderate and courteous than had been his predecessor Ahmed Wefik Paşa (q.v.) in the first session, but allowed more digression by those who spoke. The session over which he presided, prorogued by the sultan on 14 February 1878, passed no bills, but effectively criticized the ministry. Hasan did not, like Ahmed Wefik, assume the role of government spokesman. After the chamber's dissolution Hasan Fehmi continued as vice-president of a special chamber committee, even though the sultan presided, to aid refugees from the Russo-Turkish war.

In 1878 Hasan Fehmi was appointed Minister of Public Works. While occupying this office he taught commercial law and international law in Istanbul. He was also for a time director of the civil list (Khariste-i Khâsî nâzîrî). His lectures on law were published in summary form in a book entitled Tâfâhid-i bukâhid-i dawâî, but after a jornal submitted to 'Abd al-Hamîd II the book was suppressed and he was reprimanded. In 1881 Hasan Fehmi attained

Amir Khusraw, Igdîs-i Khusraw, Lucknow 1870, 51; 'Abd al-Hâdhî Dihlawî, Aghdîr al-âhâm (MS: Istanbul, Belediye O.49), 1534/1531, 101-5; Ghulâm Sarwar, Khuzzyâmî al-asfâl (MS: Lucknow 1885, 117; Lucknow 1914, 344); Muhammed Gâwâlî, Gâwâlî-i abrâr, Urdu tr., Aga 1326/1908, 93-5; Râhmân 'All, Tadhidh-i 'ulâmâ-i Hind, Lucknow 1914, 48-9; Fîrûgî, Lucknow 1878; Barani, Ta'rikh-i Firuz Shahî, Calcutta 1862, 60, 306; 'Abd al-Kâdir Badâ'înî, Muntahâb al-tawâridî, Calcutta 1874, i, 204; Shâbîl Nu'mânî, Shîrî-i Dâlî'âmî, A'amârîg 1335/1916, 2, 129-32; Nişâţî, Mavlânâ-i Fawâdî al-masâhîhî, Badakhshân 1924, i, 204; K. A. Nizami, Some aspects of the religion and politics in India during the 13th century, Aligarh 1961, 270; idem, Ta'rikh-i ma'sâmî-yi Cîdî, Delhi 1953, 181; H. Habib, Cîdî records of the Sultanate Period, in Medieval India Quarterly, i (1950), 1-43; S. M. Ikram, Armagând-i Pa'î, Karachi 1953, 43.
the rank of vizier, and became Minister of Justice.
In the first months of 1885 he was sent on a special diplomatic mission to London to negotiate the
wall of Aydln, and in 1892 (Rusumdt emini),
the rank of vizier, and became Minister of Justice.

Hasan Fehmi retained the reputation of being untainted by the regime, and after the revolution of 1908 was regarded by some affection by the Young Turks as an "Old Young Turk" and a living link between the first and the second constitutional periods. During the two years following the revolution he was twice Minister of Justice and once President of the Council of State in various cabinets,
and became a member of the Senate. He died in 1910 in his house at Edirne Kapd and was buried in the family cemetery at Fith on Agha Vokuslu. His wife was the daughter of Abd al-Halim Ghalib Pasha.

Bibliography: Ibrahim Alaeтин (Göysa), Meşher adamlar, Istanbul 1933-5, ii, 479-80; GövsKa, Türk meşhurları, Istanbul 1946?, 134; R. Devereux, The first Ottoman constitutional period, Baltimore 1963, index; Bursali Mehemd Tahir, 'Othmand mu'tsifler, 1ii, 155; Mehemd Zekii Pakaln, Son sadrasamler ve baptekiller, Istanbul 1940-8, index; İbnülem Mehmud Kemal Inal, Son asr Türk sairleri, Istanbul 1939-42, index; dem, Osmanlı devrinde son sadrasamlar, Istanbul 1940-53, index.

Hasan Fehmi Efendi, known as Ağaşehirî, an Ottoman Sheykh al-Islâm. The son of Othman Efendi of Iğlun, he was born in 1210/1795-6, and held various appointments in the teaching branch of the "Ilmiyye" [q.v.] profession. In 1275/1858-9, on the death of Yahyâ Efendi [q.v.], he was appointed to the office of Ders Wekili, with the duty of teaching and preaching on behalf of the Sheykh al-Islâm. Djewdet, who had reason to be hostile to Hasan Fehmi, indic- ated that the appointment was made for want of any one better, and says that he was known among the students as hadâbi—the liar (Tesdikr 13-20, ed. Cavid Baysev, Ankara 1950, 60; according to A. Abd al-Rahmân Sheref, he earned this sobriquet by not fulfilling the promises he made to the influential people whom he approached). His position became much stronger after the accession of Sultan Abd al-'Azîz, whose preceptor he was. In 1863 he accompanied the Sultan to Egypt, where he is said to have had learned conversations with the Azhari Shaykh Ibrahim b. 'Allî al-Sakkât [q.v.]. In 1867 he became Kâdfasker of Anatolia, then of Rumelia, and in April 1868 was appointed, for the first time, as Sheykh al-Islâm. This was a time when the modernization of the apparatus of government was reducing the jurisdiction and power of the office of the Sheykh al-Islâm; the creation in particular of new administrative bodies dealing with law and education meant a curtailment of his authority in matters previously regarded as his exclusive concern. [see also MAGHĀM-KHAT]. Hasan Fehmi tried to resist these encroaches- ments. The first object of his counter-attack was the committee which, under the chairmanship of Ahmad Djewdet [q.v.] and the authority of the Djinâm-i Akhâm-i Âlîyye, was preparing a new Ottoman civil code, the famous Medeni hukuk [q.v.]. Djewdet and his committee had successfully resisted the pressure of the extreme Westernizers, egged on by the French ambassador Bourée, for a French-style code, and were preparing a modern statement of Halâfi Muslim law. They were able to get their way, on the other side, of the 'ulamâ, led by the Sheykh al-Islâm, who saw in the preparation of this code under the department of justice a usurpation of the functions and prerogatives of his own office. Hasan Fehmi offered various objections to the work; in 1870 he procured the removal of Djewdet to other duties and the transfer of the Medjelle committee, under a new chair- man, to the jurisdiction of his own office. Djewdet was unwilling to authorise the removal of the feud between him and Hasan Fehmi continued (Ebu'lulâ Mardin, Medeni hukuk cephesinden Ahmet Cevedet Paşa, Istanbul 1946, 64, 70, 78-80, 82, 84, 88 f., 91 ff., 98-9, 106, citing Djewdet’s own account of these matters from his unpublished memoranda).

Another objective was the newly opened Dâr al-Funûn, designed by the Ministry of Education to grow into a university and serve as the corner-stone of a modern educational system. Hasan Fehmi was not present at the ceremonial opening in 1879; there is good reason to believe that he was instrumental in bringing about the closing of the Dâr al-Funûn in the following year. There is some evidence that one of the circumstances leading to this closure was a public lecture given by Djîmân-Î Dîn-Î Âffûnî, which was reported to the Sheykh al-Islâm as being heretical and blasphemous (Osman Kesikgözlû, Cemalddin Âfûnî, in İdikyiyi Faksulû Dergisi, 1962, 92-6, where other Turkish sources are cited; M. Z. Pakaln, Son sadrasamlar . . , iv, Istanbul 1944, 136 ff.; Osman Ergin, Türkiyede maarif tarihi, ii, Istanbul 1940, 460 ff.; Mehemd Âli Âyn, Dâr al-Funûn ta'vîzî, Istanbul 1927 (not seen); E. G. Browne, The Persian Revolution of 1905-9, Cambridge 1910, 7; R. H. Davison, Reform in the Ottoman Empire 1858-1876, Princeton N.J., 1963, 271).

Hasan Fehmi was dismissed from office in September 1871, ten days after the death of his protector the Grand Vizier Âli Paşa [q.v.], and two weeks after the return of Djewdet as chairman of the Medjelle committee and a member of the Council of State. He returned to office for a second term as Sheykh al-Islâm in July 1874, and remained until May 1876. He lost no time in resuming his quarrel with Djewdet, whom he blamed for the transfer of the committee from the bâb-i fethû, under his own jurisdic- tion, to the Sublime Porte (Mardin, op. cit., 114 ff., 123 f.). The work on the Medjelle proceeded, however, and by now the Sheykh al-Islâm was even willing to attend the first prize-giving ceremony of the Galatasaray school in 1875 (Mahmûd Djewad, Ma'narsî-Î Umâmiyye Neşäret-i ta'vîzî-i teşâbîd ve idâhî-lî, Istanbul 1938, 152). The last eight and a half months of his tenure of office coincided with the second Grand Vizierate of Mahmud Nedim Paşa [q.v.], and ended with his fall. The riots of 10 May 1876 were directed especially against the Grand Vizier and the Sheykh al-Islâm, the rioters demand- ing the dismissal of both. Hasan Fehmi’s unpopularity was no doubt due in part to his association with a very unpopular minister. There is also some evidence that he was personally unpopular among the ulema, as well as among the administrative and theological students (see for example Mehemd Memdûh, Murîd-i gûvanî, İzmir 1328, 64-5, where he is accused of giving advancement only to his own followers, and of appointing unqualified persons).

Prof. Davison (Reform . . . , 325) hazards the guess that his unpopularity among the students may have been due to the influence of Djîmân-Î Dîn-Î Âffûnî, against whom he is said to have acted in 1870.
The hostility of Djewdet, better grounded and more potent, will no doubt have had some influence on the events between 1550 and 1555. The Sa'did profited from this alliance to seize Tlemcen (9 June 1550). Hasan Pasha reacted at once, retook Tlemcen, and even pursued the Moroccan troops as far as the Moulouya. This was the beginning of a Moroccan policy which the Turks were long to pursue.

The beylerbey was recalled to Turkey in September 1551 as the result of many intrigues. He was once again sent to Algiers in June 1557 to replace Şâlib Paşa, who had died the year before.

Relations were again strained between the Sa'dids and the Turks, for the Moroccans had retaken Tlemcen. Hasan Paşa rapidly ejected them and even entered Morocco, but for fear of having his lines of communication cut by the Spaniards he did not push on as far as Fes. At the same time he sent to Morocco some Turks, pretending to be deserters, who succeeding in assassinating the Sa'did ruler on 23 October 1557. He then turned against the Spaniards, whom he heavily defeated on 26 August 1558. In 1559 he wished to strengthen the Turkish hold on Kabylia and inflicted a serious defeat upon his enemies in September 1559. After this he tried to enrol the Kabyles in his service against the Moroccans. The outraged Janissaries seized the beylerbey and sent him in chains to Istanbul (September 1561).

Quickly vindicated, Hasan Paşa returned to Algiers a year later. He at once made serious preparations against the Spaniards of Oran. The seizure of Mers el-Kebir lasted two months (3 April–7 June 1563), but failed, as a consequence of the arrival of a relieving fleet. In the following year Hasan Paşa received orders to prepare his fleet for the Ottoman attack on Malta, and he took part in this in July 1565. Although the siege failed, the Algerians and their commander served with distinction.

The Ottoman archival sources provide some supplementary details on Hasan Paşa's career. Upon his recall from Algiers in 1551, he was appointed sandjak-beg of Manisa, but held office for only a short time: he was retired, with a dirîsh, in 962/1554 (Başbakanlık Arşivi, Mühimme register no. 1, p. 212, no. 1326, of 15 Muḥarram 962). The text of the firman ordering him to participate in the attack on Malta is preserved (Mühimme, xvi, p. 560, no. 1326, of 12 Shawwāl 962). As beylerbey he followed his father's policy of hostility to the French, and was hence accused of piratical activities against French ships (Mühimme, vi, p. 637, doc. 1398). After his second recall from Algiers in 1567, he played a part in the battle of Lepanto [q.v.]: he was ordered to command part of the fleet sent from Istanbul to the Archipelago (Mühimme, xii, p. 244, doc. 510), and during the battle fought in the centre, with the Kapudan Paşa, Mühiddinhisâde Selim Paşa. On 2 December 1571 he was again appointed beylerbey of Algiers (Mühimme, xvi, p. 313, doc. 555) but did not go to his post (Mühimme, x, p. 99, doc. 157, of 23 Sha'bān 979/12 January 1572), probably because he was already ailing. He died in 1572, and was buried beside his father at Beshāhān. His elder son Muhâmed commanded a ship at Lepanto; the younger, Mêhmed, was a mutasferri (Mühimme, xxv, p. 93, doc. 1050, of 3 Dhu 'l-Hijjâd 981).

Bibliography: J. Morgan, A history of Algier, London 1920, 353, 353, 398, 419, 432, 474; Hâdû, Hist. des Rois d'Algier, ch. 6; Sources inédites de l'histoire du Maroc, série Espagne, ii (1956) and iii (1961), passim; H. de Grammont, Hist. d'Algier sous la domination turque, Paris 1887, chaps. 22; al-İfrani, Nüzhat al-hadî, ed. O. Houdas, Paris...
of troops in Rumeli, he died at Doghan Koprusi in of Budin. While he was supervising the movement jealously of the to Hasan Pasha's dismissal as Kapudan (12 Rabi fortified Ozi bek Giray as Khan of the Crimea (1037/1627-8). In which he had founded in the Gedik Pasha and buried by a ii, 132: [see SARAY]. Upon his appointment as Kapudan Mustafa procured him appoint- ment in the Palace service successively as Matbahh (and intermittently of adjacent provinces also) from 1126/1713 to 1136/1723, and father and predecessor of Ahmad Pasha [q.v.], founded the line of Mamlik rulers of 'Irak which lasted till 1247/1831. A Georgian by origin and son of an officer of Murad IV, he was born about 1068/1657, educated in the Saray schools, and advanced rapidly to the governorships of Konya, Aleppo, Urga, and Djftarbakr. In 'Irak he showed exceptional gifts of character by his piety, firmness and justice, and, as yearly (at times monthly) expeditions, successfully imposed discipline on the unruly Arab and Kurdish tribes, secured a high (if never flawless) standard of law and order, and demanded justice and honesty from his subordinates. The Ottoman declaration of war on Persia in 1136/1723 involved Hasan Pasha in important military operations and a large-scale invasion of enemy territory in the winter of that year. He died at Kermanshah before the spring, and his posthumous title of "conqueror of Hamadan" was strictly earned not by him but by his son Ahmad: but his own lengthy tenure of the Pashalk was rightly judged as outstandingly successful.

Bibliography: As for Ahmad Pasha [q.v.]. (S. H. LONGRING)

HASAN PASHA, ÇATLEBAQI, OTTOMAN Kapudan Paşa. The son of a Janissary from Çataldiya, he was trained as a saddler in the household of the Çâghmâr Mehmed Agha. The patronage of the Dâr al-sâda aghâsi Muštafa procured him appointment in the Palace service successively as Maṭâbaḫ emmî, Cawûh-bâshl, Kapudân-bâshl and Miraqâr-î ewvel [see Saray]. Upon his appointment as Kapudan Paşa in 1035/1626-6 he was given in marriage (TAQDAR) to Emine Sultan, daughter of Ahmed I. As Admiral, he procured the installation of Djânl- bek Girây as Khân of the Crimea (1037/1627-8). In 1040/1630-1 he destroyed the Cossack fleet which died in Rebi II ii25/May 1713.

Bibliography: Mehmed Hafid, [q.v.]. Bibliography: Mehmed Hafid, [q.v.]. As for Ahmad Pasha

HASAN PASHA (see DZIRA'AÎLI GHZTT HASAN PASHA, KâRYA HASAN PASHA, KÀDEM HASAN PASHA, TURKOLLÎ, HAKÌ'IF HASAN PASHA, YEMENÎ HASAN PASHA, YEMENIÎ HOJASAN PASHA). DâMAD HASAN PASHA, (?-1125/1713), Ottoman Grand Vizier. The sources refer to him sometimes as "Morali", i.e., "from the Morea" and sometimes as "Enişte", i.e., "brother-in-law" (of the sultan, in this instance). He became a dokâdar and then, in 1093/1683-4, rose to the rank of sâldâdar. On the accession to the throne of Suleyman II in 1190/1775, Mehmed, son of Ahmad, was made Grand vizier of Egypt (with the status of vizier)—an appointment that he held until 1101/1689-90, when, according to the Sâdî-î 'Othmandî, he became mutasarrîf of Brusa and Nicomedia (Izmid). Hasan Pasha, in 1102/1690-1, received the hand of Khadija Sultan, a daughter of Mehmed IV. After serving for some time as Bâqâder mûhâefî he was sent, in 1105/1693-4, to govern the island of Sâkîe (Chios). The war of the "Sacra Lega" (Austria, Venice, Poland) against the Ottoman Empire was still in progress (1684-99). Hasan Pasha, in 1106/1694, had to meet at Chios the assault of a Venetian naval force sailing under the command of Antonio Zeno and consisting of about one hundred vessels, great and small, with more than eight thousand troops on board. Effective resistance was not possible and Hasan Pasha, after a brief siege, surrendered the island to the Venetians, the Muslim garrison and the Muslim population on Chios being allowed to depart, with their arms and baggage, for Çehmne on the mainland of Asia Minor. As a punishment for this reverse Hasan Pasha suffered a brief incarceration, after which he became governor of Kef (Kaffa) in the Crimea (Nusretâname, i/1, 27). He was raised, in 1106/1695, to the rank of fifth and then of second vizier (Nusretâname, i/2, 27), 1125/1713), Osmanh tarihi, iv/i, 146. (V. J. PARRY)
SEYYID QASAN PASHA, Ottoman Grand Vizier under the sultan Mustafa I; a native of a village in the district of Shab (Shabin) in Bursa province, he entered the Janissary Ojlaq, in 1146/1733-4. He attained the rank of wazir (lieutenant-general), took part in the Persian campaigns and in mid-Rabi‘I 1151/29 June–8 July 1738, during the war against Austria, he was promoted to be Agha of the Janissaries. This was one of the first coups in a general rising against the Salljufis.

In 1152/26 December 1739 for his bravery in this war, he was appointed Governor of Vojvodina. In 1159/24 May 1747, during the war with Austria, which had been going on intermittently since the Peace of Belgrade (1739), he returned to Iran, where he was accompanied by an account of the accession of Sultan Muhammad Shah. He accompanied the Shah on most of his expeditions, and was an eye-witness of events from that date until 1770. He was also the best authority for the reign of Shah Tahmasp I, where he is chiefly remembered as the author of a twelve-volume general history entitled Ahsan al-amrādīkh (the best authority for the reign of Shah Tahmasp I, where he is chiefly remembered as the author of a twelve-volume general history entitled Ahsan al-amrādīkh (Baroda 1931) the text of Vol. xi, covering the period 900-985/1494-1577, and (Baroda 1934) an abridged translation of this volume (see Storey, i, 306-9). He was an eye-witness of events from that date until 1770, in which year he brought his chronicle to a close with an account of the accession of Sultan Muhammad Shah.

Bibliography: references in the text.

(1. H. MORDTMANN-[E. KURAN])

HASAN-I RÜMLÜ, grandson of the kâlimbâbh chief Amir Sulût Rûmlû, the governor of Kâzûn and Sândjî Bulâg, who died in 946/1539-40. Hasan Rûmlû was born at Kûmm in 937/1530-1, and was trained in the Şafwî army as a kârî.

Hasan-i Rûmlû is chiefly remembered as the author of a twelve-volume general history entitled Ahsan al-amrâdîkh (Baroda 1931) the text of Vol. xi, covering the period 900-985/1494-1577, and (Baroda 1934) an abridged translation of this volume (see Storey, i, 306-9). He was an eye-witness of events from that date until 1770, in which year he brought his chronicle to a close with an account of the accession of Sultan Muhammad Shah.

Bibliography: references in the text.
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power by the Isma'ïls, which emphasized seizing fortresses and assassinating key opponents and had wide success after Malikshah's death (485/1092); the Sâmilîs and the Ispâbab debated the possibility of his own rule. After Nizâr and his sons broke with the Fatimid Egyptian government in 487/1094 in support of the claims of Nizâr to the imâmât. Meanwhile Hasan, as leader in Rûdbâr, was taking a number of strongholds there and making them as self-sufficient as possible. After 498/1104, under Muhammad b. Malikshah, the Saljûq forces recovered many fortresses, including the headquarters of Ibn 'Atâ'î's son near Isfahân; Hasan was forced to provide a financial stronghold, resisting persistent Saljûq assaults. In 511/1118 a major siege of Alamût broke up only on Muhammad's death. By this time, Hasan seems to have been recognized as chief throughout the Nizârî movement. His remaining years, till 518/1124, were mostly peaceful and devoted to consolidating into a cohesive (but territorially very scattered) state such of the Nizârî movement as had been retained.

Hasan led a retired and ascetic life and imposed a puritanical regimen on Rûdbâr. He executed both his sons, one for alleged murder, the other for drunkenness. He was learned in the philosophical disciplines and wrote cogently. We have a portion of his autobiography, an abridgement of a treatise of his on theology, and possibly other writings. He expounded in Persian an intensely logical form of the Shi'î doctrine of 'âdîd, that one must accept absolute authority in religious faith; this form of the doctrine became central to the Nizârî teaching of the time and greatly affected al-Ghazâlî.

Neither in the intellectual nor in the political sphere do we know how far Hasan was an originator, how far simply the most successful exemplar of the new ways used by the Nizârîs. Among later Nizârîs, Hasan came to be looked on as the chief figure of the "daw'a di'âdîd", the reformed Isma'îlî movement dating from the break with the Egyptian government. He was the bu'dîsâ, the living proof of the vanished imâm after Nizâr's death, and the authorized link with the line of imâms who subsequently appeared in Alamût. He was called sayyid-nâd, "our master", and his tomb became a shrine. Outsiders ascribed to him the organization of the Isma'îlîs and their agents. After his death the organization and training of the fidâ'îs, dedicated assassins, who later may have formed a special corps.

What we have of Hasan's writings, in addition to brief citations and perhaps summaries in later Nizârî works, is preserved in al-Šâhrahstânî and in Raqîd al-Dîn, Diwâni' al-lavâdîrî, and Dâuwaynî (who is less full); the latter two give primary data on his life. For discussion and bibliography, see Marshall G. S. Hodgson, The Order of Assassins: the struggle of the early Nizârî Isma'îls against the Islamic world (The Hague 1955). For an uncritical Islamic world evaluation, see Jawad al-Muscatî, Hasan bin Sabbath (2nd. ed.: Isma'îlia Association Pakistan, Karachi 1953 or 1958).


Al-Utrush came to Tabaristan in the reign of the 'Alid al-Dâ'î al-Kâbir al-Hasan b. Zayd [see al-Hasan b. Zayd b. Muhammad]; his brother and successor al-Kâ'im b. 'I-Hâjî Muhammad b. Zayd, distrusting him, he endeavoured to found a kingdom of his own in the east, under the support of the governor of Nâysâbûr Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh al-Khudištânî, who took Djurdjân from al-Kâ'im. But tale-bearers cast suspicion on al-Utrush and al-Khudištânî threw him into prison in Nâysâbûr or Djurdjân and had him scourged, which injured his bearing and to this he owes his epithet "the dear". On his release he returned to al-Kâ'im Muhammad and in 287 or 288 or (according to Abu 'l-Faraq al-Ispâbab) 289 or 307/1092-309 to 1110, he recurred with the Sâmilîs and al-Khudištânî, who took Diurdjân from al-Kâ'im. But equally general was the pressure by the Zaydîyya [q.v.]

The friendship of the Djastânîs, which dated from the time they and al-Utrush were with al-Kâ'im, was as flâj as their attitude to Isalâm, which their ancestor Marzâbân had adopted only a century earlier. Several joint undertakings thus came to nothing; al-Utrush recognized the necessity of first of all securing a following of his own, and through them the followers of the Djastânîs. He conducted Islamic missions and 'Alid propaganda from Hawsam among the not yet converted tribes on the coast of the Caspian Sea and in Gilân and also built mosques.

The Sâmilîs Ahmad b. Isma'îl in 298/910 sent Muhammad b. Sa'ûdî to Tabaristan with orders to prevent the foundation of the new state; but a Khurâsân army superior in numbers and still more so in equipment was completely defeated by the Daylamîs under al-Utrush at Shâlûs in Diûmâdî 1/307/1013; many fugitives were driven into the sea; a detachment led by Abu 'l-Wâsî Khâlîfa b. Nûh escaped to the fortress of Shâlûs, surrendered to al-Utrush on a promise of pardon, but was shortly afterwards massacred by his general and son-in-law Muhammad b. Harûn, who had quired with the Sâmilîs, supported him. Al-Utrush received a welcome from Djastân of Daylam (or his son Wasûbân; cf. Vasmer, in Islamica, iii, 165 ff.). The friendship of the Djastânîs, which dated from the time they and al-Utrush were with al-Kâ'im, was as flâj as their attitude to Isalâm, which their ancestor Marzâbân had adopted only a century earlier. Several joint undertakings thus came to nothing; al-Utrush recognized the necessity of first of all securing a following of his own, and through them the followers of the Djastânîs. He conducted Islamic missions and 'Alid propaganda from Hawsam among the not yet converted tribes on the coast of the Caspian Sea and in Gilân and also built mosques.

The Sâmilîs Ahmad b. Isma'îl in 298/910 sent Muhammad b. Sa'ûdî to Tabaristan with orders to prevent the foundation of the new state; but a Khurâsân army superior in numbers and still more so in equipment was completely defeated by the Daylamîs under al-Utrush at Shâlûs in Diûmâdî 1/307/1013; many fugitives were driven into the sea; a detachment led by Abu 'l-Wâsî Khâlîfa b. Nûh escaped to the fortress of Shâlûs, surrendered to al-Utrush on a promise of pardon, but was shortly afterwards massacred by his general and son-in-law Muhammad b. Harûn, who had quired with the Sâmilîs, supported him. Al-Utrush received a welcome from Djastân of Daylam (or his son Wasûbân; cf. Vasmer, in Islamica, iii, 165 ff.). The friendship of the Djastânîs, which dated from the time they and al-Utrush were with al-Kâ'im, was as flâj as their attitude to Isalâm, which their ancestor Marzâbân had adopted only a century earlier. Several joint undertakings thus came to nothing; al-Utrush recognized the necessity of first of all securing a following of his own, and through them the followers of the Djastânîs. He conducted Islamic missions and 'Alid propaganda from Hawsam among the not yet converted tribes on the coast of the Caspian Sea and in Gilân and also built mosques.

The Sâmânîs Ahmad b. Isma'îl in 298/910 sent Muhammad b. Sa'ûdî to Tabaristan with orders to prevent the foundation of the new state; but a Khurâsân army superior in numbers and still more so in equipment was completely defeated by the Daylamîs under al-Utrush at Shâlûs in Diûmâdî 1/307/1013; many fugitives were driven into the sea; a detachment led by Abu 'l-Wâsî Khâlîfa b. Nûh escaped to the fortress of Shâlûs, surrendered to al-Utrush on a promise of pardon, but was shortly afterwards massacred by his general and son-in-law Muhammad b. Harûn, who had quired with the Sâmilîs, supported him. Al-Utrush received a welcome from Djastân of Daylam (or his son Wasûbân; cf. Vasmer, in Islamica, iii, 165 ff.). The friendship of the Djastânîs, which dated from the time they and al-Utrush were with al-Kâ'im, was as flâj as their attitude to Isalâm, which their ancestor Marzâbân had adopted only a century earlier. Several joint undertakings thus came to nothing; al-Utrush recognized the necessity of first of all securing a following of his own, and through them the followers of the Djastânîs. He conducted Islamic missions and 'Alid propaganda from Hawsam among the not yet converted tribes on the coast of the Caspian Sea and in Gilân and also built mosques.
Abū Ṭūlūb was the great-grand-nephew of the Imām al-Naṣīṣ Abū Ṭūlūb (see Būlā), who, born in 340/951, has given us the most important account of al-Utrūsh, based on the stories of eyewitnesses, such as his father.

Al-Bīrūnī, permeated by the ancient Persian traditions, blames Ḥasan al-Utrūsh for destroying the family organization of the Kadhkhudah, established by the mythical Faridūn (al-Abūr al-bâhôtâ, yea, text 224, tr. 210; cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 214, and idem, Sozien, i, Moskau 1966, 276).


IIASAN AL-UTRUSH — HASANAK 355

brought by the notables upon the dying al-Utrush to designate this same al-Ḥasan as his successor, and even to send an army against Tus.

Abū Ṭūlūb owed his rise not only to the skilful way in which he took advantage of the political discord on the Caspian Sea but also to his unusual intellectual ability. He was also a poet (cf. Brit. Mus. MS, Suppl. 1329, iv, and specimens in the Ifdīda, see Bibl.), but he particularly cultivated dogmatix, tradition and law (cf. also Ibn al-Nadīm, Fīris, 185, lines 1, 3423; al-Nadīm, Muqaddas, 119, lines 7). He seems to be a native of the UAE area (see Bibl.); he differs from the Yemeni practice in the ritual of burial and minor points of the law of inheritance; he also recognized the validity of the formula of repudiation when pronounced three times in succession as equivalent to three separate repudiations, by which he aroused the opposition of the Twelve Shi'a, who were numerous in the north; one of his sons, Abū ʾl-Ḥasan ʿĀli, was actually joined them; and he himself used their form of washing the feet, of course combined with the general Shi'a refusal to recognize the rubbing of the covered foot as a substitute for washing; he also showed himself less strict against members of other faiths, which is intelligible in view of his political and missionary aims. A particular Zaydi sect, the Naṣirīyya, was called after him, which had been predominant in the Yemen, by the Imām al-Mahdī Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad, son of the above mentioned al-Ḥasan b. al-Kāsim.

The latter, known as al-Dāʾī al-Ṣaḥīḥ, succeeded al-Utrūsh and was able to conquer Naysābūr in 306/918 through Laylā b. Nuṣādī, an old general of his predecessor, and even to send an army against Tūs. But he was killed in 316/928 when going from Rayy to the relief of ʿAbd Allah Muḥammad, son of the above mentioned al-Ḥasan b. al-Kāsim. Abu Jalīb was the great-grand-nephew of the Asasīb and the descendant of the family organization of the Kadhkhudah, established by the mythical Faridūn (al-Abūr al-bāhôtâ, yea, text 224, tr. 210; cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 214, and idem, Sozien, i, Moskau 1966, 276).

But he was killed in 316/928 when going from Rayy to the relief of ʿAbd Allah Muḥammad, son of the above mentioned al-Ḥasan b. al-Kāsim. Abu Jalīb was the great-grand-nephew of the Asasīb and the descendant of the family organization of the Kadhkhudah, established by the mythical Faridūn (al-Abūr al-bāhôtâ, yea, text 224, tr. 210; cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 214, and idem, Sozien, i, Moskau 1966, 276).

(R. LE TOURNEAU)

HASANI (pl. HASANlYUN), the name of the 'Alid [q.v.] sharifs descended from al-Hasan, son of 'Ali and Fatima. Hasani is thus contrasted with Hasami, the name of the descendants of their second son. In Morocco, the surname of Hasani is particularly reserved to those sharifs descended from Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya, son of 'Abd Allâh al-Kâmîl [q.v.] in order to distinguish them from their Idrisid [q.v.] cousins. The Hasani family have played a considerable part in the history of the Maghrib from the Western Sahara, not only by reason of their number but also in giving birth to two great Sharifian dynasties; that of the Sa'dids [q.v.] in the roth/16th and 17th/18th centuries and that of the 'Alawids [q.v.], which has been reigning in Morocco from the middle of the 17th/18th century to the present day (the 'Alawids are also known under the names of Filâlids or Sigîljimâsîs and the Sa'dîs under that of Zaydâns).

The date and reason for the establishment of the Hasans in southern Morocco are not precisely known, and it is hardly possible to verify the legends handed down to us in the abundant literature. The Arabic writers, however, are agreed in fixing the arrival of the first sharifs at Sigîljimâsî [q.v.] towards the end of the 7th/13th century, either brought back from Arabia by pilgrims or as a result of the journey of a special delegation which sought them at Yanbas, a little port in the Hûdjâz. The inhabitants of the oases of the Tafilalet (capital: Sigîljimâsî) welcomed them in the hope of ensuring for themselves good date-harvests in the future. The first of these sharifs bore the same name as his ancestor al-Hasan. He is now known by the surname of al-Dâhil, that is, the first to enter. A first cousin of this personage, Zaydân, appears to have been summoned about the same time and for the same reasons by the tribes of the oases of the Wâdi Dra. It has been suggested that these 'Alids may have come to Morocco with the Ma'âlî tribes [q.v.], who at that time were establishing their rule over the Moroccan oases south of the Atlas, where the sharifs would have played their traditional part as bringers of good luck and judges in the quarrels of these nomads from Arabia. This hypothesis is attractive but has not yet been verified. Several Arab authors have questioned the direct lineal descent from Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya, and even the Sharifian origin of the first Sa'dîs, but today the genealogy of all the Hasans, though perhaps not always unquestionable, is in fact not questioned. The genealogical table published here is complementary to that given for the 'Alids, and therefore does not go back earlier than the common grandfather of the Sa'dîs and the 'Alawids.

Genealogical Table of the Ḥasanī Sovereigns of Morocco
(cf. the table for the ʿAlīds, at vol. i, p. 401)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>both entered Morocco at the end of the 13th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ʿAbd al-Rahmān</th>
<th>Muḥammad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Muḥammad al-Ḵāʾim bi-ʿAmr Allāh |
| Aḥmad al-ʿAḍād (d. 1557) | Muḥammad I al-Mahdi (d. 1557) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ʿAbd al-Walīd</th>
<th>Yūsuf</th>
<th>ʿAli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>al-Ḥasan I (d. 1894)</th>
<th>ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muḥammad I (d. 1873)</th>
<th>ʿAbd al-Ḥāfīz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| al-Ḥasan II (d. 1927) | ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (deposed 1908, d. 1943) | ʿAbd al-Ḥāfīz (abdicated 1912, d. 1937) | Yūsuf (d. 1927) |

1) banished from Morocco from 19 August 1953 until 16 November 1955, his place being taken by his uncle ʿArafā b. al-Ḥasan.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, III
HASANWAYH, name of one of the Kurdish chieftains (and of the dynasty descended from him) who, in the 4th/10th century, succeeded in founding and maintaining in Western Iran and Upper Mesopotamia more or less autonomous and lasting principalities.

Hasanwayh b. Husayn (Abu 'l-Fawaris) belonged to a branch of the Kurdish tribe of the Barzikâni, other groups of which were led by several of his relatives (Ibn al-Âjîl, viii, 528-9). The death of two uncles (349/960 and 350/961) and the use of force against the latter's son (whom he assisted in fighting the Kurds) enabled him to increase his influence over the Kurds of these areas. This emboldened him to resist with force the governor of the province of Hamadân, Shams al-Dawla; in 349/960, his position was taken by that of the family, and things might have gone badly for him if the expedition against him organized by Rukn al-Dawla's wasir, Ibn al 'Amîd, had not been interrupted by the latter's death. The dead man's son and successor, Abu 'l-Fath Ibn al-'Amîd, negotiated with him, and in return for tribute of 50,000 dinârs and considerable numbers of animals, granted him financial autonomy, with the right to collect taxes in his province (Safr 360/December 970). He became reconciled with Sahîlân, who was himself semi-independent, and allied himself with him by marriage. In the struggle between the Bûyid 'Izz al-Dîn Bakhtîyârî [q.v.] and his cousin 'Aqîd al-Dawla [q.v.] he contrived, while promising his aid to the former in view of his connexion with the Bûyid of the Dîjbâl, Fâkhîr al-Dawla, to confine this to sending him his sons 'Abd al-Razzâk and Badr and postponing his own arrival until Bakhtîyârî was beaten and put to death. Several unpublished letters written by Abu 'l-Shawk al-Sâhîbî [see Rasûl, i, 51], Paris MS, fols. 55 v., 56 a., 94r., 97r.; Leiden MS, fols. 129r., 200 v.) in the name of Bakhtîyârî or of the caliph al-Tâhâ, bear witness to these negotiations. Meanwhile, Hasanwayh seems to have managed to make his peace with 'Aqîd al-Dawla, who at least took no measures against him; he died in 365/978 in his fortress of Sarmadî (south of Bistun).

Dissension broke out among his numerous sons. In the struggle in which Fâkhîr al-Dawla set himself up against his brothers 'Aqîd al-Dawla and Mu'ayyid al-Dawla of Rayy, several Hasanwayhids including 'Abd al-Razzâk were on the side of the first, while others including Badr supported 'Aqîd al-Dawla. The defeat of Fâkhîr al-Dawla involved his Kurdish allies, Sarmadî was taken from one of them, Bakhtîyârî was dead, and in the end all the sons of Hasanwayh were put to death except Badr (Abu 'l-Nâdîm) who, with the title of 'adîb, was installed as general leader of the Barzikâni Kurds in the name of Mu'ayyid al-Dawla, heir to the possessions of Fâkhîr (370/980). These facts are substantiated by a letter of 'Abd al-'Azîz b. Yusûf (C. Cahen, Une correspondance buyûdîe indîse, in Studi orientalissici ... Leoni Della Vida, i, 87).

Abu 'l-Nâdîm (later Nâşîr al-Dawla) is considered by the historians to be a prince worthy of all praise. Though a faithful vassal of Mu'ayyid al-Dawla, whom, for example, he assisted in fighting the Ziyârîd Kâbûs [q.v.], he was equally loyal to Fâkhîr al-Dawla once more, when the latter had peacefully succeeded Mu'ayyid al-Dawla after 'Aqîd al-Dawla and Mu'ayyid al-Dawla had died. In the quarrels between the various claimants to the succession of Fâkhîr al-Dawla he successfully supported Fâkhîr al-Dawla against Shahrâb al-Dawla, suppressed the revolt of a Barzikâni chieftain near Kûmm, and on Fâkhîr al-Dawla's death appears as a counsellor to the government of the young heir and his mother, whom he assisted for example in repelling the claims of Mahmûd of Qazwân ('Utbi, trans. Reynold, 424).

He came meanwhile to a good understanding with the new Bûyid in Baghchashmîn, Bahâ' al-Dawla, through whose efforts he was enabled to increase his influence and security. In 398/998 the lahâb mentioned above took refuge in the territories of Sâbûr-Khârâst, Dinawar, Nihâwand, Asadâbâd, Barûdîrî, and several districts of Ahwâz, as well as Karmân, Huîlân and Shahrâzûr from time to time. Abu Shudî Rûshwarî, who regards the Barzikânî as "the worst tribe on earth for brigandage", hymns his skill, energy and justice, which enabled him to impose on them a respect for order, to conduct a sensible financial administration, to develop the mountain roads and the markets (including, at Hamadân, a market for the sale of his own produce), to foster religion, and to secure by large gifts the safety and welfare of the pilgrimage which crossed his territory; several surviving coins show that he struck his own coinage (some new coins of his have been published by G. C. Miles in Mém. de la mission arch. en Iran, xxxvi, 145-7).

The last period of his principality brought him several trials nevertheless. In the quarrels in which the Bûyids or their dignitaries opposed each other, the assistance or hospitality which he gave to some involved him in the anger of others. The Hasanwayhids had immemorially been rivals of the Shâhdâhân Khurâsân, their western neighbours (towards Karmân and Huîlân) and of the most influential family among them, that of the Annâzîds [q.v.]; Badr had expelled from his territory Abu 'l-Fath ibn 'Annâz, who had taken refuge among some 'Ukaylî [q.v.] Bedouins in Upper Mesopotamia; in 397/1006-7 there were hostilities from this quarter. Again, Badr had alienated his eldest son, Hilâl, and preferred a younger; at one moment victorious with the help given him by the vassal ruler of Shahrâzûr, Hilâl was finally vanquished by an army sent by Bahâ' al-Dawla; but through this affair Ibn 'Annâz, with Abu 'l-Badâ' had been obliged to reconcile himself, had improved his position. More generally, the Kurdish subjects and neighbours of Badr ceased to respect him, and it was in fighting a minor group that Badr met his death in 405/1014.

This was the end of the family. It is true that in the previous year Bahâ' al-Dawla had died and Tâhir (Zâhir), a son of Hilâl, had again taken Shahrâzûr; and Hilâl, being freed, arrived to take his father's place. But after a few months they were conquered and put to death by the son of Abu 'l-Fath ibn 'Annâz, Abu'l-Shâh [see 'Annâzîds], whose power in the Dîjbâl was henceforth to replace that of the Hasanwayhids. There remained in the hands of the family, which had been stripped of all other possessions, only its stronghold of Sarmadî, where the last heir died in 439/1047, at the moment when a new conqueror was entering the country, the Saljûq Türk İbrahim İnâl.

Bibliography: Apart from the occasional sources given in the article, all the information derives from the history of Hilâl al-Sâhîbî, as it has been transmitted to us (apart from the brief extract
given by Ibn Ḥazm as Nawfal) were a multitude of tribes (ḥuṣūn ḡirmata), all going back to Nawfal's grandsons Ḥāshid and Baklī, "the two tribes of Hamdān (ḥabīl Ḥamdan)". This scheme places Yām (ṣūra) among the branches of Ḥāshid and Arāb among the branches of Baklī. At present the tribe of Yām lives north of the confederation and is regarded as a separate entity, while the tribe of Arāb lives to the south and is more closely associated with Ḥāshid than with its reputed ancestors of Baklī.

Another version, recorded by al-Suwaydī, gives Baklī as a descendent rather than brother of Ḥāshid (Baklī b. Diwawī). It has the tribe of Ḥāshid in the place of the tribe of Arāb. This version is less plausible, as it makes every branch of Baklī also a branch of Ḥāshid; it probably reflects the common tendency to regard Baklī as the junior partner in the alliance, a tendency also illustrated by the assigning to Baklī of second place in the joint name.

For centuries men, families, and larger groups have moved back and forth between Ḥāshid and Baklī without百年 by. Thus Baklī and Ḥāshid are both descended from Ḥāshid, their lines bifurcating from Ḥāshid's son Dīğshām al-Awsat (Ḥāshid's father was Dīğshām al-Abār).

Over the centuries Ḥāshid and Baklī, in a manner not uncharacteristic of brothers, have often fought with each other, just as they did in Sabean times. Almost always, however, they have both stoutly resisted the imposition of outside authority. As Zaydis they have been inclined to be on good terms with the Zaydī Imāms, who have kept strongholds such as Shāhāra in the country of Ḥāshid, but even under the Imāms they have shown a spirit of independence rather than subervience. The Imāms have frequently chosen members of the confederation as provincial governors. When the Turks were in the Yaman, they had little success in extending their jurisdiction into the territory of Ḥāshid and Baklī.

Sources used by the British Admiralty in 1916 are townsmen and villagers, engaged in agriculture and the raising of horses and sheep and to some extent in trade. The nomadic elements range northwards and eastwards, penetrating into al-Djawf (al-Djawf Ibn Nasir), where the influence of the confederation at about 50,000, making it probably the strongest military force in the region. The paramount chiefs, coming from the Ḥimrān of Ḥāshid, also enjoyed a degree of ascendancy over Baklī.

On the role of these tribes in the events following the revolution of September 1962 see YAMAN.

The majority of the members of the confederation are townspeople and villagers, engaged in agriculture and the raising of horses and sheep and to some extent in trade. The nomadic elements range northwards and eastwards, penetrating into al-Djawf (al-Djawf Ibn Nasir), where the influence of the confederation is not inconsiderable. Descendants of the Prophet (Sayyids) are held in high esteem by these Zaydis, especially in the land of Ḥāshid, where at Ḥūf they have one of their main centres in the Yaman.

Bibliography: In addition to the works cited under the article in EI, see J. Ryckmans, L'institution monarchique en Arabie méridionale avant l'Islam, Louvain 1951; Ibn Ḥazm, Dijama'at ansāb al-'arab, ed. E. Lévi-Provençal, Cairo 1948; al-Malik al-Aṣḥāf ʿUmar b. Yūsuf, Taʾrif al-ʿāṣib
After these imitative experiments Ahmed Hashim
sifcdya, that is, the provision of food and water for
age, he held the offices or functions of rifída and
rika, that is, the provision of food and water for
the pilgrims. For the first he collected contributions
in money or kind from the chief men of Mecca. One
year when food was scarce in Mecca, he brought
baked cakes or loaves from Syria, and crumbled
(hagama) these to make broth (tharid) for the pil-
grims; after this he was known as Hashim, though
his proper name was Abú. To improve the water
supply he dug several wells. He is credited with the in-
vention of Persian izdifs, that is, the weaving
of Persian izdifs.

Ahmed Hashim possessed an extremely sensitive,
infinity restless and constantly changing tempera-
ment. His great affections and friendships would
change to deep hatreds overnight and then he would
forgive and forget everything in turn. According to
the reports of his close friends (among others
Y. K. Kaoosmanoğlu and A. Ş. Hisar, see Bibliography),
in spite of his brilliant intelligence, poetical genius and
wide culture, he suffered from a strong feeling of
inferiority. He was an extremely sensitive person;
he thought that his physique was intolerable ugly,
that he was awkward and unsociable and unattractive
to women. He was convinced that Fate had been unkind
to him. He always felt lonely and unloved in the world.
He never recovered from the circumstances of his
childhood and from the feeling of being "strange and
different" in the early years of his youth. This made
him at times cruel and cutting. He lived as a bachelor
and married just before his death the woman who
had looked after him, so that "he could have a
mourning widow after him".

Ahmed Hāshim began to write his first poems at
Galatasaray when he was fifteen. In these early
poems there is a distant echo of the "Indian School"
ofāsid poetry in the style of Sheykh Shālib. But
he is more truly himself following in the steps of the
Tanzimat poet Abū-al-Ḥāṣib Hāmid in the choice of
morbidly sad and melancholy subjects and of Djināb
Shehāb al-Dīn in the vague symbolic imagery.
In this period his style and language follow more
closely the taste of Djināb Shehāb al-Dīn and particu-
larly Tewfik Fikret in the choice of the Arabo-
Persian sophisticated vocabulary and in the weav-
ing of Persian jmāfs. After these imitative experiments Ahmed Hāshim
did not write for a few years but read extensively the French impressionists and particularly the symbolists, whom he found close to his nature and his approach of poetry. Baudelaire, Verlaine, Rimbaud, Henri de Régnier, Mallarmé, Samain and the Belgian Verhaeren were his favourites.

In 1909 a group of young poets and writers who thought that the Thorrent-i Fünun movement was now outmoded, set up a short-lived new literary group: the Fegür-i Ali (“Dawn of the Future!”). Although Ahmed Hashim joined this new circle, because many of his friends were members, he himself was already a distinguished independent personality in Turkish poetry. Liberating himself completely from the influence of the Thorrent-i Fünun poets and not caring much for a group movement, he concentrated on developing modern Turkish symbolism, the theory of which he elaborately expounded in various articles and particularly in the preface to Piyâle. “Unlike prose, poetry is not to be understood but to felt... meaning and clarity are not the aims of the poet... Poetry, like the words of prophets, should be open to diverse interpretations”.

Ahmed Hâşim’s works underline his desire to escape from surface representation and invest his art with a deeper level of consciousness. For him the Universe exists in and through the mind and conception of the poet. There is no internal and external world, no division into subject and object, all is apprehensible by the poet in search of beauty in a transcendentality existing deeper than mere appearances.

In his poetry, he sought to convey by his acute perception of all the senses and dreams his own communication with and interpretation of that mystic reality.

For him the unity of music and poetry was a means to this deeper communication and his verse is freer and more plant in both form and rhythm than that of the earlier modernists. His poetic technique shows a rejection of the straight comparison and plainly-worked simile and a preference for symbolic imagery inspired by his growing interpretation of that ‘deeper reality’ in general symbolical conceptions.

Some of his poetry seems obscure as a result of his development of an essentially personal range of symbols with which the reader must be acquainted in order to reach a deeper level of understanding. He did not wish to be more ‘explicit’. This symbolic technique called upon the deeper imagination of both reader and poet and freely created more associations and nuances which would be stifled by a more concrete and surface technique. Ahmed Hâşim deliberately attempted to evolve a poetry whose language, of rhythm and symbol, with its own word-values and phrase-orders, defied logical analysis yet liberated and stimulated the mind to a deeper level of consciousness.

In the limited subject-matter and vocabulary of Ahmed Hâşim, dawn, twilight, evening, night, darkness, the moon, moonlight, lakes, ponds, deserts, roses, caryatids, storks, nightingales, melancholy, hopeless love, distant and unknown lands and death are ever-recurring themes and motifs. His poems are generally short. He ignored all movements and changes in Turkish language and literature and remained faithful to ārâd until the very end, as he considered the syllabic metre (heğje wezni) “only fit for folk poems”. He lived through wars and revolutions, but his poetry remained completely unaffected by these. However, the language reform movement did eventually influence him and his last quatrains are written in every-day Turkish without the sophisticated Arabo-Persian vocabulary and without Persian izâfes. Unlike Dînâb Şehâb al-Dîn, whose experiments in simple (ısdâ) Turkish were mainly unsuccessful, Ahmed Hâşim’s were among his best. And judging by them, it is safe to say that he would have grown to surpass his early work had he lived longer.

Except for a few articles, Ahmed Hâşim’s prose consists mainly of short essays on casual themes, as he was sometimes a columnnist in various dailies. His style is condensated, colourful and pithy, often tinged with cutting irony.

Ahmed Hâşim is the author of (1) Göl sa’âlîleri, Istanbul 1921 (contains poems previously published in the then leading literary review Dergâh), (2) Piyâle, Istanbul 1926, 1928 (contains his early poems, the Şir-i Kamer series and the famous introduction which was first published in Dergâh as a kind of manifesto, (3) Gürubâb-hânâ-i Lâkâhân, Istanbul 1928 (contains essays first published in the newspaper âshâm), (4) Bîa göre, Istanbul 1960 (part of his essays published in the newspaper İhâm, (5) Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi, Istanbul 1933, 1947 (travel impressions), (6) Ahmed Haşım’ın şiirleri, Istanbul 1933 (collected verse published after his death by the Semih Lutfi Kitabevi).


(Ahmed Hâşim)

AL-ḤÂSHİM (Shaykh Muhammad b. Ahmad b. al-Ḥâshîmi b. ʿAbd al-Rahmân b. Ḥasan al-Tilmâsî), theologist and šâfi of Sharîf descent, born 1222-24 (619/621) in the vilayet of Bitlis in the department of Oran, Algeria) where his father, a small land-owner, held the office of judge (kâdi). After his father’s death, Muhammad went to Tlemcen, where he followed various occupations: farm-worker, tailor, seller of drugs and spices. He attended regularly the mosques and madrasas to gain instruction in the religious disciplines and joined the mystic order (tarîka) of the Darkâwa (q.v.) “famed particularly for the learning of its members” (E. Doutré). His spiritual director (murhîd), Muhammad b. Yallas, had been the disciple in turn of the Shaykh Muhammad al-Ḥabîrī (d. 1900) and Ibn al-Ḥabîb al-Bûzîdî (d. 1909); then, on the latter’s death, he attached himself to the Shaykh Ahmad al-ʿAlawî (Ben ʿAlwa) of Mostaganem. In 1911, Muhammad al-Ḥâshîmi set off with his master for the East. After a stay of two years at Adana (Turkey), he settled at Damascus, where he completed his theological education under different ‘ulamā‘: Badr al-Dîn al-Ḥasanî, Yûsuf Nabhâni, Abu ʾl-Khâyr al-Mîdânî, etc. Shortly after the death of his master Ibn Yallas (1928), he received from the Shaykh al-ʿAlawi the office of khâṣîf of the ʿAlawîyya-Darkâwîyya-Shadhiliyya tarîba in the countries of the Near East.
From then on he devoted himself exclusively to the teaching of theology (tawhid) and mysticism (tasawwuf). His lectures at the Umayyad Mosque and in a number of madrasas (Shamiyya, Nuriyya) were very well attended; he founded zawiyas in Damascus and in the surrounding villages, at Hims, Hamāt and Halab as well as in Transjordan and Palestine. On his death at Damascus at the age of 80 (12 Raqiāyah 1381/19 December 1661), he left behind him several thousand disciples and the reputation of a renewer (muqaddid) of religion. The quality of his teaching and the virtue and wisdom which he disseminated caused him to be known as "the Shaikh of his time".

His written works consist of ten or so treatises or opuscules on tawhid and tasawwuf. (1) In tawhid, he professes an Ash'arism enriched by the addition of Avicennan ideas (the distinction of the necessary, of the possible and of the impossible and the grasping of these three categories by the intelligence in order to recognize the divine qualities, the attributes of the Prophet and the limits of the created world) and by the developments of the theological school of North Africa in particular of the Imam al-Sanusi (the doctor and safi of Tlemcen, d. 895/1490). The basic idea is that knowledge (ilm, ma'rifah) and more especially the knowledge of tawhid is an individual obligation upon the believer; it not only protects him from the error of denying (khufr) or of "associating" (shirk), but it illuminates him with a certainty (yaqīm) which is of divine origin. For the benefit of readers with varying intellectual capacities, al-Hāshimi wrote a brief "Sunni profession of faith" in prose, which he turned into verse in order to make it more easily memorized (tahdīd at-ta'lim wa mā na'mah), then a short commentary on this text (Sharh tayyib al-diwan bi sharh 'Abd al-Hādī bi al-tasawwuf, Damascus 1347/1947), Rasīlāt al-bahīth al-dājmīs... bi mā yata'allakah bi 'l-san'aw wa 'l-Sāri (Damascus 1374/1955) and Rasīlāt al-bahīth al-fasāl fi bayān al-murād min wasyiyah al-hakim (Damascus, 1376/1957), a short theologico-mystic commentary on the allegory of the swords which, taken separately, are easily broken and if joined together form a solid support. (2) In tasawwuf, several treatises written in reply to the theoretical or practical questions of his pupils have not yet been printed. The only works at present available are the Sharh Shajrinda tashrifī ("Commentary on the Chess-board of the Gnostics"), an explanation of a curious diagram attributed to Muhyī al-Dīn Ibn 'Arabī, in which human destiny and the mystic's progress towards God, together with the perils and the grace which attend them, are illustrated by the hundred squares of a chess-board (Damascus 1357/1938, reprinted 1964) and al-Hill al-madīnāt al-tashrifī, a technical glossary of Sufism by Ibn 'Abī Khālid (q.v.).

Bibliography: the essential work on the 'Alawiyya branch of the Darāwsha is M. Lings, A Moslem saint of the twentieth century, London 1961, devoted to the Shaykh Ahmad al-'Alawi and describing the essential aspects of the mystic method of training (wird, dhikr, ḥalawā) used also in the Syrian tarīkh (the author makes occasional references to al-Hāshimī). Notices on al-Hāshimi are found in the following works, written by two of his disciples: Sa'id al-Kurdi, al-Dājmī, Damascus 1388/1949, 142-6, and 'Abd al-Karim ibn 'Abī Ḥabīb an al-tasawwuf, Aleppo 1384/1964, 355 ff. (J.-L. Michon)

HĀSHIMIDS (AL-HAWASHIM), the dynasty of Ḥasanīd Шarīfs who ruled Mecca almost without interruption from the 4th/10th century until 1343/1924. After the First World War the dynasty provided kings for Syria and Iraq, which later became republics, and gave its name to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (see following article). The eponym of the dynasty was Hāshim b. 'Abd Manaf (q.v.), the great-grandfather of the Prophet.

The majority of the Shī'ī recognize as their Imāms descendants of 'Ali's martyred younger son al-Husayn. Descendants of the elder son al-Ḥasan found their opportunity to wield temporal as well as spiritual power during the chaotic period following the Karmatī occupation of Mecca.

The Ḥashimī line of Meccan Шarīfs was descended from Mūsā I al-Djawn ("The Black"), a great-grandson of al-Ḥasan and a younger brother of Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zakīyya. One of Mūsā's sons, Ibrāhīm, was the ancestor of the Ulghādīyīds (q.v.) of Ya'mama, and the other, 'Abd Allāh al-Shaykh al-Sāliḥ (also called al-Riḍā), was the sire of the Meccan Шarīfs. From 'Abd Allāh's son Mūsā II sprang three of the main branches of the dynasty—the Mūsawīds, the Hawaišīm, and the Katādīds. From Sulaymān, another son of Mūsā II, came the fourth main branch, the Sulaymānīs (strictly speaking, therefore, all four branches were Mūsawīs).

The Shijfaṭī lasted nearly a millennium, with the Mūsawīds, Sulaymānīs, and Hawaišīm reigning for well over two centuries and the Katādīds for the remaining seven centuries and a quarter.

The first of the line to make himself master of Mecca was the Mūsawī Dīja'far b. Muhammad of the fourth generation after Mūsā II. Dīja'far is said to have supplanted a representative of Egypt at an uncertain date, probably in the early years of the second half of the 4th/10th century. Dīja'far's success may have been connected with the rising power of the Fātimīds. Early in the 5th/11th century the Mūsawīds under Abu 'l-Putnī al-Ḥasan failed in an attempt to bring the Caliphate back to Mecca, and their authority was later challenged by the Sulaymānīs, who developed a base for their power farther south on the Red Sea coast (see 'Aṣfī). Neither the Mūsawīs nor the Sulaymānīs got an enduring grip on the Shī'ī. In the second half of the 5th/11th century they gave way to the Hawaišīm (so called here to distinguish them from the larger entity of the Ḥashimīds), whose eponym was a descendant of Mūsā II named Hāšim.

In or about 977/1201 (the correspondence of dates in EI1, i, 552 is inexact), one of the greatest of the long line of Шarīfs, Katādī b. Idrīs, swept down from his stronghold of Yānba' and drove the Hawaišīm out of Mecca. Katādī was in the tenth or twelfth generation after Mūsā II, and all the Meccan Шarīfs who succeeded him bore the name of his ancestor.

In the mid-7th/13th century Mūsāmād Abū Numayyā I, the eighth Katādī, first mounted the throne as a partner of his father al-Ḥasan. Nearly two centuries then elapsed before the accession of Mūsāmād Abū Numayyā II, son of Barakāt II (q.v.).

The descendants of Abū Numayyā II in time split into three principal clans which often contained with
one another for sovereignty over Mecca. The first clan to establish itself was Dhawu cAbd Allah (the Abadila), named after a grandson of Abū Numayy II, but it soon yielded to Dhawu Zayd, named after a great-grandson. The third clan, Dhawu Barakāt, named after a son of Abū Numayy II, shared dominance with Dhawu Zayd from 1082/1672 until Dhawu cAbd Allāh regained power under Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Mu'in b. 'Awn in 1243/1827. Muhammad and the seven rulers among his descend- dants, the last of the Muhārīrūn, may be named collectively as Ḥālid b. Sa'd of the Katadids. The picture is further complicated by the fact that many Sharifs reigned more than once (Sa'd b. Sa'd of Dhawu Zayd, for example, reigned five times between 1099/1688 and 1129/1717, and his father had reigned four times before him). The reign of at least one Sharīf lasted less than a day. Very often two or more Sharifs shared the rule as partners (zhurād).

The total number of Hāshimīd Sharifs is too great to devise a complete list of the Hāshimīd Sharifs of Mecca. The sources for their history, though ample, contain gaps and contradictions. A general idea of the course of their succession can be obtained from the genealogical tables in Snouck Hurgronje and al-Sibā'ī. The picture is further complicated by the fact that many Sharifs reigned more than once (Sa'd b. Sa'd of Dhawu Zayd, for example, reigned five times between 1099/1688 and 1129/1717, and his father had reigned four times before him). The reign of at least one Sharīf lasted less than a day. Very often two or more Sharifs shared the rule as partners (zhurād).

The total number of Hāshimīd Sharifs who held office as Sharīf of Mecca between Dī'āfar b. Muḥammad and al-Husayn b. 'Ali appears to have been just short of a hundred. Of them less than twenty belonged to the first three branches and slightly more than eighty to the fourth, the Katadīdīs.

Not only was the rule of the Hāshimīds disturbed by frequent internecine struggles, but it was often interfered with and on a few occasions briefly suppressed by Muslim sovereigns outside al-Hijāz, beginning with the Fatimids and the Abbasids and ending with the Ottomans and Al Su'ud. In the Middle Ages the Sharifs almost invariably recognized one or another of these sovereigns as their overlord. Given the tremendous internal and external pressures on the Sharīfīs and the shirks for independence, it is impossible to devise a complete list of the Hāshimīd Sharifs of Mecca. The sources for their history, though ample, contain gaps and contradictions.

The death of Faysal ushered in a period of drift. The youngest son, Zayd, was born there. The Congress refused to accept the mandate system. Faysal, after accepting the crown of Syria from the Congress in March 1920, somewhat reluctantly acceded to armed resistance to the French and was forced to flee from Syria when the French defeated the Arab forces in July 1920. Husayn, however, addressed him only as "King of the Hijāz."

At the end of the war, Faysal, the third son, was pre-eminent. As commander of the Northern Arab Army, he was the commander of Allied Forces in Syria and Transjordan. As representative of the Hijāz at the Peace Conference, he negotiated with the Great Powers. Faysal proved unequal to the task of mediating the opposing aims of the Allies and the notables of Syria and Palestine, who formed themselves into the Syrian General Congress in 1919. The Congress refused to accept the mandate system. Faysal, after accepting the crown of Syria from the Congress in March 1920, somewhat reluctantly acceded to armed resistance to the French and was forced to flee from Syria when the French defeated the Arab forces in July 1920. Husayn, King of the Hijāz, still dreamed of being king of Arabia. He was unsuccessful, however, in his efforts to persuade the British to support him against 'Abd al-'Azīz Al Su'ūd. Nevertheless, he would not seek an accommodation with the Wahhābī leader, despite the military superiority which the Najdī forces had demonstrated in 1919. Husayn, doubtless seeking support in the contest, adopted the title of Caliph in 1924. Su'ūdī military force prevailed, and Husayn fled from the Hijāz in October 1924, leaving 'Ali as king. The latter followed his father when Ibn Su'ūd completed the conquest of the Hijāz in December 1925. Husayn, who spent his remaining years in Cyprus, died in 'Ammān on 4 June 1931. 'Ali lived in Bagdad until his death on 13 February 1935.

Faysal [q.v.], with British backing, became king of 'Irāk on 25 August 1921. He worked diligently to form the kingdom. His ambitious reforms brought him into a unity and to create viable relations with the mandatory power. His activities culminated in the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty of 1930 and the admission of 'Irāk to the League of Nations on 3 October 1932. With 'Irāk independence achieved, Faysal sought to create a union of 'Irāk with Syria, but he failed to win the approval of the dominant political coalition in Syria.

The death of Faysal ushered in a period of drift.
The reign of the young king Ghazi [q.v.] (8 September 1933 to 4 April 1939) was marked by tribal rising, military coup, rapid succession of cabinets, and increasing agitation against the British connexion. The course of affairs during the reign of Faysal II was set by 'Abd al-Illah, who was regent during the minority of the king (4 April 1939-2 May 1953). The Regent’s policy of furthering Pan-Arab aspirations under 'Irak leadership through cooperation with Great Britain passed its first hurdle when the government of Rashid 'Ali al-Khláwi was suppressed by the British in May 1941. In 1942-3, the 'Irak govern-
ment initiated talks for the purpose of creating a federation of 'Irak, Syria, Transjordan, Palestine, and Lebanon (the “Fertile Crescent”). The result, however, was the Arab League, which under Egyptian leadership thereafter blocked 'Irak hopes. After 1945, 'Irak committed itself firmly to Great Britain and the western powers. Egypt took the lead in opposing the 'Irak foreign policy, and when 'Irak signed the Baghdad Pact with Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and Great Britain (24 February-12 October 1955), Egyptian and Syrian displeasure became intense. 'Abd al-Illah and Faysal II were killed in the military coup of 14 July 1958.

'Abd Allah, the second of Husayn’s sons, who had been the most eminent before 1918 and the first to embrace Pan-Arabism, moved to Transjordan in late 1920 with the avowed aim of restoring Faysal in Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon. When the King included Arab Palestine in the Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan in 1950, Egypt directed an attempt to expel Jordan from the Arab League. (The new name had been adopted in May 1946, but was not used by any other government until 1950.) The King’s outspoken British orientation and the existence of the British-commanded Arab Legion facilitated the continuous stream of extreme nationalist propaganda which the opponents of his policies directed against him. On 20 July 1951 'Abd Alláh was assassinated.

King Talál (20 July 1950-11 August 1952) was incapacitated throughout most of his reign, and his younger brother Náif acted as regent until 5 Sep-
tember 1951. The state of Talál’s health was such that Parliament deposed him and the throne passed to his son Husayn, who did not reach his majority until 2 May 1953. The kingdom was shaken by the problem of incorporating western Jordan at the time when the “positive neutralism” of republican Egypt was exciting the younger generation and opposition politicians throughout the Arab world. King Husayn adopted a nationalist course which culminated in the removal of General John B. Glubb from the command of the Arab Legion and the termination of the Anglo-Jordanian Treaty in 1956-7. The King, however, soon broke with his Egyptian-oriented colleagues and accepted American financial assistance. With Husayn now the object of Egyptian hostility, Jordan and 'Irak joined together in the Arab Federation in response to the formation of the United Arab Republic in 1958. The Federation came to an end with the extinction of the Hashimite kingdom in 'Irak.

K. Hitti, ed. James Kritzeck and R. Bayly Winder, London and New York 1959; ibid., *The Amor of Moscati and Cahen, who sees in the Abbasid preaching was of an ex-
tiated family of the Prophet, towards profounder is-
ams and separately organized followings, had not
of the Prophet into different branches, with different
sectarian significance, and when the split of the house
paganda and movement in Khurasan, and thus of
the Abbasids was the most active and best
supporters. From early
Abbasid claim to the Caliphate,
which it was rescued only by modern scholarship.

ally to the
Abbasids themselves, and the sectarian
notation of the term was lost in an oblivion from
which it was rescued only by modern scholarship.

**AL-HÂSHIMIYYA**, a term commonly applied in the
2nd-3rd/9th-10th centuries to members of the ‘Abbâs-
sid house and occasionally to their followers and
supporters. From early ‘Abbâsid times it was under-
stood to denote the descendants of Hâshîm b. Abd Manâf [q.v.], the common ancestor of the Prophet,
Abbas and thus, through
kinsman and rightful successor of the Prophet (Naw-
bahtl, 43). From this time onwards the political and
messianic aspirations which found expression in
Shî’ism are focused on the descendants of ‘Ali and
more especially of Fâtimâ rather than on the Banû Hâshîm as such; it may be noted that already in the
surviving Hâshîmîyyât of Kumayt [q.v.], with their
sometimes almost messianic overtones (e.g., ed. Horo-
witz, Leiden 1904, 154, 3), the poet restricts his praises to the Prophet, ‘Ali, and the ‘Alîds. In ‘Abbâ-
sid times the name ‘Hâshîmîyya’ was applied to the
family of the Prophet in general, but more specif-
ally to the ‘Abbâsid themselves, and the sectarian
notation of the term was lost in an oblivion from
which it was rescued only by modern scholarship.

This confusion as to the location of al-Hashimiyya
was applied in Umayyad times to a religio-political
faction—those who believed that the Imamate had
been transferred to Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya and Abu Hashim as such; it may be noted that already in the
Hâshîmîyya preaching has been the
subject of some disagreement. As the followers of an ‘Abbâsid pretender, the group may be described as
of Shî’ite origin—but at a time when this term had not yet acquired its later and more definitively
sectarian significance, and when the split of the house of the Prophet into different branches, with different
sects, had become a significant fact. The group has had
yet taken place. The view of Van Vloten and Well-
hausens, that the ‘Abbâsid preaching was of an ex-
tremist character [see q.v.], has been followed by
some scholars, but rejected by others, notably Moscati and Cahen, who sees in the ‘Abbâsid move-
ment an urge, focused around the still undifferenti-
ted family of the Prophet, towards profounder is-
ulation and the ending of racial domination. Of this
family, the ‘Abbâsids were the most active and best
organized, and were therefore able effectively to
mobilize the support and goodwill which the family
could command. According to the ‘Abbâsid victory there was some—perhaps deliberate—ambiguity in
the use of the terms Hâshîmîyya and Hâshîmîyyân. Statements attributed to al-Sa’īfî and al-Ma’nsûr
as for example in the inaugural khâbâa at Kûfâ and
in the correspondence with the ‘Alîd Muhammad b.
Abd Allah al-Nafs al-Zakiyya [q.v.]=already put
forward a specifically ‘Abbâsid claim to the Caliphate,
in reply to the ‘Alîd’s assertion that no one had
more than the Hâshîm blood than he [Tabarti, iii, 29 ff., 209 ff.].

The third ‘Alâbîd Caliph, al-Mahdî [q.v.], is said to
have abandoned the claim to the Imamate derived from
Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya and Abî Hâshîm,
and to have basied the claim of the dynasty on their
descent from al-‘Abbâs b. ‘Abd al-Mu’talib as the
kinsman and rightful successor of the Prophet (Naw-
bâghtl, 43). From this time onwards the political and
messianic aspirations which found expression in
Shî’ism are focused on the descendants of ‘Ali and
more especially of Fâtimâ rather than on the Banû Hâshîm as such; it may be noted that already in the
surviving Hâshîmîyyât of Kumayt [q.v.], with their
sometimes almost messianic overtones (e.g., ed. Horo-
witz, Leiden 1904, 154, 3), the poet restricts his praises to the Prophet, ‘Ali, and the ‘Alîds. In ‘Abbâ-
sid times the name ‘Hâshîmîyya’ was applied to the
family of the Prophet in general, but more specif-
ically to the ‘Abbâsid themselves, and the sectarian
notation of the term was lost in an oblivion from
which it was rescued only by modern scholarship.

ally to the
Abbasids themselves, and the sectarian
notation of the term was lost in an oblivion from
which it was rescued only by modern scholarship.

**AL-HÂSHIMIYYA**, name of the administrative capital of the ‘Abbâsids before the building of
Baghdîd, referring not to a single place but to
ever the Caliph chose to establish his residence. The
confusion as to the location of al-Hâshîmîyya stems from the existence of more than one place of
that name, as each in turn was occupied for a period as
the official residence of the ‘Abbâsid Caliph. The
founder of the dynasty, al-Sa’īfî (d. 132/754), after
leaving al-Kûfâ, settled at a site opposite Kasr Ibn Hubayra [q.v.], where he built a city and named it al-
Hâshîmîyya (situated midway between al-Kûfâ and
Baghdîd; cf. Yakot, iv, 946—confuses with Madinat b.
the Caliph had begun construction at Kasr Ibn Hubay-
ra itself, but he abandoned this location when the
populace, in preference to al-Hashimiyya, persisted in referring to the town by the name of its founder, the last Umayyad governor of Ṭrāṣ, ʿUmar b. ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, whose burial site was built on the city on the Euphrates near al-Ḵufa, but was forced to abandon this site by order of the Umayyad Caliph Marwān II (presumably Madīnat Ḥabūlayla, which Ṭabarī and Yāḵṭūš confuse with Kašr Ibn Ḥabūlayla; cf. Annales, ii, 80, 183; Muʿāšar, i, 680, ii, 208; iv, 123, 946; Baḥāḏhirū, Futūḥ, 287). In 134/754, al-Saffāḥ moved once again and established his capital on the Euphrates near al-Kūfa, but he died in 136/754 before completing it (Futūḥ, 287; Yaʾqūbi, ii, 429-30; Bulūḏ, 237; Ibn Kūṭayba, K. al-Maʿāḏirī, 185; Dināwārī, Abū Ḧabīr, 372-3; Ibn Rustaḥ, BGA, vii, 199; Ṭabarī, iii/1, 80, 87; Maʿṣūdī, Tanbīḥ, 339; K. al-ʿUyīn in Fragmenta Historicorum Arabrorum, i, 211). The authorities report that al-_MEMBERSH, who now became Caliph, established his residence at a new location in the general vicinity of al-Ḵufa which, according to al-Ṭabarī, was adjacent to Madīnat Ibn Ḥabūlayla (Yaʾqūbi, ii, 450; al-Ṭabarī, iii/1, 271, 272, 319). This site is not to be confused with Kašr Ibn Ḥabūlayla, which, as previously noted, was situated midway between al-Ḵufa and Baghdād. These accounts seem to suggest that the centre of al-.Flāṣūr’s administration was the city near al-Ḵufa which was first built and later abandoned by the governor of Marwān II. There were, therefore, no less than four ‘Abbaṣiḍ capitals: the three capitals of al-Saffāḥ at Kašr Ibn Ḥabūlayla, at the site opposite that town, and at al-Anbār, and also the capital of al-_MEMBERSH at Madīnat Ibn Ḥabūlayla. The proclivity of the ‘Abbaṣiḍ Caliphs for this constant moving is still unexplained; but it does suggest that they were searching for a site which could satisfy certain particular needs. Following a riot in the court of his palace, al-Flāṣūr began the journey which led to the founding of Baghdād. In 146/763, the administrative agencies of the government were moved to the new location signifying the formal transfer of the capital (al-Ṭabarī, iii/1, 129-33, sub anno 141/758, 271, 418 ff. also gives dates 136, 7; Khattīb, Cairo ed., i, 67 = Paris ed., 2; Muʿāšar, i, 680). Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the text: T. Nūdeke, Sketches from Egypt and Syria. This same Yaḏašīl originally, M. Strete, Die alte Landschaft Babyloniens, 54; A. L. Strange, Baghdad during the Abbaṣiḍ Caliphate, London 1900, 6-10; E. Reitemeyer, Die Städtegründungen der Araber im Islam, Leipzig 1912, 41 ff., 49; J. Lassner, Some speculative thoughts on the search for an ‘Abbaṣiḍ capital, in MW, iv (1965), 135-7; see also Kašr Ibn Ḥabūlayla (J. Lassner)

HASHISH is a narcotic product of Cannabis sativa L., hemp. When cultivated under certain favourable climatic and soil conditions, especially in India and neighbouring areas, the plant is more active physiologically; it is there called C. Indica Lam. Both of these “varieties” are morphologically alike. It is a dioecious plant; the dried flowering tops of the pistillate plants contain a resin whose chief constituent is cannabinol. Cannabis also comes from hemp by its tannate is used as a hypnotic, narcotic, and sedative used in hysteria, acute mania, nervous insomnia, and in menopausal nervous disturbances.

The Indian hemp was known as a useful plant in early historic times. In the earliest scientific literature, the ancient Mesopotamian lexical lists, there is evidence that Cannabis was used both in the manufacture of cloth and as a drug. In Sumerian, it is AZAL.LA and in Akkadian asulū. These terms are cognate to the Syriac ʿasal “to spin.” In the list, it is equated with gurussu from garaḵa “to roll, to twist.” Thus, the Persian word for hemp, gorgariṇḏ, is related to the late Assyrian gurgurangu. Another equivalent in the list is ₵amī niṣāṭu “herb of grief.” An interesting equivalent is the Sumerian GÁN.Z1.GU.NU where GÁN is probably habbū “robber,” and Z1 is napīṣtu “soul.” GUN.NU is “to twist, to weave.” The entire meaning, therefore, of the Sumerian word is “plant + a narcotic + weaving,” or hemp for weaving. In Babylonian medicine, it was used externally with other ingredients for the stomach, swellings, and loss of control of the lower limbs. Internally, it was used for depression of the spirits and renal calculi.

Towards the end of the eighth or first half of the seventh century B.C., the word qunubu or qunubu is mentioned in a Sargonid text. The cognates, Arabic ḥanīb and Persian hanāb, often refer to the hemp seed and its narcotic properties. The Greek (Wellmann, Dioscorides, III, 148) ḥanībāt and Latin Cannabis also are related.

In ancient Egypt, hemp is noted as a drug in the Berlin and Ebers papyri, internally, by smoking, and in a salve. It was called šmt (von Deines, Grapow, VI, 493). According to Laufer, the Persian bāng is a narcotic prepared from the hemp seed. Bang is cognate to the Sanskrit bhaṅga and Avestan bang “narcotic,” Arabic bāndj, Portuguese bango and French bange. Bāndj, in the old Arabic literature, was often used for henbane as a substitute for hemp, thus creating confusion; the two were often used together in prescriptions.

In ancient China, from 1200-500 B.C., when the Kh Ya was compiled, the hemp plant, ma, was known. In the biography of the physician Hoa-tho the narcotic properties of hemp are demonstrated in its use in surgery. Soubeiran gives the modern name as ma-iau, after Tatarinov.

Herodotus (fifth century B.C.) relates the use of hemp by the Scythians as a means of cleansing their bodies. The hemp is thrown on red-hot stones in an enclosed space. The odour is inhaled until intoxication; then they dance and sing. Galen discusses the use of hemp in his case of hysteria. Some-
bīs was Djabir b. Ḥayyān (2nd/8th century). It is found as bandī in his Kitāb al-Sumūm (47b, 132b) where it is used for narcotic purposes in the form of agar ("secret"). It is smoked alone or with tobacco. In Turkey a preparation from hemp called esrar ("secret") is smoked with tobacco. It is also chewed there.

In Syria, much hemp is grown. There are many dens in Damascus where hashish and opium are smoked. Addiction also occurs among the Uzbeks and Tatars.

In India, where hemp smoking is popular, it has been shown that moderate use causes no moral injury. On the other hand, excessive consumption is physically and mentally injurious and deteriorates moral weakness and depravity. The drug is smuggled today into Egypt from Syria and Lebanon. A United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs declared in 1950 that 60,000,000 square metres were under Indian hemp cultivation with an annual production in Syria and Lebanon alone of 300 tons.


Hashish—Hashishiyya, a name given in mediaeval times to the followers in Syria of the Nizārī branch of the Ismā‘īlī sect. The name was carried from Syria to Europe by the Crusaders, and occurs in a variety of forms in the Western literature of the Crusades, as well as in Greek and Hebrew texts. In the form ‘assassin’ it eventually found its way into French and English usage, with corresponding forms in Italian, Spanish and other languages. At first the word seems to have been used in the sense of devotee.
or zealot, thus corresponding to *fatim* [q.v.]. As early as the 12th century Provencal ... to survive the next copyist, the only possible position for a permanent annotation was within the text itself, and
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\[in extasim vel amentiam rapiantur, inebriat, et eis\]

Fundgruben des Orients, 

being the name of a mysterious sect in Syria, assassin 

in extasim vel amentiam rapiantur, inebriat, et eis

found also in other eastern and western sources, of the 

1

Institut Royal, 

Mtmoires de l

In the 

Institut 

In confirmation of this he was able to 

amply confirmed by new texts that have come to 
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Inferno, xix, 49-50), and is explained by his com-

mentator Francesco da Buti, in the second half of 

the 14th century, as 'one who kills another for money'.

During the 17th and 18th centuries the name assassin—and the sect that first bore it—received a good deal of attention from European scholars, who produced a number of theories, mostly fantastic, to explain its origin and significance. The mystery was finally solved by Silvestre de Sacy in his Mémoire sur la dynastie des Assassins et sur l'origine de leur nom, read to the Institut in 1809 and published in the Mémoires de l'Institut Royal, iv (1818), 1-85 (= Mémoires d'histoire et de littérature orientales, Paris 1818, 322-403). Using Arabic manuscript sources, notably the chronicle of Abû Shâma, he examines and rejects previous explanations, and shows that the word assassin is connected with the Arabic hashishi [q.v.]. He suggests that the variant forms Assasiani, Assissini, Heyssisini etc. in the Crusading sources come from alternative Arabic forms hashšši, hashšši, and ḥashšši (pl. ḥashššiyin or ḥashššiyyn) and ḥashšši (pl. ḥashššim). In confirmation of this he was able to produce several Arabic texts in which the sectaries are called ḥashšši, but none in which they are called ḥashšši. Since then, the form ḥashšši has been amply confirmed by new texts that have come to light—but there is still, as far as is known, no text in which the sectaries are called ḥashšši. It would therefore seem that this part of S. de Sacy's explanation must be abandoned, and all the European variants derived from the Arabic ḥashšši.

This revision raises again the question of the nature of the sect itself, and the problem of the origin of the name hashšši or its Arabic equivalent hashšši. This is local to Syria (cf. Houtsma, Recueil, i, 195; Ibn Muyassar, Annales, 68) and probably abusive. It was never used by contemporary Muslims or any other non-Syrian Ismā'īlīs; even in Syria it was not used by the Ismā'īlīs themselves (except in a polemic tract issued by the Fātimid Caliph al-Amīr against his Nīzarī opponents —A. A. A. Fyzzye, al-Hīdāyat u l-imsīrīya, London-Bombay 1958, 33), and only occasionally even by non-Ismā'īlī writers. Thus Maqrizi, in a fairly lengthy discussion of the origins and use of hashšši, mentions a Persian mulkid (probably an Ismā'īlī) who came to Cairo at about the end of the 8th century A.H. and prepared and sold his own mixture of hashšši—but does not call the Ismā'īlīs hashššiyin, or mention any special connexion between the sect and the drug (Khitāt, Bālāk, ii, 126-9). Hashšši would thus appear to have been a local Syrian epithet for the Ismā'īlīs, probably a term of contempt —a criticism of their behaviour rather than a description of their practices.


(B. Lewis)

**HĀSHIYA**, pl. hāwšištī, meaning (1) the margin (of pages in [fi, 'ādā, bi-] which notes could be written), then (2) the marginal note itself or "note" in general, and, finally, (3) gloss, used in the sing., undoubtably may well be the survival of modesty, in titles of independent works, at times of some length, dealing with comments on subjects treated by earlier authors. This last usage is comparatively late; none of the ca. 150 titles listed in Brockelmann, S III, 892-4, antedates the 8th/14th century. Although it was used as a book title all over the Muslim world, hāšhiya enjoyed particular favour among scholars of the eastern region.

Hāwšštī, in the second meaning, appears loosely used in titles of books no later than the 5th/11th century, the presumable date of the hāwšštī of a certain Ibn Masrāf on Aristotle's De sensu (Ibn al- Ḥastrān, Bustān al-šabāb); in the case of hāwšštī maqālld al-šālim (Brockelmann, S I, 820), the attribution of both title and work to Ibn Sīnā is dubious. The use of hāšhiya in the sense of marginal note must, however, have been much earlier. The practical use of itself of the margins of pages for annotations was, of course, not an invention of Islamic times, but, with the general increase in book production, it achieved there the status of a scholarly custom.

Since, in the manuscript age, nothing not firmly anchored in the text could be expected to survive the next copyist, the only possible position for a permanent annotation was within the text itself, and

et deliciis, immo nugis plena, ostendit, et hec eterna-

liter pro tali opere eos habere contendit" (Monumenta Germaniae historica, xxi, Hanover 1856, 179). This story, which offers an explanation of the earliest accounts of hashšši dreams, is repeated with variants by later writers. It is, however, almost certainly a popular tale, perhaps even a result rather than a cause of the name hashššiyya. The use and effects of hashšši were known at the time, and were no secret; the use of the drug by the sectaries, with or without secret gardens, is attested neither by Ismā'īlī nor by serious Sunnī authors. Even the name hashššiyya is local to Syria (cf. Houtsma, Recueil, i, 195; Ibn Muyassar, Annales, 68) and probably abusive. It was never used by contemporaries of the Persian or any other non-Syrian Ismā'īlīs; even in Syria it was not used by the Ismā'īlīs themselves (except in a polemic tract issued by the Fātimid Caliph al-Amīr against his Nīzarī opponents —A. A. A. Fyzzye, al-Hīdāyat u l-imsīrīya, London-Bombay 1958, 33), and only occasionally even by non-Ismā'īlī writers. Thus Maqrizi, in a fairly lengthy discussion of the origins and use of hashšši, mentions a Persian mulkid (probably an Ismā'īlī) who came to Cairo at about the end of the 8th century A.H. and prepared and sold his own mixture of hashšši—but does not call the Ismā'īlīs hashššiyin, or mention any special connexion between the sect and the drug (Khitāt, Bulāk, ii, 126-9). Hashšši would thus appear to have been a local Syrian epithet for the Ismā'īlīs, probably a term of contempt —a criticism of their behaviour rather than a description of their practices.
the practice of inserting notes immediately after passages to be annotated was not infrequently followed; such notes were introduced by a number of different terms, among them, if rarely, ḥāṣhiya. The margins were used to note down textual corrections, variant readings, lexicographical explanations (sometimes in another language), additional information and references, criticisms of the author’s views, and the like, with certain marks often, but by no means regularly, used to indicate the passage of the text to which a given ḥāṣhiya referred. It also was very unusual to fill the margins with material that had no direct relation to any particular passage of the text. This could include extensive remarks, quotations, and even occasionally entire commentaries or other complete works. The custom of using margins for other works carried over into printing and was expanded there.

In the 7th/8th century, the Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Djamʿa expressed his opinion on marginal notes in these terms (Taḏḥīrat al-sāmi), Ḥydarābād 1353, 286-97: “There is nothing wrong with writing important notes (ḥaṣāşık, ṣawdāʾ, ṣanbihād) in the margins of a book one owns . . . . Only important notes that pertain to the contents of the book in question should be given, such as notes that call attention to difficult or doubtful passages, allusions, mistakes, and the like, and when these are alien to the contents should not be allowed to deface the book, nor should there be so many marginal notes that it becomes disfigured or the student is at a loss to find out where they belong.”


HĀŠIYA, the entourage of a ruler [see qāṣīn]

HĀŠMET (7-1182/1768), Ottoman poet, born in Istanbul. His father was the kādī’s nephew ʿAbbas Efendi. Ḥashmet became a mādīrīs, but, because of his satires, was exiled in 1175/1761, first to Bursa and later to Rhodes, where he died. In his youth he had been under the protection of the Grand Vizier ʿAbduʾr-Raḥmān, himself a poet, and dedicated some works to him. His scattered poems were collected while he was in exile in Bursa by one of his admirers, Saʿd b. Babikr, and even with the general meaning of “scholars of little worth, particularly traditionists; this term is sometimes associated with ḡwāḍh and ḡwḥbār, and even with raṣāʾ, “the scum of the populace” (Ibn Kutayba, Muḥkālīfī, 96; tr. Lecomte, 90), and used by some Sunnis of extremist traditionists or those whose researches are of very little value. Fairly close to Nābīta [q.v.] and Muṭṭaqa [q.v.], Ḥashmet was a peerless swordsman and archer. The romantic epigrams which he exchanged with the contemporary poetess Fītnāt [q.v.] are famous.

Works: (I) Dīwān. This work (Būlāq 1842), besides two long poems in Arabic recounting the “beautiful names” of God and Muhammad, these poems are for the most part nāsires to the works of well-known poets, but are, nonetheless, very musical and contain some original images. The tarkīb-i bend expressing his grief at the death of his father is notable for its simple, sincere tone. (II) Inīsāb al-muṣāḥaḥa or Ḥaṣmi[nāme], a prose work, printed as a supplement to the Dīwān, in which Ḥashmet recounts a dream which he had on the night of the accession of Muṣṭafā III. All the rulers of the world come to the new sultan and ask for a job, each according to the specialty of his own country: the Russian to be chief furrier, the Englishman to be overseer of the powder-magazine, the Dutchman to be head gardener, the Frenchman to have charge of the wardrobe, and so on. (III) Sūnamе or Woldēnamе, a prose work describing in a lively and colourful way the celebrations on the occasion of the birth of a daughter to Muṣṭafā III (simplified version in Latin transcription by Reşad Ekrem Koçu, Istanbul n.d.). (IV) Sanād al-ḥuwa’ārī, a risāla written against those who condemn poetry and poets from the high point of view. In this work, which consists of four sections and a conclusion, Ḥashmet claims that poetry has a divine origin, that there are passages in both the Khurāsān and ḥadīth, and that Muḥammad, his Companions and Muslim rulers have all attributed great value to poetry and poets. (V) Ṣebēkāndnīmeh, a short risāla explaining the material and spiritual effects of the ḡhādāt. (VI) Although the works of Ḥashmet are often considered to be chief, his researches mention that Ḥashmet was writing a lexicographical work entitled Durratayn and containing Arabic compound words, no such work has been found.

Bibliography: Rāmīz, Tadbīr, Istanbul Un. Lib., MS T. 91; M. Nāḍīl, Esām, 1308, 121; Meḥmēt Thüreyyā, ʿṢiddīl-i ʿOthmānī, ii, 233; Bursall Meḥmēt Tāhrī, ʿOthmānī Muḥalliflī, ii, 141; Hammer-Purgstall, Gesch. d. osm. Dich- kuns, ii, 322; Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, 4v, 140-50; Rieu, Cat. of Turkish manuscripts . . . 204. (Mehmed Kaplan)

HĀŠIM [see niyaʾimā].

HĀŠH [see maw].

HĀSHWIYYA (Hashawwiy, Hushawwiy, or Aḥ al-Ḥasw), a contemptuous term derived from ḡaww (“farce” and hence “prolix and useless discourse”) and containing Arabic compound words, no contemporary instance of the ḡawwīyya for well-known traditionists such as Sūfīyān al-Thawrī or Malik b. Anas, whom he classes among the Ḥāṣbīyya for well-known traditionists such as Ṣaḥbūnīyya, Ḥiṣaḥbūnīyya, or Ḥaṣbūnīyya, and containing Arabic compound words, no contemporary instance of the ḡawwīyya for well-known traditionists such as Sufyān al-Thawrī or Malik b. Anas, whom he classes among the Ḥāṣbīyya [q.v.].

The Muṭṭaqa resided the name of Ḥashwiyā to the majority of the Ashkūb al-Ḥadīth, because, although without the unquestioning acceptance of the Ḥashwiyā proper and often with the reservation “without comment” (bilā ḵayfā), they yet admitted some anthropomorphic expressions.


HĀṢĪB [see ILM AL-ḤIṢĀB].

HĀŠIK (Hasek), a town in the Mahra country [q.v.], east of Miḥrāt [q.v.] in 17° 21′ N. Lat. and 55° 23′ E. Long, at the foot of the high range of Nūs (Lūs), the ʿAṯīyūn of the Periplus Māris Erythræi. Before the town lies the “bay of herbs” (Dūn al-Ḥāṣik), the bay of Ḥāṣik (Raʾs Ḥāṣik), also called Ḥaṣik or Ḥaṣik. Its fortifications were of a particular importance for the ridge lying opposite (Khāryan and Maryān in Idrīsī). Idrīsī describes Ḥāṣik as a small fortified town four days
east of Mirbat, with many inhabitants, who are fishermen. Ibn Ba'thātā landed here on his way through to 'Umān and found the houses built of fishbones covered with seaweed. In Ibn Ba'thātā's and Idrīsī's time there was great intercourse between Ḥasik and the island of Soḵṭrā [q.v.] to the south. The frankenassic which was produced in the Mahra country was exported through Ḥasik. The town is now quite ruined. It is called Sūk Ḥasik and is inhabited by the Kara and other tribes of the frankenassic country.

Opposite Ḥasik, according to Miles about 20 miles from the coast, lies the "seven isles of Zenobia" (the ḫatā ṣirāṣ, al-Σ名义οβιο in the Pseudo-persians), the Kharyān and Maryān group of Idrīsī, called the Dīzārʾīr Ibn Khalīfān, after a prominent Mahri family, by the Arabs of the south coast. The most westerly of the islands and the one nearest the coast bears the name Ḥasikl or Ḥasikiyyā, i.e., the island belonging to Ḥasik (the Portuguese, who visited this island in 1588, called it Ilheuque). Like the most easterly of the islands, Kībliyyā, it is covered by a large number of peaked hills mainly composed of red and streaked granite and inhabited by pelicans and diving birds. Hulton, who visited the islands in 1816, found only one of them, Hallaniyya, inhabited. He found that the language resembled that of Soḵṭrā. The huts in which the few inhabitants lived consisted of loose stones above which were laid fishbones covered with seaweed. They belonged to the Bāy (Banū) Diyanā (Dīnābī = Σ名义οβιο of the Pseudo-persians), the same tribe as lived on the coast between Ḥasik and Raʾs al-Hadd. Their ancestors are said to have migrated hither several centuries ago, after being driven from Ḥasik and Mīrbaṭ as a result of feuds with their neighbours. Ptolemy and Pliny called the people of these islands Ḥaξrīrāt or Ascieae, a name doubtless connected with Ḥasik, although the ancients connected this name with Ḥaξξίν "wineskin".


**ḤASSAN B. MALIK, grandson of the Caliph Yazid I, his father being the brother of Maysūn, the famous wife of Muʿawiyah (it has been thought, erroneously, that he was the uncle of Yazid I, because he is often referred to simply as Ibn Bahdal). This relationship, the nobility of his clan (the Banū Ḥāṣīna b. Ḏimāb) and the power of the Kalb tribe earned for him under Muʿawiyah and Yazid the governorships of Palestine and of Jordan. Before this, he had fought at Ṣīfīn in the ranks of the Syrian army, in command of the Kūfāʾ of Damascus (Naṣr b. Muʿāwiyah, waṣīt Šīfīn, ed. Hārūn, 233). It was he who accompanied the young Yazid when he arrived at Damascus to assume the caliphate, and he continued to exert a strong influence over his royal cousin, who had become also his brother-in-law. On the death of Muʿawiyah II, the son and successor of Yazid I, there arose a crisis (64/684) in which Ibn Bahdal played an important part by supporting the claims to power of the two young half-brothers of Muʿawiyah II, Khālid and ʿAbd Allāh. Having entrusted Palestine to a chief of the Dīṣḫām, Rawb b. Zīnab, Ibn Bahdal betook himself to the Ḡnūd of Jordan and then to Dābiyya in order to follow events from closer at hand. The situation at this time was favourable to the anti-caliph ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, for al-Dāḥik b. Kayṣ b. Fihr [q.v.], the governors of Ḥimṣ and Kinnasrīn, and the rival of Ibn Bahdal who had driven Rawb out of Palestine had either secretly or openly taken his side. But the cunning ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ziyād [q.v.] arrived from Ṣīrāk and changed the course of events through his intrigues (at least so Ibn Tanūkhī asserts, but the account of Ibn al-Ṣāʿdī, which seems to be the most objective). In fact ʿUbayd Allāh persuaded Marwān b. al-Hakam [q.v.], already on his way to Mecca to offer homage there to Ibn al-Zubayr, to retrace his steps, and to go to Palmyra, where he next set himself up as a candidate (on the later manoeuvres of ʿUbayd Allāh at Damascus, see al-Ḍaḥhāk b. Kayṣ al-Ṣīḥārī where, at p. 95, l. 50, for Kuraysh read Kays). Three parties were formed: the supporters of Ibn Bahdal, those of Ibn al-Zubayr, an! the neutrals, who did not mind whether the caliphate remained with the Umayyads or fell into the hands of anyone else; Marwān, it seems, had little confidence in his success. While al-Dāḥik was still at Damascus, Ḥassān attempted to bring the situation to a head: he ceased to be read out in the Great Mosque a message in which he extolled the claims of the Umayyads and accused Ibn al-Zubayr of unworthy behaviour and hypocrisy. This resulted in an upheaval, which is known as the "Day of Ẓiyārūn". Finally, it was decided to invite the Umayyads and the Syrian leaders to a conference at Dābiyya in order to reach an agreement (ʿUbayd Allāh, not being one of the ʾaṣlīf of Syria, was excluded from it). Owing to his prestige Ibn Bahdal presided, but he did not succeed in getting his candidate appointed. After 40 days of discussion Marwān
b. al-Ḥakam was proclaimed caliph. Before Ibn Bahdal would recognize him, he had stipulated that the young Khalid should succeed after Marwān and that his tribe should receive important privileges and his own family retain certain prerogatives which it had enjoyed under the Sufyānids. From then on his influence declined steadily. Before his death Marwān obliged him to recognize ʿAbd al-Malik as his successor. In the revolt of ʿAmr al-ʿAshšād [q.v.], Ḥassān supported ʿAbd al-Malik and found himself among the Umayyads witnessing the assassination of the latter. Finding himself in a most precarious situation, he heard of no better course of action. The Kalbī chief who had, at one juncture, been the arbiter of the destinies of the Umayyad dynasty. The probable date of his death is given as 69/688-9 (al-Dhahabī, Taʾrīkh, MS Bodl., fol. 58 v.; Ibn Kaḥīr, Biddya, vii, 313).


HASSĀN b. ṬHĀBĪT b. al-MUNIR b. ḤARĀM, of the Khazārajī tribe of Ḥaṭṭāḥī (later Medīnā), traditionally known as the “poet laureate” of the Prophet, is more correctly the most prominent of several poets who were associated with the rise of Islam, and one who already had an established reputation in the Dāhilīyya. When
Muhammad arrived at Medina, Hassan was of mature age (though probably not yet 60—which is the age of his death, which is variously given as 40/659 or before that year, 50/669 or 54/673. As the last we hear of Hassan is some time before ‘All’s assassination, a date around 40/659 is the most likely.

It is not certain exactly when Hassan embraced Islam, although it is stated that his brother Aws was one of the earliest converts and was assigned as the Immigrant Uthmân b. Affân as his “brother” and guest in Medina, a fact which probably partly accounts for the Umayyad sympathies with which Hassan is credited, and which are represented by (or—in the case of spurious poems—reflected in) the comparatively large number of elegies on Uthmân (8 out of 32) ascribed to Hassan in the Diwàn and elsewhere. However, Hassan himself had an urgency of his own, was rich and kept such company as Kays b. al-Khathîm [q.v.] the Aâfî poet and Sallâm b. Mishkâm, chief of the Banû ’l-Nadr.

In the year 5/627 Hassan figures in the story of the slander against ‘A’ishâ, when he is said to have been punished for taking part in the slander, to have been attacked and wounded by Sa’dân b. al-Mu’aytîl [q.v.], and then reconciled by the prophet and given Sîrin, an Egyptian slave girl, and other gifts. However, the story (and Hassan’s supposed prominent part, which is assigned by certain authorities, including Ibn Hîshâm, to ‘Abd Allâh b. Ubâyî [q.v.] rather than to Hassan) received excessive attention from later generations, and should be viewed both as a whole and in detail against the background of friction between the newcomers and the Medinese themselves, both in Medina and in the course of the campaign against the Banû ’l-Mu’aytân when the story originated. For an examination of the controversial details see W. ‘Arafat, A controversial incident in the life of Hassan b. Thâbit, in BSAS, xv (1955).

It was then, or soon after the siege of Medina, that the Muslims, and particularly the Medinese among them, realized the need for the systematic support of poets, and Hassan’s contribution was especially welcome. For better effect, advice and the necessary data were given by Abû Bakr. Once he joined the Muslim community, Hassan employed his talents on behalf of Islam, though he took no part in fighting, probably because of advanced age, rather than cowardice as is most frequently suggested. In any case, even before Islam, Hassan’s role as a poet predominates.

In 9/630, the “Year of Delegations”, Hassan is said to have had occasion to recite poetry on behalf of the Prophet in the presence of the important Tamâm delegation. Prominence is usually given to this visit, the purpose of which, however, is not certain; and the suggestion that the delegates were converted on hearing Hassan’s poem is doubtful. The fact that three different sets of poems are found, each of which is claimed to be the one which served the occasion, is indicative both of the doubtful character of such poetry and of the high esteem in which Hassan was held.

Little is heard of Hassan himself afterwards, except when ‘Umar sought his expert opinion on a poem by al-Ḥuṣayn b. ‘Abd Allâh the slanderer al-Zibîrîn b. Badr; or when he is occasionally heard reciting his own poetry. On one occasion, some time later in his life, he came reluctantly out of retirement to support his less able son ‘Abd al-Rahmân in a battle of slander against al-Najjâjî [q.v.]. Otherwise he was growing old, happy and waxing sentimental when reminiscing on his visits to the Ghassânids, but sad and repro­batory when contrasting the dignified carousing he had known at the princely court of the Ghassânids with the unrestrained enjoyment of newly found luxury by his own son and his boon-companions.

In the revolt against Uthmân, Hassan, Ka‘b b. Mâlik, al-Nu‘mân b. Bashîr [q.v.] and others were vociferous in support of the righteous Imam and (according to Tabâri, i, 2971) even tried to dissuade the rebels from their intention. After Uthmân’s death they went to Mu‘âywiya, who gave Hassan and Ka‘b a present of money each and later rewarded al-Nu‘mân b. Bashîr with a governorship.

Hassan had one daughter, who on one occasion displayed a talent for poetry, and by Sîrin, according to most sources, one son, ‘Abd al-Rahmân, who was as provocative as his father but shared neither Hassan’s ability as a poet nor his longevity.

Hassan’s Diwân in the recension of Ibn Ḥabîb [q.v.] contains 228 poems on different subjects, the Sîna 29 more, while other poems and single lines are found elsewhere ascribed to him. Nevertheless at an early period doubts were cast on the authenticity of this poetry generally or on specific poems or lines; recently a detailed study of the poetry ascribed to Hassan was made by the author of this article with a view to establishing, on internal as well as external evidence, the authenticity or otherwise of each poem. This study indicated that some 60-70% of this poetry may be spurious. The poetry in the Diwân presents such a variety of spirit and style, is so full of contradictions and anomalies and contains such a high proportion of inferior verse, that the poems could not have been the work of a single author nor all of them by a poet of high repute.

This spurious poetry should be viewed in the light of the eventful century following the rise of Islam in which the events involved the same tribes who had taken part in the early struggle. Earlier verse was forgotten or overwhelmed, replaced or supplemented by new poetry. Verse naturally accompanied tribal, sectarian or factional disputes; but was written also to other persons, including some of Hassan’s contemporaries. The long poems of boasting can be seen on other poems, parts of poems, single lines or whole poems and parts of poems are also ascribed to Ibn Hishâm and other authorities to Hassan’s son or to other persons, including some of Hassan’s contemporaries. The long poems of boasting can be seen on internal evidence to be by descendants of the Anṣâr and reflect the inferior status to which they were reduced after the Battle of al-Harra in 63/682.

Although only briefly, the spurious character of such poetry was noted by early critics, and Ibn Iṣ̄bāk was the subject of severe censure by Ibn Sallâm and Ibn al-Nadîm, for including in his Sîra spurious poetry ascribed to Hassan and others, although Ibn Iṣ̄bāk himself pleaded good faith and lack of the appropriate critical experience. His editor Ibn Hishâm omitted or rejected on expert authority a large number of such poems, branding some outright as forgeries, and others as doubtful.
In the case of Hassan, Ibn Hisham rejected 15 out of 78 poems which appear in the Sira, of which total 29 are not in Ibn Habbab's recension of the Diwan, while against 19 poems, see W. Arafat, Early critics of the authenticity of the poetry of the Sira, in BSOAS, xxi (1958). The main reason for ascribing to Hassan a larger proportion of such poetry is Hassan's higher reputation, already recognized at the advent of Islam.


HAYAT, the name given by the Turks to the Sanjak of Alexandretta, at the time of the crisis of 1936-9. For the history of the area see Antakya and Iskandarun.

HATIF, invisible being whose cry rends the night, transmitting a message; a prophetical voice which announces in an oracular style a future happening. Already in the Bible this voice is confused with that of the prophet (Ezekiel, XXI, 2, 7; Amos, VII, 16). The voice of Muhammad's call, mysterious voices were proclaiming his coming. These were the voices of "one who was calling" (munaddi) or "who was shouting" (sabt): Aghdn, xv, 76; in the legend of Magdhn, hatif is the equivalent of munaddi and of sabt: ibid., i, 169; ii, 4; i, 174; a third equivalent, tali, is found in al-Tabari, iii4, 2337). It is also the voice coming from an idol (Ibn Sa'd, i, 110; iv, 110) or from the entrails of a calf sacrificed before an idol (al-Tabari, i, 1144 f.; Ibn Hisham, 134; Ibn Sa'd, i, 105, or the voice of a mysterious horseman (ibid.). It is a hatif which brought the poet Abu l-Dhaw'ayb the news of the approaching death of the Prophet (Ibn al-Athir, Usd al-qaba, Cairo 1285/1869, v, 188).

According to al-Dhahib, this voice usually announces the death of a great person; "nomads and semi-nomads," he says, "scarcely conceal their belief in the hatif; on the contrary, they are amazed that anybody can dispute its value" (K. al-Hayawan, Cairo 1323-5/1905-7, vi, 62 and cf. 64). A passage of al-Mas'udi, Mi'udi, iii, 323, admirably describes the psychological genesis of this phenomenon: "The particular characteristic of the hatif," he says, "is to produce an audible voice without possessing any attributes of speech; the opinions on the subject of the hatif and the dyms: some say that this phenomenon, mentioned by the Arabs and used by them to announce news, finds its origin in the solitude of the deserts, the isolation of valleys, the journey across vast spaces infested by ghuls [g.v.] and the swamps filled with wild animals. For, when man ventures into these places alone, he thinks; and when he thinks he becomes fearful and cowardly; in this state he is inclined to false ideas and harmful illusions, created by the black bile, which make him imagine events and people, and to believe the impossible, in a similar way to someone who is the victim of an obsession. . . . The basis of this phenomenon lies in a wrong way of thinking in which man creates in his imagination what he reports about the activity of the hatif and the dyms." This phenomenological explanation does not remove all its mystery from the hatif, and the question put by al-Dhahib to the man who claimed to know everything, was much repeated: "Let me know [about the origin] of the verses [pronounced by the] hatif and about the news which is spread during the night" (K. al-Tarb wa l-tadawir, ed. Pellat, Paris 1955, 42).

In modern Arabic the word hatif has been adopted as the equivalent of telephone.

Bibliography: In addition to the authors mentioned above, see I. Goldziber, Abhandlungen zur ar. Philologie, Leiden 1896-99, i, 212. In Cairo and Damascus there exist two written works, still in manuscript, which discuss the subject: Abu Bakr b. Ubayy b. Abl-Tunayd (d. 281/894), K. al-Hawdtif (see Brockelmann, S, i, 247); Abu Bakr b. Di'iya', al-Kharatifi (d. 327/938), Hawdtif (see ibid.). The word is also found in the title of a work by Husayn b. kuhdun (Brockelmann, S, i, 350). (T. Fakh)

HATIF AHMAD, sayyid of the line of Husayn; his family, natives of Urdubad (Adharbaydian), in the time of the Safawids settled in Isfahan, where he was the most notable poet under the dynasties of the Afsharls and the Zand. He divided his time between his native town, Kumm and Kashan. He was a man of erudition and a physician, and had a knowledge of Arabic, in which language he wrote some poems; in Persian he was the author of an important collection consisting of ba'isdas, ghazals, rubais and other short works, in which the influence of Sa'di and Khajawi can be discerned. He owes his fame mainly to a tarjiband (strophic poem) as remarkable for its finesse and profundity of thought as for its style, which subject being the uniqueness of God; it is one of the masterpieces of mystical poetry. He died in Kumm in 1198/1783.

HATIM, 'Abd Allāh, Persian poet, son of Dīmān's sister, born in Khurāsān in the district of Dālān, a dependency of Herāt, died in 927/1521. He wrote a Tāṣʿīr-nāma, an epic known also as Zafar-nāma (lith. Lucknow 1856), on the subject of Timūr's conquests. He had planned to write a Khamsa, a collection of five long poems, but this work he was unable to complete; of it we possess a Ṣirān and Farkhād, a charming Layli and Majnūn (ed. W. Jones, Calcutta 1786) and a Haft manṣūr on the model of the Haft payār of Niẓāmī. He was influenced by this poet (though not by his artifices and obscure allusions) and also by Amir Khurāb. He eschewed the eulogies and panegyrics traditionally placed at the head of long poems; but at the beginning of Layli and Majnūn he proclaimed his Shi'ism and his devotion to the poet Kāsim al-Anwārī. At the behest of the king, he composed a poem on that sovereign's achievements, but he wrote only about a thousand lines of verse of this work.

Bibliography: On the Zafar-nāma: C. A. Storey, i/3, no. 358; on the Ismāʿīlī-nāma, ibid., no. 372. Latif, ‘Alī Beg, Aṣḥāb hāda, 65; Rādża-Kūlī-Khān, Majnūn, p. 54; Hb. ‘Andamīr, Ḥabīb al-siyār, iii, 3, 346; Bābūr, Mémories, tr. P. de Courteille, i, 409; Hammer, Redecke’s Persionische Persiens, 335; Ouseley, Notices, 146; Rieu, Catal. Persian Mus., 625; Ellī, Gr. T. Ph., index; Storey, i/2, no. 373.

Hātim al-ʿAhdal [see al-ʿAhdal].

Hātim al-Tātī b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Saʿd, Abū Saffānā or Abū ʿAṭar, poet, who lived in the second half of the 6th century A.D., traditionally the most cultivated of the pre-Islamic poets, always victorious in his undertakings, magnificent in the conquest and proclamation of his generosity and hospitality. According to legend, his mother Ghanīya (var. ‘Ināhā, etc.) was so generous that her brothers had to obtain a declaration that she was incapable of managing her affairs; from his youth the extravagances in which Hātim indulged provoked the anger of his grandfather, his guardian since the premature death of his father, so that he left him. In the Ḍawwāl books there are a number of traditions giving instances of his generosity, and it is even said that after his death he used to entertain travellers who asked for hospitality; he would rise from his tomb, slaughter a camel, and his son ʿAdī would be ordered in a dream to replace the dead animal. This tomb was probably on a hill ('Uwārid, see Yāḥi‘ī, iv, 740) at Tungha, in Wādī Ḥānī (cf. Yāḥi‘ī, i, 880) where he had lived. Four stone figures stood on either side of his tomb (cf. Ḍawwāl, No. xiv; Lane, The Thousand and one nights, 2, 295 ff.), young girls with their hair loose, representing mourners. Also seen to be near the tomb were the remains of the great cooking pots which Hātim used to prepare meals for his guests. According to Païgrave (Narrative, i, 199), the tomb was still known in the district (cf. R. Basset, Notes sur les Mille et une nuits, iii, in Revue des Trad. pop., 1897, 116–59).

As a poet, Hātim has left mostly verses in praise of liberality and altruism, but the ʿAdīnī bearing his name is probably largely apocryphal and also may originally have been much larger (cf. Fārābī, 152, which speaks of 200 ʿadbīn). His wife Māwīya also inspired some of his poems.

The figure of Hātim quickly became very popular in adāb literature, and there are scarcely any works which do not include stories of his proverbial generosity. However, no Arabic writer has made him the principal character of a literary work, although in the eastern parts of the Muslim world he has become a much loved romantic figure.

In Persian, he is the hero of a romance, Kīṣa-i Ḥātim Ṭātī (or Kīṣa-i ʿAṭar Ṭātī) (transl. D. Forbes (London 1830) from a version which differs appreciably from the Calcutta editions (ed. G. J. Atkinson, 1818 and ed. 1827); the Haft insāf-ʾī Ḥātim Ṭātī forms a sequel to these. A shorter sketch of the life and deeds of Hātim has been given by Husayn Wā’īz Kāshīf (d. 1504/5) in Kīṣa-yi ʿAṭār-i Ḥātim Ṭātī (or Rūzā-yi Ḥātim-i-yiyya, ed. C. Schefel, in Christ. persan, i, 173 ff.). The Dīvān-i Ḥātim Ṭātī (Istanbul 1959) is a Turkish version of the romance. A Turkoman version was published in Kāzān in 1876. Various editions of a translation of the Kīṣa-i Ḥātim in Urdu under the title of Ardiyān mahfil are mentioned in the India Office Catalogue, i/4, 135 ff. (cf. García de Tassis, Hist. de la litt. hindoue et hindoustanee, 4, 556 ff.;
HAUSa NAME OF A PEOPLE, NOW PROMINENTLY MOSLEM, DWELLING MAINLY IN THE NORTHERN REGION OF NIGERIA.

1. ORIGINS AND HISTORY.

Our sources for the early history of the Hausa are limited to the oral traditions of the folklore and to three chronicles, written at a late date, but purporting to go back to the tenth century A.D. and certainly themselves ultimately dependent upon this oral tradition. They are: "The Kano Chronicle" (Palmer, Sudanese records, ii, 305 f.); "The Hausa Chronicle" (Mischlich and Lippert, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Haussa-Staaten, Berlin 1903); and the "Song of Bagauda" (Hiskett, in S. O. A. S. xxvii/3 (1964) and xxviii/1 and 2 (1965). In addition we have the traditional account of the history of Katsina which was recorded by F. de F. Daniel earlier in the present century and is preserved in an undated and unpublished work under the title of A History of Katsina.

It seems probable that the early autochthons of Hausaland were a negro people who lived by a hunting economy and who at a certain point in their history became mixed with immigrants of probable Hamitic origin. This mixing took place in the Sudan, where there is evidence that in earlier times the negro stock lived as far north as the northern edge of the Sahara. Discoveries of arrow heads and agricultural implements suggest that what is now the territory of nomads was once the habitat of sedentary negro agriculturalists akin to the Hausa.

Hausa legends of origin are confused. Some name Biram as the ancestor of the Hausa Bakwai—the Seven Hausa States. Others, particularly the well-known Daura legend of the snake-killer, most conveniently available in Hodgkin's Nigerian perspectives (London 1960, 54 ff.), attribute the origin of the Seven to Bawo, son of Abuayzid, alias Bayajidda, the "King of Baghdad" and husband to the daughter of the king of Bornu. This legend of the incoming immigrants from the north is repeated elsewhere in the Sudanese cycle of myths of origin, as for instance in the henna legend of Bornu. The fact which emerges is that at a point which is generally taken to be the 4th/5th century, but which may have been considerably earlier, the autochthonous negro population of Hausaland bordering on the southern Sahara became host to and was subsequently frequently dominated by strangers from the north. These strangers appear not to have been negroid. They were also not in the first instance Moslem, although the Kano Chronicle hints that they may have already been influenced by monotheism. Certainly the cult of the autochthons was alien to them and it was not until several generations had elapsed that they became absorbed into it.

The causes of these immigrations are still to be clearly defined. They may, however, be sought in the political and religious upheavals of the North African littoral during the early Christian era and the "Song of Bagauda"—a Kano tradition—attributes what was probably the last major wave in the tenth century to famine further north.

As for the autochthons upon whom these immigrations impinged, they are remembered for us in the Barbushe legend of the Kano Chronicle and in popular legend. These were a pagan people, ruled by a hunter-priest-king who practised seclusion and divination and who appears to have presided over a cult of idol worship based on animism. The "Song of Bagauda" portrays these people as living in small open autonomous village and clan groups scattered over the country-side. Later, warrior chiefs and early Sudanese condottieri—the incoming immigrants already mentioned, or their descendants—found "an easy prey" and the small open settlements became subjected to the walled city states which the invaders began to build:

"The people were living widely dispersed over the open country, not subject to any authority. There was no chief, no protecting town wall. Tunbi together with Washa saw an easy prey And they joined forces, conquering the people of Kano. The elders said: let a chieftaincy be established. They appointed Bagauda, the protector." (S. O. A. S., xxviii/1 (1965), 115.)

By the beginning of the 8th/9th century the immigrants appear to have become seduced by the surrounding paganism, for we find that the chief Tsamia has "discovered the secret of the god" and a modus vivendi is apparent in which the rulers give a measure of official recognition to the indigenous cult. During the reign of Yaji (750-87/1349-85) Mandingo missionaries arrived in Kano and under their tutelage the chief introduced the Islamic rites of slaughter and prayer. The Mandingo also caused a mosque to be built. Clearly however, a strong anti-Islamic faction remained. Islam prevailed, but paganism, neither then nor later, was by any means extinguished. The arrival of the Mandingoes may be regarded as the first definite stage in the Islamization of the Hausa. It is significant that they arrived in the 8th/9th century. It was in 725/1325 that Mansa Musa made his famous pilgrimage and it is probable that we have here an aspect of the Islamic expansion which took place under this ruler. It may well be that the Mandingoes were merchants as well as missionaries and that they came in search of the gold of the Sudan.
The arrival in Hausaland of the famous North African divine, cAbd al-Karim al-Maghili, during the reign of Mohamma Rimfa (867-904/1463-99) marks a further stage in the establishment of Islam. In particular, he appears to have introduced the Shari'a and certain elements of Islamic constitutional theory to the Hausa, thus providing an ideological focus around which subsequent constitutional development could coalesce. Traditionally, al-Maghili also personifies the introduction of Islamic mysticism into the Western Sudan.

It is in this early period that are confined almost entirely to Kano, but it is probable that the pattern was similar over the rest of Hausaland. In Katsina, according to Daniel, Islam was received by the people but rejected by the court (in contrast to Kano where the opposite was the case). However, this is subject to the caveat that it may reflect the later rivalry between Kano and Katsina for precedence in Islam, together possible with echoes of the rivalry between Habe and Fulani. The kingdom of Gobir is known to have existed from the first half of the 8th/14th century, although our informant, Ibn Ba'ttûta, tells us only that it was pagan. Kano, Katsina, Zaria and Zamfara are listed by Leo Africanus in the 9th/15th century. By the 11th/12th century the Turkish traveller Ewiyâ Celebi is speaking specifically of the seven Hausa tribes. It appears that an early formative influence upon Hausa political institutions was that of Mali, for the Mandingo missionaries were employed by the Kano chief. As we know from the accounts of the Saharan travellers, the medieval kingdoms of the Sahara developed largely under Mamûk influences and there is evidence in the surviving ceremonial of the Hausa courts that these influences extended to Hausaland. Certainly by 831/1421 the rulers of Kano were using chain mail, iron helmets and isfâli (Ar. lâbi) —the North African quilted horse armour. By 844/1440 they were employing eunuchs and a feudal system based on slave settlements was fully established. In the 9th/15th century a further development also becomes apparent, for influences from Bornu begin to appear in Hausaland. Bornu and Kanem had of course been in contact with North Africa and Egypt from the time of Moham- medicine al-Biruni (879-950) marks a represented in some measure simply an additional channel for incoming Islamic influences. However, the Bornu kings had already established a specific constitutional framework and its influence in Hausaland is to be seen, for instance, in the wide-spread adoption of Bornu titles. The results which flowed from these circumstances have been aptly described by M. G. Smith (Historical and cultural conditions of political corruption among the Hausa, in Comparative studies in society and history, vi/2 (1964): "Thus political centralization, tributary links with Bornu, commercial development and the adoption of Islam by the rulers went hand in hand. Simultaneously the chiefs became kings, free of traditional norms and political restraints", while among the people Islam, the institution of slavery and the hardening feudal structure of society produced moral alienation into peasants, a trading class, an Islamic learned class, throne slaves and a ruling aristocracy.

Throughout this period Islam advanced slowly, but with the powerful pressures of trade and a superior culture behind it. At the same time, pre-existing African institutions continued to be fully effective, and, as we can see from the evidence of Islamic and pagan names in the king lists of the Hausa Chronicle (probably the most useful evidence that this otherwise suspect document provides), the dispute between paganism and Islam continued to characterize this history of the Hausa states. By the end of the 12th/18th century the pattern was one of a number of independent principalities with territorial boundaries broadly defined in the course of previous centuries, but still constantly in dispute. The rulers of these states paid lip-service to Islam and to the Shari'a and each was supported by a hierarchy of malams reputedly learned in Islam, whose function was to give an air of legality to the sarks' rule. In part however, it appears that these governments were discrete and contradictory and very much individual whim. Islam both constitutionally and in ritual observance was but casually observed and was involved in an accommodation with pre-existing African custom and belief, of which the Hausa malams were the principal agents.

It was in protest against this situation that, in 1804, Shaihu Usman dan Fodio ('Uğmân b. Fûdî) launched the dîkâ'd. This dîkâ'd was the violent culmination of an intellectual argument which had been developing over the preceding centuries and which changed its emphasis, but by no means ceased when the dîkâ'd was successfully concluded. When Shaihu Usman dan Fodio and his followers mainly Fulani, but with not insignificant contingents of Hausa peasantry attached had a war, they set up a system of government which is usually thought of as a loose feudal empire. The son of the Shaihu, Sultan Muhammd Bello, ruled from Sokoto over what had been the eastern half of the old kingdom of Gobir, while from Gwando 'Abd Allah Muhammad, the brother of the Shaihu, ruled what had previously been Zamfara and part of Kebbi. For the rest, the former Habe kingdoms were parcelled out among the Shaihu's flag-holders who ruled under varying feudal obligations to Sokoto. Some Habe escaped the Fulani and preserved substantial rump kingdoms further north.

The structure of this Fulani polity was not fortuitous. It was an attempt to actualize in the Sudan the medieval Islamic constitutional theory of the central "imamate" delegating authority to provincial governors and commanders. In theory, at any rate, the entire Bornu and the states beyond represented in some measure simply an additional channel for incoming Islamic influences. However, the Bornu kings had already established a specific constitutional framework and its influence in Hausaland is to be seen, for instance, in the wide-spread adoption of Bornu titles. The results which flowed from these circumstances have been aptly described by M. G. Smith (Historical and cultural conditions of political corruption among the Hausa, in Comparative studies in society and history, vi/2 (1964): "Thus political centralization, tributary links with Bornu, commercial development and the adoption of Islam by the rulers went hand in hand. Simultaneously the chiefs became kings, free of traditional norms and political restraints", while among the people Islam, the institution of slavery and the hardening feudal structure of society produced moral alienation into peasants, a trading class, an Islamic learned class, throne slaves and a ruling aristocracy. Throughout this period Islam advanced slowly, but with the powerful pressures of trade and a superior culture behind it. At the same time, pre-existing African institutions continued to be fully effective, and, as we can see from the evidence of Islamic and pagan names in the king lists of the Hausa Chronicle (probably the most useful evidence
but certainly mistaken interpretations of Lugard and certain—though by no means all—of his early administrative work.

At the beginning of the present century the British took over administrative responsibility for what was formerly the Fulani emirates, and to them they added Bornu. These became the Northern Provinces and subsequently the Northern Region of the Protectorate of Nigeria. They were governed by what has become known as "Indirect Rule". This is frequently thought of as the brain-child of Lugard. In fact, it is largely on the personalities and zeal of individual administrative officers. The progress of Northern Nigeria to self-government took place over the following half century. It was characterized by the rapid extension of Islam in the measure that the Pax Britannica achieved security and facilitated communications. Modern means of mass communication have greatly accelerated this process since the Second World War.

The existence of substantial and relatively well-trained indigenous Civil Service cadres made possible the smooth transfer of power when self-government became complete on 1 October 1960. The form of government adopted by Northern Nigeria was democratic and secular, although, as is to be expected, Islamic institutions and attitudes inform all political and social activities, and probably the greatest cohesive factor in Hausa society remains a devotion to the Islamic way of life.

Hausa institutions: slavery.

Slavery has been one of the most important of the institutions influencing the development of Hausa society. There are two aspects: the slave trade; domestic slavery.

The slave trade from the Sudan was ancient. It seems probable that the Romans traded in slaves from the countries south of the Sahara and that the Arabs, Berbers and other Saharans simply took over a trade which already existed. By the 9th/10th century Hausaland had become involved in the complex of the trans-Saharan slave trade, which focused at points along the southern edge of the Sahara. There was a southern and a northern area of activity. The slaves were harvested from the Plateau and from the forest and riverain country in the course of war, raiding and kidnapping. It was native Sudanese who conducted these activities and it is not clear how much or how often these practices penetrated into these sub-Saharan areas until relatively late times.

A proportion of the slaves were brought to Kano and other Saharan "ports" and from here they passed into the coastal cowry exchange area as part of an expanding tide of lateral trade. But despite this lateral movement it appears that the Arabs did not penetrate in person into the northern transit area, where Arab and African peoples, Nupe, Yoruba and others acquired Islam and the Hausa tongue and where exotic influences and techniques introduced across the Sahara met and mingled with the indigenous techniques of the Sudan.

In short, slavery, if not universal, has been a universal evil force in Hausaland and it is probable that the heritage of attitudes and loyalties which it has left behind remains one of the strongest bonds of Hausa society.

Trade.

In Hausaland trade was closely related to the constitutional and historical developments which we have already described. The early indigenous settlements must have lived by hunting and some farming and probably had little trade. According to the Kano Chronicle there was, in these early days, no market.

The visit of the merchants from Mali may have been exploratory, but by the middle of the 9th/10th century commercial activity had become established, associated with the increasing influence of Bornu in Hausaland. In the reign of Dauda (824-41/1421-38) a Bornu nobleman settled in Kano and is credited with the founding of the first market. Slaves, imported to the south appears suddenly to have become wholesale. The camel was introduced into Kano at this time. Touareg came to Hausaland, drawn certainly by trade, and merchants from Gwanja found their way to Katsina. There are also references about this time to trade with Zaria and Nupe and the pattern which emerges is that of fatauci—the long distance trade of the Hausa—extending northwards into the Sahara and southwards and then laterally to encompass Nupe and Ashanti and, in the east, Bornu.

By the 11th/12th century the trans-Saharan trade had diminished somewhat, although the extent of this decline has been over-stated. However, there is evidence that it was compensated for by an increase in the lateral trade. The Kano Chronicle tells us that cowries first came to Hausaland between 811/1408 and 1143/1731. Doubt has been thrown on this statement, as part of an assumption that the Saharan cowry exchange area must have reached Hausaland at an earlier date. This is still an open question, but it is certainly arguable that cowries did in fact come to Hausaland only at this late date, borne up from the coastal cowry exchange area as part of an expanding tide of lateral trade. But despite this lateral
trade, the Saharan traffic passing via Hausaland remained significant and Montell (De Saint-Louis a Tripoli par le lac Tichad, Paris 1895) has described the annual salt caravans which were still plying the Saharan routes into Hausaland at the close of the nineteenth century.

Internal trade—*kasuwanci*—centres round the institution of the market, which takes place once or twice a week and is organized on a trade and craft basis. As in other Islamic markets, each trade has its own quarter and all are communally responsible for the proper running of the market, under a market head. Market dues are payable and Usamunu dan Fodio lists such imposts—considered by him illegal—as *fassuwae* (a tax on butchers) and *agaama* (on cottons and other market goods). Clapperton and Barth give further details. The market is supported by *fatauci*; and other market goods). Clapperton and Earth give further details. The market is supported by *fatauci*;

In addition, the market has great social and psychological significance and, as M. G. Smith has pointed out, despite Islam, the institution still rests upon the sanctions and approval of the pre-Islamic spirits.

The *bori* cult.

In so far as it can be translated, the word *bori* means "the spirits of the possession cult" and this possession cult appears to represent the pre-Islamic religion of the Hausa. It has flourished on into Islam and is still practised both by Muslim Hausa and by the non-Muslim Maguazawa. The Hausa conceives of a whole spirit world which can best be visualized as parallel to the human world, but inhabited by the *bori*. Unlike the supernatural worlds of Islam and Christianity, this spirit world is in no way transcendent. It is imminent in man's immediate surroundings and is fraught with dangers for humans unfortunate or foolish enough to trespass upon it.

The spirits are of two kinds: those of the city and those of the "bush." The first are largely exotic and contain many Islamic importations; the second probably represent the original nature spirits of African popular belief. At some point Allâh became involved in the cult, but as a rather remote and shadowy deity who resembles the Sky God of the southern peoples of West Africa. Most of the spirits are proper 'ramons, such as *Kali* who gives rheumatism and Mai-Askâ the Barber, who causes baldness and rashes. Malam Alhaji, clearly an Islamic borrowing, is normally benign, a kind of "Father *bori*" who carries off old people. The *bori* live in their own city, *Jan Kasa*, popularly thought to be situated somewhere in the Sahara.

The spirits are responsible for all diseases and the cure depends on discovering the spirit responsible and then on correct placation. They must also be consulted and placated in all such important events as marriage; child-birth; building a house; setting up a market and so on. The adepts of the *bori* cult are the *masu bori*, who become possessed or are "mounted" by the particular spirits with whom they are identified. Each spirit has a peculiar sacrifice by which he or she is conjured up. Thus one has a lame hen; another a white hen and yet another a speckled hen and so on.

There are periodic *bori* dances in the course of which possession takes place. There is often also a permanent *gidan tafi*—a "temple" at which offerings can be made.

Islam has clearly become involved in the *bori* cult, in that many *bori* spirits now bear Muslim names. Also the Islamic *definition* have taken their place among the *bori* spirits, as have also the ogre-like figures of the pagan ancestors. The synthesis between Islam and the *bori* cult and the persistence with which nominally Muslim Hausa continue to consult the *masu bori* are main targets for the disapproval of the Muslim moralists.


(M. Hiskett)

ii.—Language.

The Hausa language is spoken as a mother-tongue by some twelve to fifteen million people, both of the northern and of the southern stock, living mostly in the Northern Region of Nigeria and in the adjacent Republic of Niger, but also in small colonies of settlers and traders in most of the large towns and ports of Africa north of the Congo from Cameroon to Tripoli and from Dakar to Port Sudan. In Northern Nigeria it constitutes the majority language and is used as a second language to English in the legislature the law courts and for government business, and as the language of instruction in most of the primary schools. It is now written for official and scholastic purposes in the Roman script (with the addition of three special letters), but the older Arabic script (known as *ajami*) is still extensively used for private correspondence and religious tracts. There is a government controlled agency, the Hausa Language Board, which seeks to arbitrate on matters of spelling punctuation and new vocabulary. Hausa is also spoken as a second, or third, language by several million more people in Northern Nigeria, notably Nupe, Kanuri and Birom, and it is used as a lingua franca or trade language over a large part of West Africa.

Compared with some other African languages it shows remarkably little dialectal variation, the principal dialects being those of Kano, Katsina and Sokoto. Standard written Hausa is based on the
HAUSA dialect of Kano, the largest Hausa speaking town and the provenance of most Hausa traders in foreign parts.

Hausa belongs to the Chadic group of the Hamitic, or, as it is now often called, Afro-Asiatic, family of languages, being the only language of the group that is spoken by more than a few hundred thousand speakers. Structurally it is extremely reminiscent of some Indo-European languages, both in its clause structure and word order and in the use it makes of grammatical categories such as dative and subjunctive. Its sound system, however, is in some ways peculiar, especially in the use it makes of glottalization to give distinctions of meaning. All the four basic consonants, P, T, K, and S, occur in voiceless, voiced and glottalized varieties, and most of these can be either palatalized or labiovelarized as well, at least in the older dialects of Katsina and Sokoto. Medially, however, these latter distinctions are generally speaking allophonic. Basically it has only two vowels, A and /U/, but the pronunciation of these varies considerably according to phonetic environment (in the case of /U/, also from dialect to dialect), and developed from them by the addition of H or the semivocalic Y and W are the long vowel and diphthongal sounds aa, ai, ai, si, uu (the last four as in Arabic and aa as with fatha plus alif), and also, in syllables of a restricted pattern, ee and oo. Various forms of consonant-vowel and vowel-consonant harmony operate in the syllable (including the spreading of glottality beyond the domain of the initiating consonant, as with the emphatic consonants in Arabic), and there is also both complete and partial (umlaut) vowel harmony in successive syllables of both single words and closely connected word groups, also many instances of vowel ablaut, both grammatical and dialectal. The syllable is always of CV, CVV, or CVC structure, the first C including the glottal stop (comparable with Arabic hamza, but not written in the Roman orthography, except where it occurs medially, mainly in Arabic loanwords), and the typical word is a disyllable. The fact that no word begins with a vowel effectively prevents such interverbal elisions and crises as are typical of many African languages, in all but the most rapid speech, while giving to Hausa speech a rather staccato quality. Syllables have one of two significant tones, 'high' and 'low', this alternance serving to distinguish both lexical items and grammatical forms. Falling tones also occur in some special cases. Tone is minimally distinctive in many pairs of words, but the fact that neither it nor vowel length is indicated in the standard orthography often makes the elucidation of a Hausa text rather difficult for one who is not deeply read in the language. There is normally a progressive downshift in the clause, which may be arrested, however, by a succession of high-toned syllables; but this downshift may be reversed by interrogative and other special intonations. Unlike the case with many African tone languages, both lexical and grammatical tones are relatively invariant, and there are no 'displaced tones' or 'tonal perturbation'. Stress (the secondary feature, generally linked to tone and vowel length and rarely in itself discriminatory. Ideophones and interjections tend to fall outside the normal pitch range, having either exceptionally high or exceptionally low tones.

Morphologically and syntactically, almost all Hausa words can be divided into the following categories: nouns, verbs, ideophones and particles. The first two normally consist of a root or base, simple or extended to a maximum of four syllables, and a termination, in most cases purely vocalic. Ideophones and particles cannot be so analysed and many of these have consonantal endings, the final consonant, however, having a restricted range corresponding to the range of only consonants within words of all classes. Prefixes and suffixes are few, mainly the feminine suffix -(i)yaal-(u)waa, the 'ethnic' prefix ba- (e.g. Ba-haush-ke 'a Hausa man'), fem. Ba-haush-yyaa, pl. Haus-aa-waa), and a ma- prefix, which, as in Arabic, is employed to form verbal derivative nouns. Perhaps the most striking feature of the language is the contrast between the morphology of the verb and that of the noun. The former is organized in a homogeneous, all-embracing, system of seven 'grades' (these having varied, often rather subtle, semantic correlates) each grade occurring in from one to four distinct forms, depending on purely syntactic criteria, and making a total of twelve forms in all. Any of these twelve forms may further be pluralized or intensified in meaning by a reduplication of (the first syllable of) the root. Morphologically these verbal forms differ from one another only in their termination and/or their tone pattern; there are none of the affixes that are common—and functionally comparable—in other African languages. The tense (better described as an aspect) system is expressed outside the verb proper by means of various forms of subject pronoun (in several persons and tenses distinguishable only in spoken, not in written, Hausa), whose presence (like that of the subject prefixes in Bantu languages) is normally obligatory in all but the imperative. Conversely the noun presents a complex and heterogeneous system of inflexion, employing all morphological devices from simple tonal or terminal vowel change (as with verbs) to infixation, suffission, reduplication, or a combination of two or more of these. The main function of such inflexion is to indicate plurality: there are at least eight classes of noun plural, with three or more subclasses in each, and the choice between each of these is determined by a whole complex of criteria in the singular form: tone pattern, radical structure phonology, terminal vowel and even sometimes etymology and meaning. Many nouns have two or more different plural forms in use even in the same locality, whilst many other nouns have none. There is also a great variety of nominal forms derived from verbal roots, but these do not as a rule pluralize. Etymologically unrelated verbs and nouns not infrequently have phonically identical bases, but these very rarely share a common form, i.e., termination plus tone pattern, the verbal forms, which are grammatically determined, taking priority over the nominal.

In common with other Hamitic languages, Hausa has a system of three genders, masculine, feminine and plural, the last being, in cases where there is sex reference in the singular, notionally as well as grammatically common. The masculine-feminine dichotomy cuts right across the singular-plural class system, there being both masculine and feminine nouns in almost all the eight classes (contrast Arabic). But the nouns of these classes are feminine and the others almost all masculine, and names of animals, as in French, are as a rule, assigned exclusively to one or other gender (except for domestic animals, which usually have distinct words for the two sexes). But there is a class of adjectival nouns which exhibit all three forms (except that, where the masc. form ends in -aa, this form is common to the feminine), these concording with the gender of the noun they qualify or refer to.
Gender concords also operate in the preverbal tense-marking, and other forms of personal pronoun (with prosody) and in the genitive copula (agreeing with the head noun) and in the identity particle equivalent to '(it) is', where the system of agreement is very complex. A curious feature of the language is that, where the male and female of a species are designated by different words, the plural form of the latter is common in meaning. Thus 'hens' poultry, 'mothers' parents and 'daughters' children; exceptions are 'men' and 'women', and 'stallions', not 'mares', signifying horses.

Tenses are relatively few in number, by African standards, but their usages, especially in combination with one another and with the many conjunctional particles, are as complex as anything in French or Latin. In the indicative tenses there is a partial distinction between those used in general and those used in relative constructions, the latter including not only relative clauses proper, but also certain types of question and of emphatic statement. This binary system is very similar to that of Fula and some other quite unrelated languages, as is also the usage of the subjunctive. There are fewer negative tenses than affirmative ones, and these are common to both systems. Other modes of the verbal notion, such as incepcion, continuance, repetition, priority, isolated occurrence etc., are conveyed by means of a set of auxiliary verbs. Word order is more flexible than in English, various types of inversion and front-shifting being common, and subtle shades of meaning can be conveyed by the insertion in the clause of special particles similar to those of Ancient Greek and Modern German. Various forms of ellipsis, often involving suppression of the verb, are also common, both in spoken and written Hausa, these giving the language at times a very terse and almost 'telegraphic' quality. It has a wealth of proverbs, idioms and stylistic variants and is capable of rendering almost any Western thought or idiom. Much poetry is written in the language, this being characterized by dialectal forms and other special conventions. The poetry is written in the same language as the prose.

Hausa possesses a very large vocabulary, of mixed origin. Most of its basic verbal roots (some three thousand in number) are of indigenous origin (though a number of these show a remarkable phonic resemblance to Germanic verbs of similar meaning), as are its numerous ideophones. But, as is to be expected of a traders' and a Muslim's language, many of its nouns are palpably loanwords from other languages. These include a great number of Arabic words, not only in the specialized spheres of religion, literacy, politics, justice, war, trade, crops, dress, horse equipment etc., but also words for such general concepts as 'affair, plan, discussion, argument, skill, just, generous, treacherous, brave, etc.' There are also at least a hundred Arabic verbs in everyday use, covering such general notions as 'understand, agree, promise, test, destroy', these being mostly taken over the first or second form, but adapted, like the Arabic nouns, into the Hausa phonological and morphological systems (Hausa glottalized consonants, for example, substituting for the emphatic ones of Arabic, and Arabic loan nouns invariably having regular Hausa plural forms). Arabic loans represent a number of different historical layers, routes and media of borrowing, sometimes everyday and learned forms of the same Arabic word co-occurring in the language (e.g., lafihi and aibuu 'fault, blemish'). It is interesting to note that many Arabic words have been taken into Hausa that have not been taken into Swahili, and vice versa. One or two more literary constructions, e.g. the 'cognate accusative', would also appear to have been borrowed from Arabic. Recently, since the European occupation of West Africa, however, the language has become swamped by loanwords from English and French, in their respective areas (these again being assimilated to native models), and borrowing from Arabic appears to have substantially ceased.


iii. — HAUSA LITERATURE

Hausa literature falls into three main categories, or perhaps it is better to speak of poetry, traditions and a subsequent process of synthesis which is currently in progress. But for convenience we shall pursue our discussion under the following heads: (a) the folk literature; (b) the literature of Islam; (c) modern literature.

(a) The folk literature. This is in fact an oral literature at the ultimate provenance of which we can only guess. It is highly improbable that it was ever recorded in writing before the commissioning of such work by European enquirers. As in all folk literature, the term "folk" does not mean "simple", and whatever aspect we study—provenance, interpretation or classification—we are aware of a complex convolution of ideas, motives and themes around which it is impossible to draw precise boundaries of time, type or origin.

The tales may conveniently be classified as tales about animals, tales about people and historical tales, though clearly such a classification is arbitrary and there are constant blurred edges where the division is not precise.

The concept behind the animal stories, probably the earliest chronological stratum of this folklore, is that all the animals once lived together in amity, but the tricks of the spider and the thefts and deceits of the hyena sowed discord and forced them
apart. The lion was king before man overcame him with his poisoned arrow—thus the Hausa proverb Dan Adam abin isare—"Man is a thing to be feared". In these stories the characters of the animals are stereotyped. The spider is a slick trickster, the hyena a cunning but gullible thief usually caught out by her vanity. The he-goat is the most intelligent of the animals, the jackal the most learned, and so on. The plots are elementary and have little regard for cause and effect, or for natural laws. The audience expects that the animals have their well-known characters. What delights is to see these expectations fulfilled. The animal characters function at the same level of intelligence and motivation as humans. When man figures in these stories his rôle is that of a being on terms of equality with the animal world except when his superior skills enable him to triumph. This notion of man's immanence in the world of nature is to be contrasted with the developing concept of his transcendence over and apartness from the animals, which appears in the more complex stories about people. We therefore suppose that these animal stories form an early stratum which has its roots certainly in a pre-monotheistic and not improbably in a pre-social era.

The tales about people appear to reflect the increasing complexity of man's relationship to his environment and the development of his own social self-awareness. Creation and cosmology myths now become common. Typically, giant pagan ancestors of the Barbashe type (Palmer, The Kano Chronicle, in Sudanese Memoirs, iii, Lagos 1928, 97 ff.) meet, wrestle, and leap so high in the sky that their fighting causes the sound of thunder. More subtly, the woman with many mouths appears, and stories of the "Pandora's Box" type offer their explanations of good and evil. Possibly such stories as that of the man who married the monkey woman, and the women who grew spider's eyes mark an awareness of group differentiation and incipient tribalism.

Of particular importance in these stories is the character of Auta, the "Baby of the Family", who is at first simply the enviable character blessed with luck, but who subsequently becomes the hero and dramatist in later history.

The historical stories seem to be an extension of the cosmology and creation myths, for the Barbashe-type ogres who figure in them are certainly associated with the first confrontation between the autochthons and the early immigrants. The subsequent growth of city states we find represented in this literature, and the development of his own social self-awareness.

The sources for these tales are many. Predictably, the Arabian Nights figure in this folk literature in instances too numerous to list. Suffice it to record Aladdin, Ali Baba, the Isle of Women among other familiar characters and themes from the Nights. The tales of the Nights also may be attributed tales of bawdy humour in which jealous husbands are cuckolded and foolish lovers are discomfited. But such robust humour is ubiquitous and, of great antiquity, and it would be unwarranted to conclude that the Nights were necessarily the direct or the sole source.

The style of these tales tends to short staccato sentences where grammatical structures are simple and literary conceits few. On the other hand idiom is vivid and varied, as is to be expected in tales meant to be told. There are few Arabic loan words, and those that do occur are either basic Islamic terms or thoroughly naturalized. Many stories begin with some such conventional opening as Ga la nan, or Shi ke nan, or Hungerus kan husa. In these folk tales Hausa humour is catholic and at times broad. Fun is poked at the pompous. The slave is also a frequent butt for ridicule. But on the whole the Hausa are amused less by simple incongruity and more by the spectacle of human gullibility, by him who is the victim of his own gullibility, by him who is hoist by his own petard.

(b) The literature of the Islamic period.

This literature, written initially in the ajami script, is almost entirely in verse. Also, apart from a few contemporary compositions, it is religious. Popular tradition has it that poetry in Hausa was first composed and written down by 'Usayn b. Fudî (Usmanu dan Fodio). So far, nothing leads us to dispute this tradition and we therefore accept that Hausa first started to be used in formal composition at the end of the 18th or in the early 19th century.

There are four main categories of this verse: (i) Begen Annabi—eulogy of the Prophet Muhammad; (ii) Wa'azi (Arabic wa'az)—the threat of eternal punishment and the promise of divine reward; (iii) Tawhid (Arabic tawhîd)—Muslim theology, the "oneness of the unity"; (iv) Fikha (Arabic fikha)—Muslim law. The first is primarily devotional. The remaining three had a twofold purpose. Firstly, that of the evangelical Fulani, to reach the common people with a message of salvation. Secondly, in the post-djihād era, the purpose of the propagandist, to uphold the Muslim hierarchy by the sanctions of Islam. These two purposes provide us with the very raison d'être of such a literature in Hausa rather than in Arabic.

Our present evidence strongly indicates that the poetry grew out of the religious and theological
tensions associated with the Fulani *djihād*, its immediate prelude and its aftermath. It is to be regarded as an extension of the theological and devotional writings in Arabic, which had a much earlier origin. To some extent it reflects the inadequacy of Arabic literacy in the Sudan at a point when the intellectual battles of the day could no longer be confined within the circle of those fully literate in Arabic. An important consequence was to make Hausa no longer purely a vernacular, but to give it a status as a language of learning of the second rank, as we see clearly from the testimony of Baba (Mary Smith, *Baba of Kano*, London 1964, 132).

Of the four categories, *Begen Annabi* is certainly the most pleasing by Western standards, since it attempts to express the emotions of personal religious experience in terms of human devotion. Its imagery is closely influenced by detail from the sīra literature, from the infancy legends of Muḥammad, and by incidents from *Kwar'ām* and *badīgh*. The most impressive example—moving and sincere—is a *takhīms* by Ḥāfiz b. Ḫūmān on an original by the Shaihu. Unfortunately, it is still unpublished.

*Wā'asī* at its best can be fine apocalyptic ranting, full of the fiery colour and sulphurous imagery of the mediaeval Muslim hell, and its counterpart of lust and fleshy delights in Paradise. A memorable example of this is the *Wakar jan mari*—‘The song of the red leg irons’ also attributed to Ḥāfiz b. Ḫūmān, and as yet unpublished.

*Tauhīdī* is the most intellectual of Hausa writing. The unpublished work *Ku san sammuwar Jalla* is an example of high quality. This presents the arguments for God’s existence, His unity, omnipotence and so on, in Hausa verse, but with extensive use of Arabic philosophic terms in various degrees of naturalization. It will be clear that such an exercise requires considerable command of the original Arabic disciplines and is the product of a high order of intellect.

*Fikihu* is aesthetically unattractive, but certainly not without interest to the European reader, for it is a rich source of information on pre-Islamic custom. To the Muslim it is of paramount importance, for upon this and upon *tauhīdī* depend his chances of salvation. Correspondingly, those who can write this verse hold the salvation of the masses in their hands and their authority in the Muslim hierarchy is thus considerable.

These categories of learned poetry are the main channel whereby the esoteric Arabic vocabulary, known initially only to an élite, passed through the process of naturalization into common speech. A high proportion of this vocabulary has not yet reached the vernacular, but the poetry remains popular and by a process of constant enquiry and the scholia of the *malāms* [*q.v.*] the borrowing of this class of learned Arabic words into Hausa is still proceeding.

In addition to these learned categories there is popular poetry such as *yabu*—‘praise song’; *sambo*—‘satire’, and the incantations of the *bori* practitioners. These categories are not normally written and therefore belong to the oral literature.

The learned poetry is metric and the metres conform to the classical Arabic metres, although it appears that certain minor variants are allowed to the Hausa poet which would be improper to his Arab counterpart. Among the most popular metres are *al-tawīl*, *al-kāmil*, and *al-wafīr*. Tone plays no part in the metrical system. 

The popular poetry is also metric, and while it does not conform to the Classical Arabic metres it appears to have been influenced by them. Certainly, to all intents and purposes it too is quantitative, but it may be that remnants of an earlier qualitative—that is a tonal—system have survived marginally in some of this poetry. This, however, has yet to be convincingly demonstrated.

(c) *Modern literature.* By this we mean works printed in *boko* (Roman characters), the great bulk of which has been produced over the course of the last fifty years. To some extent it is an artificial development, having been initially the production of missionaries, European administrators and the Western education system. Subsequently it was nurtured by Departments of Education and such quasi-government organizations as the Northern Regional Literature Agency. Its dissemination has been closely linked to the growth of government sponsored education. It has been written, in the main, by men who have passed through the primary and secondary schools created or supported by the Administration. But as more Northern Nigerians began to feel at home in both the world of Islamic Africa and the world of the secular West, so a synthesis became apparent in which the two earlier traditions were drawn together to emerge in a new form of literature influenced by, but certainly not slavishly copying, Western and African patterns.

Our purpose is best served by a brief analysis of certain outstanding examples of this literature, for it is still not yet sufficiently extensive to allow of further general conclusions. *Shaiku Umar* (Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Zaria 1955) is the story of a boy and his widowed mother who fall foul of the slave raiders. It has a carefully constructed plot in which a series of incidents and blows of fate arbitrate the lives of these people, who are shown as the helpless victims of their own social and political institutions. It is a story of great human sympathy, of charity and social concern and is at first sight far removed from our traditional *genes*. Yet the institutions which support the plot are those of traditional Muslim learning, slavery, the life of the Sarki’s court and Hausa kinship custom. Indeed it portrays the Islamic life of the Western Sudan at its dramatic *fin de siècle*, immediately prior to the beginning of the European Administrations. Even the hyena, that ancient rascal of a remote indigenous traditions, enters the story at one point to intervene drastically in the hero’s life.

*Gandoki* of Alhaji Bello (first printed Zaria 1934 and subsequent undated editions) is a very different tale. Here the plot is rudimentary and without chronologic discipline. It starts with a vivid picture of experiences in the fighting which took place against Lugard’s columns at the turn of the century, and the central character is a roistering pagan-slaying boastful warrior who clearly has the blood of the Nagwamatse in his veins. Then suddenly the story moves into the fantasy world of jinns and ogres and the hero moves through a series of marvellous adventures in which the author’s debt to the *Arabian Nights* is evident. Yet despite the clearly Islamic influences, both literary and moral—for Gandoki is a devout Muslim—it is clear that the ogres and pagan enemies whom he slays or enslaves have stepped out of the Barbushie cycle, for they are the giant elephant hunters and bohey-men of the cosmology and early history myths. Once again our traditions have converged, but to produce a very different though equally entertaining result.

*Magana āri ce* of Alhaji Abubakar Imam (fifth
HAUSA — HAWALA

Edition, Zaria 1960) is justly famous. This, a much larger work than the previous two, is a series of short stories based largely on the animal cycle but borrowing such exotic themes as "The Pied Piper," which it then presents delightfully in an African setting, and numerous themes from the Nights. The whole is connected by the parrot who is both narrator and hero, in that he has to invent his tales in order to prevent the young prince from rushing headstrong to his doom at the hands of the jealous vizier. The parallel with the Nights is obvious, but the parrot is also the spider stinker of the animal tales and certainly reminiscent of Abü Zayd, the witty, unscrupulous, improvising rawi of the Makâmât. The work is a mine of information on Hausa custom, is immensely rich in linguistic material and is unquestionably a classic of Hausa literature. Perhaps more overtly than our two previous examples it combines the three traditions which we have described and illustrates their leavens at work.

Clearly Hausa literature is now at a point where past tradition and recent intellectual experience provide the materials for important and exciting new developments. One such is represented by the recent works of Malam Shu'ailu Makarfi, Zamanin nan namu (Zaria 1959) and falau na Kyallu (Zaria 1960). These are full length plays on such moral and social themes as juvenile delinquency, mercenary mothers and prostitutes, written in the latest idiom of the Kano streets and market-place, full of English and other neologisms, but interspersed with uncouth asides and moralizing (in verse) by a mai shela or 'herald' who performs a function very similar to that of the chorus in a Greek tragedy.

Bibliography: (a) In addition to works mentioned in the text, Labarun Hausawa da makawnansu, Zaria 1932, i-ii; Edgar, Lilafi na tatunyoyi ya Hausa, Lagos 1924, i-iii; Shôn, Magana Hausa, ed. Robinson, London 1906. (b) The only collections of learned poetry at present available are Robinson's Specimens of Hausa literature, Cambridge 1896, a rather haphazard collection in an archaic orthography and indifferent translation; also Wâokin Hausa, Zaria 1957, Hausa texts transcribed into Roman script, a better selection than Robinson but marred by certain errors and misspelled manuscripts; M. Hiskett, The 'Song of Bagauda': a Hausa king list and homily in verse—i, in BSOAS, xxvii (1964), an edited Hausa text, with English translation in BSOAS, xxviii (1965). For a discussion of the significance of the poetry, M. Hiskett, The historical background to the naturalisation of Arabic loan words in Hausa, in ALS, vi (1965); for metre Greenberg, Hausa verse prosody, in JAOS, lxix (1949); M. Hiskett, The 'Song of Bagauda'—III, in BSOAS, xxviii (1965). (c) No critical work on modern Hausa literature has yet been written. Catalogues of NOLRA and their successors, Gaskiya Press, Zaria give lists of titles of Hausa novels, etc., which are currently available.

See further Nigeria.

HAWALA, literally "drafts," "bill," is the cession, i.e., the payment of a debt through the transfer of a claim. If A has a debt to B and a claim against C, he can settle his debt by transferring his claim against C to the benefit of B. In this case A is the transferor (al-muhîl), B the creditor (al-muhadd) who accepts the cession, C is the cessionary (al-muhîl 'alayhi). It would however be incorrect to consider the hawala merely from the viewpoint of a cession: it is first of all a means of payment to release the muhîl from a debt, therefore, besides the task of the cession it fulfills that of the declaration and assignment as well (R. Grasshoff, Die Wechselrecht der Araber, Eine rechtsvergleichende Studie über die Herkunft des Wechsels, Berlin 1899, 60). It is not identical with the suftadfa [q.v.]; this is on the contrary a pure transaction of issuing a bill, a special form of the hawala, "distinguished by the fact that the muhâdîl 'alayhi is absent at the conclusion of the contract between the muhîl and the muhaddîl" (Grasshoff, op. cit., 64). According to the fikih it is the following prerequisites which are necessary to validate the transfer: the transferor and his creditor must conclude a contract, the transferred debt must be a fixed obligation and the transferor's debt must be in agreement with that of the cessionary in kind, manner and conditions of payment.

The hawala occurs rather often in Arabic papyri, usually in the form of "written obligation" (dhukr bâbî); cf. A. Grohmann, Arabic papyri in the Egyptian Library, l, Cairo 1934, no. 48, and p. 116; ii, Cairo 1936, no. 102, and p. 118; A. Dietrich, Arabische Papyri aus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek (= Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, xxii/3), Leipzig 1937, no. 44. The cessionary may be represented through an agent (wâkil), as in the Papyrus no. 134 (for it see p. 84) in A. Dietrich, Arabische Briefe aus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitats-Bibliothek, Hamburg 1955.

The word hawala entered Europe through the commerce of the Italian Levant in the form awalât to indicate the guaranty of a draft. In modern Arabic hawâl means draft, cheque or assignment.


(A. Dietrich)

HAWALA, as a financial term, assignment; in Islamic finance, an assignment on a muhâdîl [q.v.] effected by order of the ruler in favour of a third party. The term is applied both to the mandate for the payment and to the sum paid. It is already established in these senses in 'Abbasid finance (see F. Lekkengaard, Islamic taxation in the classic period, Copenhagen 1950, 63-s). In the 'Abbasid empire, hawala was widely used in both state and private finances to avoid the dangers and delays inherent in the transport of cash. The mandates were known as suftadfa [q.v.] or suftad [q.v.]. Thus we know that the tax-collectors (ummîl), even in the hands of the Arab state or the sakk [q.v.]. Thus we know that the tax-collectors (ummîl) of cash. The mandates were known as suftadafa. In the encashment of the suftadfa and in all matters relating to hawala, the primary rôle was played by the giababî [q.v.] (see R. Grasshoff, Die Suftafa und Hawala der Araber, Göttingen 1899; W. J. Fischel, Jews in the economic and political life of mediaval Islam, Royal Asiatic Soc. Monographs, vol. xxii, London 1937, 3-35).

Hawala appears in wide use in Saladin finance (H.
practice with regard to muḥāfaẓa'ā and hawāla (Dustūr al-ḵābī, 297-8). According to Nakhjawānī, assignations were made on the tāmghāt [see TAMGHA] in the provinces (cf. Diāmī al-tawāṣṣalī). Later Khaṣṣāf Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Mawllānā Shams al-Dīn laid down the principle that these revenues should be collected by muḥābaṣīl [q.v.] of the diwān, and that allowances should again be paid directly from the treasury. But these reforms also lapsed (on the later history of muḥāfaẓa'ā and hawāla in Iran, see Taḥqīqāt al-mutālik, ed. V. Minorsky, London 1916, 79).

In the Ottoman empire, as in other Islamic states, muḥāfaẓa'ā and hawāla were the basis of the financial system. The rich material preserved in the Ottoman archives makes it possible to establish the system in detail and to shed light on obscure points in its earlier history (particularly important are the muḥābaṣīl defterleri and the māliyye āẖām defterleri in the Bașvekālet Arşıvi Umum Mūdūrlūğū). The main source of revenue which was exploited by muḥāfaẓa'ā and on which assignations were made was the ḥāwāsy-i hūmāyūn [see ḥāās], which came under the administration of the defterdār. In general payments were made at the place where the revenue was collected through assignations on the tax-farmer. The system was favoured by such factors as the difficulty of transporting cash and the slowness with which revenue accumulated from the taxation of commercial transactions, particularly in the towns. Thanks to entries made in the muḥābaṣīl registers of the central government, the defterdār was in a position to exercise close control over the administration of these revenues in distant provinces. Another group of revenues — including the ʿaḏār, which were payable in kind — was assigned to the military as ismār [q.v.]. The timar system collected these revenues directly. However, in the case of Ghiyāth Khan’s reforms, this system of enfeoffment must be seen as a departure from the hawāla principle. Revenues in this category were no longer the subject of hawāla transactions; in the Ottoman system they constituted an entirely distinct branch of the administration under the nīzhāḏī [q.v.].

The ʿamīl (tax-farmer), who took on a muḥāfaẓa’ā for a given term (usually three years), made payments in accordance with the assignations of the central government, to those in whose favour they were drafted. The payments were always made with the cognizance of the emīn [q.v.] and ḵāḍī, the government’s supervisory agents, and entered in their registers. The payments were always in cash. The ḵāḍī gave the tax-farmer a budgijet which stated the amount of the payment, to whom it was made, by what order, on what date, and from which muḥāfaẓa’ā. A copy was entered in the ḵāḍī’s register. The budgijet would then be submitted in the accounting which took place when each instalment of the muḥāfaẓa’ā fell due. If on the other hand the payment was not made, a muṭlāb stating the reason for this was given to the bearer of the assignation. The ḵāḍīs’ registers are among our most valuable sources for hawāla transactions.

The mandate for the hawāla is a kūhm of the sultan. It specifies how much is to be paid, to whom, and from what source. Hawāla orders are of three main types: (1) orders made out directly in favour of claimants, used for the payment of allowances (sāliyān, ṣulāf, masāwī'īb) to the military in the provinces; (2) assignments placed at the disposal of an emīn to cover purchases made in connexion with provincial public works or for the palace (see R. An-
The various *mubâzhâ'at* in a region tended to be ear-marked for particular claimants, and their claims regularly met from the same source. It was for this reason that the central financial administration was organized into departments with such names as *Anadolu mubâzhâ'ât*, *ma'den mubâzhâ'ât*, *Nusret-i mubâzhâ'ât*, etc. Belgrade z. sem. Sprachwissensch.; *(cf. al-Tha'labâ, Tabari, Tafsir, *fatwâd-yi Abu'l-Su'ud)*.

In the 12th/13th century onwards, we find the revenues of tax-farms being transferred to the central treasury by bill of exchange (*polîče*) through the services of *sarrâfs* established in the main towns. *Hawâlî* nevertheless continued to be used. It lost its importance when tax-farming (*mubâ'â'at*) was abolished after the declaration of the Tanzimât in 1839. The Tanzimât introduced a policy of fiscal centralization. State officials appointed to the provinces with extensive powers collected revenue directly. After paying salaries and meeting other local expenses locally, the *mubâ'â'ât* sent the balance to the central treasury (see H. İnalci, *Tanzimat'in in uygulanmasi ve sosyal tepkileri*, Belleten, xxviii/112 (1964), 639).

In *hâshâ'd*, *hawâlî* was the subject of a separate *kiûlâd*. In the *fatâwâd* collections of the Ottoman *muftîs*, the *hâshâ'd* al-*hawâlî* sometimes includes *fatâwâd* on *hawâlî* transactions involving the state, as well as those relating to transactions between private individuals, or between individuals and *waqfs* (see *Fatâwâ-yi Abu'l-Su'ûd*, Topkapı Sarayi MS Ahmed III 786, ff. 251-2; *Fatâwâ-yi Yahyâ Efendi*, MS Ahmed III 298, ff. 141-3).

In Ottoman Turkish, *hawâlî* has the further sense of a tower placed at a vantage-point; *hawâlâ* were sometimes built for blockading purposes near castles which were likely to put up a long resistance. This method was used in the blockade of Bursa in the early 8th/14th century. Mehmed II contemplated using Rûmâl Hîjârî as a *hawâlâ* to blockade Constantinople if resistance continued. Ottoman *hâwâlîs* have left traces in Balkan toponymy. One such *hâwâlî* is that built by Mehmed II near Belgrade, now known locally as *Avâla* (H. İnalci, *Hawâlî*, apostile. The word is borrowed from Ethiopic, in which language *hawârîyâd* has the same meaning (see Nöldeke, *Bestrâäge z. sem. Sprachwissensch.*, 48). The suggested derivations from Arabic, attributing to it the meaning “one who wears white clothing” etc., are incorrect. Tradition delights to endow the earliest Islamic pioneers with foreign bynames which were familiar to the “people of the Book”. Abû Bakr is called al-Şiddîk, *Umâr al-Şâbâb*, al-Zubây r. b. 'Awwâm al-Hawâri. Moreover, the collective term al-*Hawârîyûn* occurs, denoting twelve persons who at the time of the second “Akbâb” are said to have been named by Muhammad (or those present) as *mâlîks* of the inhabitants of Medina “to be the sureties for their people, just as the apostles were sureties for *Isâ* b. Mu'min, and as *muftî* (Muhammad) am surety for my people”. Christian influence is also found elsewhere in the account of the “second ‘Akbâb’”, where the total number of those present is put at 70 or 72, apparently on the analogy of the account in the Gospels of the 70 or 72 apostles (Luke, X, 1, 17). Of these 12 *Hawârîyûn*, nine are said to have belonged to the *Khaḍājâd* and three to the *Aws*. Their names were said to be: — Sa'd b. 'Ubâda, Asâd b. Zurra, Sa'd b. al-Râbi', Sa'd b. Abî Khayya'ah, Munâhir b. 'Amr, 'Abd Allâh b. Rawâhî, al-Bârî b. Ma'dur, Abu 'l-Haythâm b. al-Tâziyîhâr, Isa b. Hûdâyî, 'Abd Allâh b. 'Ubayd a. b. Şînî, 'Abd Allâh b. 'Râfî b. Mâlik. According to another version, however, the *Hawârîyûn* belonged exclusively to the tribe of Quraysh and were: — Abû Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmân, 'Ali, Ḥamza, 'Ijâ'afar, Abû 'Ubayda b. al-'Ijârâh, 'Uthmân b. Maz'ûn, 'Abd al-Rahmân b. 'Awf, Sa'd b. Abî Wâkâs, 'Abd Allâh b. al-Zubây r. b. 'Awwâm al-Ansârî, etc. (cf. Al-Tha'labâ, Kâmûs al-anbâ'în, Caen, 1920, x, 344). These accounts again make it clear to what extent the rivalry between Anşar [q.v.] and Muhâdîrûn [q.v.] has influenced tradition.

The tradition concerning these twelve Muslim apostles has perhaps, like so many others, arisen as a deduction from a statement in the *Kûrâ* (III, 45, LVXVI, 14): *Jesus* says “Who are my Anşar for God’s sake?” And the *Hawârîyûn* answer “We are the Anşar of God”, etc. The parallel with Muhammad’s own position is here clear enough, and it is evident that, alongside of the Muslim Anşar, the need was felt for Muslim *Hawârîyûn*.

On the subject of the disciples of Jesus statements will be found in various Muslim writers, for the most part deriving from passages in the Gospels; see *Isâ* and Mâ'da. The *Bibliography: in addition to the references in the text, A. J. Jeffery, *Foreign words...*, 155-6; *Tâbarî, Tafsîr*, old ed., iii, 197-200, new ed., iv, 442-8. (A. J. Wensinck)

**HAWÂSHî** [see *Hâshîyâ*].

**HAWAZÎN**, a large North Arabian tribe or group of tribes. The genealogy is given as: Hawazîn b. Mansûr b. ʔukrima b. ʔašâla b. Kay b. ʔaylān [see *yâlān*, *adnân*, *al-ʔârâb* (* Diaszirat*), vi]. Properly speaking Hawazîn includes the tribes of ʔâmîr b. ʔâsâ-sâ (q.v.) and ʔâsâ (q.v.), but the term is sometimes restricted to what is more correctly ʔâdîr Hawazîn, “the rear of Hawazîn”, comprising ʔâshāwî b. Bakr, ʔâsâr b. Mušâwîya b. Bakr, ʔâsâr b. ʔâsâwîya b. Bakr and Sa'd b. Bakr [q.v.] among the places reckoned to belong to Hawazîn were: Amlâb, ʔâsâd al-Mašâhîl, al-Dâdâr, al-Dâbân, and Fayf al-Rîh; the wadis ʔâstâs, Liyya, Turâba, ʔaṭâya (so also ʔâsâr, but variants), Abû Ḥâfîdân and the waters ʔûh-l-Hulyâfâ y. ʔiyyân and the mount al-Muḍâjâyi. Before Islam, Hawazîn along with ʔâshâwî b. Bakr worshipped the idol Dîhâr at ʔukâz; the ʔâdîr came from a family of ʔâsâr of Hawazîn.

**Early history.** For a time Hawazîn paid tribute to ʔaṭâfān (under ʔuzâhîr b. ʔîdāshîmâa of ʔâbîs, but they became independent on ʔuzâhîr’s death. Hostility continued, however, and there were many battles, sometimes between most of ʔaṭâfân on the one side and most of Hawazîn (often in alliance with Sulaymîn) on the other, sometimes between individual tribes, such as Fażâra and ʔâshāwî. Hawazîn was also bitterly hostile to Quraysh, against whom it had fought the wars of the Figîdär. The underlying cause was the trade rivalry between Mecca and al-Ţâhîr, since the inhabitants of the latter town, ʔâshāwî were either part of Hawazîn or in close alliance. One war began with a quarrel between an ally of Quraysh (belonging to ʔinân) and a man of Hawazîn. The second and more famous war of the Figîdär arose from the killing of ʔurwâ al-Ralîhî (of ʔilâb of ʔâmîr b. ʔašâ-sâ) by ʔâbrâd b. Kay [client of ʔāhr b. Umâyya of Quraysh]. Though Quraysh had to retire to Mecca on several occasions, they seem to have had the best of the fighting in the end. Peace was made
with Hawazin, but al-Ta'if passed into the control of the section of Thakif known as the Ahlaf, who were subordinate to Mecca.

Relations with Muhammad. In general Muhammad had good relations with 4Amir b. Sa'asa'a. A small section of Sa'd b. Bakr (to which he tried his wet-nurse Halima [q.v.] had belonged) became Muslims at an early date, though others fought against him at Hunayn. Otherwise he had little contact with Hawazin till after his triumphant entry into Medina in 8/630. While still settling the affairs of Mecca, he heard that Mālik b. 4Awf (of Naṣr) was concentrating a force of Hawazin and Thakif only a day or two's march away and was thus threatening both Mecca and the Muslims. Because of the old enmity between Kuraysh and Hawazin 2000 Meccans joined Muhammad when he marched to meet this threat. The battle took place at Hunayn, and, while Thakif took refuge in al-Ta'if, Hawazin was routed and lost all their possessions. Muhammad treated Mālik b. 4Awf very generously, however, restoring his wife and children, making a gift of camels, and recognizing him as chief of Hawazin. The tribe had to make a payment of sī'āya, presumably for the restoration of the captured women and children. Mālik then helped Muhammad against his former allies of Thakif.

3Hawazin; History. During the Ridda, Hawazin are said to have suspended the payment of sadaka presumably for the restoration of the captured women and children. Muhammad is called the precursor ( hopes of life, will join him near the basin. So far as one can judge, this idea is not found in the Qur'an, but it comes from the Meccans who had been in early Islam. The typical Turkish ablution tank is an octagonal reservoir covered by an octagonal pavilion resting on columns and arches, with wide eaves and a low dome. The present octagonal tank covered by a square pavilion in the sahn, but sometimes outside the mosque. It is hardly possible to assign a definite place to the reservoir among the eschatological sites. According to a canonical tradition (Tirmidhi, Kitāb al-sunnah, s.v. al-sā'af, p. 105; Ṭabarī, Ta'rif, xxx, 176 ff.; the articles of the creeds in Wensinck, The Muslim Creed, index, s.v. Basin; al-Ghazālī, Ihyā', Cairo 1302, iv, 476.)—Neither Ghazālī, in al-Durrā al-fā'īlīn, nor the author of the Kitāb al-baydā' mentions the basin. In the Ihyā' it comes between the intercession and the descriptions of Hell and Paradise, without there being any connexion with the one or the other. This uncertainty, which connects the basin sometimes with Paradise, sometimes with the trials at the Last Judgment, has given rise to the idea of two basins.

Bibliography: The statements in the collections of canonical tradition in Wensinck, Handbook, s.v. Basin; M Fu'ād 4Abd al-Bākī, Miftāh kunuz al-sunnah, s.v. al-sā'af, p. 105; Ṭabarī, Ta'rif, xxx, 176 ff.; the articles of the creeds in Wensinck, The Muslim Creed, index, s.v. Basin; al-Ghazālī, Ihyā', Cairo 1302, iv, 476. (A. J. WENSINCK)
open, and are generally square or rectangular in plan. Simultaneously with ablution tanks, fountain-cisterns were also developed in Islamic architecture, at first in mosques, and then also in palaces and gardens. The earliest extant example of such a cistern appears to be the one underneath the westernmost domed edifice in the sahn of the Great Mosque of Damascus. It was octagonal with a little parapet all round, and a jet—probably in imitation of the phiale which sometimes stood in the atria of the Byzantine churches—in the middle. The octagonal cistern in the sahn of the Great Mosque of Harrân was, in all probability, a fountain-cistern, as was that in the sahn of the Great Mosque of Sámarra (234/784-848) and of the Mosque of Ibn Tlülün, the latter being described by Ibn Dükňmâk as a great basin of marble, 4 cubits in diameter, with a jet of water in the centre, over which was a gilt dome on ten marble columns, and round which were sixteen marble columns with a marble pavement. This was later rebuilt by Ladjîln. Once thus developed, the fountain-cistern is often found in mosques of later dates along with the ablution tank—generally separate, but sometimes combined in one.

This cistern was, however, particularly developed in Iran and under its influence in India. A pool of water set in a plantation was popular not only in the pre-Islamic lay-out of gardens in Irân, but was also a frequent motif in the ornamentation of pottery and metalwork. In the rapid expansion of the Islamic period, this theme of plants and water combines the octagon and the cross, the octagon being a fountain-cistern at the shrine of Ni.mat Allah Mahán in the midst of the pool was a fountain of gold, with images, which one ascended by five steps; in the midst which Abu Ibrahim used to visit occasionally. To this group also a frequent motif in the ornamentation of the Islamic period, this theme of plants and water combines the octagon and the cross, the octagon beautiful tank at the shrine of Ni.mat Allah Mahán combines the octagon and the cross, the octagon serving as fountain at the intersection of the cross, the arms of which have diagonally cut corners to parallel this octagon. More elaborate and very characteristic are the ogee pools, often polygonal. In the big tanks, the water is usually still and the cistern is by preference filled to the very brim. But running water also had its place, trickling or leaping through the channels, according to the terrain, or dropping in musical cascades, and there were numerous fountains, some five hundred, for example, in the Hazar Djarîb. In India, the design of the tanks was copied almost exactly, but more often with multiple and varied jets in the middle. The best examples of such tanks are to be noticed in the garden of the Tâdi Mahall (second quarter of the 11th/12th century) in Ægra and in the Shahmâr Bâgh (1047/1637-8) in Lahorë.

There are other forms of the fountain-cistern, not in the open, but in pleasure-houses. We hear in the Thousand and One Nights of a pool in a wonderful domed building decorated with "all kinds of pictures in gold and ultramarine, and it had four doors, to which one ascended by five steps; in the midst of it was a pool, to which one descended by steps of gold, those steps being set with minerals. In the midst of the pool was a fountain of gold, with images, large and small, from the mouths of which the water issued; and when the images produced various sounds at the issuing of the water, it seemed to the hearer that he was in paradise". To this group belongs the recently discovered Saldjûk Hawîd- khâna at Rayy—a small vaulted building with a pool inside, octagonal in plan, and sunk below the ground level.

Large cisterns, especially for drinking water, fed by the nearest wâdi or river or by rain-water, were also built by Muslim rulers. Of these, two kinds may be distinguished: open and covered or monumental. Several of the open variety have now been re-excavated in Tunisia. The two largest, built by Abu Ibrâhîm Aḥmad between 246/860-3, are about a kilometre from the north gate of Kayrawân and receive the water of the wâdi Marjî al-Lî when it is in flood. They are polygonal, one being composed of seventeen straight sides and the other of forty-eight sides, with a round buttress at each corner internally and externally, and, in addition, an intermediate buttress externally, and a vertical wall at each end. The cistern of Rub el-Hizb, apparently of the 6th/12th century, and that of the fortress of Saûne, in Syria, of the Crusading period, belong to this type.

HAWD, usual spelling Hount (hau = a horsetrough, made of leather mounted on a wooden frame), name of the natural depression situated in south-eastern Mauritania in the angle of the Senegal and Niger basins. It is bounded on the north by an escarpment, Dhar Tichitt (sahr tiglid), stretching from Tichitt to Aratane and marking the limit of the Adal plateaux. In the north-east the escarpment which curves round above Oualata and Dhar Ouallata = dahar Wa'd and Nebem, forms the boundary of the table-land of Djouf (Djaf). The western boundary of the Hodh is much less clearly marked; after a point facing towards Bassokinou and Nara it takes in Timbedra and then turns back towards Tichitt through Alouen el Atrous (Uyûn al-‘Atrak).

The Hodh thus consists of a plateau and, below the escarpment, a plain which in turn is divided into two regions, in the south a region of grazing lands and wells, Labiar (al-Beûr), and in the North the Aouker which has been overrun by sand.

Its climate is midway between that of the Sahara and that of the Sahel. There are three distinct seasons: the rainy season lasts from July to September, the hot dry season from March to July, the dry cool season from October to March. The abundant rainfall gives the grazing land a savannah vegetation which attracts both caravans and herds.

History.—As a result of its situation on the edge of the desert, the Hodh has been a disputed region throughout its long history. According to certain traditions the Fulani of Macina originated there. The kingdom of Awadghost (which included the northern Hodh) is said to have been established by the Lamto and Ghana Berbers. It was conquered by the negro Soninke sovereigns of Ghana (990), whose capital, Koumbi Saleh, is in the Hodh. The Almoravids of Yahyâ b. ‘Umar are said to have captured Awadghost in 1054 and Ghana in 1076.

The death of Abû Bakr b. ‘Umar (480/1087) seems to have allowed Ghana to recover her independence, but the sovereign’s authority can hardly have extended beyond the Aouker and the Bassokinou. In 1203, Soumangourou Kanté, king of the Soso, seized Ghana. The pagan garrison routed the Muslim Soninke at Oualata (1224). In 1240, Sounjâlata Keïta destroyed the city of Ghana.

Arab invasions occurred in the Sahara towards the end of the 8th/14th century, at a time when the berberization of the population was becoming increasingly intensive. The Soninke towns of Chéou and Birou became, in Berber, Tighit and Iwaltale (Oualata). The Maqūl Arabs, especially the Massaï branch, supplied the Berbers with condottieri who were the chief figures of the wars of that period. The Hodh is situated at the extreme limit of the range of the Arab tribes coming from the north who, after being checked by the Senegal, turned their course eastwards. It was therefore to some extent only the
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The escarpment which curves round above the Hodh is much less clearly marked; after a point facing towards Bassokinou and Nara it takes in Timbedra and then turns back towards Tichitt through Alouen el Atrous (Uyûn al-‘Atrak).

The Hodh thus consists of a plateau and, below the escarpment, a plain which in turn is divided into two regions, in the south a region of grazing lands and wells, Labiar (al-Beûr), and in the North the Aouker which has been overrun by sand.

Its climate is midway between that of the Sahara and that of the Sahel. There are three distinct seasons: the rainy season lasts from July to September, the hot dry season from March to July, the dry cool season from October to March. The abundant rainfall gives the grazing land a savannah vegetation which attracts both caravans and herds.

History.—As a result of its situation on the edge of the desert, the Hodh has been a disputed region throughout its long history. According to certain traditions the Fulani of Macina originated there. The kingdom of Awadghost (which included the northern Hodh) is said to have been established by the Lamto and Ghana Berbers. It was conquered by the negro Soninke sovereigns of Ghana (990), whose capital, Koumbi Saleh, is in the Hodh. The Almoravids of Yahyâ b. ‘Umar are said to have captured Awadghost in 1054 and Ghana in 1076.

The death of Abû Bakr b. ‘Umar (480/1087) seems to have allowed Ghana to recover her independence, but the sovereign’s authority can hardly have extended beyond the Aouker and the Bassokinou. In 1203, Soumangourou Kanté, king of the Soso, seized Ghana. The pagan garrison routed the Muslim Soninke at Oualata (1224). In 1240, Sounjâlata Keïta destroyed the city of Ghana.

Arab invasions occurred in the Sahara towards the end of the 8th/14th century, at a time when the berberization of the population was becoming increasingly intensive. The Soninke towns of Chéou and Birou became, in Berber, Tighit and Iwaltale (Oualata). The Maqûl Arabs, especially the Massaï branch, supplied the Berbers with condottieri who were the chief figures of the wars of that period. The Hodh is situated at the extreme limit of the range of the Arab tribes coming from the north who, after being checked by the Senegal, turned their course eastwards. It was therefore to some extent only the
fringe of the Arab invasion that penetrated to this region.

At the beginning of the 9th/10th century, the Awlad Dâwûd b. Muhammad dominated the Hodh. At the beginning of the following century they were replaced by their kinsmen the Awlad Dâwûd b. ʿArrûk who, falling back on the Niger, in the middle of the 11th/17th century gave way to the Awlad Muhammad—Awlad Mbârek, who had been compelled to move westwards under pressure from the Trâra and the Brâkna. At the beginning of the 19th century the Awlad Nâsîr drove back the Awlad Mbârek to the East.

Only in about 1850 was the political supremacy of the ʿHaṣṣân Arabs replaced by that of the Maḥdûf, almost pure Berbers though Arabic-speaking, who succeeded in imposing themselves as a result of their alliance with al-Ḥâfīdī ʿUmar and his Toucoulouers, who captured Nîorî (1850).

After 1890, French penetration made itself felt. Nîorî was occupied on 1 January 1891. Two years later, Archinard conquered Macina and the Nara region. The final occupation of the Hodh was carried out by Colonel Roulet who, starting from Timbuctu, entered Oualata without firing a shot.

In the matter of the religious confraterities, the Kâdirîyya jârîka was propagated in the 12th/18th century, while in the 19th century the Tîjâniyya, under the influence of al-Ḥâfîdī ʿUmar, was more influential. But what was to be of considerable importance in this region was the “differentiated Tîjânîmism” introduced by a shârif of the Touat, Muhammad wûd Ahmad wûd ʿAbd Allâh (or al-Shârif al-Aḥâdîr) and his successor Shaykh Hamalla, whose father was shârif of Tichitt and whose mother was a Toucouluer, and who had brought together a powerful contingent of Moorish tribes linked for administrative purposes to the districts of Nîorî, Kûfûs, Timbedra, Nara and Nema. The Hamallists were the instigators of the incidents of Kâdî (1930) and Nîorî-Assaba (1940).

In 1940, almost all the tribes had been penetrated by Hamallist propaganda, which preached an actively bellicose Islam and, with its xenophobic attitude, gathered all the dissidents of eastern Mauritania and western Sudan. A numerous maraîchery, the Awlad Tenouajîb, members of whom were recorded in Kayes, Yélimâné, Nîorî, Kûfûs and Tamchakett, had shown itself hostile to this propaganda, preserving instead a strict Kâdirî orthodoxy.

On the occasion of the 1940 armistice the Hamallists thought the moment had come to suppress their Tenouajîb rivals and seize their possessions. But, after their violent attempt, thirty-three of the assailants, among whom was the eldest son of Shaykh Hamalla, were condemned to death and shot in Yélimâné. Shaykh Hamalla was deported, first to Algeria and later to France, where he died during the German occupation.

If Marty could regard Nîorî as the Mecca of the Sudan, it is certain that the Hodh was in practice the principal starting point for Islam in the direction of the negro countries. It remains a place of importance and of the negro countries. It remains a place of importance.

In 1940, almost all the tribes had been penetrated by Hamallist propaganda, which preached an actively bellicose Islam and, with its xenophobic attitude, gathered all the dissidents of eastern Mauritania and western Sudan. A numerous maraîchery, the Awlad Tenouajîb, members of whom were recorded in Kayes, Yélimâné, Nîorî, Kûfûs and Tamchakett, had shown itself hostile to this propaganda, preserving instead a strict Kâdirî orthodoxy.

On the occasion of the 1940 armistice the Hamallists thought the moment had come to suppress their Tenouajîb rivals and seize their possessions. But, after their violent attempt, thirty-three of the assailants, among whom was the eldest son of Shaykh Hamalla, were condemned to death and shot in Yélimâné. Shaykh Hamalla was deported, first to Algeria and later to France, where he died during the German occupation.

If Marty could regard Nîorî as the Mecca of the Sudan, it is certain that the Hodh was in practice the principal starting point for Islam in the direction of the negro countries. It remains a place of importance and of the negro countries. It remains a place of importance.

From the above facts it can be seen that the Hodh was a powerful contingent of Moorish tribes linked for administrative purposes to the districts of Nîorî, Kûfûs, Timbedra, Nara and Nema. The Hamallists were the instigators of the incidents of Kâdî (1930) and Nîorî-Assaba (1940).

In 1940, almost all the tribes had been penetrated by Hamallist propaganda, which preached an actively bellicose Islam and, with its xenophobic attitude, gathered all the dissidents of eastern Mauritania and western Sudan. A numerous maraîchery, the Awlad Tenouajîb, members of whom were recorded in Kayes, Yélimâné, Nîorî, Kûfûs and Tamchakett, had shown itself hostile to this propaganda, preserving instead a strict Kâdirî orthodoxy.

On the occasion of the 1940 armistice the Hamallists thought the moment had come to suppress their Tenouajîb rivals and seize their possessions. But, after their violent attempt, thirty-three of the assailants, among whom was the eldest son of Shaykh Hamalla, were condemned to death and shot in Yélimâné. Shaykh Hamalla was deported, first to Algeria and later to France, where he died during the German occupation.

If Marty could regard Nîorî as the Mecca of the Sudan, it is certain that the Hodh was in practice the principal starting point for Islam in the direction of the negro countries. It remains a place of importance and of the negro countries. It remains a place of importance.
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The establishment of the texts has enabled us to find a common source, Andalusian or eastern, it is hardly permissible to speak of a parallel development. But this could arise merely from a greater popularity of the 

bukala

poems which used to be sung at Tlemcen. Other poems are more prosaic, but they all faithfully reflect some local popular inspiration. We must adhere to this conclusion so long as no convincing proof of their Andalusian or eastern origin is put forward.

Swing games accompanied by songs are widely found throughout the Maghrib. They are attested notably at Tangier, Rabat-Salé and at Fez. But the term bufrala [q.v.] is reserved for the songs sung at Tlemcen and in the Algérois (Algiers and Bida). S. Bencheneb considers that “the bufrala of Algiers, Bida or else where is independent of that of Tlemcen”, but there does not seem to us to be any convincing argument to prove this independence. If the two types have had a common source, Andalusian or eastern, it is hardly permissible to speak of a parallel development. But if, as is the case in the present state of our knowledge, the two variants of the same melody are structurally so similar, it is not sung, it is clear that the structure of several of its poems would permit them to be adapted to the verse of the bufrala. There should nevertheless be mentioned the greater thematic and linguistic richness of the bufrala. This similarity cannot, however, lead to any serious conclusion concerning the origin of the two genres, and we can merely state again that they both belong to a popular literature which developed parallel with works in literary language throughout the whole of the Arabic-speaking area.

We have collected 83 poems, 62 of which are of Tlemcen origin, 13 of which are of Algiers and 8 of Bida. It must be noted that several of these poems are sung indifferently at Tlemcen, Bida or Algiers with variants which are not always due to the use of a different dialect. These 83 poems are divided thus: (a) 12 distichs, of which 8 are from Algiers; (b) 15 tercets, of which 13 are monorhymed and 2 rhyming ABB with internal rhymes; 8 of these are from Algiers; (c) 34 quatrains of which 23 are monorhymes and 9 rhyme ABB; expressions which divide variously into quatrain, tercets and distichs; (d) 11 poems of 7 verses, some of which are monorhymes, 3 rhyming AAAAB and 7 AAAAA; (e) 8 poems of 6 verses which consist of: 5 poems made up of two monorhymed tercets, 1 of three distichs with different rhymes, 2 made up of one monorhymed quatrains and one distich; (f) 5 poems of 7 verses which divide variously into quatrains, tercets and distichs; (g) 1 poem of 8 verses made up of two monorhymed quatrains. We have included in this list 3 poems which are in reality variants. The study of the arrangement of the internal rhymes shows that they are much less numerous than in the bufrala and are arranged in a less contrived fashion. It is rather a case of seeking for musical assonances able to sustain the melody of the bufrala.

The poems of Tlemcen are more varied than those of the bufrala of Algiers; whereas the latter is almost entirely devoted to love and the description of the gardens where swing games are played, the bufrala of Tlemcen has the following themes: (a) Poems devoted to Tlemcen, its surroundings or to certain of its districts. It should be noted that the bufrala of Algiers has nothing similar except for one poem devoted to Sidi Ferruch. (b) Religious themes: sometimes about the Prophet, his daughter Fatima, sometimes celebrating the Tlemcen saints. In this connexion there should be mentioned a definite sympathy for the great figures of Shi‘ism which is found also in several bufrala poems. Here too the Algerian bufrala has no theme of similar inspiration. (c) Themes of love: these preponderate as much at Tlemcen as in the Algérois. They sing of the lover and the happiness or the torment he gives. The bufrala of Tlemcen includes in addition descriptions of the attributes of beauty, the attributes of women and the attributes of the mouth of a young man. (d) Themes concerning different aspects of social life at Tlemcen: the life of a young woman, her relations with her mother and her mother-in-law, an account of the attributes of the members of the family, etc.

The literary quality of these poems is very uneven. Some are excellently constructed from the point of view of the sentiments expressed and in the choice of expressions and images. The use of floral themes in the description of girls is often a very happy one. Themes of grief or nostalgic sadness are particularly suitable to the melody of the bufrala. Other poems are more prosaic, but they all faithfully reflect some aspect of life at Tlemcen and, especially, of the spirit of its inhabitants. In spite of the upheavals which social life in Algeria has undergone, the bufrala is still...
popular, although the young women of today take rather less interest in this genre which delighted so many of their forerunners.

We have been unable to collect any information on the melody of the hawfi; we have however had it written down in musical notation. Evidence, already unreliable enough in the matter of the texts, is here completely lacking, and it is all the more regrettable since a scientific approach to the problems of popular poetry, and often of classical poetry also, is impossible without the recognition of the primary role which the melody plays in it; the problems of structure themselves cannot be solved without a full appreciation of it. Nor can the question of the origins be approached until an exhaustive recession has been made of the various Maghribi compositions in dialect.


HAWF, snake-charmer or itinerant mountebank, from hāyya, snake. The plural is hawd (so Lane) or more generally hāyyūn. In Egypt certain members of the Gipsy tribes (see nārî) act in this capacity. The fellâhin often have recourse to them, particularly when afflicted with various forms of skin-disease (karfa) or eczema (kūba). The general procedure of these quacks is to recite some rimegrole over a glass containing olive-oil and the white of an egg, and then to spit into it. The slimy mixture is then applied as an ointment. Certain members of the dervish fraternities, such as the Rifa'iyya and liwā', also play their part in the folk-medicine of the Nile Valley as snake-charmers and viper-enchanters. The reason why their services are requisite is because of the popular belief that skin-diseases are due to the viper blowing its poison into the body, and these men claim to possess the necessary authority to counteract the poisonous weapon.

**Bibliography:** *Abd al-Rahman Isma'il, Tibb al-rałaha, Cairo 1310-1312, i, 80 ff., ii, 31; Eng. tr. by J. Walker, *Folk-Medicine in Modern Egypt*, London 1935; MW, July 1933, 289. See also KURAY. (J. Walker)

HAWF, "pertaining to air". Al-Khallî said and repeated: *al-ālif al-layyina, al-wdw, al-ya?* are *hawd?yya*, that is to say *fi l-hawd* "in the air [exhaled]" (*Le Monde Oriental, xiv (1920), 44-5). For Sibawhayhi (ii, 454, l. 21 f.), *al-ālif is al-hawf al-hawf al-hawf*, to be understood, according to the *Sharh al-Šifâyya* (ii, 261, l. 14, 264, l. 4), as *dwf* "which has some [exhaled] air". These expressions, *hawdyya and hawf*, might be thought to be synonymous, but there is a nuance.

Al-Khallî (ibid., 44, l. 17-8) expresses himself thus on the subject of the *huruf* mentioned above: "they are *fi l-hawf*, in the air [exhaled], they have therefore no region of articulation (kawysi) to which they might be assigned, unless it is the *gloaf, the hollow of the chest". Therefore, without *makhradi*, either in the throat or mouth, these *huruf* are *fi l-hawf*: the air is so to speak their place of existence. Sibawhayhi grants them a *makhradi* (see J. Cantineau, *Cours, 19-20* or H. Fleisch, *TraitÉ, § 44b, d, g*; but he insisted on the amplitude (*ittisâd*) of this *makhradi* which makes them precisely *huruf al-lin* [see *huruf al-lin*], genesis of the *huruf*). The widest is that of the *alif* and it offers its fullest width *al-lin al-lin* "for the air of the sawf* (Sibawhayhi, ii, 454, l. 22). He is therefore considering the abundance of the air passing with the *sawf* within the full width (*ittisâd*) of the *makhradi*; he attributes this name al-hawf to *alif* as being the most eminent, leaving *waaw* and *ya?, with less extensive *makhradi*, under their appellation layyina.

**Bibliography:** in the text; see also HAMZA (hamsa madhâra) and *huruf al-hawf*. For a general discussion of the phonetics of Arabic see MAKSADDI AL-BURUF. (H. Fleisch)

HAWZA, also known by the diminutive HUWAYZA, town situated in the swamp country east of the Tigris between Wâsîf and al-Brâja. It apparently also lent its name to the surrounding area. The original town was supposedly founded by Shîhpûr II, and was later rebuilt in Islamic times by one Duwayhi b. *Affî b. al-Asadî during the reign of the Caliph al-†â'î (363/974-381/991). Thus the town is not mentioned by any of the early geographers. The population included many Nabataeans, presumably bearers of the original Aramaic culture which survives in that region until today. According to Mustawfi it was one of the most flourishing cities of Khûzîstân (8th/14th century). The surrounding land was fertile, and corn, cotton, and sugar cane grew abundantly there.

**Bibliography:** Vâlhût, i, 678, ii, 371 ff.; Hamd Allâh Mustawfi, *Nuṣha, 318-9 (trans.) = 110-11 (text); Le Strange, 241. (J. Lassner)

HAWRING [see BAYZARA].

HAWRA, a town in Hadhramawt under the eastern wall of Wâdî al-Kasr, just north of the town situated in the swamp country east of the town. The surrounding land was fertile, and corn, cotton, and sugar cane grew abundantly there.

**Bibliography:** Vâlhût, i, 678, ii, 371 ff.; Hamd Allâh Mustawfi, *Nuṣha, 108-9 (trans.) = 110-11 (text); Le Strange, 241. (J. Lassner)

HAWRING [see BAYZARA].
HAWRA — HAWRAN


HAWRA [see AL-DHI'AB].

HAWRÂN, AVROMAN, a mountainous region of southern Syria bounded west by Sanandajî (Senna) on the western border of Irân. It extends for approximately 50 km. south-east from a point 46° 30' E., 35° 30' N., to the river Sirwan. The Hawrami mountain (Avroman Dag, 2626 m.) forms a northern extension of the Shâhô range, from which it is separated by the Sirwan. Parallel to both ranges, east of the river, is the Kû (or Kûh-i) Sâlân (2597 m.). The chief products of the area are various orchard fruits, walnuts, gall-apples and mastic.

The population is a branch of the Gurân [q.v.] and numbers perhaps 10,000 persons, still distinguished from the surrounding Kurds. The members of the Bagzada family trace their descent, in the first instance, back through three centuries. Many take the title Sân, i.e., Sulân. The principal tribal division is between the Hawrâmân-i Lûhûn, south-west of the main range, and Hawrâmân-i Tağhî to the north and east. The latter is further divided into Tağhî proper of the Hasan-Sânî family (with Shâr-i Hawrâmân as its chief village), Dizî of the Bahrâm-Bâgî, and in the east Raqîz of the Mustafa-Sâm. The leading village of Lûhûn is Nâwsûdâ. Others are Pâwa, the home of a divergent dialect, lying on the western flank of mount Shâhô, and Hâjdîjî, the easternmost village of Lûhûn on the Sirwan; the inhabitants of both these are known throughout the Near East as wandering pedlars.

At the beginning of the present century all branches of the Bagzîdî family extended their sway over a number of non-Hawrânî villages (notably Biyârâ and Tawêlâ, both in Êrêk and seats of Nakhshbandî Shaykhs), bringing their total holdings to over seventy villages. Since 1350/1931 most of them have been dispossessed by the Persian authorities and exiled.

In 1915 three parchments, dating from 88 B.C., and 22-1 B.C., respectively, were discovered in the area. These 'Avroman Documents', written in Greek and Parthian, relate to the ownership of local vineyards.


HAWRÂN, region of southern Syria bounded to the east by the volcanic massif of the Diabál al-Durûz, to the north by the plateau of the Ladjâ, and the Damascus plain, to the west by the Diawán [q.v.], and to the south by the Yarmûk, a region which corresponds roughly to the administrative area of Idân, of the same name and which extends for about 100 kilometres from north to south and 75 from east to west. The term Hawrân was applied formerly to the whole of the basaltic region which separates Syria from Transjordania and thus included the Diabál al-Durûz and the Ladjâ. The low plateau (an average of 600 metres above sea-level) which forms the "heart" of the Hawrân (known as Nûkra, "hollow"), and the slopes of the mountain as well are covered with arable land produced by the decomposed volcanic rocks; within the Hawrân, permanent affluents rising on the side of the massif, together with the relatively frequent rainfall, allows the growing of cereals.

Hawrân has been inhabited from a very early date. Its small towns and villages are mentioned in the Tel el-Amarna letters and in Deuteronomy (III, 4-5), but the region at that time was generally known as Baghân. Occupied by the Hebrews during the second half of the second millennium B.C., its possession was disputed by the kingdoms of Israel and Damascus; it was finally devastated and conquered by the Assyrians, who remained masters of it for a century (732-610 B.C.). During the following centuries, Achaemenid domination assured Hawrân a long period of peace, during which towns developed and the country became extensively Arabized. The Hellenistic and Roman periods were less settled: at the time of the decline of the Seleucid empire a number of small autochthonous states grew up around the Hawrân which became the scene of their battles. It was mainly the Nabataeans, of Arab origin, who infiltrated into the Hawrân and settled permanently in the south, at Busra and Salkhād, while the Idumeans were entrusted by the Romans with maintaining order in the areas of Trachonitis (Ladjâ), Auranitis (Diabál Hawrân) and Batanea (the plain of Hawrân). It was in 106 A.D. that the Romans annexed Hawrân, the southern part of which became part of the new province of Arabia, while the rest, which was first attached to the province of Syria, later also became gradually attached to Arabia.

The Roman period was characterized by the development of towns and large villages, inhabited mainly by Aramaeans and Jews, and by the increasing infiltration of Arab elements, Nabataean and Saatîtic. This infiltration continued to increase during the Byzantine period, when new groups, sometimes from southern Arabia, penetrated into Hawrân and the neighbouring steppes, gaining control of the edges of the desert. Some took service with the Byzantines. These, the Qassânîs, supplanted the Banû Sâlîh in about the 4th century A.D. They were semi-nomads who made in Hawrân permanent encampments, the most famous of which was that of al-Dîjâbiya [q.v.]. The country then became profoundly arabized, while at the same time Christianity spread.

Hawrân was finally conquered by the Muslims in Rajab 13/September 634 after the battle of the Yarmûk which halted the Byzantine counter-offensive. Its population seems to have supported the Umayyads and, after their fall, rose under the leadership of a certain Habib b. Mûsâ in a revolt which was suppressed by 'Abd Allâh b. 'Ali [q.v.], the uncle of the 'Abbâsîd caliph.

During the 'Abbâsîd period Hawrân suffered particularly from the incursions of the Carmathian bands [see Kârmatî]. Then, in the period of the Crusades, the country was the scene of battles and many raids by the Crusaders who came periodically to pillage the area, attempting to seize its main fortresses, or crossed it on their way to attack Damascus. But Hawrân also suffered from the activities of Zaûgî [q.v.], when he was attempting to take Damascus. It was in 614/1217 that the Crusaders made their last appearance in Hawrân. Soon afterwards, in 624/1224, the north of the country was ravaged by the Kîrûzârians who had been sum-
moned by the Ayyubid rulers, and then, in 658/1260, the Monégas appeared there, before their defeat by the Mamluks at ʿAyn Ḍalālīt [q.v.].

In the 6th-7th-8th centuries, Hawrân was divided into the two districts of Hawrân proper, corresponding to the Auranitis of antiquity, and of al-Bathaniyya, corresponding to Batanaea, both of them belonging to the province of Damascus. It was then a prosperous region, with numerous villages, with a large production of cereals, and with a partly Christian population.

During the Mamluk period the region was composed of the two wilāyas of Hawrân, with its capital at Busrā, and al-Bathaniyya, capital Adhribiyya, together with the niyaba of Salqīn whose powerful fortress was commanded by an amir of high rank. To it there was probably added a district corresponding to the Lādābī, with its capital at Zūr. At this time the country was crossed by the barid [q.v.] route from Damascus to Ghazāla, while the pilgrim caravans set off from Busrā. But the region was, in the 8th/14th century, troubled by the infiltration of nomad groups belonging to the Banū Rabīʿa who gradually settled there.

The Ottoman period saw the penetration of a further nomad group belonging to the Banū Rabīʿa, that of the ʿAnaza, who drove towards the west the nomads who had arrived earlier and penetrated into the settled area, spreading disorder and insecurity. The inhabitants of the villages were forced to pay a "brotherhood tax" and there arose between the rival groups, particularly at the beginning of the 19th century, battles to which the paška of Damascus had to put a stop. In the 12th/18th century the pilgrim route was moved further to the west, the pilgrims no longer assembling at Buṣrā but at al-Muzayrib, while the camel fair was held in Tabāk.

The 18th and 19th centuries witnessed also the settlement in the Diabal Hawrân of the Druzes who had originally been dwelling in southern Lebanon. During the 18th century these mountain people drove the original inhabitants down onto the plain and their presence formed a new element of unrest. While to the south lies the Faḍlī sultanate, the land extends southeastwards to the Faḍlī sultanate [q.v.], which cuts it off from the sea. North of the Hawashībi tribe and sultanate. The land of the tribe, north of Aden in the western British Protectorate of South Arabia, is a rough quadrilateral with one of the shorter sides abutting on the Yaman, whence to the south lies the Faḍlī sultanate [q.v.], which cuts it off from the sea. North of the Hawashībi tribe and sultanate. The land of the tribe, north of Aden in the western British Protectorate of South Arabia, is a rough quadrilateral with one of the shorter sides abutting on the Yaman, whence to the south lies the Faḍlī sultanate [q.v.], which cuts it off from the sea. North of the Hawashībi tribe and sultanate. The land of the tribe, north of Aden in the western British Protectorate of South Arabia, is a rough quadrilateral with one of the shorter sides abutting on the Yaman, whence to the south lies the Faḍlī sultanate [q.v.], which cuts it off from the sea.

During the 19th century, the Ottomans incorporated Hawrân in a larger province which, in addition to the Diabal Hawrân and Nukra, comprised, Ḍiyāyūr, Ḍiwān, ʿAqiṭa and the Baḥkā. This new province served as a base for expeditions intended to subdue the Druzes, and it was at this time that colonies of Circassians were introduced into the country. Though unable to pacify the country entirely, the Ottomans nevertheless restored security in the plain, where the nomads ceased to demand from certain villages the payment of the brotherhood tax. The construction in 1904 of the Ḍiyājkī railway [q.v.], put an end to the gathering of pilgrims at al-Muzayrib and to the annual fair there. This railway played a strategic rôle in the 1914-18 war, particularly during the retreat of the Turkish army in September 1918.

Occupied by the troops of the amir Faysal for nearly two years, Hawrân revolted in July 1920 when French troops entered Damascus. Another insurrection, by the Druzes in 1925, was suppressed with more difficulty. Nevertheless the Druze and Hawrân region experienced under the French mandate a period of relative security and prosperity during which the settled population was protected from the demands of their nomad neighbours.

In the state of Syria, Hawrân, restored to its usual limits, formed a land having its capital at Adhrīṣa and made up of two biʾāt—Adhrīṣa and Azra. Its population in 1933 was 83,000, 77,000 of them dwelling in 110 villages, some of which, such as Adhrīṣa, Nawā, Buṣrā and Azra, are in fact small towns. The population is heterogeneous: together with the Druzes, living mainly on the mountain, and the Sunni Muslims, Hawrân peasants, there are found Circassian nomads in the process of becoming settled, and some Orthodox or Catholic Christians, generally grouped on the edge of the mountain.

Hawrân is now a busy and prosperous region. It is the "granary of Syria", it is crossed by the road and railway which link Damascus and Jordan, and it is frequented by the nomads who come there after the harvest to exchange wool and butter for the various commodities they need.


(D. SOURDELL)

HAWASHĪBI (pl. Hawashībi), a South Arabian tribe and sultanate. The land of the tribe, north of Aden in the western British Protectorate of South Arabia, is a rough quadrilateral with one of the shorter sides abutting on the Yaman, whence to the south lies the Faḍlī sultanate [q.v.], which cuts it off from the sea. North of the Hawashībi tribe and sultanate are the ʿAmīrī and ʿAlawi states [qq.v.], while to the south lies the ʿAbdallī state [q.v.] of Labdī with its dependent ʿSubayī tribe [q.v.]. The Hawashībi sultanate is of strategic importance for its command of the main route from Aden to Taʾizz in the southern Yemen and its control of the upper reaches of Wādi Tuban, the principal source of water for Labdī. The capital, al-Musaymir, is less than 100 km. from Aden and about 80 from Taʾizz. On the right bank of Tuban, it consists of little more than the sultan's rude stone palace and a cluster of huts. The Hawashībi tribe may number some 10,000 souls.

The Hawashībi are identified by al-Hamdānī (4th/10th century) as a branch of the Ḥimyarī living on Diabal Ṣābir (not far west of their present home) with the Sakṣikī and the Rakib, all under a Hawashībi chief. The implication in EI that the modern tribe is of "pure Ḥimyarite descent" is not, however, accurate, as among its members today a strong African strain is evident.

Although the Hawashībi concluded their first agreement with the British in 1255/1839, they did not sign a protectorate treaty until 1913/1895. The Anglo-Ottoman convention of 1932/1941 defined
inter alia the boundary between the Hawshabi territory and the Yemen, but the collapse of the Ottoman Empire introduced a new situation, and in recent years both the Mutawakkilite Kingdom of the Yemen and the Yemen Arab Republic have claimed the Hawshabi territory as part of "occupied south Yemen". The Hawashib have at times clashed with their stronger neighbour Labţ; at other times they have recognized the suzerainty of the ' Abdall ruler (see, for example, the text of the pledge of allegiance in 1321/1899 in al-' Abdall, pp. 177-9, with the names of many 'Abdall). In 1398/1968 the Hawshabi sultan, Faysal b. Surţ, joined the Federation of South Arabia.

Bibliography: Handmân; Sālāh al-Bakrī, Fi āqād Al-Djazāria al-'Arabiyya, Cairo 1368/1949; Ahmad Faţl al-Abdall, Ḥadīyyat al-sa'man fi abḏār muţāl Labţī wa-'Adān, Cairo 1351;

(G. REntz)

HAWTA, enclave, enclosure, is the name given in southern Arabia to a territory generally placed under the protection of a saint which thus is considered sacred. The term belongs to classical Arabic and in fact means "precaution". Nevertheless, inherent in the root ḥ-w-t is the technical meaning given to this word by the Arabs in the south: it does in fact express the action of surrounding, of encircling, but also that of defending, of guarding and, by extension, of preserving; whence the substantive hawta: a red and black twisted cord which a woman wears round her hips to protect her from the evil eye (LA, s.v. ḥ-w-t).

There exist many hawtas in southern Arabia. W. Thesiger found several while travelling from Salala to the Ḥadramatwāt across the interior. He particularly mentions one at Mughshin, on the edge of al-Rub‘ al-Khali, to the north-east of Zufar (Arabian Sands, 97). The most important hawta of Arabia is probably that of 'Ināţ, to the south-east of Tarim: it contains the remains of the famous Sayyid Muhšī b. Sālim, of the family of the Sayyids who, having had no success in his politico-religious offices, had to leave his native region and found another hawta elsewhere.

Thus a hawta may be considered as halfway between the haram, a place where a holy power manifests itself, and the ḥāraṯ [q.v.], a territory under the protection of a powerful overlord. The hawta, which contains no relic when it is created, possesses one finally when its patron dies.

Once the security of an area declared hawta is admitted and assured, merchants, peasants and others arrive and settle there, by agreement with the founder, who then bears the title of munsib, dignitary, and who is accorded certain politico-religious privileges known as ḥāţa. Under his authority, the hawta may become a meeting place for the tribes, a market, a centre of commerce where religion and commerce often flourish side by side.

Bibliography: W. Thesiger, Arabian Sands, London 1959; R. B. Serjeant, Haram and Hawtah, the sacred enclave in Arabia, in Mélanges Tāhā Husayn, Cairo 1962, 41-58. (J. ChElmód)

AL-HAWTA, the name of a number of towns in Arabia, the more important of which will be cited here. The tribe in the southern part of the peninsula contain the shrines of famous saints (see the article immediately preceding). Ḥawṭat al-Ḳaţn, under the south wall of Wadli Ḥadramatwāt some 20 km. west of Shibbām, belongs to the Ku‘aytī sultanate of Shīhr and al-Mukalla, the paramount state of the eastern British Protectorate of South Arabia, and the palace there has served as the residence of the Ku‘aytī governor of the Shibbām province. Bent has described the structure: "Like a fairy palace of the Arabian Nights, white as a wedding cake, and with as many battlements and pinnacles, with its windows painted red . . . behind it rise the steep red rocks of the encircling mountains!". Some of the inhabitants of the town are members of Yāfī, the Ku‘aytī sultan’s tribe.

The town of al-Ḥawta in the upper basin of Wādī Muyafa‘, also in the eastern Protectorate, is not far
north of 'Azzān, the capital of the Wābirid sultanate of Bal-Hāf, within whose domains it falls. Landberg's information on this town of al-Hawta is digested in ET², ii, 295-6. In the Lower 'Awlawi sultanate, a state of the western Protectorsate, the village of al-Hawta lies on the coast near the mouth of Wādī Awbar and the inland town of Awbar, the capital of the sultanate. The seat of the 'Abdallāh sultan of Labādī [q.v.], the premier chief in the western Protectorsate, is the large town of al-Hawta al-Djafārīyya, which takes its name from the shrine of the 'Abdallāh Musārīm al-Djafārī, whose 'iyārā is celebrated in the month of Rajāb.

The tribe of Tamīlm [q.v.] has been established in central Naḟjd since pre-Islamic times. One of its centres is the valley called by al-Hamdānī (4th/10th century) Baṃn al-Fāk, and now known as Wādī Sūdāry, northwest of al-Riyyād. The valley runs down the eastern slope of Twayyā and empties into al-Ąṭk [q.v.]. Among the settlements of Tamīlm there al-Hamdānī lists al-Hāṭ, which is probably identical with the modern al-Hawta (Hawatf Sūdāry) in the middle section of the valley, between al-Rawḍa and al-Djarnābīyya. The population of al-Hawta does not, however, hail exclusively from Tamīlm, as there are elements of Banū Zayd and Banū Khālīd present. Tamīlm has another centre south of al-Riyyād in the region of 'Uλiyya where Wādī 'l-Hawta also runs down the eastern slope of Twayyā. Wādī 'l-Hawta, which lies just south of it. In the middle section of Wādī 'l-Hawta is al-Harīk or Harīk Naʿām (Naʿām is the name given by al-Hamdānī to the valley). Farther down, the valley makes a sharp turn and runs northwards under the name of Wādī 'l-Sawt (mentioned by al-Hamdam) to empty into the Nadjīn. This turn is al-Hawta itself, also called Hāwta Banī Tamīlm, a group of oases of which the main ones are al-Hilla and al-Hilwa. Other Arabs live side by side with Tamīlm. Close ties link the people of Tamīlm in the two Hawtās.

In neither of the Hawtās of Naḍīd is there any indication of the existence of a shrine. The men of Tamīlm in these parts are noted for their fanatical devotion to the teachings of Muhammad b. Tamīm in these parts are noted for their fanatical devotion to the teachings of Muhammad b. Tamīm in the two Hawtās. By side with Tamīm, close ties link the people of Tamīlm in the two Hawtās.
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opinions are given in the History of the Berbers of Ibn Khaldun (8th/14th century), regard them as a tribe forming the 3rd branch of the B. Maghar, which is mentioned in this part of Tripolitania in the year 681/1282. The home of the tribes of the tribe of the B. Maghar, the Malila, the Maslata (Masallata), the Mazata (Mazata), the Karkuda, the Lahän or Lahana (Luhän, Luhana), the Maghar, the Malila, the Maslata (Masallata), the Mindasa or Mindas (Mandasa, Mandas), the Misrata (Misrata, the Raźin (the Raźin, the Saraj, the Tarhuna), the Wannfän (Wannfa), the Warfalla (Warfal), the Wargha, the Warsatía (Warsatī), the Waghsta, the Yagmorasaen (Ghomrāsān?), the ZakkaNova and the Zanaza.

In the earliest days, say Ibn Khurradadhbih (234/846-7) and al-Masʿūdi (345/956), the Hawwara lived in the country of Ayās (Oea), that is, Tripolitania, "a country which then belonged to the Roman Byzantines". They continued to live there, along with other Berber tribes, such as the Naṣīfa (g.v.), the Zenāta (g.v.), the Mazāta (g.v.) and the Lawāta (q.v.), at the time of the Muslim conquest. It seems that in the later decades of the 1st/7th century, at the time of the great movements of the Berber peoples, in flight from the invaders and resettling in the west of Ifrikiya and in the Maghrib under the leadership of Kusayla (q.v.) and afterwards under that of Kāhinā (g.v.), several Hawwara factions left Tripolitania, and spread throughout North Africa. Other Hawwara followed this first wave of emigration at the time of the Khāridjī rebellion against the orthodox Arabs, a rebellion which broke out about the year 122/740 and in which practically all the Berbers took part. The Hawwara, who had been converted to Islam at the end of the 1st/7th century, enriched by the vast territory of the "country of the Blacks" where they "graze flocks of sheep", but, burdened by taxation, no longer show that pride and independence for which they were at one time noted, when their warriors were famous for their victories. Now scattered and weakened, they have fallen into degradation".

Only the Hawwara of Morocco seem to have enjoyed a more prosperous situation in the 7th-8th/13th-14th centuries and in the following centuries. In the first part of the 8th/14th century they even became very powerful in the Tamesna district. Many Hawwara tribes, formerly so powerful, disappeared leaving no trace, and there are no more than a few place names to witness to the existence of these peoples who from the 2nd/8th-10th centuries played such an important part in the history of Ifrikiya and the Maghrib.

We may now consider the Hawwara tribes in the 3rd-10th/9th-16th centuries, that is, the period on which, thanks to the writings of Arabic historians and geographers, we have the most complete and detailed knowledge.

Baraka and Egypt. According to Ibn Khaldūn, the Hawwara of Baraka came to cultivate their crops on the land between Alexandria and old Cairo. Another fraction of this tribe took part in the conquest of Egypt by the Fatimid army in 358/969 and were given by the Fatimid caliphs a tract of land which, thanks to the writings of Arabic historians and geographers, we have the most complete and detailed knowledge.

Tripolitania and Fezzan. In Tripolitania, which was the ancient homeland of the Hawwara tribes, from about the middle of the 2nd/8th century mention is made of an arḍ Hawwara ("country of the Hawwara"). According to the Arab geographers of the 9th or 10th century, the eastern boundary of this land ran through Tāwarghah (Tawarga) and Waddān (in the oasis of al-Djufra), even through Zāla (Zēlla), an area in ancient times belonging to the Māzāta, eastern neighbours of the Hawwara. The western boundary first passed through the city of Tripoli, then, in the 8th/14th century, west of the oasis of Zanār (Zenār), where the Hawwara fraction of the Banū Madjīr lived. The southern boundary of the country occupied by the Tripolitians Hawwara was formed by the Fezzān. Among the Hawwara tribes who inhabited the arḍ Hawwara the Karkūda should be mentioned, whose name is apparently related to that of the ancient town of Karkūza (Gargūza), lying south-west of Zanzūr and mentioned by Tījānī. The Misrāta, whose chief centre was the little town of Suwayqat Ibn Khaldūn, occupied the most eastern part of the coastal zone of the "country of the Hawwara". They devoted themselves, according to Ibn Khaldūn and Leo Africanus, to trade with Egypt, the Bilād al-Djārid and the "country of the Blacks". The name of Wādī Maghār (Wādī Mager, to the south-east of Zliten) doubtless has its origin in that of the tribe of the B. Maghar, which is mentioned in this part of Tripolitania in the year 685/1286. The home of the
Malila is not known. The Ibaḍi chronicles refer to the existence of this tribe in Tripolitania in the 2nd/8th century. The Lebda region—according to Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, the most ancient settlement of the Hawwāra—was occupied by the tribe of the Maṣṭāta (Massallāta), whose name survives in that of the present Djebel Msellāta. This tribe was still rich and powerful in the 10th/16th century. Earlier, towards the interior, Arabic sources note the presence of the Tarhūna, who led a nomadic life in the present homonymous district, and also that of the B. Gharvan, who disappeared at an early date from Tripolitania, have left their name in the area of the Zab, near Hodna, where the later al-Masila, by the Fāṭimid prince, Abu 'l-Qāsim. They appear again in this district in the year 352/964, in revolt against the Fāṭimid al-Manṣūr, in the ranks of the army of the famous Nukkārī chief Abū Yūsuf Makhli b. Kāyādī, of whom, together with their confères south of Constantine, they became the most faithful followers. Another group of the B. Kāmilān, from Zāb, settled at Kayrawān, after the defeat of Abū Yūsuf. Abu 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Hawwārī. It is in the same region that Arabic sources mention the Hawwāras as being in revolt against the Aghlabid government, in 315/927, in the neighbourhood of Tāfšā (Bējā), whither they came with the Ṣurfī chief 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Hawwārī. It is in the same region that Arabic sources mention the Hawwāras as being in revolt against the Aghlabid government. We must also add that to the east of the ārāf Hawwārī, in the heart of the Mazātā country, lived the Hawwārī tribe of the Mindāsā.

The Tripolitanian Hawwāras, who were probably Warf alia, who were still pagan in the 5th/11th century, in the northern zone of the Tunisian Haut-Tell, in the 8th/14th century, at the time of Leo Africanus they spoke the same Berber language as the Adjara. Between the end of the 6th/12th century, of a small Ibadī-Berber population, the Aures (Awras) appeared in the Mazātā, established in the plain of Kayrawān, the左右 Kāsim also in the same region. In the 7th/13th century, found in revolt against the Aghlabid government. Other Hawwārites groups came to settle in the Zāb around 343/953, after the defeat which the Fāṭimid ruler al-Mu'izz inflicted on the Ibadī Hawwārī of the Djebel Awras. They were still living there in the 12th/18th century, towards the end of the town of Tabūda, and still faithful to Ibadīsm. Al-Ya'kūbī also describes Hawwārī tribes (among others the Sahmār) in the western Zāb. It is probably from the Zāb that certain Hawwārī tribes found their way to the Wdī Sīf and the Wdī Rāfī, where they are described by Ibadī sources towards the 6th/12th century. Certain Hawwārī tribes and factions inhabited, along with other Berber peoples, the Aures (Awras) and the area to the east of this towards the town of Tēbessa. Ibadī Hawwārī are already found there towards the end of the 2nd/8th century, at the beginning of the reign of the Rustamid imām, 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. To the west, the whole Hau-Tell of Tunisia was in the Middle Ages the classical homeland of Hawwārī tribes. They appear already in 124/742 in the neighbourhood of Bādja (Bējā), and also in the area between this place and Zab, near Hodna, where the later al-Masila, by the Fāṭimid prince, Abu 'l-Qāsim. They appear again in this district in the year 352/964, in revolt against the Fāṭimid al-Manṣūr, in the ranks of the army of the famous Nukkārī chief Abū Yūsuf Makhli b. Kāyādī, of whom, together with their confères south of Constantine, they became the most faithful followers. Another group of the B. Kāmilān, from Zāb, settled at Kayrawān, after the defeat of Abū Yūsuf. Another group of the B. Kāmilān, from Zāb, settled at Kayrawān, after the defeat of Abū Yūsuf. Another group of the B. Kāmilān, from Zāb, settled at Kayrawān, after the defeat of Abū Yūsuf. Another group of the B. Kāmilān, from Zāb, settled at Kayrawān, after the defeat of Abū Yūsuf.
from the Hawwara), the B. Kamlân of the Aures and other Hawwàri fragments who had settled in this area and been converted to Nukkrârism by this chief and accompanied their chief in his flight to the neighbourhood of Tahert \( [q.v.] \) and the valley of the Mina (tribe of the B. Masâla). Some of the Hawwàri tribes was identified with the B. Kamlân and the Malila of the Aures set out for the Ahaggar in the second half of the 4th/10th century. Yakut \( [g.v.] \), quoting the lost geographical work of al-Muhallabi (364-85/975-96), mentions an important state, with its capital Aksintülâ, situated in the middle of Ifriqiya and ruled by a chief of the Hawwàri tribe. This account, in other particulars especially far-fetched, may relate to the beginning of the Hawwàri confederation of the Qâl Ahaggar.

Morocco. Nothing is known for certain about the history of the Hawwàri tribes of Morocco, traces of which, however, are to be found in this country from the 3rd/9th century, and certain groups of which have survived in various regions of the country to this day. It seems possible that the Hawwàra came to Morocco with the Berbers of Ifriqiya and of the central Maghrîb, who, according to the author of al-Baysâw al-maghribî, went to Tangier with the Muslim governor of that city, the future conqueror of Spain, Târib b. Ziyyâd. Today a Hawwàra fraction is to be found in the plain of Tafraât in the east of Morocco, on the right bank of the Mulûyâ, and, further to the north, to the east of the lower course of this river. The name of the town of Malîla (Melîla), already attested in the 4th/10th century, derives from that of the house of the Hawwâra chief. In the 7th/13th century the B. Râzîn are mentioned, probably in this country from the 6th/12th century. We know this from al-Bakrî, who describes another Tarhûna fragment there. A place named Washtatâ, among the Berber groups inhabiting the Fez region.

The centre of this state was situated, towards the end of the 3rd/9th century, on the territory of Hilîl and Relizân. In all probability the state of the B. Masâla included also the Kâfîlât Hawwàra \( [q.v.] \), today Kâfîlât B. Râshîd, lying in the mountains between Relizân and Mascara and in later centuries the headquarters of the Hawwàra of the Mina. Some other Hawwàri fractions established themselves, probably in the 2nd/8th century, on the plateau of Senûl and in the massif of Wânsûrîshât (Ouârsenîs). Among the Hawwàri of Orn were also a fraction of the Misrâtâ, whose name survives in that of the coves of Merkâtâ near Kâfîlât B. Râshîd, and a branch of the Mindâs, which has given its name to the plateau on the right bank of the Mina (mentioned by Ibn Khâldûn) and to the present village of Mendez in the south-east of Relizân.

Ahâggar (Hoggar). This region owes its name to the Touareg tribe of the Ahâggar \( [q.v.] \), whose name preserves that of the Hawwàra (Hawwâr > Hoggar). A fragment of the latter "crossed the sands", says Ibn Khâldûn, and settled near the towns of the Lamjâ, "wearers of the veil", who lived near the town of Kawkaw (Gao) in the "country of the Blacks". Ibn Baṭṭûța—who in 754/1353 crossed the country of this tribe (which he calls Hukûr < Hoggar) while travelling from Takaddâ (in Air) to Tawât (Touât)—says that its members wore veils on their faces. The history of the Ahâggar before the 8th/14th century is unknown. However, it seems that the ancient Hawwàrîs and the Ahaggar who now occupy must have been connected with the defeat inflicted on the Hawwàra of the Aures by the Fâtîmid ruler al-Mûṣîz in 342/953 and with the dispersal of the "assemblies" of these rebels, some of whom, Ibn Hâmûdû tells us, fled as far as the "country of the Blacks". We have mentioned above a place, west of the Aures, called Thâniyyat Hoggâr, which might be the point from which the Hawwàra of the Aures issued out for the Ahaggar in the second half of the 4th/10th century. Yâkût \( [g.v.] \), quoting the geographical work of al-Muhabbî (364-85/975-96), mentions an important state, with its capital Aksintûlâ, situated in the middle of Ifriqiya and ruled by a chief of the Hawwàra tribe. This account, in other particulars especially far-fetched, may relate to the beginning of the Hawwàri confederation of the Qâl Ahaggar.
HAWWARA
Africanus these peoples comprised 260,000 warriors.
Another considerable branch of the Hawwara lives
to this day on each side of the lower course of the
Wad Sus. In the time of al-Idrisi (549/1154) the
people of Aghmat, a town to the south of Marrakush,
who carried on trade with the "country of the
Blacks", belonged to the tribe of the Hawwara.
Finally, in the time of Leo Africanus, some Hawwara
lived also in the Sidjilmasa district.
Spain. Some Hawwara fragments left northern
Morocco at an early date for Spain (with Tarik b.
Ziyad, according to Ibn Khaldun). They established
themselves there in remote areas, where they enjoyed
almost complete independence with regard to the
Umayyad amirs. A Hawwari family called B. Zennun
(B. Phi *l-Nun) was dominant in the Shantabariyya
(Santaver) district, where it is mentioned in the year
158/775 as being in revolt against the Umayyad amir
€
Abd al-Rahman I. Some Hawwara lived at Shantabariyya, according to al-Istakhri (340/951) and the
B. Zennun dynasty was still in existence in the 5th/
nth century. In the immediate vicinity of Shantabariyya, east of this area, the B. Razin, another
Hawwari fragment from the north of Morocco,
settled at an early date. They occupied the plain
named after them Sahlat Bam Razin—Albarracin on
modern maps. Obscure in the first centuries of the
Umayyad period, this family acquired a certain
importance in the second half of the 4th/ioth
century, and after the downfall of the Caliphate of
Cordova became independent. To judge by the
place-names of the region, there were also Hawwara
in the neighbourhood of Valencia, where the author
of al-Baydn al-mughrib mentions a place named
Sakiyat Huwwara. The present name of this locality,
Mislata, probably comes from that of the Hawwari
Maslata tribe.
Sicily. It seems from Arabic sources and Christian
documents, as well as from the evidence of placenames, that there were also Hawwari fractions in
Sicily. The Hawwara of Ifrikiya took part in the
Aghlabid conquest of the island in 212/827. They
remained there for a long time. In 592/1196 there
were still Hawwara in Palermo. Among other
Hawwari tribes represented in mediaeval Sicily, the
Misrata, the Malila, the Karkuda and the Andara
should be mentioned. It seems that at least a part of
these immigrants remained faithful to Ibadism. Indeed, the 6th/12th century IbadI author, al-Wisyani
speaks of IbadI in Sicily, probably of Hawwara
origin, as being in touch with their co-religionists in
North Africa. According to another IbadI source,
the Dhikr asma3 ba*d shuyukh al-wahbiyya (6th-7th/
i2th/isth centuries?), Kasr Yanu (Castrogiovanni)
in Sicily constituted the northern limit of the
territory occupied by the Ibadis.
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(T. LEWICKI)
Egypt and the Sudan. An important historical
role was played by Hawwara of Egypt, a completely arabized group. Their first centre was in
the Buhayra, where they became the dominant tribe.
Some Hawwara were settled in Upper Egypt by
Barkuk (c. 782/1380-1), their chief, Ismacll b. Mazin,
being granted the t'$£dc of Girga [q.v.]. His successor,
c
Umar (d. 799/1396-7) was the eponym of Band
c
Umar, the ruling clan for the next two centuries.
Under the next chief, Muhammad Abu'l-Sunun, a
period of agrarian prosperity began, connected with
the development of sugar-planting. Meanwhile,
Hawwara were expanding in Upper Egypt, and, in
815/1412-3, they attacked and devastated Aswan,
then held by Banu Kanz, an Arabo-Nubian clan.
The authority of the Mamluk sultanate was represented in the Hawwari territory by the governor of
Kus and Akhmim, but with the Ottoman conquest
of Egypt (922-3/1516-7) this appointment lapsed.
The ruling chief, the amir CA1I b. cUmar, was recognized as the governing authority in Upper Egypt:
he is described in Ibn lyas as "administrator of the
districts of Upper Egypt" (mutawalli d^ihat alSa'id), as well as "chief of the Arabs of Upper Egypt"
(shaykh 'Urban al-SaHd). The rule of Banu cUmar
lasted for about sixty years, but ultimately became intolerable to the Ottoman administration. In 983/1576,
Banu cUmar were formally deprived of their powers,


and a certain Sulaymān Bey (? Djanbulad) was appointed governor of Upper Egypt. In the 12th/13th century, there was a revival of Hawwāri power, associated with the tribal chief, the amīr Humām b. Yūsuf. He overshadowed the transient governors of Upper Egypt, who were distracted by the factional politics of the neo-Mamluk régime. Under Humām, Upper Egypt enjoyed a period of comparative tranquillity and prosperity. Dījbartī depicts him as a paragon of Arab shaykhly virtues—openhanded, hospitable and loyal. A less favourable memory of the period of Hawwara has been transmitted by Burckhardt, who speaks of extortion practised on merchants, and the reduction of the Copts to servile status. Humām and his tribe belonged to Nisf Haram, the group associated with the neo-Mamluk Kāsi-miyya faction. After the collapse of the Kāsi-miyya ascendancy in Cairo (1145/1730), remnants of the defeated faction took service with Humām, and were assimilated to the local people. Towards the end of his life, Humām played a critical part in Egyptian politics by the support he invariably gave to grandees who had been ousted from power in Cairo. He had particularly close relations with ʿṢāliḥ Bey, the last Kāsi-miyya notable, who was exiled by Bulut-kāpan ʿAll Bey (1178/1765). When ʿAll himself sought asylum in Upper Egypt (1180/1769), Humām effected a reconciliation between him and ʿṢāliḥ, enabling the two boys to defeat their opponents, and retake Cairo. After ʿAll had procured the assassination of ʿṢāliḥ, in 1225/1768, Humām assisted the dead grandee's followers to capture Assūt, and hold it against the governor of Upper Egypt nominated by ʿAll. The rebels and Hawaiāra were ultimately defeated, and Humām fled, to die near Isna (8 Šaʿbān 1183/7 December 1769). With his death, the political supremacy of Hawaiāra came to an end, but they retained their social and economic importance until the time of Muḥammad ʿAll Pāsha. After the extermination of the Mamlūks in Upper Egypt, Ibrāhīm Pāsha proceeded to confiscate the ʿilżāms and other sources of the wealth of the old régime (1813). The descendants of Humām were broken by this policy, and their tribesmen were subsequently absorbed into the masses of the peasantry.

In the Suwaydī Division of southern Egypt, there was a distinct group of Hawaiāra connected with the Hawwāri of Egypt. The Hawaiāra are a nomadic tribe, having their territory in the steppe, west of the Nile. They probably represent a southerly wave of Hawaiāri expansion from Egypt. The Dījlāba (i.e., pedlars) Hawaiāra have immigrated into Kordo-fan and Dār Fūr within the last three centuries, admitted as traders, as their name suggests. Their designation as Hawaiāra may imply no more than an original domicile in territory dominated by this tribe.

Ahmar, Raljamina, Manabaha, Harbîl) and of the Guich of the liawz, see J^ZAYSH; E. Aubin, Le Morrocco d’aujourd’hui, Paris 1904; L.t.-Col. Voinot, Les tribus guich du Haouz Marrakech, in Bull. du cinquantenaire de la Société de géographie et d’archéologie d’Oran, 15 April 1928. A small tribe from the Haôwz, the Awlad Abî Sîba (O. Bousbaa) has won a great reputation for its thick woolen carpets (P. Ricard, Corpus des tapiss marocains du Haouz Atlas et du Haouz de Marrakech, Paris 1927). Certain Moroccan Jews bear the name of Haôwz.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references given in the text: G. Deverdun, Marrakech, des origines à 1912, Rabat 1959, vol. ii of which (in the press) contains a full bibliography on southern Morocco.

**G. (DEVERDUN)**

**HAWZ, in the sense of “astronomy”** [see *ILM AL-HAY’AYA*].

**HAWZ (a.), synonym (see LA; TA) for ‘shape’ (shakl) and form’ (swara), and also for ‘state’ (hâl) and ‘quality’ (hayatya).** Al-Kindî states that, according to Hippocrates, one of the meanings of the word ‘nature’ applies to the configuration (hayâ’ya) of the human body. In the *Rasâ’il Ikhwan al-Safa* we find: hay‘at al-arkân: the configuration of the elements; they use this word also to discuss the thesis of the materialists who think that the Living and All-powerful Being is a body, since he exists in a configuration that is distinguished by accidents, such as life, power, knowledge (‘âlâ hayâ’ya malikhîs bi-ardâd; ii, 55). In this sense, hay'â is the geometric shape of a body insofar as it reveals a metaphysical reality, form, which fashions it from inside. The idea of hay’â is bound up with that of a form and that of a motion, which is itself regarded as a form: “The term ‘form’ is used for any configuration (hay‘âya) and for any action upon a receptive (kabîl) object, whether simple or compound, so that motions and accidents are forms (swara)” (Ibn Sinâ, *Shifâ*; ii, 282). Avicenna distinguishes motion, as defective (nahîsya) form, from completed (tâmma) geometric shape, such as the square or the circle. The *Ikhwân al-Safa* have analogous ideas: there is constitutive form (swara muhawwima) like length, breadth, depth (for a body), and perfective form (swara mutammima), such as shape (shakl); triangle, square, pentagon, circle (ii, 202b 4). The illustration that should be noted. The word hayâ’ya is used to describe the result of motions that produce such and such a shape, whether in nature or in art. Hay’â is completed form, considered not by itself, but in relation to the motion that, in it, completes constitutive form. Hay’â is more alive and more dynamic; shakl is static. That is why the word hay’a is applied in particular to the bodies of animals and men, which certainly contain curves and angles, but whose configuration is more than an arrangement of geometric shapes.

From this meaning it is an easy step to that of ‘predisposition’, which is more frequent in the technical language of philosophy. It is found in Avicenna, and it is related to another term from the same root: takhayyuy: ‘aptitude’, often used in conjunction with is’tîd. A text of the *Ikhwan al-Safa*, concerning the development of the soul during gestation, is particularly clear; it speaks of ‘the aptitude (takhayyuy) and predisposition (is’tîd) that are stamped (yanâbil) into the soul, which are first form and potentially apt to become form in actuality by acquiring the aptitude (‘ind al-takhayyuy) for receiving moral characteristics, moral actions, the various types of knowledge, education . . .’ (i, 9). We are here concerned with the configuration assumed by the soul in the interval between its reality as first form in potentiality and its completion in actuality. The immediate situation is well indicated in the phrase in which takhayyuy is framed by the two particles be- (for, in order to): “al-sûra al-âlî bi-l’-humma li-tâsira sûra bi-l-lîfî ‘ind al-takhayyuy li-kabîl al-âlîhîd . . .’.

There is then a hay‘a of the soul, just as there is of the body. Aptitude or predisposition is inherent in hay‘a. In fact, the first meaning of the verb takhayyuy in Arabic is the same one’s ‘haîkah’ (al-kabîl), and it is from this meaning that it takes on that of ‘to be predisposed towards’. Avicenna says that one of the causes of the excitement of desire is a consequence (daghar) arising from one hay‘a, and the wish to change to another hay‘a. He speaks also of particular causes that particularly distinguish one hay‘a, to the exclusion of another (tahâfsî hay‘a dun hay‘a) and make it the object of desire (Shifâ; ii, 288). The dynamism that distinguishes every hay‘a becomes consciousness and desire in the soul.

A very special use of this term, which derives from the Arabic translation of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, should be noted. The word hay‘a is used to express in Arabic 3îsî or habitus (malaha). At first sight, this meaning appears very far removed from the preceding ones; but it may be derived from them, and may retain some connexion with them. It would seem that we should start from the force of the Vth form takhayyay: ‘to qualify oneself by the particular configuration that one assumes’; the fā‘î acts on a munfa‘î which reacts on it. Aristotle, in the first place, defines 3îsî: “οτὸς ἐνέργεια τὸς τὸ έχοντος ἕνα δυναμικόν” (Met., 1022b 4). The illustration that he draws from clothing is well represented by the Arabic Vth form: one who wears a garment (action) is clothed by that garment (reaction). Ḥabîlus lies between action and reaction. The definition of this hay‘a is translated: ka-ananah fi-lu-mnnâ il-lâqad hiya lahu wa-huwa lahd. Ibn Ruṣîd comments: “It is the action of an agent on an object that undergoes the action . . . Aristotle says: ‘When something acts and something else undergoes its action, the fact of undergoing the action (infi’dl) is between the two; this means: . . . when one thing carries out an action and acts on another thing, this action, the hay‘a is the state (hilâl) that occurs between them. If the hay‘a is considered with respect to the agent, it is called action; if it is considered with respect to the patient (munfa‘î), it is called passivity (the fact of undergoing the action)’. This commentary is not very clear, for it is based on an approximate translation. But, short of being a truism, it can have only one meaning: that the hay‘a unites two characteristics, one active, the other passive, and as an intermediary transfers the action that is carried out to the patient, and the action that is suffered to the agent, the two actions mingling into one. It should be remembered that hay‘a is an intermediate state, of the same type as a motion, which allows an object moving towards actuality to receive a qualification that it possessed in potentiality. We meet, once again, the lexicographical meanings of hâl and hayatya.

A second meaning of 3îsî is that of ‘disposition’ according to which a being is in a good or a bad condition (diâtheros, xalîl ḥâl) or is similar (diâthesis). Of the two Ping, nom., Met. 3122b 10). Diâtheros is rendered wa‘î. Averroes’s commentary: ‘Hay‘a is used of the state (3îsî) that is produced as a consequence of a composition (tarkhîh, instead of the wa‘î of the translation). It is the hay‘a by virtue of which the
composition of a thing is good or bad. For example, health is a hay'a which results from a composition, that of the organs and the humours. This hay'a is good or bad, either in itself, or with regard to another hay'a. This meaning comes close to that which we have encountered in Ibn Sinā, concerning the disposition from which desire springs.

Finally this term enters into the nomenclature of a branch of astronomy (ilm al-nujum) which is called 'ilm al-hay'a [q.v.]. According to the definition of the Ikhwan al-Safa', it is "the knowledge of the hierarchy of the spheres, the division of the zodiac, the number of the heavenly bodies, the divisions of the zodiac and its stars, their distances, sizes and motions". It is perhaps because hay'a is used of the organic human body, the microcosm, that the term is applied to the macrocosmic order.


HAY'Á (A.), life. The Kur'ān mentions life in very many verses. God is Himself living (hayy), see II, 255; XL, 65, etc. Al-Tabarī writes, in his Tafsīr (ed. Dār al-Ma'ārif, v, 386): "This word hayy describes Him who has perpetual (dā'imah) life and a permanent existence (ba'dah) without any initial or terminal limit, for everything that is not He, although it be living, has a life that begins at a definite point and ends at a fixed limit". On this, he says, all the commentators are agreed. They differ on other questions. For some God is Himself spoken of as living because He Himself provides for the maintenance of His creatures and allot every creature its portion. He is therefore living by virtue of His management (tadbir) of the Universe, not by virtue of Life. For others He is living by virtue of Life, which is one of His attributes. Others again say that it is one of His names. Al-Zamakhshāri states that hayy, in the technical language of the theologians, describes one who has knowledge and power (Kaghghal, Cairo 1948, i, 291). The question of the Life of God enters into general discussions on the divine attributes. A critical account is to be found in the Fiṣal of Ibn Ḥazm (Cairo 1317, ii, 253 f.). In the Mafātīḥ al-ghayb, Faḍhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, taking up Ayverd's objections (between his terminology of the possible being, shows that God is the only necessary being, but that, contrary to Ibn Sinā's contention, the existence of the possible being does not necessarily follow from the existence of the necessary being in itself, that is to say that creatures do not necessarily proceed from God; they are created by Him, in His Wisdom and His Freedom. This is the sense that should be given to hayy (ii, 307 f.).

The Kur'ān also mentions life in this world (al-hay'āt al-dunyā) in order to contrast it in a religious and moral sense with the after-life. Life on earth, as a creation of God and considered in itself, is full of beauties; but it is nothing in comparison with the next life (Sūra III, 185), and the error of the unbelievers is to cling exclusively to it. Whether the attractiveness (kayyīriya) with which life on earth is invested in the eyes of the unbelievers is the effect of an illusion for which man is responsible, or the result of an action of God, is a problem that normally sets Muťazzils and Asgharíars, Kadaris and Djabaris at odds with one another (cf. Faḍhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Mafātīḥ al-ghayb, ii, 198 f.; commentary on II, 212). Life in this world, compared with life in the next, is something that is purely for use (mafā'; Sūra XII, 26; XL, 39), that is to say, according to the Tafsīr al-Djalālayn, a thing of little value which is enjoyed for a certain period of time and which disappears. It is a diversion (nāfis) beside out that real life (XXIX, 64; cf. Blachère, Le Coran, ii, 335, note on al-hay'ātun as an intensive of hay'āt). The True Life is the "abode of permanence" (dār al-ḥarakār). The life of this world may seduce one (gharrā; VI, 70, XXXI, 33, XLV, 34, etc.). A parable summarizes these ideas. It compares life in this world to the rain that fertilizes the fields; then, when man believes that he himself has the power to cultivate the fruits of the earth, God sends His "amr" that is to say, according to the Tafsīr al-Djalālayn, His judgment and His chastisement, and He mows down the crops, and it is as if they had never existed (X, 24). Consequently, life on earth and all that is connected with it is a gift of God which must be used with gratitude and piety, not for its own sake, but in order to expend it in good works and thus orientate it towards the future Life. Islam does not approve of contempt for life. Nevertheless the dunyā is an object of reproach, insofar as it "cuts" the path that leads to God. Nor is it merely loosely condemned, for life on earth is attended with values that remain associated with man in the next life (cf. Ghazālī, Ḥay'ā, 3rd part, Bālāk ed., 151 f.).

As for life in the biological sense of the word, it is a frequent theme in the Kur'ān. There is a kind of Kur'ānic embryology, for example XXIII, 12-4; XXXII, 7-8; LXXVII, 20. Al-Rāzī comments: "A human being is generated from a seed which is itself generated from the fourth of the excreta produced by the digestion (min faḍī al-ḥaḍm al-rābī', that is to say the spermatic fluid). This is generated as a consequence of the consumption of food, which is of animal or vegetable origin. The animal derives from the vegetable, and plants are generated from very pure earth and water" (iv, 189). The end of verse 14 of Sūra XXIII: "Then we developed him in a second creation", is interpreted as referring to the development of the human being after his birth, during his infancy and his youth, the creation of understanding (jāhm) and reason (ṭabī'), until his death. The text reads: anākhu'na, "We developed him", because God established the development of the spirit (aṣghā al-ruḥ) between the soul and the body. This is proof of the error of al-Nazzām, who thinks that man is spirit and not body, and of the mistake of the falāsifā, who say that man is indivisible and that he is not a body. In fact, man is a compound (murakhab) of both attributes.

Certain Muslim philosophers may have been inspired by these verses in their representation of life as a development away from matter, proceeding by way of organic life to spiritual life. Several passages in the Rasa'il Ikhwan al-Safā' and in Ibn Tufayl also give the impression that the idea of some kind of evolution is not unknown to them. For Ibn Bāḍi'da (Avempace), in his Risālat al-Ittīḥād, natural heat (al-harr al-ghariz) exists before all the other parts of the body; it is the instrument of the instruments; all the parts of the body function with reference to it; it exists in the embryo before it has blood, but it is also found in the animals that have no blood; it is called the motive force (al-buwaw al-muḥarrika) it is form (sūra), and this form is the prime mover, the natural spirit (al-rūḥ al-ghariz). In the womb the embryo has organs that make it resemble a plant: this is what is created in the first place; it is nourished, and grows, like a plant. On emerging from the womb, the human being makes use of the senses and resembles an irrational animal. It moves in space and
has desires: this occurs only because of the arrival of the spiritual form (al-sura al-rahānijyya) which appears in the “common sense” and the imagination. At this level of life the imaginative form (al-sura al-munmiyya al-khaydiyya), as the imaginative force (al-kuwwa al-fyuwwa al-munmiya al-khaydliyya), is the prime mover. Below this there is the impulsive nutritive force (al-sura al-fcuwwa al-munmiya al-abbadiyya), and the sensory force for propagating the species (al-sura al-munmiyya al-hissiyya). Animality begins with sensory spiritual form, the first degree of the spiritual forms. Below this is the vegetable kingdom, and it is disputed whether plants are living creatures; this problem is made more acute by the relationship of hayāt and hayawān. The plant-man in the womb is potentially an animal, for the natural spirit that is in it is capable of receiving spiritual form. The natural spirit that is in plants is incapable of doing so. The reason for this is a difference in the mixture of the humors (al-imitasād). Beyond the senses and the imagination comes thought (al-āwāqis al-fikriyya), when intelligibles, which are potential in the sense, become actual.

We can recognize in this structure the broad outline that the commentators have taken from the Kur'ān. But for the falsāsīfa this development is not due to a series of disconnected creative acts of God. The Aristotelian idea of potentiality introduces a dynamism into nature itself. Moreover philosophical doctrine, in the tradition of Plato and Aristotle, connects life essentially with the soul. For example, al-Kindī (Rasā'il al-Kindī al-falsafīyya, ed. Abū Rida, Cairo 1950, i, 226) sees life as an accident that happens to the body, since the living being disappears when life is extinguished, while the body retains its corporeity. The natural heat or natural spirit which is in the heart of the animal is not itself life; it is merely a disposition by virtue of which the animal can receive life (wa'dad ilā yandla bihd 'l-hayāt). Al-Kindī gives two versions of the Aristotelian definition of life: the (first) entelechy of a natural body (with organs) capable of receiving life (which has life in potentiality): (1) tamāmiyya dījrm tabī'ī dhi ādāt, dābi li-‘l-hayāt; and (2) isticmāl awal ilā dījrm tabī'ī dhi ādāt bi-l-hawāːna.

Thus the conceptions of life in Islam offer us a particular kind of life the imagination of Greek ideas and Kur'ānic images, even though the falsāsīfa, by transposing disconnected creative acts of God into terms of the continuity of natures, have altered the fundamental Islamic meaning.

Bibliography: Further to that given in the article, there may be mentioned Abū Ḥayān al-Tawhīdī, Riḍāt al-Ḥayāt, ed. I. Kayālānī, in Trois éphèbes, Damascus 1951. Fr. tr. Cl. Audebert, in B.Et.Or., xviii (1963-4), 147-95. (R. Arnaldes)

ḤAYATĪLA, Arabic broken plural from Hayṭal, the name given by Islamic writers to the Hephthalites or White Huns, the Ye-Ta of the Chinese authors, a steppe people from Mongolia who settled along the Oxus during the fourth or fifth centuries A.D. and formed one, or perhaps several, powerful kingdoms. The first Huns to appear in Khorāsān, some twenty-five years earlier than the arrival of Huns in Europe, were the Chionites of Ammianus Marcellinus (XVI, 9, 4; XVII, 5, 1; XVIII, 6, 2). Their name may consist of the Pers. isticmāl ādāt, which connects life essentially with the soul. For example, al-Kindī (Rasā'il al-Kindī al-falsafīyya, ed. Abū Rida, Cairo 1950, i, 226) sees life as an accident that happens to the body, since the living being disappears when life is extinguished, while the body retains its corporeity. The natural heat or natural spirit which is in the heart of the animal is not itself life; it is merely a disposition by virtue of which the animal can receive life (wa'dad ilā yandla bihd 'l-hayāt). Al-Kindī gives two versions of the Aristotelian definition of life: the (first) entelechy of a natural body (with organs) capable of receiving life (which has life in potentiality): (1) tamāmiyya dījrm tabī'ī dhi ādāt, dābi li-‘l-hayāt; and (2) isticmāl awal ilā dījrm tabī'ī dhi ādāt bi-l-hawāːna.

Thus the conceptions of life in Islam offer us a particular kind of life the imagination of Greek ideas and Kur'ānic images, even though the falsāsīfa, by transposing disconnected creative acts of God into terms of the continuity of natures, have altered the fundamental Islamic meaning.

Bibliography: Further to that given in the article, there may be mentioned Abū Ḥayān al-Tawhīdī, Riḍāt al-Ḥayāt, ed. I. Kayālānī, in Trois éphèbes, Damascus 1951. Fr. tr. Cl. Audebert, in B.Et.Or., xviii (1963-4), 147-95. (R. Arnaldes)

HAYATI-ZADE, Ottoman family of physicians and 'iāmād), the prominent members of which are: (1) Muṣṭafā Feydī, said to have been a convert from Judaism (born Moqhe ben Raphael Abravanel) and to have acted as interpreter during the interrogation of the 'Messiah' Shabbētay Ṣebī (q.v.), see above (1934), 22); and (2) Abū al-Tābarī Khushnavāz by Firdawṣī. He obtained his release by leaving his son Kubdā as a hostage, but later ransoming him returned to the attack, and charged his cavalry into a hidden ditch to perish with all his men. According to Ṭabarī, i, 879, his opponent had the bodies interred in tumuli (al-nawawī). The classic account of the (H)ephthalites in this context is by Procopius, Wars, 1, 3, who claims that though Huns by name and race, they did not live as nomads,
were of fair complexion and regular features (a detail scarcely corroborated by paintings at Bâmiyân) and practised inhumation of the dead, up to twenty of his boon-companions being buried with each chief. This contrasts with the cremation found amongst the Chionites. The Sâsânian Kûbâb owed his restoration in A.D. 488 or 9 to (H)ephthalite support. In A.D. 557 Khâsrav Anûshjîrwan allied himself with the Khan of the Turks, called Singîbû or Zîkîzîbolosî in the Arabic and Byzantine sources, to crush the (H)ephthalites. The fullest account is that of Firdawsi, who names the Chionites the Ghârjûs and the Arabian and Greek sources, such as the Kârouloş of Menander Protector (Fîg. IV, 206 and 225), who is called Wazar or Waraz in Tabarî, i, 859. After a fierce battle the Hayâtîlâ were dispersed, and their lands partitioned between the Turks and the Sâsânians. To the same period belongs the enigmatic rûper nphö MLKû, whose name appears thus in Pahlâvi script on coins of the Kâbul area, and who may also have minted at Andarab. The extent to which the king of the Khûrâsân (q.v.), south of the Hindu Kush, was distinct from that of the Hephthalites in Bactria is disputable. Even after the arrival of the Arabs in Khûrâsân during 31/651, (H)ephthalite survivors from Harât took part in resistance to 'Abd Allâh b. 'Amîr in Kûhîstân (Tabarî, i, 2886), while as late as Sûjûn'îsîr others are mentioned with 'Tibetans' and 'Turks' during confused fighting in the rebellion of Mûsâ b. 'Abd Allâh b. Khâzîm (Tabarî, ii, 1153). Yâkût, s.v. Bâdghîs, calls this the district of the 'headquarters of the Hayâtîlâ' (Dâr mamlûkat al-Hayâtîlâ), a reminiscence of the tribe's participation in the wars of the local chief Târkân Nizak against the Arab governors, in particular Kûtyaba b. Mûsîlîm. Earlier, the main centre of the Hayâtîlâ was probably at Kunduz.

Unless it survives in Khaljî Turkish (see below), the language of the Hayâtîlâ is entirely unattested, like that of the European Huns. The 'Iranian' hypothesis of Ghîrshman and Enoki—based on the coin legends in cursive Greek script, though these are sometimes difficult to decipher—has now been overthrown by the discovery of earlier inscriptions at Surîk Kotal which prove the language in question to have been the local Iranian dialect of Bactria. For the reign of Bulak, supported by Minorsky's evidence, now holds the field. According to the Chou Shu, the Hayâtîlâ practised polyandry. Eastern Hun military equipment, probably Kîdarite, is represented on a silver dish (O.M. Dalton, 1964, 53, no. 201), and included a straight sword, possibly used for either sex (naml 'ants'/nam/a 'an ant'), live in flocks: a collective noun and a noun of unity (naml/ây/ây 'ants'), the form used for either sex (naml 'ants'/nam/a 'an ant'), but the noun of unity, characterized in this case by the same suffix as the feminine, tends to be felt as indicating the female (kâmûna 'pigeon'/hamâmîna "a pigeon" > "a female pigeon"); (2) wild or domestic animals in which the sexes are distinguished: the masculine form is reserved for the species and for the male when the feminine form comes from the same root (kâhî "dog"/kâhîba "bitch"); when the
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opposite is the case, the word for the female, though grammatically feminine, has a masculine form and often indicates both the female and the species (dabū'ī (fem.) "bynea", dhādā'ī (mas.) "male bynea").

c. Three terms are used for a certain number of species: a collective noun, a noun of unity used regardless of sex, and a term to indicate the male of certain animals who live in flocks (nā'ūmīn "ostriches") nā'ūmīn "an ostrich" of either sex (salīm "male ostrich"). In cases such as bīmārīn "donkey" / bīmāra and alān "female donkey", bīmāra seems to be a secondary fem. and not a noun of unity for either sex (cf. nā'īn "male").

(d) For some domestic species which live very close to the Bedouin, four terms can be found: one for the species, one for the individual regardless of sex, one for the female and a fourth for the male (ibīb "camels" / bātir "one animal of the herd" / nābi "female camel" / dījāmi "(male) camel"). In this category the name of the species is generally masculine in form but treated grammatically as feminine (e.g., ibīb, qhanām, etc.) because of the preponderance of females over males.

Examination of a certain number of names of animals shows that the name of the male is independent of that of the name and that the formation of the feminine by the addition of the suffix -tī > -ā is secondary; this "particularizing" suffix serves basically to form the nouns of unity used for either sex (bāgījā means a he-mule as well as a she-mule) but, the females being always more numerous than the males among the animals which live in herds, the noun of unity comes to be confused with the noun for the female (e.g., dājādāji "one fowl of the poultry yard" > "hen"). On this question, see Ch. Pellat, Sur quelques noms d'animaux en arabe classique, in GLECS, 25 May 1960.

Among the great number of names found in the lexicographical or zoological works, the existence should be noted, along with specific or metaphorical terms, of appellations formed like the kunyya (q.v.) or the mu'rifah (see 193) of humans: umm būbāsīy "chameleon", ibn dādā "jackal", etc.; these metonymical forms, widely used throughout the centuries especially in Arabic dialects (see Dozy, Suppl., s.vv. ibn, ābā, umm), have sometimes ended by supplanting the corresponding specific term, but this cannot be considered as a systematic personification of the animals in question, for a number of plants have similar names; we might rather consider them as euphemisms used with prophylactic intent or as a kind of pet-name, notably for example when such an attractive creature as the sparrow is called Abū Mūhibbī, Abū Mūṣākīn, Abū Yā'kīhī, etc.

2. Animals among the pre-Islamic Arabs.

All the same the Bedouin, like other peoples, attributed to animals the qualities and the faults of humans, as is proved by a number of proverbs which are also found in the pre-Islamic. These proverbs almost all appear in the form of an elative followed by the name of the animal; thus generosity is attributed to the cock (asābī min lāfīsīs), perfidy to the lizard (asābī min lāfīsīs), stupidity to the bustard (amlāb min būbāsī), boldness to the lion (alānīn min al-lāyī), etc. (see the collections of proverbs, and especially the index to the proverbs in the K. al-Hayawān of al-Dībājī). It has been noticed moreover that a certain number of tribes of ancient Arabia bear the names of animals: Asadūn, Kuraysh "shark", etc. and it has been suggested that they might have a totemic signifi-
cance; on this subject, W. R. Smith (Kinship and marriage in early Arabia, London 1903) collected some factual details about survivals of animal cults, prohibitions of certain foods and other indications, and inferred from them the existence of a totemic system among the early Arabs; his theory has not on the whole, however, been accepted by ethnologists, and it is possible that the importance which the Bedouins of necessity attach to animals of every kind does not arise at all from totemism but is simply a form of animalism (see J. Henniger, in F. Gabrieli (ed.), L'ontologie sociale bedouine, Rome 1959, 85-6 [for references there given]). It is perhaps worth recalling here that the early Arabs portrayed the souls of the departed in the form of a bird (hāmē), usually a sort of owl, which flew for some time around the tomb and on occasion cried out for vengeance (see J. Goldziher, in Globus, Ixxiiii (1903), 3 ff., analysed by G.-H. Bousquet, in Arabica, 19603, 257-60). Although the Prophet rejected this belief (liā "some- one-else- is-him-who-was-later-safar") it has lived on under Islam in various forms [see ta'ayr].

The Kurān (V, 102/103, VI, 139/138 ff.) inveighs against the practices of the dījāliyya which consisted of consecrating certain animals to certain gods, or of applying a taboo to certain camels, sheep and other animals among the herbs. The animalism of the early period included also, as well as the bābīyā (q.v.), various terms, containing which it suffices to refer to the comprehensive work of J. Chelod, Le sacrifice chez les Arabes, Paris 1955; a number of them, however, have been retained in Islam [see gharīb] and Muslims today still perform sacrifices on many occasions (see, e.g., A. Jaussen, Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab, 337-63). Animals were and still are associated with the practice of sympathetic magic such as islāmīr (q.v.), even quite recent zoologists expatiate happily upon the method of interpreting the sight of one or another animal in a dream [see ṭaḥr al-ru'yā], also on the magic properties of the different organs, of which sorcerers make great use [see shirr]. Fabulous animals inhabited the deserts [see gūrūl], and it was often in animal form that the dījins (q.v.) approached humans. Animals such as camels, horses, cows, sheep, greyhounds, cats and bees possess barākā (q.v.), but dogs, cats and others also possess the evil eye (on this question see E. Westermarck, Pagan survivals in Mohammedan civilization, London 1933, passim).

3. The creation of animals. Apart from the proverbs mentioned above, the folklore of early Arabia, in the form in which it has reached us, contains hardly any animal stories (see below); at the most we find legends explaining the creation or the modification of certain animals. Thus the mouse (fa'ra) was a miller's wife or a Jewess who was metamorphosed; similarly certain lizards were formerly tax-gatherers, etc. (see al-Dībājī, Tarbī, 197 and references). This question of animal metaphors (wasākh) retains a certain importance, even under Islam, while the Kurān, apparently, solved the problem; for it states repeatedly that animals were created by God (II, 159/164, XXXI, 9/10, XLII, 29, XLIII, 11/12, XLV, 3/4) "[starting] from a liquid" (XXIV, 44/45) and that, of every thing, God "created a pair" (LI, 49). To the word dābba (pl. dawābb), which is used here instead of hayawān and refers more especially to riding animals and domestic animals, is opposed, in the verses intended to emphasize the Divine solicitude, the term anūm, the herds, of which God "created down "eight (single) pairs" (XXXIX, 8/6; see also XXV, 54/49, XXXVI,
71); camels deserve a special mention for “they were created by Him for you” (XVI, 5).

However, early beliefs concerning the temporary or permanent metamorphoses of certain humans into animals are confirmed by such verses as “Those whom Allah has cursed, against whom He has been angry, of whom He has made monkeys and pigs” (V, 65/60) or “We have said (to those who have broken the Sabbath): “Be despicable monkeys!” (II, 61/65; see also VII, 166). There were two problems for commentators to solve: the first was to find out to what events the verses quoted above referred, and the second to examine the fate reserved for these creatures who had been metamorphosed. It goes without saying that the replies to the first question were various; al-Kisâ, for example (Kisâ as al-anbiyâ? 274 f.), considered that the monkeys were Israelites who had undergone metamorphosis in the time of David for having caught and cooked fish on a Saturday, and that the pigs (op. cit., 307) are contemporaries of Jesus who did not believe in him. The same Kîsâ, following other authors, thinks that the monkeys resulting from these metamorphoses multiplied, while others on the contrary think that they died without issue, that is to say that God had created independently the species in question (see al-Djâhî, K. al-Hayawân, iv, 68). The belief in creation by metamorphosis or in the modification of certain animals is still current (see, e.g., H. Masse, Croyances et coutumes persanes, Paris 1938, i, 185 ff.). To masûd is closely linked the question of metempsychosis, at least for the unorthodox sects and the theologians who admit the transmigration of souls into the bodies of animals [see hulûl, tanâsukh]. We should note in passing that the Beast [see dâbâra] is associated in Muslim eschatology with the LastJudgement and that a Kûrânic verse (VI, 38): “No creature is there [crawling] on the earth, no bird flying with its wings, but they are nations like unto yourselves. . . . Then to their Lord they shall be mustered”; permits commentators to consider that the animals too will experience the Resurrection and the Last Judgement [see kiyâma]. Furthermore, the Kûrân, which mentions some dozen different species, contains five sûras named after animals: the Cow (II), the Bee (XVI), the Ant (XXVIII), the Spider (XXIX), and the Elephant (CV)—the largest and the smallest creatures thus being described.

4. Animals and Muslim law. Islam concerns itself with animals in many other connexions, and there is hardly a chapter of Muslim law which does not deal with them. Domestic animals are subject to the zakût [q.s.]; the sale of animals [see bâyû, tâdâra] is bound by restrictions in connexion with the legality of the consumption of their flesh (e.g., it is forbidden to sell pigs; however it is permitted to sell leeches, though it is forbidden to eat them); the question of their barter against other animals [see J. Schacht, Origins, 108] or of a contract for delivery with prepayment [see sâlam] is also debated; ritual sacrifices are the subject of precise instructions as is the killing of animals intended for eating [see dhâhâ]; to this chapter is connected that of hunting and game [see sâvu] and, secondarily, of furs [see farî]; the prohibitions imposed on pilgrims in a state of ihram form another legal question [see hardî and ishrâm], while some traditions of the Prophet lead to the posing of the question whether, outside the state of ihram, it is legal to kill certain animals and, on occasion, to eat their flesh. Thus the fundamental problem is reached, which concerns on the one hand food, and on the other the use for other purposes of one or another portion of a forbidden animal. In what follows we shall concern ourselves with the juridical status (bukhûm) of the various species of animals.

The Kûrân authorizes and imposes the prohibitions concerning the eating of the flesh of an animal which has not been ritually slaughtered, concerning the spilt blood, and the pig (V, 4/3; see also II, 168/173, VI, 146/145, XVI, 116/115), but in the last verse it provides for the lifting of the prohibitions in a case of absolute necessity (on the question of the pig, see khînâ; for the spilt blood, we remember that David—Arabs, whereas they are dying of thirst in the desert, sometimes resigne themselves to slaughtering a camel and drinking its blood [madjâd; see Arabicia, 1955/5, 327]). Traditions of the Prophet and Islamic jurisprudence concede this darura, but in general they are much stricter, for they impose prohibitions upon species of which nothing is said in the Kûrân, but without it, seems, restoring pre-Islamic practices (on which at present we do not undertake to enter). In the schools, much the same schools as have been applied by all the schools. Thus, by virtue of V, 97/96 “Permitted to you is the game of the sea and the food of it”, all fish are lawful and their flesh may be eaten without ritual slaughter; however, some marine or aquatic animals are declared hardî or mahrâk, or are still the subject of discussions, for they come within the sphere in which other criteria are applied; thus the frog, which would normally be halâl, is regarded as harâm because the Prophet forbade the killing of it (see below). Moreover, some fudhâ biâ zealots, in their meticulous search for anything impure, condemn the eating of those aquatic animals which have names resembling those of unlawful land animals (“dog of the sea”, “pig of the sea”, “ass of the sea”); their zeal leads them to prohibit an animal which has the same name as a forbidden animal even in a language other than Arabic, as with the ass, which in West Africa has the same name as the pig, cf. A. Gaully, L’Islam dans l’Afrique occidentale frangaise, Paris 1953, 205, or those which have the same shape (especially the eel, which is the same shape as the serpent). They go so far as to declare unlawful all marine creatures which have not got the shape of fishes (Hânâfs), with the explanation that the Kûrânic text authorizes fishing, but not necessarily the eating of everything caught (al-Marghînâ, Hâdîyâ, ms. Paris ar. 0763, fol. 248 v.). Special cases are the scaphophagous fishes, fishes found inside the belly of another fish, and above all the tâfî, dead fish floating in the water, which is lawful only for the Mâlikîs and the Shâfi’îs, though the Hânâfs permit the tâfî if it has been killed by an accident and has not died a natural death, which leads to a discussion of whether death from heat or cold is to be considered as natural (al-Marghînâ, op. cit., fol. 249 v.). The crustaceans are often
unlawful or reprehensible, as is the whole class of animals with shells.

By virtue of the verses (V, 6-7/4-5) "The good things (ta'ādāh) are permitted you", we find included in the chapter of what is хаālī those animals whose flesh is esteemed for its flavour (chickens, sheep, etc.); conversely, the peacock and other animals are declared хаārim because of the bad quality of their flesh. By the same token istiṣbaṣh or istiṣbahī, i.e., the habit of consuming unpleasant food, causes animals possessing it to be classed among those which are хаārim. In this field there is a certain amount of indecision and not a little subtlety: the stork for example, which would be хаālī, is regarded as хаārim because it eats snakes. Snakes themselves are хаālī, but eating them class the stork among the carnivores. Indeed, among the Traditions of the Prophet which are also invoked, there is one (see Abū Dāwūd, xxvi, 32; Zayy b. 'Alī, Corpus iuris, no. 536), which was to serve also as the basis for a division into хаārim and хаātīb (see below), and according to which all carnivores are forbidden whether they are mammals equipped with fangs (dhu nād) or birds provided with claws (dhu mikhlab); but it is not universally accepted, and the Mālikīs (see al-Kayrawānī, Risāla, ed. and tr. Bercher, *Algeriens 1949, 299) permit the eating of the flesh of birds of prey, while the Awzā'īs (see al-Dāmirī, s.v. al-bāzā) consider that no bird is хаārām. All the jurists consult the cat, the dog, the wolf, the crocodile etc. as хаārām, and travellers report with disgust any cases of eating dogs which they witness (see, e.g., al-Mu'āskadda, *Description de l'Occident musulman*, Algiers 1950, 61 and n. 172); the fox is generally considered as lawful, the jackal and the wild cat are unlawful, and the hyena is lawful, except for the Mālikīs, who pronounce it маbārīh. (The Prophet, questioned on the lawfulness of the hyena, is said to have replied: "But who eats the hyena?"; see al-Dāmirī, s.v. arnāb; Ibn Mādīja, xxviii, 15; al-Tirmidhī, xxiii, 4). The classification of the elephant is disputed, for although it is a herbivore, it possesses means of defence which are termed sūd in Arabic.

**According to another хаādīth the Prophet is said to have forbidden the killing of bees (because God made a revelation to them [see NAHL]), which states (for the same reason) that [bisāh] like the lizard (dubb), the scarab beetles. In this field personal dislike, but some others say that this species represents a tribe of the Banū Isra'il which had been metamorphosed, and this leads to their being prohibited (al-Bukhārī, lxx, 10, 28; Abū Dāwūd, xxvi, 27; al-Dārimī, vii, 80; Ibn Sa'd, i/2, 111 f., etc.; cf. al-Ghazālī, *Ibīd,*, ii, 93). Animals which are considered to have no liquid blood are in general regarded as lawful, since blood is what constitutes the impurity of animals which have not been ritually slaughtered (al-Ghazālī, *Ibīd*, ii, 83). Many, however, are forbidden (except by the Mālikīs) because of the disgust which is felt for them and which causes them to be classed among the хаādīthī, "unclean foods", discouraged by the Kur'ān (VII, 156/157). This vicious circle, from the logical point of view, is moreover applied to other foods and allows all prohibitions to be canonized. This is particularly true for the хаārārdī al-araq, (sometimes хаārārīs), a term which embraces in a variable and inconsequential way the small animals which live on the ground, and are in general forbidden or reprehensible, in spite of a хаādīth (Abū Dāwūd, xxvi, 29a; cf. Dāmirī, s.v.). They include scorpions, all kinds of insects, and worms. Concerning the latter there is much disagreement, for it is difficult not to eat them accidentally with other foods. Some schools make efforts to distinguish those which have been engendered by the earth itself, and are dead or alive, those which have דאכית or not (cf. discussion by al-Dżāzarii, *Kitāb al-Fuḥůkh*, ii, 3 and n. 1). In general birds without talons are permitted, but certain of them are the subjects of discussion, and receive different classifications according to the schools; this is the case notably with the parrot and the owl.

It goes without saying that a certain number of animals have not received any classification, because it has not occurred to anyone to eat their flesh. Similarly for very rare species the question has not been solved because it has not arisen; thus al-Dāmirī mentions that nobody has been concerned with the rhinoceros, which he himself considers at first sight to be хаālī; the case of the giraffe is disputed; and finally the monkey is regarded as хаārām except by the Mālikīs who consider them to be canonized. The nīsān (see Ibn al-Uqīqawa, *Maṣālīm al-kurba*, ed. R. Levy, London 1938, 105, tr. 34) the new idea of a resemblance between animals and humans, which, by a kind of natural law, prevents people eating these creatures without a formal prohibition being necessary (Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *apud* al-Dāmirī, s.v. کید, where is found moreover a хаādīth condemning the eating of monkeys).
Among domestic animals, while the camel, the ox, the sheep etc. present no problem, the equidae, in contrast to the other schools, consider it *mahráh*; the domestic ass is *hárám*, except for the Ḥanbalis who regard it as *mahráh*; while the wild ass is *halál* for all schools except the Ḥanafis. The mule, arising from a crossing of two differently classified species, is prohibited, except that, at least for those who regard the horse as *halál*, the offspring of a horse and a wild she-ass is permitted. In contrast to the other schools, the Ḥārīfs, and particularly Ibn Ḥazm [q.v.], remain faithful to their fundamentalist criterion and base themselves on *Kūrān*, VI, 179 "... seeing that He has distinguished for you that He has forbidden you", to reject prohibitions which are not found in the *Kūrān*.

The *Shāfi‘i* do not differ radically from the Sunnis; although they differ from them on points of detail, they nevertheless base their decisions on identical criteria. Thus the *bidden* of *Nasīr al-Mu‘īn* (Kūdūb al-Bīlār, ed. Mu‘īn Waḥīd Mīrzhā, Damascus 1376/1957, 95-6), who sets forth the doctrine of the Ḥārīfs, points out that God has forbidden the eating of carrion, split blood and pork (*Kūrān*, V, 4/3) and that the Prophet declared unlawful carnivores with fangs and birds with talons (see above); he adds that the hyena and the fox are forbidden, and that the eating of the lizard, the hedgehog, insects (*bāshārdī*), snakes and all the small reptiles or insects included under the name of *shārdī* is to be discouraged; only locusts caught alive while in flight are permitted. However, the *Shāfi‘i* include among the flesh which is forbidden or reprehensible that of several particular birds (the lark etc.) and that of two new categories: birds which hover more than they fly, and birds which lack both a gizzard and other organs (Querry, *Droit musulman*, ii, 252 ff.). The Ḥārīfs authorize the eating of horse-meat only in the case of an animal useless for any work, and they forbid absolutely the flesh of mules and domestic donkeys; also *hárám* are animals which habitually eat excrement (*gāllālāt*), unless they have been fed a certain time on herbage. It is also *hárám* to consume the milk or the eggs of forbidden animals, but abstention from eating certain parts of permitted animals—the glands, the skin and the haunches, and the intestines—is also obligatory. Among aquatic animals those which have no fins and scales; birds which are held in abomination and reptiles which are lawful are listed separately, as are those which are not alive when caught. In cases of necessity, however, all these prohibitions are waived.

These general considerations leave the way open for argument, especially in the case of animals which are difficult to classify; an example is the cat-fish (*diwr*; see H. Laoust, *Profession de foi d’Ibn Batîta*, 136-8). Divergences appear as well among the *Shī‘i* sects; thus Ibn Batîţa (ii, 352; tr. Gubb, ii, 468) relates that for the Ḥanafis the inhabitants of Sinope (*ṣūnūb*) was to offer them a hare, for the Rafidis do not eat the flesh of this animal (though the *Islāmīs* do). To the question of the legitimacy of killing certain animals is added the forbidding of pilgrims in the state of *tāyr* [q.v.] to shed blood, from which arises the problem of how one is to deal with vermin; the question arises also in connexion with prayer [see *ṣalāt*].

At another level arises the question of the way in which animals are to be treated; for example it is permitted to kill a cock, but the Prophet forbade reviling it because it performs the religious function of awakening the Faithful at the time of prayer; the same rule applies to flocks "who awakened a prophet". In general Muslims are counselled to treat other living beings, and particularly their mounts, well, for they will have to give account in the next world of any cruelty which they have inflicted on them in this (on behaviour towards animals, see G.-H. Bousquet, *Des animaux et de leur traitement selon le Judaïsme, le Christianisme et l’Islam*, in *St. Isl.*, ix (1958), 31-48; H. Ritter, *Das Meer der Seelen*, Leiden 1955, ch. xxii).

The problem presented by the use of the parts of animals regarded as *hárám* is a complex one which cannot be given here the full treatment which it deserves (al-Damîrî gives precise details on this topic). By way of example, among the Mâlikis (al-Kayrawānî, op. cit., 297), the Muslim who has had of necessity to eat the flesh of an animal not ritually slaughtered may not use its skin as a prayer rug, nor may he sell it. Similarly, before the skins of wild beasts (*ṣūbā‘*) may be used as prayer rugs, or sold, it is necessary for them to have been ritually slaughtered. Although pigs are forbidden in the *Kūrān*, the Mâlikis allow the use of hogs' bristles.

It is hardly possible within the limits of this article to enlarge on the subject of the lawfulness of animals, the complexity of which in Islamic law is due to what the doctors consider to be the insufficiency of the *Kūrān*ic regulations. Prohibitions concerning food being considered necessary—as is proved by the fact that later "prophets" hastened to enact more of them [see, e.g., *ṣalāt*]—the schools, in order to develop the system outlined in the verses at the beginning of this section, applied various criteria (on which they are not always unanimous), so that in order to present this intricate subject more completely, it would be necessary to list all the animals and to indicate for each one the *ḥukm* adopted by each of the different schools. It would also be instructive to compare these classifications with the Biblical regulations (Leviticus, XI, 1-47; Deuteronomy, XIV, 4-21; see also Isaiah, LXV, 4, LXVI, 3, 17) and with the criteria laid down: it is lawful to eat ruminant quadrupeds with cloven hoofs (this excludes the horse, the donkey, the camel, the rabbit, the hare and the leporid), to eat birds with fins and scales; birds which are held in abomination and reptiles which are lawful are listed separately. The prohibitions set forth in the Old Testament are regarded in the *Kūrān* (IV, 138/166) as a punishment inflicted on the Jews for their iniquity and their disobedience to God, and the Holy Book of Islam had no reason to be so severe, but the scruples of the *fukhād* led them to adopt a more rigorous position and to restrict the alleviations from which Muslims could benefit. In certain cases custom superseded a legal ruling which is considered to be too liberal: thus, the coney (*wādr*) is in general considered lawful, in contrast to the Biblical regulation, but it is the object of prohibitions based on custom, for example among the Egyptian Bedouin (see G. W. Murray, *Sons of Ishmael*, London 1935, 90), or among the settled communities of Southern Arabia (see Freya Stark, *The southern gates of Arabia*, Penguin ed., London 1945, 67 f.).

5. Animals in literature. Several animal species occupy a notable place in pre-Islamic Arabic poetry. To give an idea of the extent of this, in vol. i of *al-Majdīm ‘l-sadīthā* of F. al-Bustānî, Beirut 1945, which provides a representative survey of this poetry, are mentioned, under various names, about
80 animals among which camels [see IBIL], horses [see FARAS], ostriches [see NACAM] and lions [see ADJ, BILLAWR, C] are among the most frequent (M. M. D. al-Nowaihi has studied this question in an unpublished thesis presented at London in 1942: *Animals in ancient Arabic poetry* [excluding the horse and the camel]; a thesis entitled *Le chameau dans la poésie arabe antéislamique*, by E. Z. Zakharia, is in course of preparation at Paris).

In Arabic poetry in the Islamic period, animals of the desert naturally tend to occupy a less important place than in the classical and neo-classical writers, although these continue to describe their camels and to boast of their journeys across the empty spaces; in spite of the abundance of new sources of inspiration, the "modernists" did not hesitate to display their linguistic knowledge in *tarādiyya* [q.v.] in which they built up artificially an extraordinarily rich vocabulary. Some of them wrote charming verses on pet animals, especially Mub. b. Yasir (see Ch. Pellat, *Muhammad b. Yasir al-Riyāḍī wa-asābīrāk*, in Machrîq, 1955, 289-338) or al-Kāsim b. Yūsuf b. al-Kāsim (see D. Sourdel, *Vissirat*, 229 and index), who composed elegies on goats, cats, birds (see K. A. Farîq, *An ʿAbbāsid secretary-poet who was interested in animals*, in IC, xxiv (1950), 261-70). During the following centuries the crow [see GIÂS] and the lion retain their place in literature (for they symbolize respectively the sadness of separation, and strength and boldness), while new species appear: e.g., the elephant and the giraffe. Descriptions of nature induce new themes and original symbols, and the poets describe the ugliest animals as well as the pleasantest; the pigeon [see HAMAM], the nightingale [see BULBUL], the peacock [see TÂR], and the elephant and the giraffe. Descriptions of nature induce new themes and original symbols, and the poets describe the ugliest animals as well as the pleasantest; the pigeon [see HAMAM], the nightingale [see BULBUL], the peacock [see TÂR], and the elephant and the giraffe. Descriptions of nature induce new themes and original symbols, and the poets describe the ugliest animals as well as the pleasantest; the pigeon [see HAMAM], the nightingale [see BULBUL], the peacock [see TÂR], and the elephant and the giraffe. Descriptions of nature induce new themes and original symbols, and the poets describe the ugliest animals as well as the pleasantest; the pigeon [see HAMAM], the nightingale [see BULBUL], the peacock [see TÂR], and the elephant and the giraffe. Descriptions of nature induce new themes and original symbols, and the poets describe the ugliest animals as well as the pleasantest; the pigeon [see HAMAM], the nightingale [see BULBUL], the peacock [see TÂR], and the elephant and the giraffe. Descriptions of nature induce new themes and original symbols, and the poets describe the ugliest animals as well as the pleasantest; the pigeon [see HAMAM], the nightingale [see BULBUL], the peacock [see TÂR], and the elephant and the giraffe.

In the field of the prose the situation is quite different. No stories of animals are found in pre-Islamic Arabia, which in any case did not, generally speaking, possess a very highly developed folklore [see BIKLAYA], and the fables attributed to Luṭmān [q.v.] date for the most part long after the beginning of Islam. The translation of *Kalila wa-Dimna* [q.v.] was thus something of a revelation, but it remained a master-piece which was occasionally imitated but never surpassed. First should be mentioned the verse rendering of these fables by Abân al-Lâbîlī [q.v.], then that by Ibn al-Ḥabbâriyya [q.v.] in his *Naṭâṣi al-fiṣṭa fi Ṽaṣm Kaʿla wa-Dīmna*; next the imitations of Sahl b. Hârûn [q.v.] in his *Ḳalâma*, ʿAfîḥā and his K. al-Nâmir wa-l-ṭhaʿlab [a ms. of which has just been identified in Tunis; see *A. al-Mhiri, in Haselböldt al-Djima al-Tanuseyya*, i (1964), 10-40] of Ibn Zafâr [q.v.] in his *Sultân al-mulâjlī fi udwân al-ḥāba*, as well as the K. al-Sâlid wa-l-bâghim of Ibn al-Ḥabbâriyya and the *Fihāḥ al-ḥulāfā* of Ibn ʿArabgâhī [q.v.]. None of these works can have gained the same success as *Kalila wa-Dimna*, and it may be said that Arabic literature still awaits its La Fontaine.

We note also that a certain number of animals are introduced in the *Thousand and one nights* and that in it the theme of metamorphosis is widely used (see N. Elisséeff, *Thèmes et motifs des Mille et une nuits*, Beirut 1949, 93, 142-4, 193 and passim; M. I. Gerhardt, *The art of story-telling*, Leiden 1963, 305 ff.).

Apart from ʿajīms and ḍhāls [see above] there exists also a certain number of fabulous animals, mainly birds [see H. Basset, *Essais de la littérature des Arabes*, Algiers (1920), 240 ff.]. In the dialectic of the Arab North Africa, the perceptible Berber influence is added to the eastern borrowings drawn principally from *Kalila wa-Dimna*; apart from the jackal, the most usual figures are well-known animals: the donkey, the ox, the ram, the he-goat, the hen, the dog, the cat, as well as the fox, the gazelle, the hyena and the lion. Most of the manuals and collections of texts in dialect Arabic reproduce some of these stories (see *Bibli.* of the art. HIRAYA).

6. Animals in art. Representations of animals occupy only a restricted place in the art of the Islamic countries, limited by the tendencies towards non-representationalism and decorative abstraction which typify this art and which, though varying considerably from one region and one period to another in their development, contribute in large measure to the originality of Muslim civilization [see PAH]. For it was primarily religious restrictions which led to the prohibition of all representations of living beings and which explain their total absence from public buildings such as mosques. Such restrictions, however, in no way prevented painted or sculptured compositions of a secular character from taking their inspiration from nature, and in particular from fauna, even when they avoided too precise a delineation of physical form, or from frequently testifying, within the bounds of Islamic culture, to the continuance or revival of very ancient traditions.

A systematic inventory of the zoomorphic figures thus used and their main types has not yet been undertaken. The diversity of the various fields in which such an inquiry would have to be conducted, from architectural ornament to illustrations of manuscripts and ranging through all the luxury articles produced by craft-work, suffices to show its importance. The results obtained do not vary greatly according to the nature and material of the objects under consideration [see *Ahl, Billawr*, etc.]. It would also reveal the differences of treatment accorded to each species of animal, based on ideas derived either from literature or from daily observation as well as symbolic and magic significance [see SAD, FAS, etc.]. This point has been made clear in the all too rare studies of any profundity based on certain iconographic animal motifs, such as, for example, the unicorn or the ibex devouring a snake (cf. R. Ettinghausen, *Studies in Muslim iconography*, i, *The unicorn, Washington 1950*, and The "Snake-eating Stag" in the East, in *Late and mediæval studies in honour of Albert Mathias Friend Jr.*, Princeton 1955, 272-86).

Even beyond all these investigations of this kind are undertaken, it may be stated that certain animal figures, employed as much for their ornamental qualities as for the different connotations that they might convey and often associated with the glorification of royal power, made their appearance in Islamic art as early as the Umayyad period. Certain elements of the bestiary were thus incorporated in the sculptures carved in half-relief on the façade of the
palace of Mshatta [q.v.], while subjects of the same order, though more familiar, were painted on the walls of various other palaces. The principal mosaic of the castle of Khirbat al-Mafdjar [q.v.] had as its theme two facing gazelles grazing and a lion attacking one of them, on each side of a majestic tree. Mention must also be made of the realistic representation of a galloping horse and wounded deer in a fresco of Kasr al-Hayr al-Gharbi [q.v.], for in these experiments we can see the first illustrations of a taste which was subsequently to provide the stimulus for the development of a new art. Indeed, the decoration of palaces and rich mansions sought to find a place for a whole stock of more or less stereotyped animal motifs taken from the Sasanid or Hellenistic East, and later associated with the life of luxury and pleasure lived by the new holders of sovereign power.

The same reasons explain the frequency of these motifs on articles of furniture connected with the daily routine of princely life and, whether ceramic or metal artefacts or even precious fabrics, characterized alike by the need to ensure the glory, happiness and good fortune of the patrons who had ordered them. For this reason, particular preference was shown for representations of those animals which had long been utilized as the symbols of royal power (the lion, the bird of prey, etc.), which might evoke the sovereign's pastimes (hunting scenes), or which had been endowed with some benevolent properties of talismanic and astrological origin (signs of the Zodiac). These images provided the craftsmen with the essential elements for linear decorations (painted, engraved, or worked on a flat surface) which generally combined interlaced floral and geometrical forms with bands embellished with strings of quadrupeds or birds, as well as medallions decorated with figures exactly repeated or sometimes symmetrically facing each other. They also formed the subject of the rarer sculptures in relief imitating the silhouettes of well-known animals especially for ewers and incense-burners.

Examples of this kind remain relatively rare during the earliest centuries of Islam, from which period we can cite only the bronzes influenced by Sasanid tradition, such as the group to which belongs the splendid vessel known as the "aiguiere of Marwan II. But their number steadily increased with the development of 'Abbasid civilization and its growing receptivity to foreign customs, some of which were tainted with heterodoxy. A significant proof of this is afforded by the Buwayhid articles of goldsmith's work or textiles which, with due observance of the aesthetic laws of stylization and repetition, were decorated with such animals as felines, ibexes, elephants, eagles, peacocks and even griffins (analyses of these motifs in G. Wiet, Soieries persanes, Cairo 1947).

But we can also take as an example the ivory boxes made in Muslim Spain in the 4th/10th century [see 1940] and Egyptian Fatimid sculptures in crystal, ivory or wood (see particularly G. Marçais, Les figures d’hommes et de bêtes dans les bois sculptés d’époque fatimide, in Musée du Caire, in Mélanges Maspero III, 1935-40, 241-57), not forgetting the dishes and bowls of faience with lustre decoration that were made at that time in different parts of the Muslim world.

Of these various instances in which animal decoration takes a prominent place, some employ a range of figures of "heraldic" style, to be found principally in 'Irāq or Iran, and whose Sasanid antecedents can be recognized without difficulty: simplified interpretations of these motifs appear even in the most common types of ornamented pottery (see, for examples from the 5th/11th century, sherds found at Bāb Zu'ayr, in the exhibition "Iranian Art in Islam," in Storia dell'Arte, 1947, pl. 12). Other figures reveal the appearance of touches of a delicate realism, which in their veracity of detail or sense of movement, renew the handling of classical subjects and give an authentic freedom of posture to the animals carved on Egyptian panels or painted with rapid strokes on pottery of the same origin (cf. the remark by F. L. Hoffman, in T. Arnold, Painting in Islam, Oxford 1928, pl. LIX d) — while a later echo is to be found in the "lions of Baybars" which were to mark, as though with a coat-of-arms, the principal constructions and foundations of this Mamlūk sultan.

In the same period too zoomorphic figures were utilized in linear ornamentation to decorate the walls of public buildings studied in J.-C. Gardin, L'art des Mamlūks, and not forgetting the region of Mosul (for its workshops of bronze-workers, see AL-MAWSL). But it must be noted that only the provinces of Khurāsān witnessed the development of those astonishing types of zoomorphic inscriptions, restricted to objects in metal, which have quite recently attracted attention and which made use of the silhouettes of animals either to delineate the actual characters, or else to "animate" them by outlining them within the interlaced foliage which formed the background (see D. S. Rice, The Wade Cup in the Cleveland Museum of Art, Paris 1955, 21-33). No doubt this must be regarded as the most perfect example of the adaptation of fauna to the requirements of the arabesque to be found among the typical aspects of ancient art in Islam.

It was moreover in the Iranian or Indo-Iranian arts that, during the later periods, the taste for...
animal motifs continued to serve as a pretext for ornamental stylizations that are full of freshness and delicacy, while in the other regions of the Muslim world they were gradually abandoned. Safavid brocades and carpets thus provide, up to a recent period, an illustration of the resources of this at once graceful and conventional repertory, which research in the Mongol period had successfully revived, but which thereafter was to remain unknown to Muslim artisans working elsewhere than in Persia. Outside by side with the zoomorphic elements of Islamic decoration, we must also not overlook the representations of animals multiplied, though in quite a different spirit, by Muslim painters and miniaturists, who very frequently took their models from the animal world and succeeded in giving interpretations of markedly ornamental character, yet sometimes not devoid of exactness or even realism.

Indeed, even in an ancient period, at the time of the rise of what it has recently been suggested should be called “Arab painting” (cf. R. Ettinghausen, Arab painting, Geneva 1962), and which corresponds more precisely with a flowering that took place in post-Salju?ukid Irako-Mesopotamian or even Syro-Egyptian culture (from the end of the 6th/12th to the 8th/14th century), the actual nature of the works illustrated, books of adab including collections of fables as well as technical treatises on the art of hunting on zoology, further encouraged the very particular popularity that representations of animals then enjoyed. By way of example it will suffice to refer to the illuminated copies of the Kalila wa-Dimna of Ibn al-Mu?affa which have survived (copies in Paris, B.N., Ar. 3465 and 3467; Munich, Staatsbibl. C. arab. 66; Cairo, Nat. Lib., Pers. lit. 61; Oxford, Bodl. Lib or technical treatises as well as copies of the two K. Manf?j's al-Hayawan edited by Ibn Bakht?gh? (in Persian; New York, Morgan Lib., M. 500; Washington, Freer Gall. No. 27-5) and by Ibn al-Durayhim al-Mawsili (Escolar, Ar. 898), without overlooking the K. al-Baytara of Ab?l Ahmad b. al-Husayn b. al-Ahnaf (Istanbul, Topkap? Saray, Ahmet III 2113) or the K?sh?l al-s?r?r of Ibn Gh?nim al-Makd?l (Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Lala Ismail 565) and also the other Arabic manuscripts (in Persian; in Latin) Ambrosian fragments of an illuminated manuscript containing the zoology of al-Q?simi, Uppsala-Leipzig 1946.

But in these various works, to which might be added the “genre scenes” with figures of familiar animals found occasionally in other illustrated manuscripts of the same period (see, for example, the scenes known as “the herd of camels”, “the departure of the caravan”, or “the discussion near a village” in a MS of the Mak?mat al-Har?r? (Paris, B.N., Ar. 5847), it is of particular interest to note a stylistic continuity which makes it permissible to speak of a style of portrayal of animals peculiar to the pictorial art thus represented. This style might essentially be defined as the “combination of a zoomorphic element with a natural way of presenting them” (R. Ettinghausen, Arab painting, 136).

In point of fact, in the earliest known copy of Kalila wa-Dimna, of the beginning of the 7th/13th century (MS Paris, B.N. ar. 3465), it is easy to see that care has been taken to give life and expressiveness to animal forms, little by little escaping from the conventionalism inherent in the traditional Iranian style, which incidentally is reflected in the balance of each picture. The apogee of this tendency is ultimately found in such a typical work of the so-called Baghd?d school as the MS Hariri-Sch?fer previously referred to, signed by a certain al-Wsa?fi in 634/1237. It can be seen to disappear finally with the rise of the formalism that was to characterize Maml?k painting, while it was to be reborn in a new form in the truly Persian schools of painting which were to take shape after the rupture brought about by the Mongol conquest. These schools were indeed set up in order to preserve the feeling of the animal’s movement, even when they substituted the return to a more ornamental conception of the different subjects treated and when their masterpieces took shape under the inspiration of extremely varied aesthetic sensibilities (in addition to the classical works on the subject, see the recent work of B. Gray, Persian painting, Geneva 1961).

Thus it is possible to confer upon the Muslim miniaturists, considered as a whole, the well-deserved epithet of “master animal-painters”, a title which it would seem difficult to reconcile with the regulations restricting the freedom of the creative imagination in that civilization, but which none the less justly emphasizes one of the most attractive aspects of art in Islam.

Bibliography: There is no comprehensive study devoted to this question. Various individual works have been referred to in the text. For further study of certain of the aspects discussed above, reference should be made to K. A. C. Creswell, A Bibliography of the architecture, arts and crafts of Islam, London 1961, to which may now be added E. J. Grube, Three miniatures from Fus?f in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, in Ars Or., v (1963), 89, 95, and H. Goetz, Indo-Islamic figural sculpture, ibid., 235-41.

See also E. J. Grube, Ars Or., v (1963), 89, 95.

7. Zoology among the Muslims. On the scientific plane, one might have thought that the works devoted to animals by Aristotle (see Aristotelis, the founder of rational zoology, who have allowed those Arab scholars who were willing to use the results of Greek learning to make great progress in the knowledge of the animal kingdom and to introduce zoology among the disciplines cultivated by the Muslims, on a level with, for example, scientific geography, mathematics or medicine. But, in spite of Yah?b b. al-B?tr?k’s translation of Aristotle’s Historia animalium (2nd-3rd/8th-9th centuries), zoology has never been a very popular discipline and the increasingly limited place which it occupies in the various theoretical classifications of the sciences is significant in this respect. In the classification of Aristotle it forms an integral part of “physics”, linked with psychology, and it is still found with the soul (nafs) among the physical and natural sciences (al-’ilm al-tabii) in al-Farabi’s ?h?d? al-‘ul?m, ed. ?thm Amla, Cairo 1949, 99 (see L. Gardet and M.-M. Anawati, Introd. a la th?l. mus., 106); it appears as an independent science among the ?h?w?n al-?af’ (Gardet-Anawati, 109), in classified among foreign sciences in the Mak?mat al-‘ul?m of al-Kh?rizmi (Gardet-Anawati, 111), but is no longer found in the ?h?d? al-Q?za?l (Gardet-Anawati, 117), or in the Protegomena of Ibn Kh?lid (Gardet-Anawati, 123-4). It does not seem either to have interested al-Kal?kh?ndi, who does not cite any work of zoology proper among Les classiques du s?rie g?n?rien (G. Wiet, in St. Isl., xviii, 50-5).

This growing indifference to zoology shown by Arab thinkers and writers is very difficult to explain
when one considers the interest taken in animals by Muslim law, but is probably due in great part to the absence of organized research and specialist works of truly scientific character, although zoological gardens (hayy al-wafrsh) in which the rarest and fiercest species of animals had been assembled at great expense (see A. Mes, Renaisonce, 383; Eng. tr., 404-5, where also organized combats are mentioned) ought to have aroused the curiosity of scholars and encouraged them to undertake thorough studies. But zoology among the Muslims remained at the literary, or perhaps one may say the religious stage; it is true that the scholars and jurists (fiyrah al-wafrsh) ought to have aroused the curiosity of scholars and encouraged them to undertake thorough studies. But zoology among the Muslims remained at the literary, or perhaps one may say the religious stage; it is true that the scholars and jurists (fiyrah al-wafrsh) have often mentioned the existence of the Creator through the observation of His creation (ii, 109 ff., iii, 209 ff.) and the glorification of the Divine Wisdom which has created nothing completely useless or harmful: dangerous or malicious animals (which it is permissible to kill, i, 307-9) are in fact a trial (miḥna) imposed on men by God (iii, 300). Al-Dījāz is perfectly well acquainted with Aristotle and allows himself on occasion to criticize him (e.g., vi, 17) and quotes from him quite extensively (see T. al-Hājījī, Taḥīrī fī nasīṣ aristaṭīlīyya min Kitāb al-Hayawān li ’l-Dījāz, in Majdallat Kulliyat al-Adāb, Alexandria 1953 ff.), but he is convinced that he has no need of recourse to Greek ideas, given that practically all that is found in the zoological works of the "philosophers" is known already to the Bedouins (iii, 268); thus, although an admirer of the ʿAbī al-Manṭūk, he deliberately ignores Aristotle's principles of classification, admittedly rather negative and difficult to grasp (see Parties des animaux, tr. J.-M. Le Blond, Paris 1945, i, 66), in order to adhere to a rudimentary empiricism.

After having stated (i, 26) that created things are divided into three categories: mutaṭṭaf (similar), mutuṭṭam (different), muṭādād (opposite), al-Dījāz, after some hesitation as to the place to give to the spirits (muthānā), is divided into four sections, on the one hand inorganic (dījāz = inert) and on the other organic matter (nāmūn = growing). He then divides the organic section into two "kingdoms": animal (hayawān) and vegetable (nabāt); the animal kingdom is in turn subdivided into four branches according to the way in which the animal moves: walking (mā yawāḥ), flying (mā yaʃār), swimming (mā yasāḥ), crawling (mā yawāt); this classification, which is based simply on current observation, is the same as the Biblical division (I Kings, 4:33: "[Solomon] spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes") and corresponds to one of the Platonic criteria of classification. Starting from these "classes", al-Dījāz experiences some embarrassment, for not only does he admit that his own division is not a rational one since he is obliged to exclude the ostrich from the "class" of birds while including the bat, but he has to give up the attempt to adopt too rigid subdivisions because of inability to pass from the particular to the general in defining the fundamental attributes of the species and the genera. Finally, he mixes functional criteria and habits of life to determine the species, and though he has a vague idea of what were to be the "orders", "families" and "genera" in the modern systematic classification, he adheres in general to the species which he divided into the four categories mentioned above:

1. animals which walk: men (māṣ), the bahādīm (i.e., non-political quadrupeds, either domestic or wild), the sībā (fierce animals, i.e., carnivores, domestic or wild), insects (bashkarāt) without wings.

2. animals which fly: of these there are only three "orders": (a) carnivorous birds (sībā) which in turn are subdivided into "noble" (ahdār, i.e., large birds of prey such as the eagle, the vulture, etc.), "common" (bashkarāt, less equipped with means of defence), and little birds which feed on insects; (b) the birds which are high up, i.e., in general the grain-eaters which protect themselves by fleeing; (c) the hamādi, winged insects.

In the course of his work he distinguishes many different species of reptiles, but he does not suggest any classification. Similarly he does not venture to classify the fish (among which he includes intentionally mammals such as the whale), and in any case he says that he has not found in early poetry enough reliable evidence, the accounts of sailors being untrustworthy (vi, 16).

The Kitāb al-Hayawān, which is a work of adāb of religious character and not of natural science, is characterized by the greatest disorder. Its sources are varied, but the most important are the literary data collected by the investigators of the 2nd and 3rd/6th and 5th centuries, enriched by oral traditions, by information obtained from conversations and current observation, and also by little experiments performed by the author himself or by his Muṭāzill friends, e.g., that which concerns the effect on animals of spirituous drinks (ii, 228-9), or his researches on spontaneous generation (iii, 348), of which he is a convinced supporter (iii, 372, v, 371, etc.) against those who deny it and claim that an animal can be begotten only by a male (v, 349). Al-Dījāz takes a particular interest in hybrids and devotes to the mule [see Bashq] a treatise which follows the K. al-Hayawān. On another plane, following the method of Aristote, who links zoology with the study of the soul, he scatters throughout his work pertinent notes on the psychology of animals (e.g., vi, 69 ff. on pride) and, considering the influence of environment to be of major importance, he sketches a doctrine of evolution which is not without interest. In all, nearly 350 animals are examined in a manner more or less profound but always unsystematic, and to find one's bearings use must be made of the excellent index to the edition of ʿAbd al-Salām Ḥārūn; it is thus possible to gauge the zoological knowledge of the early Arabs and to gain an idea of the opinions which they held on certain animal species. Being a good Muṭāzil, who submits everything to the criterion of reason, al-Dījāz makes an effort in passing to demolish some legends (e.g., ii, 14) and mingle with the traditions which he relates thoughts of his own which, if they were not so chaotically expressed, would earn him an honourable place between Aristote and Buffon.

While his Bayān has been to a certain extent systematized and presented in a more orderly form by al-ʿAskarī (q.v.), in his K. al-Simāt al-sayn, the K. al-Hayawān and zoology in general have hardly inspired later writers. At the time when adab flourished, Ibn Kūṭayba (q.v.) in his Qayān al-akhrūr (tr. L. Kopf, The natural history, etc., Paris and Leiden 1949) and a little later Abū Ḥāyyān al-Tawḥīdī (q.v.) in his Ḥillā (tr. L. Kopf, in Osiris, xii (1956), 390-466) devoted some space to animals but without bothering about scientific classification. Similar
treatment is given in the popular encyclopaedias of which the Mustafa' (ch. ixii) of al-Damiri (q.v.) is a typical example. The 'I⋮awun al-'Sa⋮a', on the other hand, set out clearly, at the end of the second part of their Ras hasil, the hierarchy of created things which comprises, in ascending order: minerals, plants, animals, man, the heavenly bodies; in each of these categories the highest rank is close to the lowest rank of the next category; thus the palm-tree, which belongs to the highest rank among the vegetables, is very little removed from the snail which possesses only the sense of touch because the Divine Wisdom does not endow an animal with organs of which it has no need. The top of the scale among animals is occupied by the monkey, who is close to the uncivilized human, placed on the lowest rung of the next subdivision. Man constitutes a separate category because he alone possesses all the privileges which are granted only separately to animals.

It was not until the 7th/13th century that al-Kazwini (d. 682/1283) put forward the theory that fables in which animals play the role of human beings are of Indian origin, while earlier ideas and inserted a treatise on zoology in his Tuhfat al-zaman wa-kharidat al-a逴d (MS Topkapi Sarayi, Revan Koskii, 1664), the earlier history of the Arabian Nights, 1924, 8, Fann, i, translated by D. B. Macdonald, (Pantschatantra, Vol. I, p. xxi, Leipzig 1859) put forward the theory that fables in which animals play the role of human beings are of Indian origin, while evidence that by the 4th/10th century the view was current that the telling of stories about animals was a useful manual for the identification of the names of animals; glossaries for particular areas are found in A. Hanoteau and A. Letourneux, La Kabylie et les coutumes kabyles, Paris 1893, i, 208 ff. (the fauna of Kabylia); J. B. Panouse, Les mammifères du Maroc, Tangiers 1957, 191 ff.; V. Monteil, Faune du Sahara occidental, Paris 1951. See also A. Mez, Renaissance, 429-31 (Eng. tr. 455-8) and passim; D. Santillana, Istituzioni, Rome n.d., index, ii, 665; J. J. Rivlin, Gescts im Koran, Kultus und Ritus, Jerusalem 1934; Maswani, Islam's contribution to zoology and natural history, in IC, xii (1938), 328-33; on a fragment of a hitherto unknown work on zoology, see A. J. Arberry, in JRAS, 1937, 481-3. On the so-called "Twelve animal" calendar, see TA ⧲[ilm] and L. Bazin, Remarques sur les noms turcs des "Doux animaux" du calendrier dans l'usage persan, in Mélanges H. Masse, Tehran 1963, 21-30.

(Ch. Pellat)

Animal stories in Persian literature

In looking for the origin of the animal story in Persian literature, we are handicapped by the virtual absence of secular works prior to the 4th/10th century. The earliest extant literary sources in which animal stories occur (if we except the surviving fragments of Rōdahl's (d. 329/940-1) Kalila wa-Dimna and Sindbādnāma) are Abu 'l-Ma'allā Naṣr Allāh's translation of the former, made in 538-9/1143-5, and Zahrīl Samarkandīl's version of the latter, composed in 556-7/1160-1. Of these, while Kalila wa-Dimna is certainly from India, the Sindbādnāma has been convincingly demonstrated by B. E. Matravers, "Indian origins of the "Arab Book of Sindbad", Berlin 1960) to be of Persian origin, though probably not earlier than the 2nd/8th century. The Ḥasār afsīnā, the presumed Persian original of the Afī layla wa-layla, can be traced back to roughly the same period. The Pahlavi translation of the Sanskrit Pantalantara can on the other hand be quite safely assigned to the 5th century A.D., and even Ibn al-Mukaffa's Arabic version of this is earlier than the Sindbādnāma. Is this then, when and how the animal story entered into Persian literature? According to Ibn al-Nadim, author of the Fihrist (c. 400/1008), "the first who made separate compilations of ḫurūṣīt and made books in which to put them and laid them up in libraries and in some gave speaking parts to beasts were the early Persians" (Makāla 8, Fann 1, translated by D. B. Macdonnelt, The earlier history of the Arabian Nights, in JRAS, 1924, 364-5). In the context, the last term refers to the first two Persian dynasties, and the passage is at any rate evidence that by the 4th/10th century the view was current that the telling of stories about animals was buried deep in Persian tradition. Theodor Benfey (Pantschatantra, Vol. I, p. xxi, Leipzig 1859) put forward the theory that fables in which animals play the rôle of human beings are of Indian origin, while
those in which they act as animals are "Aesopic", that is, Near Eastern.

In the classical Persian literature the animal tale is introduced primarily to illustrate moral or mystical points, notable examples being the Ḥadīdat al-kalbīya of Sanāʾī (d. 525/1130), the Tafṣīr of Abu’l-Futūḥ Rāz (d. 538/1143), the Asrār-nama and the Ilāhī-nama of ʿAṭṭār (d. ca. 627/1229), and above all the Maṭmawī of Dīlāl al-Ḏīn Rūmī (d. 672/1273-4). More directly in the tradition of the earliest animal story collections are the Marbūn-nama of Warāwīn (622/1225), the Tafṣīr of Nāshabī (730/1330), the diary of Dījan’s Bahārīnān (893/1487) and the Anbār-i Suḥaylī of Husayn Wāḍī Kāshifī (d. 910/1504-5). These are followed by the Layājīf al-tawāṣif of Fāhr al-Ḏīn ‘Alī Safī (d. 939/1532-3), the Dījāmī al-lamţālī of Muḥammad Ḫābālārūdī (1054/1644), and other similar collections that have no particular moral intent. Aside from all this, there still remains much fresh material to be recovered from the current oral literature.

We may tentatively classify the animal tales of Persian written and oral literature as follows:

i. Moral tales, in which animals behave much as human beings, and serve as types.

ii. Tales in which both animals and humans are involved, the animals often showing human characteristics such as speech.

iii. Adventure stories and romances, in which humans play the major roles, while animals appear in helpful or hostile capacities, usually with magic powers.

iv. Stories involving mythical animals.

In the oral literature, as against the written, the last two categories are the more common. Examples include the Ĥāṭim Ťārī, Rustam, Ḫusayn-i Kurd, and Šīhrīyā cycles.

The list of animals that figure in the tales is extensive. Many are identified with particular characteristics. The lion is the symbol of majesty, both tyrannical and beneficent; the bear is stupid, selfish and kindly, the wolf simple and kindly, the fox cunning, the jackal shrewd, the peacock and the peahen beautiful, the bear and swan gentle and kindly, the wolf and dog simple and kindly, the fox cunning, the jackal shrewd, the peacock and the peahen beautiful, the parrot worldly-wise, the elephant clumsy and gullible. However, even unclean animals like the dog and the pig may be found playing sympathetic roles.


L. P. Elwell-Sutton

ANIMALS IN TURKISH TRADITIONS

In various Turkish languages, the Turkicized forms of the Arabic hayawān (hayvan, ayvan, ayban, etc.) indicate the animal species, excluding man; the Klqnhz word ḥijānbar, with the same meaning, is made up of a Persian element, ḥijān (soul) and a Turkish element, bar (there is, has); ḥijānbar (= caṇavār) in the Turkish of Turkey (from the Persian ḥijānbar, "possessing a soul") has a more particular meaning: wolf, wild boar, fierce animal, wild beast, monster; the words ḥijānl, ḥijānt, etc. derived from the Persian ḥijān, and irtīg, ṣirtī, ḥinnc, etc., from Turkish roots, are used to indicate all animate beings, including man.

Many Turkish tribes had animal names; others, as for example the 24 clans descended from Oguz Kaghan, each had a bird emblem; many Turkish personal names are derived from names of animals; furthermore a large number of beliefs and practices, which are today tinged by Islamic features, are survivals of an animal cult which formed one of the important elements of the religions of the Turks before they were converted to Islam. The wolf has a specially important place in these: according to an account attested in a 7th century A. D. Chinese document, the Tou-K'iu were descended from the union of a she-wolf with a man [see Ergencen]; vestiges of an ancient wolf cult are still attested in Anatolian folklore (see Ali Riza, Anadolu’da Bostur, in Halk Bilgisi Haberleri (= HBH), i, 1930, 200 f., ii, 1930, 32 f.). The bear is also the main subject of many stories which are related today (at least in Turkey) as true adventures, but which are nevertheless the scarcely discernible remains of ancient myths (see P. N. Boratav, Histoires d’ours en Anatolie, in FFC, no. 152, Helsinki 1955). In the same category of survivals of an animal cult can be classed the stories of eponymous heroes reared by a leoness (see Kūḏīb d Ded Korkut, ed. and tr. E. Rossi, Vatican 1953, 193; Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ayyāb, Kanā al-dawar, Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayi, ms. Ahmed 3 1932, vol. vii, 173 f.).

Among the accounts in oral tradition concerning animals (animal stories of the fable type and stories of marvels with animal heroes treated separately in the article ḤİΓAYA), a number, aetiological in type, are part of the international repertoire; among them are those which form part of the cycle of the Flood and those which are related to the Hoopoe of Solomon. The source of these must be Biblical and Kurdīnic traditions (commentaries and apocrypha).

But a great number of aetiological legends concerning various animals are certainly original creations of Turkish folklore or original re-castings of themes borrowed from the traditions belonging to the countries which the Turks had occupied. The horse occupies first place, through its importance in narrative literature; there are recounted legends concerning its supernatural origins: a race of horses said to be descended from a stallion which inhabited the depths of the waters, one of winged steeds, or a combination of an eagle and a horse, or a race of horses whose ancestor, tamed by an eponymous hero, was called the "horse of fire" (for this last race see Abū Bakr, op. cit., vii, 180 f.). In the epics and other heroic tales, the horse is represented as a devoted companion of the hero; it is endowed with speech and is able to converse with its master in order to give him advice and warn him of dangers. The veneration of the horse seems to have conferred on it, in certain circumstances, an aura of saintliness. The tomb of the horse of Sultan ʿOṯmān II at Üskūdar became a place of pilgrimage; it was known as At-Ewliyāš ("Saint of the horses") and sick horses were brought to it (see İstanbul Ansiklopedisi, s.v. At Mezar).

From a more general point of view, popular superstitions attribute to certain animals magical powers because they are considered capable of embodying evil spirits [see ḤIN]. The metamorphosis of men into animals and, less frequently, of animals into men, belongs apart from the repertory of stories of the fantastic, to the field of miracles performed by saints.
Some animal species have their patron saints; these usually take the form of the animals they protect. The superstitions, legends and practices connected with these supernatural beings can be traced for the most part to rites belonging to hunting and the beliefs attached to them. Originally the guardian spirit was identical with the animal itself; this explains the designation, among the Khurgz, for example, of the animal species by the name of the patron saint: Oysul Ata (<Uways al-Karanl), patron saint of camels, also "camels"; Kambar Ata, patron saint of horses and "horse", etc. In Turkey the stag is still considered sacred and the patron saint of stags (sometimes a woman) is believed to strike the hunters who pursue them (see Y. Z. Demircioğlu, Yürükler ve köylülerde hikayeler, masallar, Istanbul 1934, 115 ff., 120 ff.). There are also legends describing saints metamorphosed into stags or riding on them (cf. the legend of Abdül Məsə, in S.N. Ergun, Türk masalları, Istanbul n.d., i., 166-9, and that of Geyikli Baba, in A. Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre ve tasavvuf, Istanbul 1961, 10-3).

The saints also possess the power of charming animals, including wild animals and fabulous beasts such as dragons. There is a wealth of legend providing edifying examples of their kind actions towards domestic and wild animals. The ox, being used for ploughing, has acquired, more particularly in the rural districts of the 'Alawi-Bektashis, an especial veneration; several episodes of the legendary biography of Hacıddi Bektash are stories inspired by this notion (Vilâyetnâme of Hacıddi Bektash, ed. Gölpınarlı, 53 ff., 83, tr. E. Gross, Leipzig 1927, 90, 93; Vilâyetnâme of Hüdâım Sultan, ed. R. Tschudi and G. Jacob, Berlin 1914, 28, 32). Shepherds are considered to have certain supernatural powers, generally interpreted as proofs of sanctity; many stories of folklore stress the intimate understanding between them and their animals and a part of their magic powers was manifestly due to the animals.

Turkish art—even in the Islamic period—has been fairly rich in animal themes. In weaving, embroidery and knitting a number of stereotyped figures are stylized representations of animals. On one kind of prayer rug—the most ancient types of this ritual practice—the only decorative element is the reproduction of animal skins: sheep, stag, goat, bear. It appears that this type represents the transitional stage between the use of an actual animal skin and that of a prayer rug with ornamental figures of a secular character (see Yusuf Durul, Türkmen, Yırık, Asfar kah ve kitim motifleri üzerinde bir araştırmâ, in Türk Etnografya Dergisi, i (1957), 65-6, pl. XL and XLI).

In the imagery of popular anonymous works and in the works of known artists (of drawings, paintings and miniatures), animals are depicted as often by motifs which are stylized, often to the point of being abstract, as by a very realistic representation situated in the context of everyday life: scenes of hunting, stock-rearing, training, etc. (see S. Eyuboglu and M. Ş. İşpıroğlu, On "L'album du conquérant," the Turkish periodical Turk Folklor Araştırmaları by P. N. Boratav, in Öreni, x (1957) onwards, and the same author's bibliographies at the end of the chapters L'opération et la "hîkâye" and Le conte et la légende, in Ph.T.F., ii, 38-44 and 62-7. (P'hettv N'hîl Boratav)

Haydar, menstruation. The laws of purity concerning menstruation are less complicated and less severe in Islam than in Judaism, but much more severe than in Christianity. A discharge which exceeds the legal duration fixed by the laws of purity is called sîhidâ; these irregular losses involve only minor impurity, hadath [q.v.]. Contact with a woman who is menstruating does not result in impurity (contrary to the laws of Judaism) and although the Kursîn (II, 222) forbids sexual relations with her, the violation of this taboo is not penalized in this world. Menstruation being one of the circumstances which, involving a major impurity, invalidate the state of purity, a ghfisi [q.v.] (complete washing of the body) with water which is legally pure is necessary to re-establish that state of purity in which the performance of the salât etc. is valid. To those in this state of major impurity, in addition to the consequences of hadath, the following prohibitions apply: they may not recite the Kursîn (except for one or two verses) or touch the Devil nor remain in the mosque (or even walk through it). Furthermore the Ramadân fast and the salât performed by those menstruating are not valid, and the fast is even forbidden to them. The regulations concerning the nifâs (lochia) are almost the same as those concerning menstruation: thus the ghfisi of the woman who has given birth takes place when there is no more discharge, the fixed interval of forty days (Levícus, Zend-Avesta) being unknown at least in theory. The casuistical differences between the various schools on this subject may be omitted here.

The hayd plays an equally important part in family law: it determines the prescribed period of waiting ("idda) before a widow or a divorced wife may remarry. It determines also the legitimacy of certain children (the theory of the child asleep in the womb), fikh conceding that long periods of gestation may occur.

Bibliography: The collections of hadâts (cf. Wensinck's Handbook) and the books of fikh all discuss the question, near the beginning (see Hâdâtd). (G. H. Boussuert)

Haydar, "Ilium" [see as-lasad]; by-name given, particularly by the Shîfs, to 'All b. Abî Tâlib [q.v.].

Haydar, Shaykh, the 5th Safawid shaykh in line of descent from Shaykh Šaff al-Dîn Ishâk, the founder of the Safawî farîka. The son of Dînâyad [q.v.] and Khâdîjî Begum, the sister of the Ak Köyunlu ruler Uzun Hasan, Haydar succeeded his father as head of the Safawî farîka at Ardabil in 864/1450.

Haydar, by his marriage to Hallâma Begût Âgha (or Marta; better known as 'Alamshâh Begüm), the daughter of Uzun Hasan and Despina Khâtûn, the latter the daughter of Calo Johannes, the Emperor of Trebizond, maintained the close alliance with the Ak Köyunlu which had been formed by his father Dînâyad. Haydar was thus at once the nephew and the son-in-law of Uzun Hasan, and the brother-in-law of Ya'kub, who ruled the Ak Köyunlu empire from 883-901/1478-90.

With the overthrow of the Kara Köyunlu empire by Uzun Hasan in 872/1467, the Ak Köyunlu—
Haydar, b. 'Ali Husayni Razi, Persian historian, b. ca. 993/1585, date of death unknown; author of a large history of the world, which in the manuscripts is sometimes entitled "Istahla" and sometimes "Zubdat al-tawdrikh"; and is generally known as "Tabihi-i Haydari." The work is arranged chronologically. They deal with political history and frequently reach into the time of the author, so that occasionally otherwise inaccessible accounts have been preserved. (Ch. Rieu's view that the work is nowhere original is based on an error.) A second part which was to deal with philosophers, learned men and poets was apparently not written (in any event it is not known.) The work does not contain a dedication to a prince and only portions of it have been published; otherwise it has been used only in manuscript form. Its value lies particularly in the information it gives on Central Asia.

'Ali Khan Bahadur rose to power in Mysore (Mahisur) during the second half of the 18th century. His family claimed descent from the Kuravay and to have migrated from India to Mecca at the end of the 10th/16th century. He was born in 1721 at Dodballapur, 27 miles north-west of Bangalore. When he was five years of age his father, Fath Muhammad, a soldier of fortune, lost his life while in the service of the Nawab of Sira. Left an orphan, Haydar was brought up by his cousin, Haydar Shabih, an officer in the Mysore army. Haydar first entered the service of 'Abd al-Wahhab, brother of Nawab Muhammad 'Ali of Karnatak, and then secured a small command in the Mysore army. Having distinguished himself in the siege of Devanhulli (1749), he received the title of Khan from Nandjaradji, the 'ulama (imam-in-chief) and the most powerful man in Mysore. He then fought in the Carnatic wars, and Nandjaradji, much impressed by his abilities, made him jangidjar of Dindigul (1755). In 1758 Haydar was rewarded with the fort and district of Bangalore for repelling a Maratha invasion; and when shortly after Nandjaradji retired from politics (June 1759), he took his place. But in August 1760 his dewan, Khande Rao, put him into a cage. But he forgave the Raja and allowed him to continue as a figurehead on the throne. Haydar then rose to power in Mysore and invaded Mysore and annexed some of the districts. But he died in 1772, and Haydar, taking advantage of this, occupied all the Maratha territory south of the Kistna.

On 12 November 1766 the English and the Nizam formed an alliance to overthrow Haydar, and jointly invaded Mysore. But Haydar managed to win over the Nizam, and with his help carried the war into the Carnatic. Although after a year the 'Nizam deserted him, he fought alone and succeeded in concluding a favourable peace (April 1769). But the English refusal to help him against the Marathas aroused the hostility of his neighbours. Between 1764 and 1772 the Peshwa Madhav Rao thrice invaded Mysore and annexed some of the districts. But he died in 1772, and Haydar, taking advantage of this, occupied all the Maratha territory south of the Kistna.

Haydar was tall, robust and of fair complexion. He was a figurehead on the throne.

Bibliography: Storey, 124, 1241 (Manuscripts, partial editions); Richard Gosche, Über die Chronik des Haidar, etc. (monograph with selections), in manuscript, see Rieu, CPM, iii, 587b. (W. Bartold-B. Spuler)
Brave and resourceful, he never despairs in defeat. Though illiterate, he was an able ruler. He was harsh but just, ruthless to his enemies but kind to his friends. He appointed Hindus to positions of responsibility, endowed temples and, in deference to Hindu sentiment, retained the Râdji on the throne of Mysore, himself remaining only as dalanâ-yî and Nawâb of Sîra, a title conferred on him by Bâsîlât Dîang and confirmed by the Mughal Emperor.

**Biography**


(MOHIBULL HASAN)

**HAYDAR MIRZÁ** (his real name was Muhammad Haydar; as he himself says, he was known as Mîrzâ Haydar; Bâbur calls him Haydar Mirzâ), a Persian historian, author of the Ta'rikh-i Rashidi, born in 905/1499-1500, died in 958/1551 (for his descent see below). Though his mother was a grand-daughter of the Çâhâtây Khan Yûnus and a cousin of Bâbûr. Most of our knowledge of his life is gleaned from his own work; Bâbûr (ed. Beveridge, p. 11) devotes a few lines to him; the Indian historians Abu 'l-Faqîl and Fîrîghta give some information about his later years.

After the assassination of his father (914/1508) he had to flee from Bukhârâ via Badakhshân to Kâbul, which he reached in 915/1509. Received like a son by Bâbûr, he took part in the victorious campaigns against the Özbek and in the reconquest of Bûkhârâ and Sama'rând, but abandoned his benefactor in 918/1511, betook himself to Farghânâ to the Mongol prince Sa'id Khan, received from him the title Gurgân (son-in-law) and accompanied him against Kâshâhar and Yârândân. In the Mongol empire as restored by Sa'id Khan he held a prominent position; by the Khan's orders he carried out several campaigns to defeat the evilvâns Kâshâhar, Kâfîrîshân, Lâdakh and Tibet. On the Khan's death in 939/1533 and the accession of his successor 'Abd al-Rashid, who was presumably active before this, engaged in the civilian population was impressed i.e., the cavalry population was impressed in the hunt. He was surrounded near Ulu-borlu and killed.

The first mention of the son in the sources (Na'îmâ, loc. cit.) refers to the autumn of 1055/1647, but he was presumably active before this, engaged in brigandage in the passes between Andakâr Parsi, Harîlî and Hamîl-elli, i.e., on the main caravan routes from Persia, the Arab countries and Izmir to Bursa and Istanbul. His headquarters were at Sûgyûd-âdâl (north of Eskişehir), and all the notorious bandits of the day were in his following (Ewilîyâ encountered them at Bâlk-işâr near Ankara and mentions their names, i.e., 418-26); the most prominent of them was Kâshâhîrî-î oglu [q.v.]. These brigands, called in the sources eştîkî and gilîdî [q.v., in Supp.], from time to time joined by substantial numbers (200, in 1058/1648) of the vagabond troops of Anatoîa or Anastîa (or Kâshâhar, Kâfîrîshân), its more generally legend [q.v.]; when they could not find employment with a paşa or in the service of the state, these wandering soldiers would attach themselves to a rebel leader and support themselves by brigandage (see C. Uluçây, Saruhan'îda eştîkilîk ve halk hareketleri, Istanbul 1944; M. Akdağ, Gilîdî isyanları, 1550-1603, Ankara 1963; M. Cezar, Osmanlı tarîhinde Levandîler, Istanbul 1965). At one point Haydar-î oglu, wishing to enter the service of the state with his following, asked for appointment
as a sândîqâh-begi; but in spite of the substantial bribe which he sent to the Grand Vizier (Na‘imî, iv, 249, 347), this was refused. Therefore, he attacked the great Pilgrim caravan between Akşehir and Hîghun. He was in control of all the roads, and obliged the local people, peasantry and notables, to enter his service. The vizier İbshîr Mustafâ Pasha [q.v.], beglerbegi of Karaman, was then appointed ser’âshker and ordered to suppress Haydar-oghlu in co-operation with the beglerbegi of Anatolia, İbrahim Pasha (by a firman dated Dhu ’l-Ka’dâ 1057/December 23, 1647; see Ç. Ulucay, op. cit., doc. 120; cf. Na‘imî, iv, 270). All the troops of all categories which were left in Anatolia (the absence of so many on the campaign in Crete had left the brigands a clear field) were put under his command. Although İbshîr Pasha hemmed in Haydar-oghlu at Sogud-dagî, he was unable to capture him (letter to the Exalted Highness, a British title conferred in 1918) the Nişâm.

Haydar-oghlu city

The site of the present city was selected in 997/1589 by the fifth Kutb Şâhî dynast, Muhammed Kutb Şâh, on the right bank of the river Mûsî, a tributary of the Kırshâna, some 11 km. east of the fortress of Golkondâ [q.v.], and at first given the name of Bâhnagâr after a Hindû dancing-girl named Bâhmâtî, one of the sultan’s concubines. A city quickly grew up on this site, since there was no room for expansion in the overcrowded Golkondâ where, moreover, there was no water-supply. The exact date of the transfer of the seat of government from Golkondâ to Haydar-oghlu is not known, although this seems to have taken place within a dozen years of the foundation; Haydar-oghlu was not at first fortified, Golkondâ remaining as the citadel of the capital. At this time North India was in the hands of the Mughals, and envoy’s from Akbar were well received in 1599/1591; the Kutb Şâhî sultan sent valuable presents to Akbar, and entertained the Mughals as tribute, and his domains were left unmolested. The new city prospered, some of its finest buildings dating from this time (see below), until the intervention of the Mughal prince (later the emperor) Awrangzîb in the dispute between Mir Dîjumî [q.v.] and Abd Allah Kutb Şâh in 1665/1655 when Haydar-oghlu was plundered before the sultan bought peace; but the peace was uneasy, and Haydar-oghlu again fell to the Mughals under Awrangzîb four years before the great siege of Golkondâ in 1688/1689. After the conquest Haydar-oghlu became the residence of the şâhâddar of the Deccan, under the last of whom, Cm Kilic Khan, Nişâm al-Mulk, the governor Mubâriz Khân commenced the fortification of the city by a stone wall. After the important and decisive battle of Shâkarkhâldî [q.v. in 1137/1724, by which the Nişâm al-Mulk crushed the plan of his deputy Mubâriz Khân to usurp power in the province, Haydar-oghlu became the capital of the now independent Deccan province under the Nişâm al-Mulk, who received the title of Aşaf Di’llî from the Mughal emperor Muhammed Şâh; the titles Nişâm al-Mulk and Aşaf Di’llî henceforth became hereditary in his family. The new province which Aşaf Di’llî thereby acquired included the co-extensive modern state of Haydar-oghlu before its dissolution, plus the northern province of Barâr and the so-called Northern Sarkâs—is described below. The political history of the city thereafter is little different from that of the state. The city has grown continually as it became the centre of an increasingly organized state, its suburbs soon spreading on both sides of the river Mûsî far beyond the old city walls completed by the first Aşaf Di’llî. The central district of the state, called Atraf-i balda, is the sarf-i khâss or ‘crown’ assignment around Haydar-oghlu city itself, and was constituted, with the other districts, in 1865; the municipality of Haydar-oghlu, with four divisions in the city proper and five in the suburbs (now much extended), was created in 1869; the suburbs include the important cantonment of Haydar-oghlu (‘Sikandarbad’), named after Mir Akbar ‘All Khân Sikandar Di’llî, the sixth Nişâm, which now has its own city corporation. Haydar-oghlu is an important communications centre (road, rail and air), with a modern hospital, important museums, one of the best equipped astronomical observatories in India, and the flourishing ʿUtrzymîyyâ (Osmania) University (1918). With a population of well over a million, it is the sixth largest city in India. Textiles,
including fine velvets, carpets, red earthenware, glass and paper are produced by industries within the city, and excellent cigarettes are made in Haydarabad for local trade.

Monuments.—The old city is surrounded by a bastioned wall, completed by the first Asaf Dîhâb, with thirteen gates and a number of smaller posterns. The city is connected to the northern suburbs by four bridges, the oldest of which (Purândâ pul) was built by Muhammad Kûl Kûtb Shâh in 1001/1593. The same ruler was responsible for the buildings in the central focal point of the city, notably the Câr minâr, 'four minarets', a triumphal archway, 30 m. square in plan, its ground storey consisting of four great arches of 10.8 m. span, each facing a cardinal point; above this is an arched tridrome running round the building supported on carved corbels, with a smaller arched tridrome supported above it; each corner stands a minaret 55.8 m. in height from the ground level, each decorated with a double arcade and a perforated marble screen above it; at roof-level (this is the characteristic feature of the Kutb Shâhi architecture); and each minaret is topped by yet another such balcony supporting a round kiosk with an ogee dome foliated at its base in the Bidjapur (g.v.) manner. The small rooms inside the upper storey are said to have been used for instruction by shaykhs; but, from the strictly ceremonial and royal nature of the use of this building under the Kutb Shâhis and Asaf Dîhâhs, this story may be doubted. (See Annual Report Arch. Dept. Hyderabad State 1917-18 AD (1327 F.), 2 ff., with an inscription of 1043/1633, A.C. (1346 F.), 2 of the Shaykhpet suburb, see ARADHyd. 1936-37 A.C. (1356 F.), 3 ff., with an inscription of 1043/1633, X.E.I.M., 1937, 211 ff. and Pl. XII.)

The city water supply depends on tanks, to which the former Ismâ`îl Shahi sultanate of Barâr, and the Barid Shâhi sultanate of Bidar had already been attached, in 1042/1633; the 'Âdil Shâhi sultanate of Bidjapur in 1097/1686; and the Kutb Shâhi sultanate of Golkonda in 1098/1687 their lands eventually became one great Mughal province—except for those tracts which had been taken by the French soldier M. (Michel Joachim Marie) Raymond (corrupted locally to 'Musa Rafrim'), d. 25 March 1798, are worth notice.

b. Haydarabâd State.

When the old sultanates of the Deccan [see DAKHAN] fell one by one to the Mughal emperors Shâh Dîhâh and Awrangzhâb in the 17th/18th century (the Niçâm Shâhi sultanate of Ahmednagar, to which the former 'Imâm Shâhi sultanate of Barâr and the Barid Shâhi sultanate of Bidar had already been attached, in 1042/1633; the 'Âdil Shâhi sultanate of Bidjapur in 1097/1686; and the Kutb Shâhi sultanate of Golkonda in 1098/1687) their lands eventually became one great Mughal province—except for those tracts which had been taken by the French soldier M. (Michel Joachim Marie) Raymond (corrupted locally to 'Musa Rafrim'), d. 25 March 1798, are worth notice.

The city water supply depends on tanks, to which modern waterworks are now attached, excavated in former times. The Husayn Sâgar, about 8 sq. miles (2100 hectares), lies between Haydarabad and Sikandarabad, the road between the two cities running along the band on its east; it was originally excavated by Ibrahim Kûtb Shâh in 983/1575 as a reservoir for Golkonda and was filled by a channel cut from the Mûsî. South-west of the city is the Mir 'Alam tank, built by French engineers in the Niçâm's service early in the 19th century, while the Mir Diumla tank to the south-east, now no longer used, was constructed in 1035/1625.

Of European monuments the old British Residency of 1803-5, now a women's college, and the tomb of the French soldier M. (Michel Joachim Marie) Raymond (corrupted locally to 'Musa Rafrim'), d. 25 March 1798, are worth notice.
Kilid Khan, entitled Nizam al-Mulk, set the internal administration in order (he had indeed been rühadār of the Deccan some six years earlier, but had then had insufficient time at his disposal to reorganize the province). This noble, the ablest man in the Mughal empire, was after two years recalled to Dilli to become chief minister, but retained his Deccan appointment, leaving Mubāriz Khān to govern as his agent at Ḥaydarābād. The latter, instigated by Nizām al-Mulk's enemies, opposed him on his return to the Deccan to combat a Marāthā invasion, but was decisively defeated at the battle of Shākarkhelīdār (q.v.) on 22 Mufrarrām, 1137/11 October 1724, the date usually taken as the beginning of Nizām al-Mulk's dynastic rule over the Deccan, although his independence had been virtually complete two years earlier when he led the opposition against the Mughal kingsmakers, the Sayyid brothers of Bārha. After his victory he marched for Ḥaydarābād, which he made his capital; the Mughal emperor Muhammad Shāh, wise enough not to oppose him further, deposed the Mahrātā agent and henceforth blessed the award of the further hereditary title of Āṣaf Dīāh.

Āṣaf Dīāh had soon to recognize the power of the Marāthās in the Deccan, to whom the Mughal emperor had in 1130/1718 granted the right to levy the cess known as cawn, one-fourth of the land revenue; their demands were met by Āṣaf Dīāh's agreement to pay this tribute from his own treasury—thus excluding the Marāthā tax-collectors from the necessity of entering his dominions; and continuing to publish the unauthorized sardeṣhmukhī and rābhdārī extortions [for these taxes see marathās]. The agreement was concluded on behalf of Shāhāb, the Marāthā ruler; but the Marāthā Peshwā Bādīl Rāo, now rising to a position of great power, pursed a more aggressive policy towards Āṣaf Dīāh, who in 1140/late 1727 invaded Mahārāshṭra against him. Bādīl Rāo's light guerrilla cavalry eventually completely out-manoeuvred Āṣaf Dīāh, who did not receive the expected support from the Peshwā's rivals, and the campaign ended with the cession of several border forts to the Marāthās. Local conflicts, however, continued, until eventually by a secret agreement between Āṣaf Dīāh and the Peshwā the Marāthās left the Deccan undisturbed except for the levy of cawn on condition that Ḥaydarābād remained neutral during the course of the Mughal empire. This noble, the ablest man in the hands of Asaf Dīāh, returned to Dilli, Āṣaf Dīāh had no sooner re-ascended the Mughal throne—doubtless hoping thereby to be able to rule the Deccan as his deputy. Ghazī al-Dīn marched from Dilli with his army, and, though indecisive, not unsuccessful, obtained the award of the further hereditary title of Āṣaf Dīāh.

In 1178/1765 the coastal districts north of Mādrās (the "Northern Circars" [i.e., sarkārs] of the older histories) were ceded to the British by the Mughal emperor, having been previously under French administration. Nizām 'All considered these tracts to be a portion of his dominions, and in the following
year advanced to recapture them, but without success; the British negotiated a treaty whereby they re-
maintained the districts and undertook to maintain a
body of troops for employment by Haydarabad
whenever required; the treaty was extended in 1768 to include the Nawwâb of Arakât in the obligations
to assist the Niżâm. In 1790, when war broke out
between Tipû Sultan [v.] and the British, a tripart-
tite offensive and defensive agreement was concluded
between Haydarábâd, the Maráthás, and the East
India Company, who shared the land ceded by Tipû
Sultan to be kept for peace. The treaty further
promulgated in 1791, it was to include the Nawwâb of
the late ruler's brother Mubarîz al-Dawla was im-
perilously; the Nizám's services in the revolt the districts of Uthmanabad and the Raycur
dbâb were restored and the "assigned districts" of Barâr became a British trust territory. Niżár
dawla died in 1859 and was succeeded by his three-
year-old son Mir Maḥbûb al-Dawla. The treaty was
extended in 1768 to include the Nawwâb of Arkat in the obligations on payment of a 5 per cent duty.
*Ali's health was failing, and the Nizám
In 1803 Niżám 'Alî's health was failing, and the
Maráthâ râджâs Holkar and Sindhi, dissatisfied
alike with the reinstatement by the British of Bâджi
Râo II as Peşwâ and the possible accession in
Haydarábâd of the pro-British heir-apparent Sikan-
dar Dîjah, prepared to invade the Niżâm's dominions. The British and Haydarábâd campaign under
Welliesley against the dissident Maráthâ forces culminated in the battles of Ase ("Assaye") and Arête
when the British in turn agreed, the bâitions and secured the safety of the Niżâm's do-
minions. Sikanârar Dîjah duly succeeded as Niżâm in the same year; during his reign of twenty-six years
the Peşwâ was overthrown (1818) and the British,
who had thereby technically succeeded to the right
of exacting tâush, released the Niżâm from the obli-
gation to pay it. Sikanâr was succeeded in 1829 by
his son Nâṣir al-Dawla, who reigned for twenty-
eight years with a rare spirit of religious toleration.
The notable events of his reign included the suppres-
sion in 1839 of a Wabhâbî [v.] conspiracy, in which
the late ruler's brother Mubâriz al-Dawla was im-
plicated; serious Šhîl-Sunni riots in 1847, which
did not abate until the Niżâm's government made a
pro-Suni settlement; the assignment in 1853 of the districts
of Bâdar, Uğmánábâd (Naldrug) and the Raycur to the British who
maintained a British auxiliary force, not part of the
Niżâm's army, of 5000 infantry, 2000 cavalry, and
four field batteries of artillery, and to release the
Niżâm from the unlimited obligation to provide
service and assistance in the event of war; and,
perhaps the most significant event in the modern history of Haydarâbad as a state, the accession of
Nawwâb Sâllâr Dîjah [v.] as minister in 1853.

When Nâṣir al-Dawla died in May 1857 his eldest
son Afgâl al-Dawla succeeded to the throne at a
critical period in Indian history, for it was feared
that if Haydarâbad joined the Sepoy Mutiny the whole of Bombay and Southern India would follow
suit; but Haydarâbad adhered to the British cause, and in consequence of the Niżâm's services in the revolt the districts of 'Uthmânabad and the Raycur
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1884, and was succeeded by his son, the present Nizam Mir 'Uthman Ali Khan Bahadur Fatih Djang, in 1911. Under both these rulers the process of modernization of the state continued, with notable improvements in sanitation, education, communications and other public works; further departments parallel to those of British India were introduced, including a government department of publications, and the excellent department of archaeology which, besides assuming responsibility for the preservation of the archaeological monuments of the state, undertook an extensive programme of research and publication in which much attention was given to Hindú and Buddhist material (for example the caves at Adzentía, Elurá [g.v.] and Awrangábād; the corpus of Telugu inscriptions, etc.) as well as to Muslim history and monuments. Muslim learning in a wide field was represented by the Haydarábad journal Islamic Culture (1927). The political boundaries of the state remained more or less unchanged, except that administration was divided into Districts of Barár were leased in perpetuity to the British government in 1902 at an annual rental of 25 lakhs of rupees; while the titular sovereignty of the Mughal emperor at Díhil had been theoretically recognized by Haydarábad until the deposition of the last emperor in 1902, it was explicitly asserted by Lord Reading in 1926. The British title of "Exalted Highness" was conferred on the Nizám in 1918 in recognition of Haydarábad's contribution to the allied war effort, and in 1936 Barár was added to his title, the heir-apparent being styled "Prince of Barár".

At the time of the partition of India into the new dominions of India and Pakistan the Nizám's government opted for accession of the state to Pakistan; the state was, however, forcibly integrated into the Indian Union in 1948, although maps published in Pakistan continued to show Haydarábad as a part of Pákistán territory for long afterwards. The Indian States Reorganization Commission's recommendations resulted in an Act whereby from 1 November 1956 the former state of Haydarábad was redistributed on a linguistic basis between Bombay [now Maharashtra] (Marathi), Mysore (Kannada) and Andhra (Telugu), Haydarábad city becoming the capital of Andhra Praësth. The Muslim population was much depleted by emigration to Pákistán; although there has been no official discrimination against Muslims in the new predominantly Hindú state; Haydarábad is still an important Islamic cultural centre, with Urdu the common language of Muslim intercourse.

Bibliography: For the early history of the first Nizám al-Mulk see W. Irvine, Later Mughals, ed. and continued by Jadunath Sarkar, 2 vols., Calcutta 1921-2, and bibliography given there; short notices in Kh‘āsr Khán, Muntakhab al-lubāb, Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1869, Eng. tr. in Elliot and Dowson, History of India . . . , vii; Ghulám ‘Ali Asád, Muzaffar-i umira, lith. Kānpur n.d.; Sháh Násir al-Dín, Mu‘allaqat al-qawwá‘, “Nisvat al-mulk,” on the Ilaydarábad mint, the paramountcy of the Rajás and the Muslim intercourses, appeared in Delhi in 1825, and was printed at Paris by Henri-Robert Lamy in 1829; Arabic and Persian translation of this treatise were published in 1861 and 1865. The journalfur the later history of the state, especially the reforms of Sir Sálár Djang: Syed Hossain Bilgrami and C. Willmott, Historical and descriptive sketch of His Highness the Nizám's dominions, Bombay 1883-4; Gazetteer of Awrangabad, Bombay 1884; on these are based the various series (Main and Provincial) of the later editions of the Imperial gazetteer of India, with revised information being continually added from Census reports and the communications of local administrative officers. Of biographies by officials resident in Haydarábad that of Col. Meadows Taylor, Story of my life, 2 vols., London 1879, is notable. See also bibliography to sálár Djang.

Further material relevant to Haydarábad will be found in the following articles: AWRANGÁBAD, BERÁR, BIDÁR, BIDÁJÁPUR, DAKHAN, DAWLÁTÁBAD, Elurá, Golkondá, Gúlbárghá, Kártántaka, Kútbi Sháh, MARÁTHÁS, NALDRUG, PARENDÁ, RAYCÓ?, UGDIR, WARPANG. On the coinage, land tenures, and language, see respectively SIKKA; TENURE OF LAND; URDU. See also the general articles on India under HIND.

(J. Burton-Paige)
The old town, built in a haphazard way, consists of narrow lanes and bystreets lined with dingy, old-fashioned, many-storied houses. A peculiar feature of these houses is that they carry on their roof-tops strange-looking contraptions for catching the sea-breeze blowing from Karachi. These wind-catchers deceived Sir Charles Napier, during his victorious march on Sind, into taking them for small guns. The main street known as Şahî Şâhâyis is slightly wider but is crowded at all hours of the day. In 1847, it was inhabited till recently by Muslim refugees from India who have now been moved to the new colonies constructed for them. In earlier days the fort was surrounded by a ditch, now completely filled with debris, which separated it from the old town (for a full description of the town and the fort as they stood in 1836, see the Gazetteer of the Province of Sind, "B" volume II, Hyderabad District, Bombay 1902, 404). In April 1896, an explosion in the ammunition stored in the fort destroyed many buildings and shops both within the fort and outside. Thereafter the fort was handed over to the civil authorities. In the compound of the blown-up magazine were buried many British officers who fell in the battles of Mîyân and Dubba.

Among the notable buildings in the town are the tombs of the Mîrs, the former rulers of Sind, at the northern extremity of the ridge on which the town stands. While the tombs of the Kalhôrânas are fine specimens of Sindhi architecture, those of the Tâlpurs are a poor imitation of modern styles. All the tombs are richly decorated with coloured tiles set in geometric and floral patterns, but both the colours and designs are of inferior workmanship. Under the Tâlpur rule, the tombs of their vanquished rivals, the Kalhôrânas, are greatly neglected; indeed they still lie neglected although they are now in the midst of a very busy district and are protected under the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act. With the moving of the University of Sind to this town in 1954 and in 1962 of the Sindhi Adabi Board, established by the Government for the development of Sindhi language and literature and for the publication of works of Sindhi authors of Sindhi origin, it has become a prospering centre of cultural activities. The town also houses the recently established Şâh Wall Allâh Academy, devoted to research on the philosophy of Şâh Wall Allâh [see al-Dîhlawî] and his contribution to Islamic religious and theological thought.

The town has considerably expanded in recent years and two new suburban townships—Laţîfshâd and the Industrial Trading Estate—have sprung up, adding to the amenities of the town. The languages spoken are Urdu and Sindhi, and the population consists of many ethnic elements, such as Balûchis, Sayyids, Rûdjîts, pure Sindhis of Dîjât and Mêd origin and the Mewânts.


(A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

HAJDARÂN, an ancient place-name in south-eastern Turkey—which may be located in the neighbourhood of Gabês on the road leading from that town to Kayrawân, according to Ibn Hîdjiya 443/ 14 April 1052. The Sanhadja forces under the command of the Zîrid amîr al-Mu'izz b. Bâdis were annihilated by the Hîlîlî hordes, to whom the Fâtimid caliph in Cairo had handed over Ifriqiya as a reprisal for its recognition of the ʿAbbâsîd caliph of Baghdîd. There were not two battles at Hajdarân, taking place, at one year's interval, on the same day and in the same place, as a misinterpretation of a passage in the Bayâns of Ibn ʿIdhârî has suggested. After fondly entertaining the hope of enrolling the Banû Hîlîl and minimizing the importance of an invasion whose causes are perhaps as much demographic as political, the Zîrid stayed all to stop the barbarian flood. Hajdarân commemorates the collapse of the Zîrid power, the end of the civilization typified by Kayrawân and the start of a new era for the whole Maghrib, which thereafter, progressively from East to West, was to suffer from an increase in nomadism so serious that its effects are still visible today.


(H. R. IDRIS)

HAYFÂ, modern Haifa, a port at the foot of Mount Carmel. The name does not occur in the Bible, but appears frequently in the Talmud and in later Jewish sources, and is mentioned by Eusebius as 'Egaz. In the early Muslim centuries Haifa was overshadowed by 'Akkâ [q.v.], and is first described by Nâşir-i Khusrav, who was there in 438/1046. He speaks of the palm-groves and numerous trees of this village (diš), and mentions the nearby sands of the kind used by Persian goldsmiths and called by them diš, which he said, he also found shipwrights who, he said, made the large, sea-going ships called ʿDjûdî [Safar-nâma, ed. and Fr. trans. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1881, text 18, trans. 60; ed. Kaviani, Berlin 1340 s., 26; English version in PPTS, iv, 13].

The Crusaders on their way south at first by-passed Haifa. They soon turned their attention to this useful port, perhaps still containing a shipyard, and ca. Shawwdî 493/August 1100, after a siege of about a month, captured Haifa with the help of a Venetian fleet. According to Albert of Aix (vii, 22-5, RHC.Occ., iii, 531 ff.) the population were Jews, who inhabited this place with a special grant from the Fâtimid Caliph, for which they paid tribute, and who defended it in arms, with the help of Muslim troops. After the capture, the Jewish and Muslim garrison and population, apart from a few who escaped, were assembled and massacred.

Under Frankish rule Haifa acquired some importance, and was often a subject of dispute between the Frankish barons. Idrisi, whose account belongs to this period, describes it as an excellent anchorage and as the port of Tiberias (ed.吉ildeimeister, in ZDPV, viii (1885), Supp.). During the wars between the Crusaders and the Muslims, the fate of Haifa, like other ports on the Palestine coast [see ʿAkkâ, ʿAyyârîyya, ʿYâfa], was linked with that of 'Akkâ.
In 583/1187, after the fall of 'Akka, Haifa, with other places, was occupied by Saladin's forces (Baha al-Din b. Sha‘shu‘i, Rawdatayn al-Suljndiyya, ed. G. Shayyal, Cairo 1964, 79; Abu Shama, Rawdatayn, ii, 88; Muhammd al-Hamawi, al-Ta'rikh al-Mansuri, ed. P. A. Graznevich, Moscow 1960, fol. 92 b; Ibn Wsii, Mu‘assirm al-kurbd, ed. G. Shayyal, ii, Cairo 1957, 202. In view of the evidence of the Muslim sources, the statement of some Frankish sources, repeated by most modern Western historians of the Crusades, that Haifa was captured before the fall of 'Akka must be rejected (see W. B. Stevenson, Crusaders in the East, Cambridge 1907, 205). In 587/1191, anticipating the Frankish recovery of 'Akka, Saladin demolished the walls and fortifications of Haifa, before abandoning it to the Franks. Haifa now remained in Frankish hands, and was refortified by King Louis IX of France ca. 1250-1. In 663/1265 it was abandoned by its inhabitants before the advance of Baybars, who razed its fortifications to the ground. It was later recovered by the Franks, and was finally reconquered by the Mamluk Sultan al-Ashraf Khallil in 690/1291, after the reconquest of 'Akka.

In the Mamluk period Haifa was affected by the general policy of keeping the Palestine coast in a state of devastation, as a precaution against a return by the Crusaders. Kalkashandi mentions it only as a ruin (Sabh, iv, 155 = Gaudefroy-Demobynes, La Syrie a l‘époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, 224). The first Ottoman survey registers of the conquest [see DAPTRA KGAPKAN] do not list Haifa among the inhabited places. At about the same time Piri Reis, in his description of the Palestine coast, mentions only a ruined castle (U. Heyd, A Turkish description of the coast of Palestine in the early sixteenth century, in IEJ, vi (1956), 206 and 210-1). By 1012/1601, however, a Turkish document speaks of Frankish merchants who "used to come" to the port (iskele) of Haifa. They had stopped coming because of molestation, which was therefore to cease (U. Heyd, Ottoman documents on Palestine 1552-1615, Oxford 1960, 129). In this period Haifa seems to have formed part of the possessions of the 'Arabah (q.v.) family. In 1032/1623 it was besieged by Fakhr al-Din II Ma‘n (q.v.), who offered to raise the siege if Ahmad Ibn Tarabulus and another man destroyed the walls of Safad. The latter, however, preferred to destroy Haifa rather than risk its falling into the hands of his enemy (I. Ben-Zvi, Erez-Yisra‘el we-yishuv Yisra‘el, Jerusalem 1877, 851; P. Carali, Eres-Yisra‘el we-yishuv dh Ahwatz, ed. P. Constantino Bacha, Harlez n.d. (2 1927), 45 ff.).

The new village built by Shaykh Zahir was the nucleus of modern Haifa. After his fall it was ruled by Djazzár Ahmad Pasha, and in 1799 was captured by the French, who, however, abandoned it after their failure to take 'Akka. In 1837 it was captured by Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt, and in 1840, with 'Akka, suffered damage when the two ports were bombarded by Turkish, British, and Austrian ships. The gradual silting up of the port of 'Akka had resulted in a diversion of traffic to Haifa, which began to grow in size and importance. The Jewish population was increased by newcomers from Morocco, Turkey and later from Europe. A new element was the Templars, a group of German Protestants from Württemberg who settled in Haifa in 1868. Though their purpose in coming was pious, they inaugurated the modern economic development of Haifa. They built roads, introduced four-wheeled carriages, and established regular passenger services to 'Akka and Nazareth. Among other activities, they built a steam-mill, planted vineyards, and introduced modern agricultural methods. Another group of religious settlers were the Baha‘is (q.v.), the followers of Baha‘i Alíh (q.v.) who died in exile near 'Akka in 1892. The tomb of his precursor the Báb (q.v.) on the outskirts of Haifa had been attacked by the Turkish authorities, and was a mausoleum on the slopes of Mount Carmel; Haifa is the administrative centre of the Baha‘i religion.

In 1886 work was begun on a government carriage road from Haifa to Tiberias and Djinn; in 1896, on the occasion of the visit of the German Emperor and Empress, a pier was built, and a carriage road was constructed from Haifa to Jaffa. Despite these developments the population remained small. Towards the end of the 19th century Turkish estimates put it at about 6000 souls, most of them Muslim; by the outbreak of war in 1914 they had risen to between 10,000 and 12,000, of whom about half were Muslims, and the rest Catholic and Orthodox Christians, with a few hundred each of Jews and of Germans and Austrians. The Jewish impressions of the German and Jewish settlers, and their work, see Bereketzade Ismail Halaki, Yid-ta‘ maid, Istanbul 1332/1914, 132 ff.). In late Ottoman times Haifa was the seat of a kad¿ in the sandjak of 'Akka in the vilayet of Bayrut.

On 23 September 1918 Haifa was occupied by British troops and, as part of the mandated territory of Palestine, entered on a phase of intensive growth and development. A new era in the economic life of
the town had already begun with the opening, in 1905, of the Dar'asidah branch of the Hijáz railroad [q.v.]. This, by linking Haifa with Damascus and Haurán as well as with Arabia, had given a great impetus to its development as a port. The low freight charges, made possible by the gift capital of the Hijáz railroad, gave it an immediate advantage over both Jaffa and Beyrút. In 1912 a new line linked Haifa with Southern Palestine and Egypt; the port was improved in 1921, and a major expansion completed in 1933, by which date the tonnage entering Haifa harbour had quadrupled in ten years. The completion of the oil pipeline from ʻIrák in 1933 and of the refinery in 1939 also contributed greatly to the economic growth of the city. These developments helped and were helped by a considerable Arab immigration into the city, and, especially in the thirties and forties, by the immigration of large numbers of Jews, chiefly from central and eastern Europe. Cenuses held under the Mandate show the following population figures: 1922: 9,377 Muslims, 8,863 Christians, 6,250 Jews, 164 others; 1931: 20,324 Muslims, 13,824 Christians, 15,923 Jews, 332 others. By the end of the Mandate, in 1948, the population of Haifa was estimated at 120,000, two-thirds of whom were Jews and the rest Arabs.

On 27 April 1948 the general commanding British troops in Haifa informed Arab and Jewish leaders that he was going to concentrate his forces in the port area and the roads leading to it, and withdraw them from the rest of the city. This announcement was followed by a swift struggle, which left the city in Jewish hands, and, after abortive negotiations for a surrender, by the departure, by sea to ʻAkka and Lebanon or overland to Nazareth, of the greater part of the Arab population. The circumstances of this departure remain obscure and controversial (for varying accounts, see Ārif al-ʻArif, al-Nabka, i, Beirut 1956, 205-23; R. Gabbay, A political study of the Arab-Jewish conflict, Geneva-Paris 1959, 94-5; J. and D. Kimche, Both sides of the hill, London 1960, 115-6, 118-24; G. Kirk, The Middle East 1945-1950, London 1954, 261-3; Walid Khalidi, The fall of Haifa, in Middle East Forum, December 1959, 22-32; Muhammad Namr al-Khatib, Min al-ʻarab al-waṭanî, n.p. [7 Damascus] 1951; N. S. Lorch, The edge of the sword, London 1961, 116-100; H. Sacher, Israel, the establishment of a state, London 1932, 241-5; R. D. Wilson, Cordon and search, Aldershot 1949, 167 ff. and 199).

At the present time (1963) there is an Arab population of about 20,000 in Haifa, including Muslims, Druzes, Bahá'ís, and Christians. Most of the Muslims live in the Wādī Niṣān quarter, on the slopes of Mount Carmel. The Great, or ʻIzaryana Mosque, damaged during the fighting in 1948, was repaired and brought into use again in June 1949. The Carmel village of Kafr ʻAyrūs, inhabited by Ahmādīya [q.v.], is now also within the city limits of Haifa.


Hāyīl or Hājīl, chief town (pop. 20,000 in 1987) of the district of Ḥājīl in Central Arabia, former capital of the Rashīd dynasty of Najd after 1340/1922 a provincial capital of the enlarged realm of the House of Suʿūd (since 1351/1932 the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia). Ḥājīl, bounded on the north by the basin of the Great Naḍf, forms the natural northwestern limit of Najd, although residents of the Ḥājīl area sometimes refer to al-ʻAsāq as the northernmost district of Naḍf proper. Ḥājīl, situated at an altitude of 979 metres near the eastern edge of the granite massif of Aqīl, lies at the heart of the dira of Shammar [q.v.] (of Tāy; of the classical historians), dominant tribe of the area. The hill of Samra, also known locally as al-Mawikīda, bounds the town on the east; the ridge Umm Arğāb forms a barrier on the north. The name Hājīl was first applied to the area adjacent to the town of the settlement, itself originally known simply as al-ʻAṣāq. Hājīl was mentioned by the poets Imruʾ al-Kays and Tāräṣ b. al-ʻAbd. Sprunger identifies Hājīl with the Arme Kome of Ptolemy.

The Ḥājīlīs inhabited the region Hājīl submitted to Wahhābī [q.v.] rule in 1202/1786-7, and in the early years of the 19th/19th century were marked by disputed between the Houses of Ibn ʻAli and Ibn Rashīd for local authority. The forces of Ibrahim Pasha, commander of the Turkish-Egyptian expeditionary force, exacted tribute from Hājīl after the fall of al-Dirayya [q.v.] in 1233/1818. Occupation troops entered the town again in 1253-1837. In 1255/1838 the House of Rashīd became firmly established as rulers of Hājīl under the suzerainty of Al Suʿūd. Independent Ḥājīl Shammar reached the height of its power under Muhammad Ibn Rashīd, ruler of Hājīl between 1289/1872 and 1315/1897. The town then had a population of about 20,000 in four quarters around the market square, al-Masāhba. On the northeast was Barazn fortress, the construction of which was begun by Muhammad Ibn ʻAli early in the 13th/19th century. The Lubda quarter was on the south; al-Makka on the west; and Affān on the northwest. Commerce was in the hands of 80 merchant families from al-Naḍf in Iraq. At the mosque in Barazn was the religious law school of al-Margahī, and the Lubda quarter had a similar institution.

Muhammad b. Bāhā, an armourer at Hājīl during this period, was famous throughout Arabia for his decorated weapons. Hājīl and its environs were stricken by an epidemic ca. 1288/1871, when many of the townsman died. Doughty estimated the population to be only about 500 at the time of his visit in 1294/1877. After the death of Muhammad in 1315/1897, large parts of the town were destroyed during a period of dynastic disputes that weakened the House of Rashīd. The successors of Muhammad received active assistance from the Ḥājīl region: ʻAbd al-ʻAsāq Ibn Suʿūd, who finally took Hājīl on 1 Rabi I 1340/2 November 1921.

The economy of Hājīl is based on small-scale farming and commerce. Staples long grown in the area, such as dates and grains, have been supplemented by a wide variety of vegetables and citrus fruits. Hājīl lays on the pilgrim track from Iraq, but the economic benefits of this traffic were often lost owing to the lack of public security in the district before 1340/1921. Overland pilgrim traffic was diverted, ca. 1383/1963, to the north through the district of
al-Djawf [q.v.]. Muhammad Ibn Rashid was known for the quality of his horses; he kept some 500 head in the Hā'il area and was called "Aziz b. Mușād b. Bājlūlī, who was installed c. 1341/1323 by 4Abd al-'Azīz Ibn Su'ūd. He administers an area of some 160,000 square kilometres including the towns of Kībā, Taymā, and Khaybar.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Bishr, *Unmān al-maǧdād* (Cairo 1373); Lady Anne Blunt, *A Pilgrimage to Najd* (London 1888); C. M. Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta* (Cambridge 1888); J. Euting, *Tabakht al-Shāfīْīyya*, iv, 220, a good general account of the region.

**Important quarters in the modern town, in addition to those mentioned above, are al-Djundayda, al-Zabārā, and al-Wusayţā. The garden suburb of al-Suwayfīla is now contiguous with Hā'il, and the formerly barren tract known as al-Nukra, between Hā'il and Khufā, is cultivated.**

The flora is not as rich as in the north, but there are many coffee-groves, and luxuriant in all the glories of gorgeous vegetation, amongst which banana-leaves could be plainly distinguished, waving their green heads!" Glaser considered that the best coffee of al-Ḥayma came from the region of al-Urr. Rathjens and von Wissmann mention fig trees, peaches, and large sycamores to provide shade. These two authors and Deflers give other details on the flora.

The district of al-Ḥayma is believed to be Hamdānī's land of the Akhrādī, an offshoot of Hamdānī. Today the district is regarded as a stronghold of Zaydism, even though the Ismā'īlīs of the tribe of Yām in Nafrān [q.v.] penetrated there during their advance on Ḥarāz in the 19th century. In the last years of the Mutawakkilite Kingdom of the Yaman and the first years of the Yaman Arab Republic, the People's Republic of China built a paved highway from the Hudayda through al-Ḥayma to Su'ān [q.v.].

**Bibliography:** In addition to the works cited in E1, see Husayn b. 4All b. Wils, *Al-Yaman al-Kubrā* (Cairo 1962); A. Deflers, *Voyage au Yemen* (Paris 1889); W. Harris, *A journey through the Yaman* (Edinburgh 1893); and C. Rathjens and H. v. Wissmann, *Südarabien Reise* iii, Hamburg 1934 (maps and photographs).

---

**HAYIL [see HAYR].**

**HAYS [see Supplement].**

**HAYSA BAYSΑ, nickname of the Arab poet Shihāb al-Dīn Abū 'l-Fawāris Sa'd b. Muhammad b. 'Alī al-Šayfī al-Tamīmī. He was born c. 492/1098-9 and died at Baghdad on 6 Shaban 574/11 January 1379. He studied fiqh under al-Wazzan al-Shāfī, at Rayy and bājdī under 4Abd b. Wallīb Husayn b. Muhammad al-Zaynabī and others, but turned to poetry and belles-lettres and gained fame by the elegance of his style. At Hilla he eulogized the Banū Anushiwān b. Ḥālid and especially of the latter's rival 4All b. Tārrād al-Zaynabī. He also eulogized other grandees of his time, e.g., al-Djawād Muhammad b. 4All, the Atbgeg Gi'hāzī b. Ẓangī, and the Begtgegnīd 4All Kūlīk.**

As a writer Hayṣa Bayṣa is a representative of the florid style in vogue in Arabic poetry and ornate prose from the 10th to the 12th century. In his odes he praised the caliphs, e.g., al-Mustarshīd, al-Muṣṭafī, and al-Mustadī, but also the Sa'dīyūt inhabitants, e.g., Muhāmid b. Muḥammad and his brother Mas'ūd b. Muḥammad, after whose death he was imprisoned for a while by order of al-Muṣṭafī. He enjoyed the patronage of the vizier Anūshīwān b. Ḥālid and especially of the latter's rival 4All b. Ẓurūl b. al-Ẓarāzi. He also eulogized other grandees of his time, e.g., al-Djawād Muhammad b. 4All, the Atbgeg Gi'hāzī b. Ẓangī, and the Begtgegnīd 4All Kūlīk.

Hayṣa Bayṣa was very proud of his Arab lineage, claiming descent from Aχbām b. Șayfī [q.v.]. He dressed himself like a Bedouin chief, riding on horseback through the streets of Baghdad fully armed. He also affected Bedouin speech, pronouncing the qāf like g; he was fond of obsolete words—he got his nickname from the expression fi ḥayṣa bayṣa "in straits and distress"—and addressed everyone in the classical language with all its grammatical niceties. The biographers give instances of the affected style of his private letters which made them nearly unintelligible to the addressee. These weaknesses made him an easy target for the satire of his enemies, e.g., the physician Ibn al-Kaṭānīn (d. 558/1163).

**Bibliography:** Ibn Ḥadār, *Liṣān al-Miṣnān* ii, 19 ff.; Ibn al-_AUDīr, xi, 300; Ibn Abī ʿUṣaybā, i, 233 (in the article on Ḥabīl Allāh b. al-Faḍīl); Ibn Khallikān, no. 254; Subkī, Ṭabarib al-Salīḥyīa, iv, 222; Damīrī s.v. bājdī; Brockelmann S i 445;

J. W. Föck

HAYTĀL [see HAYṬIΛA].

AL-HAYTHAM b. 'ADI Al-TAṬ, Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān, author of historical works (ahkāmī) born at Kūfah ca. 120/738 in a family originally from Manbījī, died at Fām al-Sīlīḥ in 206/721. His father, Abū al-Muḫṭalīb, who was a poet, left him as a child in the care of the Abu Hāriūni family, which is represented in the form of a branch of history. He was freed by the latter after a criticism of Abī Ḥabbās b. Abū al-Muḫṭalīb that his wife's family had slanderously attributed to him, and that the Abbasid court more or less regularly from the 3rd/9th to the 6th/12th century, most of whose works have been lost. The Fihrist (Ibn al-Kalbi, Abu Mikhnaf and other authors of the Abbasid period, etc.), genealogy for himself. On the whole, he is blamed for an impropensity of his stories (K. al-Mu'ammarīn; Khawdīm al-Khulafā; Fihrist vii, 209-211; Askalānī, vi, 207-209; J. W. Fock).—It is current in translations from the Greek, and in the researches and systems that draw their inspiration from them. According to the taste of the various thinkers, and (2) of the "Hellenistic Philosophers" (falsafīyā), we find it again in the treatises of 'Imād al-kalām which discuss the arguments of both of these groups.

A complete survey would be very extensive. The following constitute some points of reference:

1. In Abū Bakr al-Rāzī, al-hayūlā is the third of the "Five Eternals (i.e., Principles)", in its strict sense of "principle matter" (Raḍā'il falsafīyya, ed. F. Kraus, Cairo 1939, i, 195 ff.).—A recession and summary of al-Rāzī's arguments was made in Persian by Nāṣīr-i Khusrāw, and in Arabic by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī. The "Second Eternal", the Universal Soul (al-nafs al-kulliyāyya), shook and agitated Matter in order to produce the world—without success; it needed the help of the "First Eternal", al-Bārī', the Creator (op. cit., 308). Matter is then subjected to Form.

2. Emanatist world-views, particularly in Shi'iism, take up the theme of Primary Matter, emanating or radiating from the Supreme Principle, and eternal. In Karmatī cosmology, as well as, for example, in the Kītāb al-Yanābī of the Isma'īlī Abū Ya'qūb al-Sidjāstānī (4th/10th century), al-hayūlā is the third emanating Principle. According to al-Sidjāstānī, it is when the First Intelligence imagines its "Follow", the Universal Soul, that Matter comes into being. The last "is powerless to manifest itself by itself; it needs the help of Form, that is Nature, since Matter is by definition that which can manifest itself only with the help of something else" (text and trans. apud H. Corbin, Triologie ismaélienne, Tehran-Paris 1961, 62/85). We find an analogous cosmogenical process in Ibn Sinān, but here al-hayūlā is replaced by the Celestial Body.

Three characteristics seem to be inherent in this Isma'īlī Matter: (a) it is pure virtuality vis-à-vis Form (cf. also Mullā Sadrā Shīrāzī, 4th/10th century); it can "manifest itself" only by means of Form; (b) it has, as it were, a positive desire for Form; (c) it nevertheless keeps its autonomous position as the third emanating Principle. Nāṣīr-i Khusrāw says that when all the souls of the sublunary world have found their true Homeland again, not only the Universal Soul, but Abū Bakr al-Rāzī would have it, but Matter also "will be liberated, released from its subjection to Form, just as it was in pre-eternity" (H. Corbin, introduction to the Kītāb Dhīmān al-hayūlā yawmān of Nāṣīr-i Khusrāw, Tehran-Paris 1953, 133). The "desire for Form", constitutive of Matter, therefore remains, as it were, ambivalent: it is a positive desire to be manifested in Being, but a desire that is also a subjection. It is a force that is both negative and positive.

A tradition attributed to Empedocles had a great effect on the elaboration of Isma'īlī systems (cf. Asīn Palaçios, Atenismarr wa su Escuela, Madrid 1914, chap. V, 54 ff.). In the extracts of pseudo-Empedocles reproduced by the Kītāb al-Mīlāl wa-l-nīḥal of al-Shahristānī (ed. Cairo 1320, ii, 168), the first, and thus the most noble "Thing Caused" is called al-'unsur, "(primordial) Element!", simpler than Intelligence, Soul, Nature and the Mixtures.
This ʿunṣūr, the First of the Five Emotions (the same theory is found in the summary of Thāle given by al-Shahrastānī, op. cit., 158), seems to have done much to foster the idea of a primordial spiritual or intelligible Matter (al-ḥayūlā al-rābīʿiyya). We find the idea of this again in Mullā Ṣaḥdār ʿṢhīṣāz in Iran, in Ibn ʿArabī, al-Ḥikma al-Makrama in Andalus. In this sense, too, ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Dīlī calls God the Ḥayūlā of the Universe.

3. The Rasāʿīl ʿlīkhwān al-Ṣafāʾ give us, as it were, an abridged (and sometimes rather clumsy) version of the Ismāʿīlī views on Primordial Matter. The ṣūṣāla on “matter, form, time and place” (ed. Cairo 1347/1928, ii, 4 ff.) reaffirms clearly that the principle of individuality (contrary to the Aristotelian tradition) comes not from matter but from form. “All bodies are of one single genus—which is of one single substance and one single matter. Their differences come from form; this is why purer and nobler than others” (op. cit., 6). It is ʿūrū, not ḥayūlā, that is changeable and volatile (cf. ṣūṣāla on “Intellect and the Intelligible”, iii, 230-2).

The ṣūṣāla on “Matter and Form” (ii, 4-5) explicitly states that ḥayūlā can be understood in four ways: (a) “the Matter of art”, ḥayūlā al-ṣandāʿa, every substance that serves as material for the craftsman; (b) “Physical Matter” or “the Matter of nature”, ḥayūlā al-ṭabāʿa, that is the “four elements” of which all sublunary bodies are composed, and to which they return when they decay; (c) “the Matter of the Whole”, ḥayūlā al- kull, “the absolute (mūlāb) body from which the Cosmos emanated”; (d) “primary Matter” (or, here, rather “primordial Matter”), al-ḥayūlā al-ʿālī, defined as simple, intelligible “substance” (dawāḥir), not perceptible to the senses, and as the “form” (ṣūrā) of all Selfhood (hwawūyya).

The term ḥayūlā, then, is used for “secondary matter” (already formed), as well as for “primary matter” — or rather the ʿlīkhwān al-Ṣafāʾ do not refer to this classical distinction; their idea of ḥayūlā ʿālī is not that of “pure potentiality”. In fact, the hierarchy of ḥayūlās begins with their lowest degree, the idea that every existing thing is, in different respects, both “form” and “matter”; each one of the four classes of ḥayūlā is “form” with respect to the class above it. “... The Absolute Body is form in Primordial Matter ... The latter is a spiritual form emanating from the Universal Intellect, which emanates from the Creator” (Rasāʿīl, iii, 230). According to the Ismāʿīlī idea of “form” (see above), all form, even spiritual form, can disappear, since it is limitation. The Creator (al-mubdiʿ) alone remains (op. cit., 231), and every existing thing returns to Him (op. cit., 232).

This hierarchy of the four connotations of ḥayūlā, as synthesized by the ʿlīkhwān al-Ṣafāʾ, accords closely with that subsequently adopted by Ibn ʿArabī. It is, in fact, probably a Hylemorphism, or rather a Hylemorphism remodelled on Neoplatonic lines. Matter exists for form, and, in sublunary beings, form for matter (e.g., al-Ḥārīb, al-Madīnā al-fāḍila, ed. Dieterici, Leyden 1895, 20-1; the term used is mudda, but in one example, mudda wa ḥayūlā: similarly in Maʿānī al-ṣalāḥ, 46). Ibn ʿArabī, in another connexion, stresses the interaction of matter and form, giving priority to form: “It is untrue that matter (mudda) is in some way the cause of form. Form alone is that by means of which matter necessarily exists” (Ṣaḥīḥ, ʿIlāhiyyāt, viii). It follows from this that “form is anterior to matter (ḥayūlā); not that it always exists potentially of itself; but (in composition) it is actuated only by means of matter (mudda)” (ibid., 88). On the following page (69): “Form exists only in matter (ḥayūlā). It should be
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noted here that the world of “material forms” (suwar maddiyya, a common expression) is not confined to the corporeal world. Primary matter, hayuld, can receive forms other than corporeal forms (ad-ḏa'.) Ibn Sīnā appears here to allude to the world of Celestial Souls, showing also, perhaps, some influence of the Shi‘i “spiritual matter”. The world of Separate Intelligences, however, is usually represented as free from all matter.

In the famous Risāla fī l-iṣbīḥ (ed. Mehren, Leyden 1894, 5-7), it is the term hayuld that denotes the first of the three simple Substances that have no existence of themselves: matter, form, accident. They too are pervaded by the impulse of iṣbīḥ, of “desire”; it is with an “innate” (gharīḥ) desire, we might say “an ontological desire”, that matter desires form, without which it does not exist, and form desires matter, as its substratum. We find here again the positive desire for form that we have already found in Isma‘īlī system.

Many other references to the fašāṣīfa could be given. We should note in Ibn Sīnā (an Aristotelian line of thought, influenced by Alexander of Aphrodisias?) the idea of a “material intellect”, al-ṣabī‘ al-hayyulānī, conceived of as pure potentiality vis-à-vis all knowledge, and so called because “of its resemblance to primary matter, by which itself possesses no form, while being the subject for all existing forms” (Nāṣīr, 165). The expression is not found in al-Kindī, or in the Averroës literature, and the later Māturidis, who particularly adopt the term fašāṣīfa, as used by Ibn Sīnā, for the “material intellect”. In certain modern dialects the word hayy, which denotes the name of the principal tribe in the region of the Arabian Peninsula, has only the meaning “to live”, but the name of Eve, the mother of the human race, Hawwā‘, which is explained in Genesis (III, 20) by a Piel form “who gives life”, could well represent the concrete starting point of the same semantic derivation.

In certain modern dialects the word hayy denotes a quarter in a town or settlement, more precisely a quarter inhabited by the same ethnic or tribal element (see Madīnā, Mahāllā).

Bibliography: Robertson Smith, Kinship and marriage in early Arabia, Cambridge 1885; Nöldeke, review of the preceding, in ZDMG, xl (1886), 176; J. Henninger, Le probleme du totémisme chez les Arabes après quatre-vingts ans de recherches, in Actes du VIe Congrès intern. des sc. anthr. et ethn., Paris 1909, ii, 401-4; idem, La société bédouine anciennemen, in L’Antica società beduina (Univ. di Roma, Studi Semitici, ii), Rome 1959, 69-93; Bible du Centenaire, Paris (Société Biblique) 1941, i, 4, n. f.

(H. LECÉRÉ)

HAYY B. YAKZÁN, the name of the principal character of two philosophical allegories, one by Ibn Sīnā, Kīṣāt Hayy b. Yakzān, and the other by Ibn Tufayl, Risāla Hayy b. Yakzān fī asrār al-bikma al-muḥāṣabīyya (L. Gauthier’s vocalization; Hourani gives it as muḥāṣabīyya). Until the end of the 19th century the Risāla of Ibn Tufayl was much better known than Ibn Sīnā’s short work, the contents of which if not the title were unknown. The similarity in titles led to the belief that there was a
close kinship of thought, and at times that the one was a translation of the other. Mehren, *Traité mystiques*, i, 7-8, translates the title given in 1299/1882 to the Risâla published in Istanbul: "Traité Hayy ben Yaqzan sur la philosophie orientale, que l'Imam Abou Djafar ben Thoefli a tiré des ouvrages précieux du grand maître Abou Ali ben Sindâ". The last page containing a note: Ibn Khallikân attributes this treatise to Ibn Sinâ; "perhaps he wrote it in Persian, and so we may have an Arabic translation of it, made by Ibn Thoefli". De Goeje, in Léden, was the first to notice, on examining a manuscript, that Ibn Sinâ's work was in fact written in Arabic and that the title was all it had in common with the other. Its authenticity is now indisputable and it figures in all the bibliographies, but the text was only established and published two centuries after that of Ibn Tufayl.

I. — *Kissat Hayy b. Yakzdn*, by Ibn Sinâ, who wrote it while imprisoned in the fortress of Ferdagdân, probably in 414/1023, as it seems likely that his captivity took place between 412/1021-2 (when the Buyid prince Samâî al-Dawla succeeded his father Shams al-Dawla, who, at the time of his death, still had Ibn Sinâ as his doctor) and 414/1023-4 (when the town of Hamadân was captured by 'Allâ al-Dawla, whose minister he was). The *Account of Hayy b. Yakzdn* is mentioned by Djuzdjapl in his bio-bibliography of Ibn Sinâ, which is repeated by all the Arabic notices. Ibn Sinâ's work inspired the poetic allegory *Hayy ben Melis*, by the Spanish Hebrew author Abraham ibn 'Ezra (?1050-1167).—Critical editions: 1) Mehren, *Traité mystiques*, i, 1889, the text preceded by a kind of paraphrased resume which is not a translation, and accompanied by extracts from the commentary written in Arabic by Ibn Zayla, a disciple of Ibn Sinâ. 2) Corbin, 1952, with a translation which does not follow the Arabic text exclusively, but takes into account the Persian translation and even the Persian commentary. These accompany the text and are also printed *en extenso*; both were written at the request of prince 'Allâ al-Dawla in the five years following Ibn Sinâ's death, by an anonymous writer who may be Djuzdjapl (Corbin, *Avicenne et le récit visionnaire*, ii, 151). The division into paragraphs by the Persian commentator gives great clarity to a text which in itself is all the more difficult to comprehend since it is the proper name of the active Intellect; "Living", since Ibn Sinâ places his main works for him an insurmountable obstacle. To the reader familiar with Ibn Sinâ, however, the *Account* brings a wealth of echoes of themes already discussed, to such a point that the French translation published by A.-M. Goltchon in 1959 is illustrated with a continuous commentary drawn from these very works of philosophy and medicine, thereby following the Persian commentator's advice. Indeed, the latter concluded his work with these words: "It must be realised that a simple statement has been given here of each of the questions discussed in this epistle. A complete exposé of them can be found in the major works. The Master Avicenna has himself discussed them ..." (following Corbin's translation).

Adherence was as close as possible to the Arabic text; this new translation was checked by comparing all the ideas expressed, phrase for phrase and often word for word, with the passages in the great works that they called to mind. This method allows the meaning of the *Account of Hayy b. Yakzdn* to be fully appreciated, both in the general sense and in detail. It is then seen to be a poetic narrative, related in form to the celebrated *Poem of the Soul* and similarly based on a philosophic doctrine which, beneath the decorative imagery, remains very precise.

This philosophical meaning was confirmed by research into the sources. These were discovered in Aristotle, Plato, Porphyry, Galen, Ptolemy, Fârâbî, in the Kur'ân, in popular Semitic and Iranian legends and the Arab geographers. But certain chapters are specifically Avicennist, in particular the three most beautiful ones which conclude the *Account*.

The unity of the work can then be grasped: it is that of the theory of forms taught by Ibn Sinâ. Alike given by the active Intellect which is the last of the pure Intelligences, the material forms constitute the terrestrial world, whilst on the other hand the intelligible forms permit the knowledge of the universe peculiar to the human spirit which, with their help, can pass beyond the attainments of the senses. The material forms of the astral bodies and those of the pure Intelligences are above the active Intellect and the sublunar world, but can also be known. The *Account of Hayy b. Yakzdn* is thus found to include the Avicennist theory of knowledge even as far as its loftiest reaches, the Prime and Necessary Being.

The name given to the work is then easily explained. *Hayy b. Yakzdn* is the proper name of the active Intellect; "Living", since Ibn Sinâ places perfection in life in intelligence and action, "son of the Wakeful One", because he emanates from the penultimate pure Intelligence which knows neither sleep nor inattention. This name is closely connected with the theory of creative emanation professed by Fârâbî and Ibn Sinâ. The active Intellect is also, through knowledge surpassing the perceptible world, the soul's guide towards its prime Principle, the Being that shines forth over all others.

We now give an outline of the *Account*:

The human soul, mastering its sensual faculties, comes with these, as it were while walking, to the edge of intellectual knowledge. A splendid Sage, whose beauty is unassailable by time, appears before it, and the soul desires his acquaintance. He is the first to speak (it is he who gives the intelligibles), a conversation develops; the Sage gives his name—"Living, son of Wakeful". "My profession", he said, "is to travel through all the countries of the world, to be able to embrace them all in an exhaustive knowledge (it is he who possesses all the intelligibles). My face is always turned towards my Father (the Wakeful), and I have received from him the keys to all knowledge". Looking at his interlocutor, the soul
with its human nature, he tells it that its features reveal it to be the possessor of the best of the natures in the terrestrial world; but it must beware of its evil companions. These are the taste for carnal pleasures, violence and giddy imagination, that retails both true and false. It is, however, impossible to remain aloof from these on earth; it is necessary at least to compel them to obey, to preserve a balance, and not to let them take control.

With this warning, the soul reflects and is then quite ready to learn how to keep these difficult companions under restraint. It would be very happy to travel like the Sage. He replies that, in its present condition, it can only make a journey punctuated with halts. And the soul replies by questioning him about the regions that he knows and about which he has undertaken to acquire complete information.

He then sketches out for the soul a metaphysical geography of the world. One of the regions, bounded by the East and the West, is well known and a subject of study; it is there that forms are to be seen in matter, it is the world as ordinarily presented to man. The latter can only penetrate into the other two regions by means of a strength not entirely natural to him, since it must have the help of the active Intellect. Ibn Sinā here makes use of popular geographical data about the terrible Ocean which none can cross, and describes it as the home of matter. The region in the West, where the material forms come for refuge, to lose themselves, just as the sun disappears over the horizon. Symmetrically, the East is the place of origin of the light which the forms, whether material or intelligible, carry with them. A description which takes its features from the mountain of Kāf reveals the land of the intelligibles, reached by the human spirit after a dreadful ascent. To walk above the abyss, to climb ever higher towards more perfect forms, is possible only by means of a vigour renewed by fresh, ever-flowing water from a spring near the motionless source of the Living Being. The two commentators have seen logic in this ever-moving water with which the human intelligence was to revivify itself; as for the source of the living Being, it is motionless because the intelligible form, in the absolute and direct state at the origin of the material form, is quite certainly removed from all mobility. With the help of logic, the reasoning soul can traverse the deserts and darkness of the unknown, the sea of matter, and scale the mountains of the intelligibles. After the darkness of the unknown the soul, still fortified by logic, reaches a great light. It is the light arising from the explanations given by Ḥāyā b. Ṭakān.

Under the symbolical form of a band of émigrés fighting against the inhabitants, the Sage explains to the soul the incessant changing of forms in matter. Many of the terms recur in the Epistle on Love, the Poem of the Soul, the soul which little by little becomes accustomed to being in contact with "the ruin deserted" by previous forms, which has become its body. The forms are the light which creeps into the obscurity of matter, given, according to the latter's requirements in its dark preparation, by the luminous active Intellect. It is for this purpose that Ḥāyā b. Ṭakān must know all beings and all circumstances perfectly. But the corruptible world can only be a ruin temporarily decked out. "Every animal and every plant has come by night into this country", for every form comes invisibly. "Joy and beauty are taken from a distant place", the place whence come the forms which are the light, whether material in beings, or intelligible in the spirit.

Between this living, immaterial Orient and the world of incorruptible matter is located the world of incorruptible matter, that of the astral bodies, nearer than our own to the "window of light". It is the Region of stability and peace, for there the forms are not driven away from matter. The heavens are described as spaces populated with inhabitants whose features express the physical characters of the astral bodies according to Ptolemy. The Empyrean, the ninth sphere, is described as the dwelling of the pure Intelligences, "beyond there is no more inhabited land". The elements are outstripped, the vast earth, the mass of water, winds imprisoned, flaming fire . . .

How can these forms, which have just been shown us under their aspect of substantial forms, be possessed by intelligence as intelligible forms? They are first captured by the five senses, then handed over to the general or common sense which is as it were a guardian responsible for the five paths taken by the watchers for news. It hands over all its prizes to the memory; this places them at the disposal of the intelligence, which gives fecundity to the intelligible forms (that is to say universality), if imagination has not previously spoilt them. Like a sun, intelligence rises between the senses and the imagination, despite the satanic rule that they enact upon it, insinuating themselves through the breath into man's inmost parts. If it succeeds in holding them in a harmonious, submissive state, intelligence lives in a sense in the realm of the angels. It mounts upwards to regard the pure Intelligences themselves, the primordial creation through the medium of which being descends from the prime necessary Being, down to the very lowest creatures. The soul contemplates the Intelligences, each with its own immutable place, grouped round the supreme King like children around their father, in a region without matter.

Above all these, and above all expression, is the King, the prime and necessary Being, in an absolute unity, with none of the divisions that our language attributes to him, "all countenance through his beauty, all hand through his generosity", so dazzling that he is veiled by his own radiance. Some men, those the best, leave the baseness of this world to make their way in solitude towards him.

Here the Sage, the active Intellect, directly intervenes; he reveals that to awaken a human soul to these lofty realities is his own way of serving the King, and adds: "If you wish, follow me towards Him". This invitation is the last episode in the Account.

The links between this work and Ibn Sinā's other writings appear to be extraordinarily numerous, close and precise. If certain translations have failed to grasp them, it is because they have minimised or paraphrased the unexpected terms, while they are in fact the key to the passage in which they occur. On consideration, it is impossible to see a dress in a fancy or theosophy, in those pages; one can only admit that they present the philosopher's thought in a new and poetic, but faithful and coherent, form. A philosopher is not forbidden to be a poet. On several occasions Ibn Sinā showed that he had the ability to be one, and he did not remain dryly didactic, but enriched by his own sensibility the discoveries of his intelligence. The highest knowledge open to the human soul, that of the pure Intelligence which is the King creator, is expressed with a tone of undeniably personal emotion, which is repeated
when the other works speak of knowledge through
the depth of the heart, the sirr. This is the point that
survive intact today. List of the manuscripts and
before 581/1185, the date of the author's death. The
editors: i) Gauthier, Ibn Thofail, 43-51; 2) Gauthier,
Ibn Tufayl, Risdla
account of IHayy b. Yafadn,
written by the Andalusian philosopher
and doctor Ibn Tufayl, the protector of Ibn Rushd,
very probably between 565/1169 and some years
before 581/1185, the date of the author's death. The
Risala is his best known work and the only one to
survive intact today. List of the manuscripts and
texts: 1) Gauthier, Ibn Thofail, 43-51; 2) Gauthier,
Hayy ben Yaqdan, 2nd ed., XXII-XXXIII, com-
pleting the first list included in the ed. of 1900. The
Risala was published for the first time in 1671, with
a Latin translation, by Edward Pocock at Oxford
(reprinted 1700), followed immediately by two
English translations and one Dutch made from the
Latin, and also a German one in 1726. Translations
from the Arabic text: Hebrew, by an unknown
author, with Hebrew commentary by Moses of
Narbonne in 1349; then from the text established by
Pocock: English, Ockley, London 1708 and 1731;
German, Eichhorn, Berlin 1783; Castilian, Pons
Boigues, Saragossa 1900 (repr. Cairo 1905). It is
possible that Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, the first part of
which appeared is 1719, owed something to
Ockley's translation of Ibn Tufayl. Another English
translation by P. Brünnele appeared in London in 1904
(revised A. S. Fulton 1929). Three editions of the
text alone in Cairo 1882, 1921; two in Constantinople,
one in Beirut (1936). Critical edition of the text with
French translation: Gauthier, Algiers 1900, followed
by a new edition of the text, improved by the use
of new manuscripts and accompanied by a new
translation, Algiers 1936. Russian translation,
Kuzmin, St. Petersburg 1920; Spanish, González
Palencia, Madrid 1934, from the text established by
Gauthier.
Without any doubt, Ibn Tufayl borrowed the title
from Ibn Sīnā; but curiously enough, it was to
introduce a philosophical thesis entirely contrary to
that writer's. We have just seen that the very name of
Hāyy b. Yaḥṣān and his rôle were inspired by the
theory of emanation, which makes the active
Intelect the last of the separate Intelligences. By
attributing to it the gift of the Intelligibles to the
human soul, Ibn Sīnā deprived the latter of its
highest intellectual function, namely the abstraction
of the Intelligibles. Ibn Tufayl, says González Palencia
in his introduction (22-3), teaches that one cannot
apply to separate essences either our categories of
thought or our ways of reasoning, and he raised the
question of the unity of human intellect. In our
opinion, Ibn Tufayl went further; for he returns to
the name which denotes the active Intelect to
attribute it to a man. This man, the Philosophos
autodidactus as Pocock called him in the title of his
translation, succeeds precisely in discovering, quite
alone, the sciences and philosophy, and clearly by
means of abstraction. That is to say, he appears as
"the incarnation in man of the active Intelect", as
Gauthier puts it (Ibn Thofail, 89), or better still as
the personification of the specifically human active
Intelect. Its true function is thus restored to man's
intelligence. This is a fundamental change in the
discipline described above, presented in the form of
imaginative writing. This work sums up the con-
tradictions which continued for two centuries in the
West; for it implies the theory that St. Thomas
Aquinas put forward nearly a hundred years later,
that the perfection of human nature requires that
the active intellect should not be external to man
(En Aristotelis librum de anima commentarium,
§§ 730 and 734).

The prologue to the Risala refers expressly to Ibn
Sīnā in respect to the choice of this name and those of
Asāl and Salāmān which occur in the narrative. On
some particular points it refers to his doctrine and
to that of al-Ghazzālī, which are studied and compared
with "opinions expressed in our own time", as words
which have made it possible to isolate the truth
(1936 ed., 6-7). Four long textual quotations from
the Ṭghtardi (ed. Forget, 202-4, French trans. 493-7)
leave no doubt that Ibn Tufayl approved of Ibn Sīnā's
exposé of the Šofā'ī states, their asceticism and the
beginnings of ecstasy, and probably also the
ending of his Account of Hāyy b. Yaḥṣān which,
however, is not quoted verbatim. This harmony of
views is all the more evident in that the freedom with
which he handles his source is also more marked, as
well as the dissatisfaction which Fārābī and the
Šofā'ī inspire in him, no less than the Andalusian
scholars (trans. 10-11 f.). No kind of allusion to any
esoterism in Ibn Sīnā is made.

Ibn Tufayl's story has often been summarized,
among others by Carra de Vaux, E1, art. Ibn
Thofail, and more briefly by Gauthier himself (Ibn
Thofail, 62-3) as follows:

"On a deserted Indian island situated on the
equator, and thus under particularly favourable
conditions, from amidst the ferment of the surround-
ing clay a child was born, with neither father nor
mother. According to another version, the author
tells us, he was brought to the island by a current,
in a chest which the mother, a persecuted princess
dwelling on a neighbouring island, had been compelled
to entrust to the waves to save her child's life. This
child was Hāyy b. Yaḥṣān. He was adopted by a
gazelle which suckled him and acted as his mother.
He grew up, observed and reflected. Possessing a
superior intellect, he was not only able to supply all
his needs with ingenuity but, through a com-
bination of observation and reasoning, he soon
discovered by himself the highest physical and
metaphysical realities. The philosophical system
which he finally evolved, which was naturally that of
the fašasīfa, led him to try to find in mystical
ecstasy the intimate union with God which con-
stitutes at once the plenitude of knowledge and
sovereign, continual, eternal felicity. Withdrawing to
a cave where he succeeded in fasting for forty days on
end, he trained himself to separate his intellect from
the external world and from his own body by
exclusive contemplation of God, to unite himself
with his Lord; in this he finally succeeded. At that
moment, he met Asāl, a devout man who had come
dwelling on a neighbouring island to devote himself in
peace to the ascetic life on this little island which he
believed uninhabited. Asāl teaches language to this
companionship as singular as unexpected, and he is
astonished to find in the philosophic system discover-
ed by Hāyy b. Yaḥṣān a transcendent interpretation of
the religion that he himself professes, as well as of
all the revealed religions. He takes him to the
neighbouring island which is ruled by the devout king
Salāmān, and commissions him to disseminate the
sublime verities that he has discovered. But the project fails. Our two philosophers finally have to recognize that pure truth does not at all suit the vulgar, enslaved by the senses; to penetrate those materialistic intelligences, to act upon those rebellious wills, it is obliged to clothe itself with the symbols that constitute the revealed religions. They therefore left these poor people for ever, recommending them faithfully to observe the religion of their fathers; and they returned to their desert island, to live the superior and truly divine life which very few are privileged to "believe" (Ibn Thofail, 62-3; another more detailed resumé, 101-13). Hayy, Asāl and good king Salāmān represent respectively Philosophy, Theology and simple Faith (Ibn Rochd, 20).

The book can also be divided, under a more schematic form traced out by G. F. Hourani (The principal subject: ..., 40), as follows: 1. The author's introduction, sources of knowledge on mystical philosophy. — 2. Unassisted, Hayy progresses from the most elementary knowledge to the loftiest mystical state. — 3. Harmony of Hayy's philosophy with the religion which Asāl claims to be revealed. — 4. Attractions of the external aspects of religion for the majority of men. — 5. The author's conclusion.

According to Gauthier, the book's essential purpose is to show "the harmony between religion, principally the Muslim religion, and the philosophy of the falāṣīfa" (Ibn Thofail, 89, repeated in Ibn Rochd, 20). Every reader seems to have interpreted the work in his own way. Munk: a simple treatise of natural philosophy; Pocock: the history of an auto-didactic philosopher, whose life traverses the whole as- sent possible for human reason; Renan: Sufi mysticism (cf. Ibn Thofail, 64-6); Meir: it can lead man to the same development as civilization, etc. Gauthier's interpretation was rejected by E. García Gómez, who discovered a popular story bearing some analogies with Ibn Tufayl's work; he claimed to find in it a proof of a source common to both Ibn Tufayl and B. Garcia who, in the 17th century, wrote an allegorical novel in which Gauthier sees an imitation of Ibn Tufayl. The opinion expressed by García Gómez would change the whole perspective of the problem; but this hypothesis does not explain the references to the philosophers clearly indicated by Ibn Tufayl, still less the numerous passages inspired by their works and those of the physicians, without any indication of source but still very recognizable.

Gauthier's thesis is challenged on grounds more in keeping with the subject by G. F. Hourani, who points out (The principal subject, 42) that the prologue, following Ibn Sīna, announces the description of a mystical state, which in fact is dealt with in the second part, that of Hayy's progress, and presented at the end of the book as the object of all his desires, since he abandons men in order to come back to it.

To the reader, it certainly seems that the book's purpose is to show the capacity of the human intelligence. It is capable not only of discovering the sciences and the existence of the soul, but also of somatic intelligences, which the author considered as being attached itself uniquely to Him when He has been found. The journey made by Hayy is necessarily described in terms of the scientific knowledge and philosophy then understood, and at the same time an answer is given to the great preoccupation of the falāṣīfa, by confirming the harmony between philosophy and religion. It is a kind of consummation of the experience of Hayy b. Yaqzan, but it is very difficult to believe that the latter had been imagined in order to provide proof of it. The result however, when acquired, was to be compared by Gauthier and Hourani with the most exclusively philosophical theory of this harmony as expounded by Ibn Rūghd, particularly in the Fasl al-Mahāl. Bibilography: I. Ibn Sīna. Manuscripts noted particularly by Anawati, Essai de bibliographie avicennienne, 1950, no. 219, and Madhavi, Bibliographie d'Ibn Sīna, 1934, no. 65. — A. F. Mehren, Travaux mystiques, fasc. I, Leiden 1889, L'allégorie mystique Hayy ibn Yaqzan, preceded by an article with the same title in Mamluk, 1886. — Risālat Hayy b. Yaqzan, 91-113 in the collection Qamāl al-badā'ī, Cairo 1917, Istanbul 1937, 41-53 in that of Ahmad Amin, Hayy ibn Yaqzan li-ibn Sīna wa-ibn Tufayl wāl-Suhrawardi, Cairo 1952; but the very short work published under this name and attributed to Suhrawardi is in reality the 'Story of the exile from the West', Kifṣat al-ghariba al-gharibiyaha, written to supplement what he considered to be a lacuna in the Hayy b. Yaqzan of Ibn Sīna, which makes no mention of the great Mount Sinai in the esoteric sense. — Critical text, Persian translation, Persian commentary, French translation by H. Corbin, Le récit de Hayy ibn Yaqzan, vol. i of Avicenne et le récit visionnaire, Tehran 1952, followed by vol. ii, Étude sur le cycle d'Avicenne, 1954. — A. M. Goichon, Le récit de Hayy ibn Yaqzan commenté par des textes d'Avicenne, Paris 1959, French translation, with explanatory comments taken from other works of Ibn Sīna, and others, edam, Le prétendu esotérisme d'Avicenne dans le Récit de Hayy ibn Yaqzan, communication to the XXIVth Congress of Orientalists, Munich 1957, published in extenso in Giornale di metafisica, 1959, 538-46; edam, La théorie des formes chez Avicenne, in Atti del XII Congresso internazionale di filosofia, ix, 131-8; edam, Le Sér, l'intime du cœur, dans la doctrine avicienne de la connaissance, in Mélanges J. Bankoé, Prague 1965. II. — Ibn Tufayl. For editions and translations, see the text and Brockelmann, I 460, II 704, S 1 831. Also the 1952 edition by Ahmad Amin, already referred to, and a German translation by Quatremère, in ms. at the Staatbibliothek, Munich; Léon Gauthier, Ibn Thofail, sa vie, ses œuvres, Paris 1909; idem, La théorie d'Ibn Rochd (Averroës) sur les rapports de la religion et de la philosophie, Paris 1909, 168-74, analogy of thought between Ibn Tufayl and Ibn Rūghd; idem, Ibn Rochd (Averroes), Paris 1948; E. García Gómez, Un cuento árabe, fuente común de Ahelofail y de Gracian, in Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, 1926; George F. Hourani, The principal subject of Ibn Tufayl's Hayy ibn Yaqzan, in JNES, xv (1956), 40-6; idem, Averroes on the harmony of religion and philosophy, London 1961. (A. M. Goichon) ḤAYYA (A.) "snake", generic name of the ophi- dians, embracing all kinds of reptiles (mā yānšūd) from the most poisonous to the most harmless, the viper (aṭfār) competing to be the largely disting- uished species among them. Terms such as hanāqūḥ, aym, ḥubūš, usuṣad, rakāša, sīl, etc. are given in classical Arabian to species which are not always easily identifiable from the descriptions in the early zoological works, there being a certain amount of confusion in this field; and present-day terminology is still far from being precise even in dialects and for the species which actually live in the Arabic-speaking countries (see e.g., V. Montel, Faune du Sahara.
occidental, Paris 1951, 81-8); it is desirable that some fresh researches should be made.

There are various ideas on the origin of the snake: some present it as a creature of Satan, others as the result of a metamorphosis, while others hold that it was created by God, Who, when He drove it from Paradise, made it fall at Isfahan or at Sīgīsītān (whence the great number of vipers in this region). The word ḥayyā appears only once in the Qur'ān—

in the description of Moses's staff being changed into a serpent (XV, 21).

There naturally exist in folklore monstrous or fabulous serpents, the most enormous of which is probably the tinnin (see al-Djahīz, Tarbīt, s.v.); here it need be noted only that these animals have an important place in popular beliefs, for they are one of the forms in which dinins most often choose to appear.

The ḥayyā enjoys an extraordinarily long life, never dying a natural death; twice a year, in spring and autumn, it casts its skin and gains fresh strength. When mating, snakes curl themselves one round the other; the female lays 30 eggs (the same as the number of her ribs and of the days of the month), but only a few are hatched because ants gather on the eggs and destroy most of them. The eggs are of elongated shape and of various colours. The female stays with the eggs until the young are hatched, while the male clings tightly close about.

The tongue of the snake is so deeply split that some believe it to have two tongues. Snakes feed on birds, mice, frogs, young chickens and pigeons, eggs, meat, grass, etc., but never on dead animals, and if no food is available they can live on air. They swallow their food without chewing and break down any bones in their stomachs by coiling themselves tightly round a tree. They need no drink, but once having started to drink they may absorb an excessive amount of liquid and die of it; they are particularly fond of milk.

They have eyes like nails, fixed and immobile in their heads, which grow again if torn out in the same way as their fangs, or their tails if cut off. A snake which has become blind or has come blinded from naked men. They possess extraordinarily strong fangs, or their tails if cut off. A snake can swim, but they are unable to climb up walls.

The snake is friendly to the spider, the fox and some other animals, but is very hostile to man, pigs, and weasels. Cats, wolves, eagles, hedgehogs, pigs, etc. all eat snakes and sometimes die of it; in pre-Islamic times some tribes ate them, and this custom is a favourite theme of the satirical poets. In Islam it is as meritorious to kill a snake as to kill an infidel.

Snakes are widely used in medicine. Widely varying interpretations are put upon their appearance in a dream.

For protection against snakes and their poison [see Sallāt], there exist various forms of incantation [see ṭalqat] used by the ṭāki or ṭaqbāt, who may also be a snake-charmer (khwāi [q.v.] or būwāi?).

Bibliography: Dīghīt, Hasayyān, index; Damirī, Ḥayāl al-ḥayāyān, s.v.; Kazwini, ʿAdīṣbāh, s.v.; these works contain material which might profitably be used as the basis for a monograph.

(J. Rūska)

Háyyān b. Khalaṣ [see IBN HÁYYÁN].

Hazaqī [see ṬARQ].

Hazāra [see Supplement, and IRĀN—LANGUAGES].
Sayed Ahmad Barelwi and the Sikhs; Diyar Khan, chief of the Khanpur Gakkafs [q.v.] from 1789-1803; Gulshir Khan, head of the Tanawls, and Nadilb Allah Khan, chief of the Tarins who defeated the Ghurids [q.v.] from 8 f.]. In 599/1203 the Khazars defeated the Khwarizmians here and occupied their Bengal, near the left bank of the Oxus; in Djumada I-II 542/October-November 1896-7 and 1899-1900, the last two being not so

Taking advantage of internal dissensions, the Sikh governor of Rawalpindi, Makkhian Singh, invaded Hazara, occupied the country and built a fort at Saray Salih (Serai Sahib). Emboldened by the Sikh occupation of Kashmir, Makkhian Singh pressed the Tarin chief, Muhammad Khan, also for revenue. This was resisted by the tribe, who attacked the Sikh force, overcame their resistance and murdered the governor. The defeated Sikhs vacated the fort of Saray Salih and retired to the stronghold of Attock built by the emperor Akbar. This reverse was followed by a number of skirmishes between the Hazara tribes and the Sikhs, in which the Sikhs practically always lost. The repeated Sikh reverses brought prince Shri Singh, eldest son of Randjit Singh, the Sikh ruler of the Pind, to the scene; he established himself in the Harspur plain and built a fort at Tarbela. Not satisfied with the measures taken by Shri Singh, Randjit Singh deputed Hari Singh Nalwa, the governor of Kashmir, to subdue the refractory tribes. Hari Singh, known for his ferocity, fell on the tribes and cut them down mercilessly. Nalwa celebrated his victory by building a fort at Nawalgarh and then marched on to lower Hazara. As a reward for his exploits Randjit Singh conferred on him the governorship of the country. His rule, which lasted from 1831 to 1837, was marked by unprecedented barbarity and is still remembered by the residents with horror. It was during the governorship of Hari Singh, founder of the town of Haripur which now houses the biggest telephone equipment manufacturing factory in Pakistan, that the followers of Ahammad Barawli infiltrated into the district and rose against the oppressive Sikh rule, but were defeated and crushed (1828) and finally routed in 1831 at the historic battle of Balakote. That very year Hari Singh brought the semi-independent tribes of the Gakkhars, and the Dhunds under his control. Gradually Hari Singh succeeded in making Ahammad Khan, chief of the Girans who had his sway the various tribes who had refused to recognize his authority. His rule ended with his death at the battle of Djamrud, at the mouth of the Khayar pass, in 1837. The Sikhs, however, continued to hold Hazara till 1847 when it was ceded to the British by Raja Gulab Singh, ruler of Kashmir, in exchange for a part of Diamd Mountain. In May 1847 a British officer, Maj. James Abbott, was deputed to administer and organize the country. For a number of years he remained in Hazara, occupying positions of control and responsibility. He established a fine administration ushering in an era of peace and prosperity for the country. As a tribute to his services the flourishing hill-station of Abbottabad was founded in 1853 and named after him. "Among the people of Hazara he left a name which will not die". The country-wide military campaign also had its repercussions in this district but the disturbance was soon brought under control. Thereafter it remained practically peaceful except for the agrarian riots of 1868 and 1888 in the Aghor valley. It suffered great scarcity in the widespread famine of 1783, and again in 1879-80, 1897-8 and 1899-1900, the last two being not so severe as the previous ones. Hazara has made considerable progress during the post-independence period and with the construction of new roads and marked improvement in the means of communications a new era of increased prosperity has been opened for the district with the merger of the tribal states of Phulka and Amb in 1950 with the district and the establishment of the new capital of Pakistan at Islamabadd in 1959, the district is likely to develop rapidly.


Hazarasp (Persian: "a thousand horses"), a town in Khizarim, near the left bank of the Oxus [see AMO DARYA] at the outlet of a navigable canal, a day's journey from Khiva and 10 farasah from Gurgandi (Hamid Allah Mustawfi, Nusha, 179 ff.). The town had wooden gates and was surrounded by a moat (Mukaddasi, 289), which almost entirely enclosed it, so there in 1616/1229 there was only one entrance. Hazarasp was a strong fortress, and at the same time an important trading centre with large bazaars, lying on the trade route from Amul on the Oxus to Khazarim (Yakut, iv, 471 = Beirut 1957, v, 404). As a result of its military importance, Hazarasp was fought over at various times in the Middle Ages: in Muharram 480/June 1077, Muhammad of Ghzna defeated the Kharatirids who held his sway the various tribes who had refused to recognize his authority. His rule ended with his death at the battle of Djamrud, at the mouth of the Khayar pass, in 1837. The Sikhs, however, continued to hold Hazara till 1847 when it was ceded to the British by Raja Gulab Singh, ruler of Kashmir, in exchange for a part of Diamd district. In May 1847 a British officer, Maj. James Abbott, was deputed to administer and organize the country. For a number of years he remained in Hazara, occupying positions of control and responsibility. He established a fine administration ushering in an era of peace and prosperity for the country. As a tribute to his services the flourishing hill-station of Abbottabad was founded in 1853 and named after him. "Among the people of Hazara he left a name which will not die". The country-wide military campaign also had its repercussions in this district but the disturbance was soon brought under control. Thereafter it remained practically peaceful except for the agrarian riots of 1868 and 1888 in the Aghor valley. It suffered great scarcity in the widespread famine of 1783, and again in 1879-80, 1897-8 and 1899-1900, the last two being not so severe as the previous ones. Hazara has made considerable progress during the post-independence period and with the construction of new roads and marked improvement in the means of communications a new era of increased prosperity has been opened for the district with the merger of the tribal states of Phulka and Amb in 1950 with the district and the establishment of the new capital of Pakistan at Islamabadd in 1959, the district is likely to develop rapidly.

HAZARASPIDS — HAZIM

which thus contributed to the preservation of a native Persian individuality even under foreign dynasties.

From their capital Ishjadj [q.v.], the Hazaraspids ruled over eastern and southern Luristan [q.v.] from about 550/1155-6 to 827/1424, though the extent of their domains varied greatly. They were descended from a Kurdish chieftain, Faḍlō, and were known also as the “Faḍlawi dynasty” after him. The tribes grouped around this chieftain had left Syria (when?) and after wandering through Afcharbāyjān had reached the district round Ushtrān-Kūh in Luristan in the early 6th/12th century. Here in about 550/1155-6 Faḍlō’s descendant in the ninth generation Abū Tāhir (no. 1) gained independence from the Salghūrids [q.v.] in the area round Kūh-ū Sīlūya, and assumed the title “Atābeg” [q.v.]. His son Malik Ḥazarāsp, however (no. 2), after whom the dynasty is named, makes his appearance in history only at the beginning of the 7th/13th century. By driving out the Shīl tribe [q.v.] and extending his domain to just west of Isfāhān, he became the real founder of the small principality. He was clever enough to remain neutral between the ‘Abbāsīd Caliph al-Nāṣir [q.v.] and the Khwārizm-Shāh Muhammad II [q.v.]. In this he was helped by the not inconsiderable forces (infantry and cavalry) which he had been able to assemble round him from Iranian and Arab tribes also recently arrived in the area. On the other hand, his successor Tākla (no. 5), having won many victories over the Salghūrids, finally quarrelled with the Mongols; Hūlagū had him executed in Tabrīz in 655/1257. But in this case as in others the Ilkhan rulers (such as Arghun in 1284 and Gavkhatu in 1296) allowed the local state to remain undisturbed. It was obliged from that time on to bow to their authority, contribute troops and from time to time render homage to successful Ilkhan rulers (such as Arghun in 1284 and Gaykhatu in 1291). In return the Hazaraspids were granted various territories, including Khūzistān. When Afrāsīyāb I (no. 8) tried to go even further and seize Isfāhān, Hamadān and Fārs (690/1291), he finally paid for the attempt with his head in 1296. His successor (no. 9), who grew up at the Ilkhan court, adapted himself remarkably well to their wishes, paid an annual tribute of 91,000 dinārs and even tried to introduce Mongol laws in his territory, without, however, falling out with the *ulamd* and wishes, paid an annual tribute of 91,000 dinārs and after renewed troubles, that his grandson Isfāhān, he became the real founder of the small principality. He was clever enough to remain neutral between the ‘Abbāsīd Caliph al-Nāṣir [q.v.] and the Khwārizm-Shāh Muhammad II [q.v.]. In this he was helped by the not inconsiderable forces (infantry and cavalry) which he had been able to assemble round him from Iranian and Arab tribes also recently arrived in the area. On the other hand, his successor Tākla (no. 5), having won many victories over the Salghūrids, finally quarrelled with the Mongols; Hūlagū had him executed in Tabrīz in 655/1257. But in this case as in others the Ilkhan rulers (such as Arghun in 1284 and Gavkhatu in 1296) allowed the local state to remain undisturbed. It was obliged from that time on to bow to their authority, contribute troops and from time to time render homage to successful Ilkhan rulers (such as Arghun in 1284 and Gaykhatu in 1291). In return the Hazaraspids were granted various territories, including Khūzistān. When Afrāsīyāb I (no. 8) tried to go even further and seize Isfāhān, Hamadān and Fārs (690/1291), he finally paid for the attempt with his head in 1296. His successor (no. 9), who grew up at the Ilkhan court, adapted himself remarkably well to their wishes, paid an annual tribute of 91,000 dinārs and even tried to introduce Mongol laws in his territory, without, however, falling out with the *ulamd* and the dervishes, on whom he bestowed lavish presents. Nor did he discontinue local customs, according to the description given by Ibn Baṭṭūta, ii, 30 ff.; tr. Gibb, ii, 287 ff. of his visit to the country.

After the disintegration of the Ilkhan empire (736/1335) Luristan was repeatedly subject to attacks by the Muzaffarids [q.v.]. They made many incursions, and also interfered in disputes between individual members of the family. More dangerous were the attacks of Timūr, who finally in 798/1395-6 carried off Fīr Ṭabaḥ (no. 14) and two of his brothers to Samarkand. But it was not until about 827/1424, after renewed troubles, that his grandson Ṭabārkhān [q.v.] b. Shāhruḵ ended the Hazaraspid dynasty.

Many details in the history of the Hazaraspids are uncertain, and there are many contradictions in the accounts passed down, so that all sorts of chronological problems arise. The following list of rulers can therefore be given only with reservations:

2) Malik Ḥazarāsp, son of the above; the dynasty is named after him. Mentioned from about 600/1203-4.

The date of his death is given as 626/1228-9 or 650/1254-3.
3) 'Imād al-Dīn, d. 646/1248-9, son of no. 2.
4) Nuṣrāt al-Dīn Kalba, d. 649/1251-2, brother of no. 2. 
Nos. 3 and 4 appear only in Ghafrār (cf. below), fol. 137 f.; in other sources Malik Ḥazarāsp’s reign is reported as continuing until 650 (cf. above).
5) Tākla (Takla), son of Ḥazarāsp, mentioned from 655/1257; executed probably in 657/1259.
6) Shams al-Dīn Alp Arghūn, brother of no. 5, 657/1259 to 673/1274-5.
7) Yūsūfshāh I, son of no. 6, 673/1274-5 to about 689/1288.
8) Afrāsīyāb I, son of 7, about 689/1288 to 27 Dhu 'l-Hijja 695/26 October 1296.
9) Nuṣrāt al-Dīn Ahmad, brother of no. 8, beginning of 696/1296 to 730 or 733/1329-30 or 1332-3.
10) Ruḵ al-Dīn Yūsūfshāh II, son of no. 9, 733/1332-3 to 740/1339-40.
11) Muṣṭafār al-Dīn Afrāsīyāb II (Ahmad), son (or brother, according to Ibn Baṭṭūta, ii, 30 f.) of no. 10, 740/1339-40 to 756/1355.
12) Nāwīr Ward, son of no. 11, ruled only briefly, 756/1355.
13) Shams al-Dīn Fāḡān, cousin (or nephew) of no. 12 (? presumably a descendant of Yūsūfshāh II), 756/1355 to 780/1378-9.
14) Civil war between Malik Fīr Ṭabaḥ, 780/1378 to 811/1408-9
15) 22
and then in Seville and Granada and came under the influence of al-Shalawbin [q.v.], who... 

His immense learning in the fields of grammar and rhetoric... (Qayyara); even more profound than his erudition (riwa'a). 

Hazim is particularly deserving of interest. He is the author of... the last three parts of which survive; these... 303; Ibn Makhluf, Shadiarat al-nur, Cairo 1350, 197, no. 667; M. 'Allam, Abu'l-Hasan Hazim al-Karţidjani... noting the... 

in the Library of the Univ. of Tunis), of a critical edition by... 1734) where he spent the rest of his life in spite... the contemporary Persian poets), he also wrote a... 129, 303; Ibn Makhluf, Shadiarat al-nur, Cairo 1350, 197, no. 667; M. 'Allam, Abu'l-Hasan Hazim al-Karţidjani... 401; Kurtin, Kulliydt, Lucknow 1293;...
HAZMIRIIYUN — HEKIM-BASHI

—

therhood, founded by the two brothers Abu Zayd 'Abd al-Rahmān and Abu 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad, sons of 'Abd al-Karīm al-Hazmīrī. The Hazmīrī to

—

tribe, from which the brotherhood was created and which was the confederation of the six tribes of the Dukkāla.

—

The first of these brothers died, at a very great age, at Fez, in 706 or 707/1306-8 and the second, at Ṭāmānī, in 678/1280, at the age of 60. In view of these dates, the brotherhood can be founded at the earliest only during the second quarter of the 7th/13th century.

—

Ibn Kunfūdḥ al-Kusantūlī (740-810/1339-1407), in his Un al-fakīr, listed the principal brotherhoods which existed in Morocco during the period in which he was conducting there his researches on the saint Abū Madyān Shu'aybā and his disciples, i.e., between 759/1358 and 777/1376. He counted six main ones: the Ḥādiyyūn of Abū Shu'aybā of Azemmour, the Shu'aybīyūn; the Ṣanḥādiyyūn which, in the Ṭibāt of Tīt, situated about 12 km. south-west of Mazagan, comprised the Banū Amghār; the Mūṣiliyyūn, the Shu'aybīyūn; the Sanḥādiyyūn which, in the Ṭibāt of Aṣṣīr (Ṣafī), who was himself one of the Banū Māḡār; the Hūdīdājī, whose members had to have performed the Pilgrimage to the Holy Places; the Hābbīyūn, settled in the Atlas to the south of Marrākūṣh. The last one mentioned, and the most recent, was that of Abū Zayd al-Hazmīrī. The author specifies that it was that of the Ghāmāṭīyīn (its centre was indeed at Ṭāmānī).

—

The first two of these brotherhoods grew out of the teaching of Abū Shu'aybā Ayyāb, who died at Azemmour in 561/1165, and his disciple Abū Ya'qūb al-Wādī bi-man hall Marrākūṣh, who may therefore have known the two men. It is entitled Ṭāmānī wa Ṭītun al-aḥṣām, who was still living at Marrākūṣh in 719 or 720/1320, and who may therefore have known the two men. It is entitled Ṭāmānī al-ajwān wa mustah al-majārīn fi maḥātah al-ahdawayn Abī Zayd wa Abī 'Abd Allāh al-Hazmīrīyyūn, and Abī 'Abd al-Salām Ibn Sūdāa mentions that there is a copy in the library of the Fāsiyyīn (see Dālī mu'tarrīk al-Maghārib al-aḥzā, Tetuān 1950, 209); on the documentary value of this manuscript and the bibliography of these two saints, see E. Lévi-Provençal, Les historiens des Chorfa, Paris 1922, 233-4. In addition see 'Abāb b. Ibrāhīm al-Ṭā'im bi-mān Hall Marrākūṣh wa Ṭāmānī min al-ajwān, Fez 1337, ii, 162-92; the text of Ibn Kunfūdḥ, Un al-fakīr wa tas al-jaḥr, established by Muḥammad al-Fāsī and A. Faure has just been published (Rabāt 1965); there are several manuscript copies of it in the Rabat Public Library and one in the Karawiyīn.

(A. FAURE)

—

HEADGEAR [see LIBĀS].

—

HEBROWN [see AL-KHALIL].

—

HECIGRA [see HIGRA].

—

HERIM-BASHI, (HARIM-BASHI), "Chief of the Physicians", in the Ottoman Empire the title of the chief Palace physician, who was at the same
time head of the health services of the state: besides being in charge of all the Palace physicians, surgeons, apothecaries, pharmacists, etc., he exercised supervision over all the physicians of the Empire, Muslim or non-Muslim; it was he who appointed and dismissed all physicians, surgeons and pharmacists, who kept a check on them, who examined aspirants to these professions, and who appointed and promoted worthy candidates.

Physicians were employed in the Palace, whether permanently or temporarily, probably from the earliest times. In the reign of Mehemmed II the skill of the Hekim-bashi, the former physician of Abü Sa‘id the Timurid, procured his appointment as head of all the physicians of the Ottoman court, who at that time included Shukr Allâh Shirwânî, Khâdîja ʻÂṭâ, Allâh ʻAdîmî, Lârî, and others. His daily stipend was 500 akçe, which remained in later years the usual salary of the Hekim-bashi; there were also the perquisites of official gifts of summer and winter garments, and personal gifts as well.

The Hekim-bashi counted as one of the officers of the Kâşk-oda. He resided in the Bash Lala Kulesi, built under Mehemmed II [see Saray]; he was to some extent subordinate to the Bash Lala (Chief Preceptor of the sultan, see Lala). When the sultan fell ill, his was a most important responsibility; if his patient died, he was usually dismissed. The medicines which he prescribed were made up under his supervision by the Palace pharmacists in the pharmacy situated in the Bash Lala Kulesi; they were placed in vessels sealed by the Hekim-bashi and the Bash Lala and administered to the royal patients as required.

From the time of Mehemmed II onwards, such famous and skilled holders of the post as Yaşkıb Paşa [q.v.], Lârî Celebi, Ağa Celebi and Gâhs al-Dîn-zade were also highly favoured intimates of the Sultan. In later years, on the eve of the (solar) New Year (21 March), the Hekim-bashi made a special ecclesiary called Newruziyye, which he presented to the Sultan and to the high officers of the Palace and of the government. One indication of the high esteem which they enjoyed is that their status and comfort of being in the Kashmir, or vizier. In the nth/17th century it began to be reckoned as one of those depending on the Ağhas of the Dâr al-Safıdât and came completely under their influence, the holders of the post being frequently changed. From 1836 onwards appointments to the post were made from the mülkiyye branch of the administration. The title was changed in 1844 to Ser-Tâbib-i Şehriyârî, and with the establishment of the Ministry of Medical Affairs (Tibbiyye) in 1850 the holder's duties were limited to those of private physician to the Palace.

because the latter had seized his share of their father's estate, he went to Istanbul, embraced Islam and received the name of Ahmed, under which name he is mentioned for the first time in 1474. As early as 882/1477 he is mentioned in a firman of Mehmed II as the "servant of my kingdom Ahmed Beg". The reason for his going to Turkey and embracing Islam is shrouded in tales and legends which have been diligently recorded by Ewliya Celebi (Seyahatname, iii, 4, vi, 423, 425-4; see also J. Radonic in Vatroslov Juglic-Festscrb, Berlin 1916, 406-14). In the following year (883/1478) he is found in the retinue of Mehmed II in the Albanian campaign as the Sultan's mir-i-alem.

Before 14 December 1481 he was married to the princess Khâñûdi Khâtûn, daughter of Bâyezid II, and became first sandiakbegi of Bursa and then beglerbegi of Anatolia. In this capacity he fought against Prince Djem (Djumâddâ I 887/July 1483) and helped his father-in-law to strengthen his position on the throne. As beglerbegi of Anatolia he was appointed, in the first ten days of Rabî I 891/16 March 1486, as commander-in-chief of the expedition whose aim was to avenge the Turkish defeat in Syria (889/1484), in which the sultan's son-in-law, Ferhâd Beg, had been killed, and to take from the Mamlûks of Egypt the towns of Adana and Tarsus; but he was defeated, wounded, captured (Şafar 891/Februrary-6 March 1486) and taken to Cairo (Dhu 'l-Ka'da 891/November 1486). In Muḥarram 902/January 1487 he was released from captivity and sent back to Turkey. Already at the end of the following month he is mentioned as vizier. Before 3 Rabî I 893/17 March 1488 he had become kapudân pasha, for on that date he led the Ottoman fleet in an operation, carried out in co-operation with the land forces, against the Mamlûk army, but his fleet was all but destroyed in a storm, and also the Ottoman land forces were defeated at Agha Çaybîr (8 Râmâdân 893/16 August 1488). After this unfortunate expedition, Ahmed Pasha remained on his îmârât at Gallipoli until the autumn of 1489, when he was again appointed beglerbegi of Anatolia. When the Mamlûks besieged Kaysâri [q.v.], Ahmed Pasha, in Rabî II 895/February-March 1490, was sent against them for the third time as commander-in-chief. The outcome of this, the third battle, was ambiguous, but it is certain that Ahmed Pasha was not taken prisoner by the Mamlûks either then or at any time later, but only on the one occasion in 1486, and it is to his captivity at that period that the Arabic inscription in Cairo published by Van Berchem (see Bibl.) relates. In the spring of 1493 and in Djûmâddâ II 901/Feburary 1496 Ahmed Pasha is referred to as beglerbegi of Anatolia, On a Radjâb 902/8 March 1497, or some days later, he became for the first time Grand Vizier; but in the following year (after 19 August 1498) he was dismissed and appointed kapudân pasha and sandiakbegi of Gallipoli. In this capacity he took part in the following year in the attack on Aynabâhît [q.v.], which was taken on 19 Muḥarram 903/26 August 1499. In the spring of 1500 he became vizier and in this capacity, in the autumn of 1501, commanded the Ottoman fleet in the fighting against France and the defence of Mîdilli [q.v.]. Shortly before December 1502 he again became Grand Vizier, concluded a treaty of peace with Venice (12 Djûmâddâ II 908/14 December 1502) and a truce with Hungary (25 Şafar 909/20 August 1503). He remained in office until 18 Rabî I 912/7 September 1506, in a period of great difficulty and unrest, when the country was afflicted by famine and plague, and also by general insecurity on sea and land. It is probable that he was subsequently again appointed kapudân pasha and sandiakbegi of Gallipoli, although he is mentioned in the sources in this office only in the spring of 1509, with the title of vizier. In September 1510 he became effectively vizier and in Rabî II 917/July 1511 he became for the third time Grand Vizier (upon the death of Khâdîm 'Ali Pasha), but at the end of Djûmâddâ II 917/end of September 1511 he was dismissed at the insistence of the Janissaries, who had mutinied and demanded that he be replaced as chief obstacle to the accession to the throne of prince Selim. Before that, they had looted his residence and he only just escaped with his life. As the new Grand Vizier, Köşma Muştâfa Pasha, was very soon executed (9/1512), Ahmed Pasha, who was then Second Vizier, was again appointed Grand Vizier and in that capacity took part in Selim I's victorious campaign against Persia (battle of Câdlîrân [q.v.]). He remained in office until 9 Râmâdân 920/28 October 1514, when he was dismissed and sent into retirement. As his successors, Dulkâñ-zâde Ahmed Pasha and Khâdîm Sinân Pasha, very soon incurred the displeasure of the ruthless and hot-tempered Sultan Selim, Ahmed Pasha became Grand Vizier for the fifth and last time on 29 Radjâb 921/8 September 1515. Seeing how easily the officers of Selim I could lose their lives, he attempted to avoid the appointment, pleading old age, illness, and exhaustion, but consented at the insistence of the sultan and the other viziers. Suffering torments from rheumatism, he rarely attended the diwan but dealt with affairs in his own house. The following incident demonstrates that it was by no means easy for him to serve Selim. At the end of April 1516 the news was received at the Porte that the Safawis were besieging Dîyarbakr. On learning this, the sultan became extremely angry and vented all his wrath on his viziers. Then Ahmed Pasha suffered one of the worst days of his life: the sultan summoned him to the diwan and in anger seized him by the throat and began to strike him about the head so that all his turban became unwound. He was immediately deprived of his office and his liberty, and, together with the vizier Fîrî Pasha, escorted to Yedî Kol 23 Ramîd ûmûr 1, but, when the intervention of the new Grand Vizier, Khâdîm Sinân Pasha, both of them were pardoned and set free on the same day. At the time of Selim's campaign against Egypt Ahmed Pasha was muâlbîf of Bursa, and after the victory went to Cairo to congratulate him. On 9 Djûmâddâ II 923/23 June 1517 he was received in a last audience by the sultan and given a reward. He died on 2 Radjâb 927/1 July 1527 while returning from Egypt in the Kêlî Col mountains on the borders of Dhu 'l-Kadr. He was buried beside the mosque which he had built in the village of Dil, near Yalova, which is called Hersek after him. Here he built also an îmârât and an aqueduct. His mosque in the village of Dil was a masterpiece of Ottoman architecture. He built another mosque in the village of Rûmâhلك (in the sandjak of Gallipoli); he made over a number of villages to his wakfs.

Having spent forty years in the service of three important sultans, Ahmed Pasha played a prominent role in the Ottoman empire. Even while he was the Sultan's mir-i-alem he had so much influence with Mehmed II that through his intervention Gedik Ahmed Pasha was released from prison. He enjoyed still greater prestige with his father-in-law, Bâyezid II. He was remarkable for his wise and independent
opinions in the diwaan, which he bravely maintained even before Selim I. He was a friend and protector of the republic of Dubrovnik. His foreign contemporaries also thought highly of him. The Venetian ambassador, Andrea Gritti, describes Ahmed Paşa as "valentissimo di buon animo e ingenuo". He was a courageous, but not very successful, general. He excelled as a skilled diplomat and politician. Ahmed Paşa had a daughter named Humâ (who died after 1531) and two sons, Ali Beg and Mustafa Beg, both of them born before 1509, in which year they were circumcised. *Ali Beg* distinguished himself as a lyric poet and wrote under the name Shîrî. He is mentioned until 1545, and Mustafa Beg until 1582. With him the Muslim branch of the Hercegović family died out.


**HEYBELI ADA** [see MARMARA].

**HEZÆRFENN** [see HAZÆRFENN].

**HEZĂRGRAĐ, Ottoman name of Rázgrad in north-east Bulgaria, on the Bell Lom. A prehistoric settlement, it is the site of the classical Abritus, in which the Roman-Bulgarians are mentioned. No details are known of its fate during the Ottoman expansion; it was probably occupied in the course of Cândarî *Ali Paşa’s campaign of 790/1388*. It begins to be mentioned only towards the middle of the 10th/16th century as a village, variously named Yeğidîye, Herzârgârd-i Djeidî and Kayadîjk, belonging to the kaďâ of Cernovi (Cervern). The Ottoman name Herzârgârd is a deformation of a pre-Ottoman name Hrazgârd. With three other villages it was, in the 10th/16th century, incorporated in the waqf of the Gate of Constantine and Ibrahim Paşa.

In the second half of the 10th/16th century it is mentioned as a kaďâ in the sanhâq of Nicopolis. The town and the district around contained a significant population of Turkish colonists, yirûks [s.v.] among them. In the middle years of the century there were over 400 Muslims in the town (Turks, and also many converted Bulgarians), and about 1300 Christian Bulgarians. In 1566-1569 there were in the town 800 Bulgars (and 10 Catholics, immigrants from Dubrovnik). In 1606/1659 there were no more than some 350 Bulgars, while the Muslim population had increased to 7000 (with 30 Catholics). Later there were also some Jewish and Armenian inhabitants.

Situated in a fertile district, Herzârgârd rapidly became a vigorous commercial town, where numerous crafts flourished, one of the chief centres for the export of raw hides to Dubrovnik. There were in 1300 shops in its commercial quarter. A code of regulations for its market was in existence in the 10th/16th century (Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS a.f.t. 85, fol. 118 v). In the 19th century there was in the town a Government saltpetre factory.

A pleasant town, it contained several mosques, the best known being those of Ibrahim Paşa and Mehmed Paşa. There were 12 kâns, some modernes, a clock-tower, baths, fountains, and a bridge over the river. The sources mention two churches in the 11th/17th and 19th centuries. This town suffered many disasters, attacks by brigands, and massive emigration between the 16th and 19th centuries. The Bulgarian inhabitants of the town played an active part in the political and religious struggles for independence in the 19th century.


**HIBA,** one of many Arabic words used to express the concept of "gift", and the preferred legal term for it, see following article.

The giving of gifts, that is, the voluntary transfer of property, is a fundamental material and psychological purpose. In the pre-history of man, it probably antedates the contractual payment for goods and services. In Islam, it has retained its inherited functions as an important component of the social fabric and has exercised a considerable influence on political life. Literature (in the narrow sense of the term) tells us more about gifts than it does about commercial transactions.
A Muslim definition of "gift", attested for the 5th/6th century and reported by the Ottoman jurist Ibn Nudjaim, speaks of it as "something to which no condition is attached" (in contrast to bribes, cf. E. Tyan, Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire, Leiden 1960, 259; F. Rosenthal, op. cit. (below), 136, n. 8). The latent or obvious purposiveness of all gifts was, however, fully realized. In one of the many attempts made to distinguish between the different Arabic words for "gift", which were arbitrary from the etymological point of view and rarely obtained the sanction of usage, hiba is considered the transfer of property from a more highly placed person to one on a lower level of society (and, therefore, also as applicable to God's gifts to man); hadisiyya, on the other hand, implies an effort on the part of a person on a lower level of society to get into the good graces of a recipient of a higher social status (and the word, therefore, is not and cannot be used in connexion with God) (Abû Hilâl al-'Aštârî, and the Maltezer-Z Yaşar, Cairo 1321, 133, but cf., for instance, Ibn Kûtaybi, 'Uyun al-akhdhâr, Cairo [reprint] 1964, iii, 38, who finds no inherent distinction of social levels in hadisiyya). The purposiveness of giving is above all indicated by special linguistic usage. Thus, the Arabic vocabulary knows a meaning of the root m.n.n (minnas, maninâin) which implies an objectionable insistence by the giver upon the obligations created for the recipient as a result of gifts received. The Kur'ân, LXXIV, 6, using the verb istaahirâ, warns against giving (m.n.n) in the expectation of receiving a larger gift in return, this being the widely, if not generally, accepted interpretation of the passage (cf. al-'Tabari, Tafsîr, Cairo 1321, xxix, 80 f.; Wörterbuch der klassischen arab. Sprache, 6.f.). The third and tenth conjugations of gâ.b.r are noted as special terms for the procedure, which, in the minds of some lexicographers, is a custom preferably associated with strangers, in accordance with an alleged hadith (cf., for instance, Ibn al-Athir, Nihâîyâ, Cairo 1322, iii, 181; I. A, vi, 326, and the commentators on sura LXXIV, 6).

Generosity was acknowledged to be one of the primary virtues of the pre-Islamic Arabs, among whom it naturally found its principal expression in hospitality, and the generosity shown in Islam to guests remained a custom much remarked upon. The ideals of the pre-Islamic Arabs, among them the primary virtues of the pre-Islamic Arabs, were often noticed and complained about. The higher a person was placed within the power structure, the more he was expected to dignify his status and secure his position by frequent manifestations of largesse. The lavish gifts of caliphs and powerful waizârs are often mentioned and commented upon. They were correctly interpreted as a sign of firmly established power and political success. Obviously, such "gifts" were as a rule expected forms of remuneration. The rich rewards bestowed upon poets and artists, and the unhappy occasions on which such rewards were not forthcoming, were the result of the sponsorship of the arts felt to be part of the duties of the government. Gifts by rulers were in a way the more spectacular extension of regular government spending, and they fascinated writers and readers more than the routine character of the latter.

Gifts to persons in positions of authority were usually proffered for the purpose of engaging or rewarding their services. At times, this came to be customary procedure, and officials (occasionally even those in the highest places) depended on it for their income. It was an obvious source of moral corruption and political decay, and was, in turn, nourished by it. It is impossible to give a precise and final answer as exemplified by Hâtim al-Târî [q.v.] to some degree counteracted by the Aristotelian definition of generosity (kuriyya, sakhâ') as a subdivision of moderation (sophrosyne, 'îffa), involving the prudent balancing of income and spending; in this sense, the giving of gifts as an expression of generosity required taking into account the appropriate size of the gift and the deserving character of the recipient (cf., for instance, Abu 'l-Hasan [al-'Aimirî], Sa'adâ, ed. M. Minovi, Wiesbaden 1957-8, 87 f.; Miskawayh, Tahdhib, Cairo 1322, 8). However, the philosophical virtue blended well with the traditional appreciation of the liberal spender. The admiring reports in literature of anecdotes about outstanding generous men (gawâd) and their acts of generosity ([q.w'])-> never ceased to interest Muslim readers. The lively discussion of the opposite view, stinginess (bukhl [q.v.]), is merely another way of illustrating the Muslim esteem of generosity. To pre-Islamic and Classical tradition, Muslim religious tradition further added the concept of generosity shown to the needy, charity (sadaka [q.v.]), as a virtue of great merit.

The giving of gifts was viewed as an activity among equals and an expression of friendship. Characteristically, Ibn Kûtayba discusses the subject of generosity from the larger context of friendship, and in the eyes of the religious authorities, the giving of gifts helps toward the establishment of better personal and communal relations. Gifts were exchanged on joyous personal occasions, such as weddings or circumcisions. Special occasions for the exchange of small gifts among relatives and friends were various holidays, among them the 'id al-fitr [q.v.] as well as the festivals of naurusî and mihrân [q.v.] (M. Froula, Renaisse, 400 f.). The latter festivals were, however, also used at times as occasions on which the people had to present major "gifts" to their ruler. Gifts on festive occasions, as well as other gifts, were often accompanied by appropriate verses deemed worthy of preservation in literature, or by messages in artistic prose.

From the personal sphere of generosity and friendship, where the motivation was primarily psychological, there was a short step to the—broadly speaking—politically motivated giving of gifts by or to persons holding positions of authority in the community. The higher a person was placed within the power structure, the more he was expected to dignify his status and secure his position by frequent manifestations of largesse. The lavish gifts of caliphs and powerful waizârs are often mentioned and commented upon. They were correctly interpreted as a sign of firmly established power and political success. Obviously, such "gifts" were as a rule expected forms of remuneration. The rich rewards bestowed upon poets and artists, and the unhappy occasions on which such rewards were not forthcoming, were the result of the sponsorship of the arts felt to be part of the duties of the government. Gifts by rulers were in a way the more spectacular extension of regular government spending, and they fascinated writers and readers more than the routine character of the latter.

Gifts to persons in positions of authority were usually proffered for the purpose of engaging or rewarding their services. At times, this came to be customary procedure, and officials (occasionally even those in the highest places) depended on it for their income. It was an obvious source of moral corruption and political decay, and was, in turn, nourished by it. It is impossible to give a precise and final answer as exemplified by Hâtim al-Târî [q.v.] to some degree counteracted by the Aristotelian definition of generosity (kuriyya, sakhâ') as a subdivision of moderation (sophrosyne, 'îffa), involving the prudent balancing of income and spending; in this sense, the giving of gifts as an expression of generosity required taking into account the appropriate size of the gift and the deserving character of the recipient (cf., for instance, Abu 'l-Hasan [al-'Aimirî], Sa'adâ, ed. M. Minovi, Wiesbaden 1957-8, 87 f.; Miskawayh, Tahdhib, Cairo 1322, 8). However, the philosophical virtue blended well with the traditional appreciation of the liberal spender. The admiring reports in literature of anecdotes about outstanding generous men (gawâd) and their acts of generosity ([q.w'])-> never ceased to interest Muslim readers. The lively discussion of the opposite view, stinginess (bukhl [q.v.]), is merely another way of illustrating the Muslim esteem of generosity. To pre-Islamic and Classical tradition, Muslim religious tradition further added the concept of generosity shown to the needy, charity (sadaka [q.v.]), as a virtue of great merit.

The giving of gifts was viewed as an activity among equals and an expression of friendship. Characteristically, Ibn Kûtayba discusses the subject of generosity from the larger context of friendship, and in the eyes of the religious authorities, the giving of gifts helps toward the establishment of better personal and communal relations. Gifts were exchanged on joyous personal occasions, such as weddings or circumcisions. Special occasions for the exchange of small gifts among relatives and friends were various holidays, among them the 'id al-fitr [q.v.] as well as the festivals of naurusî and mihrân [q.v.] (M. Froula, Renaisse, 400 f.). The latter festivals were, however, also used at times as occasions on which the people had to present major "gifts" to their ruler. Gifts on festive occasions, as well as other gifts, were often accompanied by appropriate verses deemed worthy of preservation in literature, or by messages in artistic prose.

From the personal sphere of generosity and friendship, where the motivation was primarily psychological, there was a short step to the—broadly speaking—politically motivated giving of gifts by or to persons holding positions of authority in the community. The higher a person was placed within the power structure, the more he was expected to dignify his status and secure his position by frequent manifestations of largesse. The lavish gifts of caliphs and powerful waizârs are often mentioned and commented upon. They were correctly interpreted as a sign of firmly established power and political success. Obviously, such "gifts" were as a rule expected forms of remuneration. The rich rewards bestowed upon poets and artists, and the unhappy occasions on which such rewards were not forthcoming, were the result of the sponsorship of the arts felt to be part of the duties of the government. Gifts by rulers were in a way the more spectacular extension of regular government spending, and they fascinated writers and readers more than the routine character of the latter.
and between Muslim and non-Muslim rulers through their ambassadors or through persons who functioned, or presumed to function, as such; usually, participants in the countries of giver and recipient and upon their relative standing as to wealth and industrial development.

As in the societies preceding Islam and contemporary with it, the personal giving of gifts came under the scrutiny of the law (see below). The propriety of diplomatic gifts and of gifts to officials was occasionally questioned by jurists. Rules were proposed to govern the tender and acceptance of such gifts. Presumably, they were disregarded most of the time (cf. Rosenthal, op. cit., and, for an apparently complete copy of Taqi 'l-Din al-Subkhi, Faṣl al-makālī fi hadiyāt al-amālī, Ms. Chester Beatty 4870, fols. 1-5).

In addition to human giving, we find the concept of God as the giver of gifts, which concerned Muslim theology. All existence, including that of man himself, is a gift of God’s kindness (ni‘ma), and so are all special benefits, talents, and achievements of man. Sufism quite generally tends to describe every spiritual breakthrough by the mystic toward the achievement of his mystic striving as being given by God, and every material manifestation of saintliness in the form of miracles as possible only through some divine gift (ma‘wida). While God’s gifts are unsellably given and cannot be matched or requited in any way, human beings are expected to show their gratefulness (shukr [q.v.]) by obeying the divine commands and doing what is right in the eyes of God; yet, their gratefulness can never exhaust the depth of their obligation to their Maker. The role of God as the unique Giver requires mention here, for an individual section following. See further BAKHTAM, BIBLIOGRAPHY. (F. Rosenthal)

i.—The Caliphate

The giving of presents was a practice which permeated all levels of mediaeval Islamic society, its aim being to cement the bonds of obligation and dependence which ran through the structure of that society. At the highest level, the exchange of presents was an integral part of diplomacy. In ch. xxii of the Sīyāṣat-nāma, Nizām al-Mulk refers briefly to the diplomatic use of presents, and Fakhr-i Mumtāz al-Mubarakshah devotes a whole chapter of his treatise on war and statecraft to the despisation of ambassadors and the gifts which they should bear (Ādāb al-mu‘āk, India Office MS 647, bāb xii, fols. 45b-52a). Also, the general works on secretarial practice (kiyāda) often refer to the letters which should accompany presents or which should be sent in thanks for them. Thus Hilāl b. al-Mu‘āassin al-Sāhī’s Ghurar al-baladīgha has a chapter on hadiyyāt (cf. W. Björkman, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatskunst der islamischen Ägypten, Hamburg 1928, 14-15). Kalāqashan and gives example of the correspondence involved on the occasion of gifts of robes of honour, horses, hunting falcons, game, fruits, etc. (mukadabat al-takaddi wa ‘l-mul‘iṣafa) and when seeking gifts (istiḥdād), in his Šuḥ al-‘alā, viii, 339 ff., 351-6, ix, 100-24.

The most important non-Islamic power with which the Caliphs had to deal was, of course, Byzantium. The Emperors themselves had long appreciated the value of court diplomacy, of impressing their subjects with the splendour of their court and using costly gifts to mollify opponents; and for the luxury textiles and mechanical contrivances which were the staple presents, the Emperors had the productions of the state workshops to call upon (cf. W. Ensslin in Byzantinum, an introduction to East Roman civilization, ed. Baynes and Moss, Oxford 1948, 306-7). The Caliphs, for their part, exerted themselves equally to impress Christian ambassadors. The Frankish chronicler Einhard speaks of the rich gifts sent to Charlemagne by Ḥārūn al-Rashīd in the course of their celebrated diplomatic exchanges, involving the textiles and aromatics of the Islamic world and such exotica as an elephant and a water clock (Vita Karoli Magni, ed. and tr. L. Halphen, Paris 1923, 47). In 305/917-18 al-Mu‘tadīd staged an especially lavish reception in his palace for the envoys of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in the course of which rich gifts were exchanged (cf. Kāfī Ibn al-Zubayr, Kitāb al-jahādīn wa ‘l-tuḥaf, 130 ff.). Many of the Baghdād-Constanтинople diplomatic exchanges revolved, as did this last mission, around the making of truces on the Anatolian frontiers and the ransom of prisoners. Just over a century later, Constantine Monomachus in 441/1049-50 sent an embassy with presents to the Saldjūk Sultan Ṭoghrī (q.v.) seeking for peace and for the ransom of the Georgian prince Liparit Orbeliani; when Ṭoghrī, on the intercession of the Marwānid ruler Nasr al-Dawla Ibn Marwān, released Liparit without a ransom, the Emperor sent further presents and allowed the construction of a mosque in Constantinople (Ibn al-Aṯīr, ix, 380).

When the Caliphs and other Islamic rulers delegated their military or civil authority to subordinate rulers or governors, presents were invariably bestowed on the recipient of the office, as a material sign of the grantor’s favour. In an age when dress was so decisively an indication of official or social status, and when wealth was often stored in the form of textiles, it is not surprising that richly-embroidered or bejewelled robes of honour are the most constant element in these presents (see ʿGaris, a). Such centres of manufacture as Damasci, Baghdād, Mawṣīl, Ḫisān, Ṭayy, Niẓāmūr and Marw, all produced luxury textiles for these robes, and in some cases, rulers had special workshops producing luxury goods for court consumption or for bestowal as gifts; Narshāqī mentions the bayt al-tīrās at Bukhārā, whose products were taken each year to Baghdād in lieu of taxation (The history of Bukhara, tr. Frye, 19-20; see also qaṣīr and ṭirās).

In 284/897 al-Mu‘tadīd was compelled to invest ʿAmr b. Layth with Transoxania in succession to the Tāhrids, who had exercised an overlordship in that region. He sent with the investiture diploma seven robes of honour, a crown set with sapphires and other gems, eleven horses with golden accoutrements and bejewelled caparisons, and chests of clothing and luxury articles (Gārdīzī, Zayn al-ʿāqāḥī, ed. Naṣīm, 17). In 369/979 Ḥādūd al-Dawla demanded from al-
That he should be crowned in Baghdad, should have further honorific titles and should be given robes of honour. The feeble Caliph had to assure his son-in-law the Byzantian emperor that he should be crowned in Baghdad, and invested him with the robes and two swords; three days later he further sent a linen tunic, a gold dish and a crystal vessel and goblet (Ibn al-Djawzi, al-Muntasi, vii, 98-100). In 513/1120 the supreme caliph, Sultan Sanjar, appointed his nephew Mahmod b. Muhammad, ruler of Ṭābil and Ṭabād, and, in addition to the usual robes of honor, sent a horse with luxurious equipment and an elephant with a bejewelled litter (Rāwandī, Rābat al-sudur, 170). The presents sent by the Caliph al-Musturghid in 527/1133 to Mas‘ud b. Muhammad, when he recognized as his Sultan the western caliph, included seven ceremonial durrāt (fabrics or tunics of various materials and colours, one being in the 4th/baghdad colour of black, a jewelled crowned, two arm bracelets (sawād), a gold collar, two swords and two banners (Ṣadr al-Din ‘Usayn, Akhbār al-halēla al-Qalīṣīyya, 102). Victory brought the Caliph, and other commanders with robes of honour, a gold collar and two arm bracelets (‘Arīb, 3, under 291/904; cf. Mez, Renaissance, 137; Eng. tr., 133).

The bestowal of lesser honours, those of a social rather than a military or political nature, was likewise accompanied by presents. In 321/933 al-Kahir made Ibn Muṣka a nadim or boon-companion in the Caliphal entourage, and at the same time gave him robes of honour, began calling him by his kunya or his patronymic, and added further gifts of a silver-gilt dish of ambergris, perfumes and musk, a second dish, a crystal decanter and goblet and a silver washbowl. Five years later, the Turkish general Beckem was honoured in similar terms when he became al-Raṣi’s nadīm (Miskawiyh, in Eclipse of the ‘Abbāsid Caliphate, i, 258-9, 396, tr. iv, 293-4, 440).

On the other hand, the grant of honours and awards from the Caliph usually involved the recipient in much reciprocal expense. Even when the secular authority of the ‘Abbāsids was at a low ebb, such as the period and early epochs dominated by the Seljuqs of Persia in the 4th/baghdad and 5th/baghdad centuries, their moral and spiritual influence was still very important. They alone could legitimate de facto power, and for the privilege of this approval, the provincial ruler who sought an investiture diploma (‘ābd, manhār) or a grant of honorific titles (aikdā) had to be prepared to pay. The sale of honours and the seeking of presents were, indeed, some of the means by which the Caliphal court augmented their meagre resources during these lean years. According to Hilāl al-Ṣabi, the requiring of presents had to be distributed not only to the Caliph himself, but also to his chief wife, to the wall al-‘abd ‘Uddat al-Din (the later al-Muktadil) and to the princess’s own mother (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 436-7; Bundārī, 22).

It was the custom to exchange gifts at such festivities as weddings (cf. the munificence of al-Hasan b. Sahl when his daughter Būrān married al-Ma‘mūn at Fām al-Ṣibl, described in, e.g., Ṭabarī, iii, 1085-8; ‘Ṭal‘ūb, Latīf al-maṣādīr, ed. de Jong, 73-4; Nāḍīr Ibn al-Zubayr, 98-100, 100; and Nizāmī ‘Arifī Samarkandī, Cāhār mābūlā, Browne’s revised tr., 21-2), circumcisions and the obsequies of early central and eastern parts of the Caliphate. We hear, too, of personal gifts from subjects to rulers; doubtless some private advantage was often sought. A Zoroastrian mībāhā presented a flask of precious ointment to al-Muṭawakkil; and a landowner of the Ghazna district, one Mānk ‘Alī, had the custom of annually presenting the Ghaznavid Sultans with pickles, savouries, dried meats and fine cloth (Mas‘ūdī, Murādī, vii, 229; Bayhaḵī, ed. Ghāni and Fayyāḍ, 128-9).

The goods and products most frequently given as presents have emerged through the examples given above, with fine textiles, aromatics and spices, and jewels, to the fore. However, the gifts sent westwards by governors and rulers on the eastern fringes of the Islamic world usually included some of the specialities of those eastern regions and even of the Indian and Chinese worlds beyond. Very prominent were Turkish slaves from the Central Asian steppes, greatly in demand for the new professional armies of the Caliphs and provincial rulers (see gulalm i. The Caliphate, and ii. Persia). From the 3rd/baghdad century onwards, the tribute and presents forwarded by the Tāhirid governors of Khurāsān and then by the Sāmānīd Amīrs of Khurāsān and Transoxania always included large numbers of Turkish slaves. In a very detailed list in Bayhaḵī, 416-17, of the presents sent to Hārūn al-Rashīd by ‘Alī b. Ṣa b. Māḥān (Governor of Khurāsān 180-91/796-807) are 1,000 each of Turkish men, coloured cloths and, and one of the Central Asian specialities mentioned in it include hawks and falcons for hunting, Badakhshān rubies, Nīṣāpūr turquoise and Tūkhrāstān horses. Particularly interesting is the inclusion of 200 pieces of Chinese porcelain (‘īnī faqṣāfūrā), which already at this early date were making the long and hazardous journey across Asia (on this product see P. Kahe, Chinese porcelain in the lands of Islam, i Opera minora, Leiden 1936, 230-61). Elephants sporadically appeared in
The presentation by Muslim rulers of costly and often exotic gifts to European heads of state, for long a common practice, accounted in large part for the mediaeval western view of Islam as a world of luxury and splendour. This view was nourished nowhere more abundantly than in Mamluk Egypt, whose rulers staged lavish receptions for foreign envoys and their principals included precious and elaborate stuffs of local manufacture, presented sometimes as cloth not made up, or with honorific titles, with examples from the caliph period. Of outstanding interest is the K. al-Dhakhdhīr wa 'l-tufyaf of the Fatimid official Kādī Abū 'l-Husayn Ahmad b. al-Zubayr, ed. Mub. Hamlī Aūlāh, Kuwait 1955, which dates from ca. 463/1071. Inter alia, the author describes here famous offerings of gifts amongst rulers in pre-Islamic and Islamic times, with many examples from 'Abbāsid and Fatimid history.

(C. E. Bosworth)

ii — Mamlūk Egypt

The presentation by Muslim rulers of costly and often exotic gifts to European heads of state, for long a common practice, accounted in large part for the mediaeval western view of Islam as a world of luxury and splendour. This view was nourished nowhere more abundantly than in Mamluk Egypt, whose rulers staged lavish receptions for foreign envoys and their principals included precious and elaborate stuffs of local manufacture, presented sometimes as cloth not made up, or with honorific titles, with examples from the caliph period. Of outstanding interest is the K. al-Dhakhdhīr wa 'l-tufyaf of the Fatimid official Kādī Abū 'l-Husayn Ahmad b. al-Zubayr, ed. Mub. Hamlī Aūlāh, Kuwait 1955, which dates from ca. 463/1071. Inter alia, the author describes here famous offerings of gifts amongst rulers in pre-Islamic and Islamic times, with many examples from 'Abbāsid and Fatimid history.

(C. E. Bosworth)
ments; carpets, arms and armour (notably the famous shields of leather made from the skin of lam’i [q.v.], a type of antelope peculiar to the western Sahara); harness; state tents; furs; perfumes; ambergis, musk; thoroughbred horses; falcons; slaves. More rarely there were presented copies of the Kur’an, of historic value or richly bound and ornamented! by the prince of Genoa sending to the Marinid sultan Yusuf the famous sword of leather made from the skin of lamp [q.v., a type of antelope peculiar to the western Sahara]; from the Marinids to the Il-Khanids, and in the early 14th c. to the Ghurids and the Il-Khanids.

In the towns, the costs of the hadiyya, in money and in kind, were divided by the government among the rulers of the town and the guilds. The Jewish community had its own hadiyya, often consisting of items of gold or silver work. In the rural areas, the hadid of each tribe was charged with the distribution of the spoils among the victorious. The exchange of gifts was that between Mahmud of Ghazna and Kadr Khan: Mahmud presented gold and silver dishes, precious stones (or pearls), “Baghdad” vessels, beautiful clothing and carpets, weapons (battle-axes and Indian swords), horses with costly trappings, ten elephants, camels with luxuriously appointed litters, sandalwood and ambergris, leopard-skins, falcons and eagles, and slave girls. Kadr Khan responded with a large sum of money, horses, slave-girls, falcons and products of Turkestan (weasel, squirrel and fox pelts) and, significantly, objets d’art of Chinese origin (brocade, articles made of silk). A year amongst the Persians, (1830) and the defeat of the Moroccans in the wadi Fumey, ii, 172. — 2. Michaux-Bellaire, Histoire des Berberes, 144; tr. de Slane, Glossar zu Firdosis Schahname, Berlin 1935, s.v. Hadiyya, the term hiba does not appear here. At least from the Mongol period onwards, presents from governors etc. are described as pishkash wa hadiyya indiscriminately for any kind of present (F. Wolff, Glosarry, nos. 153, 240, 242, 404; Salawi, GMS, n.s. xvi, London 1943, 156) simply indicates a broadening of this clerk’s duties.

The presentation of the haddiyas was an obligatory gift made to the sultan by his subjects; from being the spontaneous homage of gratitude and of vassal status it ended as a supplementary tax. Particularly at the time of the two canonical feasts of the haddiyah, a tree in gilded metal was an obligatory gift to the sultan, of the nature and the amount of which were fixed by the government. At least from the Mongol period onwards, presents from governors etc. are described as pishkash wa hadiyya indiscriminately for any kind of present (F. Wolff, Glosarry, nos. 153, 240, 242, 404; Salawi, GMS, n.s. xvi, London 1943, 156) simply indicates a broadening of this clerk’s duties.

Islamic rulers practised this exchange of gifts not only on the signing of treaties and at their accession, but also on family occasions such as the circumcision of a son. Nizam al-Mulk had an already quite Machiavellian conception of the principal purpose of diplomatic missions: it was to profess subservience to the opponent by the presentation of rich gifts, lull him into security, and reconnoitre his strength or weakness in the event of a war (Siydsat-ndma, c. 96). The type of presents exchanged between Islamic rulers varied little from the early Middle Ages until modern times: jewellery, brocade and other costly stuffs, which were given to the Caliph by the famous Byzantine mission of 937 A.D., continually recur in the lists of presents given by Persian rulers too; also included were money, weapons, perfumes, saddles, horses, slaves, and many other things. The Turks quickly adopted Iranian customs: Toghrilbeg, on the occasion of one mission to the Caliph, sent 10,000 dinars, precious stones and precious cloths. A famous exchange of gifts was that between Mahmud of Ghazna and Kadr Khan: Mahmud presented gold and silver dishes, precious stones (or pearls), “Baghdad” vessels, beautiful clothing and carpets, weapons (battle-axes and Indian swords), horses with costly trappings, ten elephants, camels with luxuriously appointed litters, sandalwood and ambergis, leopard-skins, falcons and eagles, and slave girls. Kadr Khan responded with a large sum of money, horses, slave-girls, falcons and products of Turkestan (weasel, squirrel and fox pelts) and, significantly, objets d’art of Chinese origin (brocade, articles made of silk).
of horn, etc.). Similar presents were given by the Ilkhans to foreign rulers: money, armour, precious stones, cheetahs, silverware, musk, and garments of green and white wool. No doubt some symbolic significance attached to a throne of rattan-wood (Sah-i kbayzurin) with canopy (sadababan), which an Ak Koyunlu ruler received from India. The renowned Kuh-i-Nur diamond came briefly to the Safawid Court in 1544 when Humâyûn (q.v.) sought refuge in Persia. Costly Frankish robes and other European products came into the possession of the Safawids after the 16th century. The horses, always much coveted, were given by the Safawid Shah to the Ottoman mission in 1566/1560-1, as well as the usual robes of honour (khilâf[q.v.]) and gilded saddles and harness. For India, Persia was a transit country useful as a source of Arab horses; Shah 'Abâb I once sent the Emperor Akbar (as well as costly stuffs) 100 stallions and mares of Arab and Georgian stock. From the Indian court came elephants and exotic beasts (tigers, leopards, gazelles, rhinoceroses, parrots and hip-popotamuses), but also (perhaps originally from Europe?) optical instruments, as well as armour set with jewels. A valuable sabre presented by Akbar must have had symbolic significance (victory over the enemies of the Safawids). Even in the very lively diplomatic exchanges with European courts after 1600 A.D., the Safawids confined themselves to the traditional list of presents (slaves naturally did not figure here). Anthony Sherley was commissioned by the Shah to take to various European rulers presents of sabres, bows and arrows, turban silk, belts of pure linen and broad woollen belts. The Persian embassy to Louis XIV in 1715 presented 100 small pearls, 280 turquoises and two gilded boxes of mummy balm [see Wûrm].

From the Crusades onwards, Europeans were well acquainted with oriental customs and preferences, and also, through trade with the East, they were well provided with objects suitable for presents. We therefore find that in the lists of presents of European missions to the Ilkhâns, apart from tents, leopards and hunting dogs, precious stones, etc., there are included silk, purple dye, velvet, canopy material, and mosquito nets, silver gloves, musk boxes, etc., which in the Safawid period relations between Europe and Persia were renewed and intensified to a hitherto unparalleled extent, technical equipment found its way to Persia along with the presents previously customary. Moreover, gifts began to be chosen more to suit individual tastes; specialities of particular countries gained prominence; and firearms were on some occasions delivered in numbers which already approximated to a kind of 'military aid'. The embassy from Philip III of Spain in 1617 brought to Shah 'Abbâb I brocade, dishes and vessels of silver-gilt, harness and armour, but also surgical instruments, locksmiths' and carpenters' tools (the Shah was in some way a forerunner of the Czar Peter the Great in his interest in carpentry), as well as portraits of the Infanta of Spain and the Queen of France (European portraits by way of the Armenians of Djulfâ). Portraits were then very often offered by other embassies too. From France came spy-glasses, crystal chandeliers and crystal mirrors, and (the result of Far East trade) porcelain from China, veils from India, and tea; but there were also cannons of the most modern design, and carpets of silk and gold thread from the Savonnerie factory (near Paris). A coach and four, which the East India Company wished to present to the Shah in 1621, was not greatly welcomed in Persia, where there were no roads; on the other hand the Shah accepted 1,200 arquebuses from the same mission, whereas he criticized armour as unserviceable in war. A Russian mission also had little luck later with a carriage drawn by six horses, which was brought only with the greatest difficulty from Djulfâ to Isfâhân. More welcome were the valuable Russian sables and the barrels of vodka, which the Shah greatly appreciated. An embassy from Holstein brought among other things a fine pavilion and porcelain dishes. The gifts offered by the Dutch ambassador in 1652 were equally conventional, if more luxurious: 2,000 ducats (only gold coins were accepted, as Tavernier states; silver coins, not to speak of forged coins, the Shah rejected), scarlet cloth, a large mirror, ambergreis and amber boxes, Hindustani metal bowls, Japanese lacquer wares and exotic birds. Clocks in costly cases were also favourite articles for presents. The Russian embassy of 1837 had already fallen in with the standards of the other European countries in its choice of presents. The gifts included a set of cut-glass, a set of St. Petersburg porcelain, toilet mirrors, a clock in the form of an elephant, guns, pistols and sabres from the renowned arms factory of Tula, two wall mirrors, diamonds and rings, as well as the traditional sables. The gifts of the British mission of 1812, on the other hand, seem to have been chosen more to suit the personal tastes of Fath 'All Shah: several coaches (kindly received but never used), a pianoforte (the Safawids had once received an organ from Moscow), a large mahogany dining table and 70 mirrors. Most of these, however, were broken on the difficult journey from Bushir to Tehrân.

Christian clergy, too, who were sent as envoys of the Pope or of their Orders, did not present themselves at the Safawid Court without presents, but in these cases even less costly gifts were accepted with indulgence. A Capuchin presented nautical and astronomical instruments (a compass and an astrolabe), a Dominican a clock and "petites nippes de feu de valeur" (as Chardin puts it). A Carmelite mission from the Pope had the extreme naiveté to present Shah 'Abbâb I with a costly crucifix, at which the Shah took no offence. Safl I received from the Vicar-Provincial of the Carmelites an edition of the Psalms in an Arabic translation, together with a few water-melons, and from the Bishop of Baghdâd a portrait of Urban VIII. Innocent XII sent Shah Sultân Husayn in 1700 Venetian brocade, striking clocks, a few pictures, mirrors with filigree frames, a microscope and a magnifying glass, and a block-and-pulley. Organ, spectacles and lifting-gear, also intended for the Shah, were left behind in Aleppo. An Archbishop, on the other hand, presented himself before Nâdir Shah in the traditional manner with a splendidly briddled horse as a gift.

The presentation of gifts was accompanied by a solemn ceremonial. Here it was of the utmost importance to make as great an impression as possible. Thus the presents of Philip III of Spain in 1617 were borne in by not less than 600 servants. Individual missions would arrive in the Persian capital with a baggage train including hundreds of persons. On the other hand, the relatively few presents given by 'Abbâb I to Anthony Sherley were transported on 32 camels. For the Persian embassy to Louis XIV things were simpler: the interpreter carried the presents (pearls and turquoises) in a casket which, like the ambassador's credentials, was
wrapped in gold brocade. On Persian soil the ambassads and their often numerous retinue were entertained at the expense of the Shah, and provided with saddle- and baggage-horses. On top of this would be personal presents, for the ambassador himself usually a robe of honour, horses with trappings, and other gifts, and for his suite presents of more or less value according to rank. Provincial governors were also in the habit of honouring passing ambassadors with presents. Johann Cunaeus, on returning to Holland, was permitted to keep robes of honour and sabres, and one of 15 horses given to him, and for the other gifts he received compensation on account of the expenses incurred by him personally. At the beginning of the 19th century ambassadors were already receiving decorations (the Lion and Sun Order), but in addition still received the traditional robes of honour.


v. OTTOMAN EMPIRE

The giving of presents had some curious ramifications in the Ottoman Empire. During the centuries in which their armies stood at the gates of Central Europe, the Sultan and his viziers were well aware of their power. Accordingly they could expect considerable sums of money to be spent on providing the "presents" which were offered to them by ambassadors.

The justification for expecting such presents was to be found in the case of the Turks (as with other Muslims) in their regarding foreign ambassadors as guests of the Sultan and the Government. Since they were given hospitality and entertainment, it was expected at the Ottoman Court that they would pay back their respect in the same coin. It was considered necessary that foreign ambassadors should receive presents. These included gifts for the ruler of the land to which the envoy was returning after the discharge of his mission (see Usually and, for a general discussion of diplomatic practice, sapfr). The usual presents for this purpose were fine materials and clothing, finely wrought bows, and spices. The ambassador himself almost invariably received the kâhil (g.n.), which had the same significance as a European Order.

The presents brought by the envoys also consisted in the majority of cases of examples of their native arts and crafts, or the natural products or animals of their homeland. In the case of Western and Central Europe, typical gifts were goldsmiths' work, textiles, richly ornamented clothing, or chandeliers. Great Britain would also send mastiffs, and Poland greyhounds. The Slav countries, Poland and Russia, would often present "Nordic wares" as they were called, and as they were known to Arab geographers of the early Middle Ages: furs, especially sables, falcons and other birds, walrus tusks for making trinkets, and also medicines; but equally they included products of native industry: chandeliers, clocks, dishes and so on. The extensive collection of porcelain in the present-day Topkapi Sarayi Museum (especially celadon) originates largely from presents from China at the time of the Manchu dynasty (1644-1912).

It is a fundamental truth of human nature that these presents should be prized not only for their ideal, but also for their material value, and that the circle of those who expected such gifts should grow continually. In the course of time it embraced not only the Grand Vizier and his ministerial colleagues, but many dignitaries, the Agha of the Janissaries, the Governors of particular provinces, especially those which the ambassadors had to traverse on their journeys to and from the Court, but most important of all the interpreter of the Sublime Porte [see TAHİRÎ VOSPAN] and his assistants, upon whom ambassadors bestowed in the language were almost entirely dependent. According to Islamic social custom, any gifts explicitly destined for ladies were unacceptable, and indeed their existence was hardly acknowledged in diplomatic life at the Ottoman Court at that time. Naturally one might indulge the hope that some present or other might come into their possession by indirect means, and arouse their interest in the donor's country.

As ambassadors came into direct contact with the leading Government officials and even the Sultan only at the presentation of their credentials, at official meetings and on taking leave, whilst at the same time they must attempt somehow to exert some influence during their sojourn of months or even years at the Sublime Porte if they were to safeguard the interests of their own countries, "presents" proved a useful means of attracting notice. They could indeed play a decisive role, and many a vizier
or interpreter was not above demanding presents—even with threats. These gifts naturally involved the envoy in considerable expense, and he was under-
standable in view of the frequent changes among the influential officials, especially in the 11th/12th and 12th/13th centuries, that many ambassadors delayed for a time before sending a present. It was always possible that a newly-appointed official might be very quickly relieved of his office, as in the case of Surnâzen Mehmêd Paşâ, who was Grand Vizier for only four hours on 6 March 1566. On the other hand, such swift reversals of fortune did not occur, as in the case of Ahmed Köprüli [see Köprüli] a few years later, it could have highly unpleasant consequences for the dilatory ambassador (French in this case).

It goes without saying that under such circumstances these so-called “presents” acquired more and more the character of bribes for officials, and that the representatives of the various Powers continually tried to outdo one another in the extravagance and frequency of their gifts. Equally there can be no doubt that the interests of the Ottoman Empire were not always served by this custom (as on the Frutch in 1711; see BALTADJİ, at end). The side-effects of present-giving, therefore, undoubtedly contributed to the ruin of the Ottoman Empire and the decline of its moral standards.

Bibliography: B. Spuler, Die europäische Diplomatie ... in Konstantinopel ... , 11, in Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven, N.F. xi (1935), 192-6 (with bibliography of sources and lists of presents); R. Mantran, İstanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIIème siècle, Paris 1961, 513-83 (scattered references, with bibliography).

B. Spuler

HIBA, gift inter vivos, transfers the ownership of a thing during the lifetime of the donor, and with no consideration payable by the donee. The term ṣadaka is used to designate charitable donation, which does not require offer and acceptance and which, moreover, is always irrevocable. As for the term hadîyya, this is preferably applied to the donation of a movable object, given as a present; according to certain Shafi’is it would be valid even without acceptance on the part of the donee.

Gift is a contract. It is formed, say the scholars, by kâdir wa-kabul, by offer and acceptance; though this mutual agreement, however indispensable (barring exceptional circumstances), does not have the same juridical value in all the schools.

(a) According to the Hanafis and the Shafi’is, mere acceptance by the donee not only does not transfer ownership, in sale, it does not even create any obligations binding on the donor. Transfer of ownership is effected only by the donee’s taking possession, when this has been authorized by the donor. Until this taking of possession (kabûl), the donee can neither compel the donor to deliver the subject of the gift, nor put himself in possession against his wishes. The death of the donor or of the donee before possession is taken terminates the agreement. It is true that the Shafi’is, in their so-called “presents”; 

(b) In Mâlikî law, mutual agreement or, if preferred, the acceptance of the donee added to the offer of the donor, creates a true contract which, even if it does not transfer ownership—this is acquired only by kabûl, taking possession—does procure some very great advantages for the donee. Indeed the latter has the right to compel the donor to effect delivery of the thing given, and consequently the transfer of ownership, a right which then passes to the heirs of the donee if the latter dies before taking possession. It should be added that in Mâlikî law the donee could dispose of the thing given, even before delivery, in case of the donor’s decease, provided he took care to have his act officially recorded by the kâdiri.

(c) Of the four Sunnî schools it is the Hanbali alone which attributes to the mutual agreement the effect of transferring ownership, at least when it is a question of gifts of things which are not measured by capacity or weight (Ibn Kudâma, Mughâlî, v. 591). Where the latter are concerned (precious metals, foodstuffs, grain), taking possession again becomes indispensable.

Since gift is a “necessarily impoverishing” act, it can be performed only by individuals whose capacity is complete. Hence it is forbidden even to the semi-incompetent, the prodigal, the weak-minded, even if attended by his guardian (wâli). But it is permissible for the person of full capacity to donate inter vivos the whole of his property, despite the fact that such an act is morally reprehensible if it is aimed at depriving prospective heirs or at favouring some over others. To this rule the jurists add three qualifications, the first two common to all schools, the third peculiar to the Mâlikîs. The bankrupt (muflûr) cannot dispose by gift of goods acquired by him before the sentence of interdiction. Gifts made by an individual at the point of death (fi marad al-ma’âsî) are assimilated to bequests. In other words a person suffering from a fatal disease, or one who finds himself in danger of death, although enjoying all his mental faculties, cannot give more than a maximum of one third of his property, with the further condition that the donee should not be one of the heirs. Finally, in Mâlikî law the married woman, although considered fully competent as in the other schools, is not entitled without her husband’s authorization to give more than one third of her possessions, the husband alone being entitled to contest the validity of a gift in excess.

Broadly speaking, everything susceptible of being sold can be donated. However, this assimilation applies fully only in Shafi’i and Hanbali law. The Hanafis and the Shafi’is treat in gift the same things as in sale, as a general rule the gift of undivided property (muqâbî) when it is divisible by nature; this is an important reservation, for a share in property indivisible by nature (slave, animal, tiny house) can always be donated, the taking of possession, of course, being total in such cases (Hûdâya, iii, 164). The Mâlikîs, on the other hand, display a more liberal attitude towards gift than towards sale, authorizing the gift of something future, uncertain, or insufficiently defined as to kind, quality or value. In their view the exigencies of the law with respect to sale are dictated by an anxiety to avoid risk and illicit profit; they lose their raison d’être in the case of acts of liberality, since these call for no consideration from the side of the donee.

Revocation of gifts: this is a point where the differences between the schools seem quite arbitrary, despite the efforts of the jurists to explain these differences in the light of certain hadîthûn which the proponents of the two conflicting doctrines invoke, in opposite directions of course. Thus on the one hand we have the Hanafi doctrine, according to which the donor is normally entitled to revoke his gift (barring impediments), unless he is related to the donee within the degrees where marriage is forbidden, or is the
The right to revoke, more or less liberally accorded by the various schools in terms of the quality of the donor, disappears in the presence of one of the following impediments:

(a) The death of the donor, revocation being a right attached to the person of the donor, or the death of the donee, since the property then passes from his ownership;

(b) Alienation by the donee of the thing given, with or without consideration;

(c) Its loss or destruction, whether due to the passage of time, to accident, or to the act of the donee himself;

(d) Changes produced in the thing given also create an obstacle to revocation. It is not necessary that the change be caused by the donee. Any change which may rest on the donor before possession is taken (Egyptian Civil Code art. 493; Syrian Civil Code art. 401). That is why the withdrawal of gift from the domain of personal status, where it was traditionally placed, has been accompanied by many changes in the rules of Ijana law. Indeed it is in the countries of Hanafi persuasion that this phenomenon is especially apparent. For instance, nearly all these countries have purely and simply abandoned the restrictive and complicated ruling of their school relative to the gift of undivided or jointly-owned property. The Sudan gave the lead on this point with its Judicial Circular no. 13 of 1953. Likewise, there is a tendency no longer to demand taking possession as a condition of validity, provided the gift is effected by an authentic deed (Egyptian Civil Code art. 490; Syrian Civil Code art. 458). Lastly, the Maliki principle that the donor binds himself immediately to ensure delivery of the thing given has been substituted in most places for the Hanafi rule under which no obligation rests on the donor before possession is taken (Egyptian Civil Code art. 493; Syrian Civil Code art. 401).

Besides gift proper (hiba), the essential characteristics of which have just been outlined, there are certain special forms of donation about which a few words may be said, if only to establish the degree to which they are valid.

'Umar, as defined by the Hanafi, Shafi'i and Hanball schools, is gift with full ownership but as an ordinary gift, it is enough for an animal to have grown bigger or fatter, a slave to have become more handsome, a house to have been whitewashed, etc. One would suppose that this kind of impediment would be most often invoked in order to render a gift irrevocable.

In three schools, the Maliki, Hanball and Shafi'i, revocation is impossible where it could harm the creditors of the donee; for the first two of these schools, everyone who became a creditor after the gift, should be allowed to attach to the person, or the death of the donee, the withdrawal of gift from the domain of ownership of the thing given has been substituted in most places for the Hanafi rule under which no obligation rests on the donor before possession is taken (Egyptian Civil Code art. 493; Syrian Civil Code art. 401).

'dimmi, vizier of the caliph al-Mustazhir. Hibat Allah was once appointed vizier in Muharram 501/August-September 1107, but he was dismissed in Ramadan under pressure from the Saljuk sultan Muhammad b. Malikshah. It is true that the caliph soon restored him to office, in the form of Muhammadan Law, the withdrawal of gift from the domain of personal status, where it was traditionally placed, has been accompanied by many changes in the rules of Ijana law. Indeed it is in the countries of Hanafi persuasion that this phenomenon is especially apparent. For instance, nearly all these countries have purely and simply abandoned the restrictive and complicated ruling of their school relative to the gift of undivided or jointly-owned property. The Sudan gave the lead on this point with its Judicial Circular no. 13 of 1953. Likewise, there is a tendency no longer to demand taking possession as a condition of validity, provided the gift is effected by an authentic deed (Egyptian Civil Code art. 490; Syrian Civil Code art. 458). Lastly, the Maliki principle that the donor binds himself immediately to ensure delivery of the thing given has been substituted in most places for the Hanafi rule under which no obligation rests on the donor before possession is taken (Egyptian Civil Code art. 493; Syrian Civil Code art. 401).
HIBRI — HIDJA

Tophaps Sarayi .... türkçe yazmalar katalogu, ii, Istanbul 1961, no. 2728); (3) a concise History of the Ottomans, from the beginnings to the reign of Phōbim I, with lists of viziers, etc., entitled Defter-i ahhbār, it is of some importance for the events of his own time (see Ist. kit. tarih-coğrafya yazmaları katalogları, li, Istanbul 1944, no. 40); (4) and (5) short accounts of Murād IV's conquests of Baghdād and Rewān (A. S. Levend, Gazavat-nāmelere, Ankara 1956, 111); (6) a riddle on the times of prayer, composed in 1607/1606-7; (7) a small disdēn.

He is remembered for his Anis al-musāmmirīn, completed in 1045/1065-6 (but added to in later years), a history and description of his native town. In the tradition of earlier 'histories of cities' in Arabic and Persian literature (but apparently for the first time in Ottoman literature, if a few panegyrics of Istanbul are excluded), he describes in detail the mosques and other public buildings and records the famous men of the town. It was used by Ḥāḍidatī Ḥājī for the relevant section of his Taṣārīmil Āmmār (fr. J. von Hammer, Rumeli und Bosna, Vienna 1827, 1-15), and was revised and considerably expanded by Bādi Ṣumār Ef. (d. 1908) as Riyād ū tedāl-i Edīrīne (unpublished: 1 vol. Autograph MS in the Library of the Selimiye mosque, Edīrīne). The so-called Ṭarīḥat-i Ḍiwarī Čelebi, 2 parts, Istanbul 1293-2, consists in part, at least, of extracts from the Anis al-musāmmirīn and the Defter-i ahhbār (see Babinger, 214).

Bibliography: Hammer-Purgstall, x, 691-2: Bursall Mehmēd Tāhir, Ṭūḥānī muğlisiflerleri, iii, 9-78 (Bādi Ahmed Ef. at. iii, 31); Babinger, 212-4; Tāyib Gökbilin, Edīrīne hākkanda yaz出入境 tarihler ve Ents-ül mūsāmīn, in Edīrīne (armanāg hikābā), Ankara 1964, 77-117 (full biography and summary of contents of the work).

(V. L. Ménage)
Encyclopaedia of Islam III
In the pre-Islamic period, "poetry was abundant only in regard to wars between the clans... If Kuraysh had little poetry, it was because they harboured no hatreds and were never at war".

It is in the struggles that took place between Muslims and polytheists that we see the important part played by hidja, and the verses of the Kur'an (XXVI, 224-7) condemning poets, except for those who were believers, are a retaliation against the attacks to which the nascent Islam was subjected; the Prophet himself had to resign himself to using the services of several poets to combat his adversaries with the appropriate weapons to dishonour and vilify them, even going so far as to pledge his supporters the aid of Gabriel (see Ibn Sallâm, Tabâdâl, 181); the most celebrated and virulent of these champions of Islam is Ḥassân b. Thâbit [q.v.], but we should also note at least Kâb b. Malik [q.v.] and 'Abd Allâh b. Rawhâ [q.v.], who is less mordant but perhaps more effective in the mockery with which he overwhelmed the incredulity of the Meccans. If hidja had not been so influential in Arabia, the Prophet, who disavowed it, would certainly not have gone so far as to incite the poets against the infidels; incidentally he said that the shafts they shot were more potent than arrows.

Under the first caliphs, hidja was rejected as being contrary to the teachings of the new religion, but to a certain extent it continued to be practised, feared and encouraged, for religious, political and racial reasons. It was primarily cultivated in what C. A. Nallino (Raccolta di scritti, vi, Rome 1948, 110 ff.; French trans., La littérature arabe, 170 ff.) calls the poetry of the troops (delle milizie). Feeble when the enemy was non-Arab, it reached the vivacity and verve of the ancient hidja as soon as the adversaries present could understand (see, e.g., the accounts of the Battle of the Camel [q.v.]). Perhaps of greater interest are the poems inspired by the politico-religious hatreds born or inflamed during the early days of Islam, an especially eloquent echo of which can be found in the works of the Khârijî [q.v.] and in isolated poets like al-Âshâ of the Banî Hamdân [q.v.] or Ibn Mufârrîgh [q.v.].

Hidja was also practised in a quasi-official manner in that sovereigns tended to surround themselves with poets able to defend their glory and attack their enemies; thus al-Âkhâl [q.v.] hurled invectives at all his master's foes, while at the same time insulting his own rivals, Dîjarf and al-Parâzâd [qq.v.], who heated abuse upon each other and set out to procure each other's destruction in Nâkâhid [q.v.] which remain a characteristic example of hidja of the Bedouin type—but of a hidja henceforward deprived of its social character and reduced to a punishment in the form of an insult delivered by opinion (represented in this case by the poet) upon anyone who failed to conform with the modes of existence, outlook and behaviour inspired by the sentiment of honour.

This character is even more markedly absent from another form of hidja, of the most sordid sort, which came into being at the very beginning of Islam: for the poet, it consists in earning himself a reputation for foolishness of speech, with the aim of extorting nothing less than blackmail from potential patrons. Thus, for al-Ḥuṭâyâ [q.v.], that "eroder of honours" (mihrâb al-aš'âda), invective was a means of subsistence, for the terror inspired by his reputation won him a stream of gifts. This extortioneer poet had a crowd of emulators in the 2nd/8th century, and a certain rhymester reached the point of simply writing on his stick the object of his desire, so great was the dread of his comments in verse (see AL-MAKAM B. 3ARHAL)

In the same period, hidja became epigrammatic in the hands of poets of greater or lesser renown who respected nothing and took malicious pleasure in denigrating their opponents, and sometimes even their friends, by addressing crude and obscene observations to them; the Aghdân teems with verse of this type, the writers being Bashâhr, Ḥarmâd 4Ashrâd, Ibn Munâshîr, Dîbîl [qq.v.] and many others; among them the Khârijî [see-q.v.] were never behindhand, since the epigram had become a pastime of the upper classes.

The indecent hidja underwent a relative eclipse in the 3rd/9th century when neo-classical poetry flourished, although Ibn al-Rûmî [q.v.] became a past-master of the art of abuse, and a quantity of satirical verses is to be found in Abû Tammâm, al-Buhîrî, and then in al-Mutanaâbi [q.v.]. They are, however, in no way comparable with the writings of the 2nd/8th century, nor with the works of later poets such as Ibn al-Ḥadîdâdji or Ibn al-Habîbîrîyâ (qq.v.); the propensity of these last poets for subha [q.v.] inspired them to write virulent, gross and obscene epigrams which they addressed to patrons whom they held to be too misererly; the principal themes were avarice, meanness of spirit, and lowly origin, but more and more insinuations crept in, not to say accusations, of homosexuality and other deviations.

The theorists had, however, endeavoured to restrict the subject-matter of hidja by restoring greater moderation; for them, it consisted essentially in refusing every praiseworthy quality to the person under attack and attributing to him defects of a purely moral order such as avarice, greed, lack of courage, etc. Physical defects should not be taken into consideration, nor, for some, even the smallness of the group (see al-ʿAskârî, Sinâât al-ṣâyîn, 105); Ḫudâmâ [q.v.] and other critics stood up against the grossness of the hidja and recalled the remark of Abû Ṭâmâr b. al-ʿAlî [q.v.]: "the best hidja is that which can be recited by a girl without loss of modesty", but Ibn Rasîq [q.v.] admits that it should be adapted to the milieu for which it was intended, although he prefers the discreet and subtle allusion to over-emphatic assertion (see A. Trabulsî, Critique poétique, Damascus 1955, 228-30).

In Muslim Spain, where the eastern tradition was faithfully followed, Ibn Bassân [q.v.] stated in his Dakhîbra (vol. iii, still unpublished) that he had not included any hidja in his anthology, in order not to spoil it; Ibn Bassân lived in an austere period, which explains his scruples, but his contemporary al-Fâth b. Ḫâfîk [q.v.] and others as well did not refrain from attacking their fellows, though without exceeding the limits permitted by decency, at least as understood by Arab authors.

In regard to style, the literary form of the hidja, which is very supple, allows the use of generally clear and simple language; only the subtlest epigrams appear obscure on account of the allusions that they contain.

This genre being exclusively poetic in origin, one would hardly expect to find any hidja in prose; and yet, from the 3rd/9th century, simple prose tends to replace certain functions of poetry, and al-Dîhâs [q.v.] does not disdain to include in his Kitâb al-Turbi wa l-ṣudâr some satirical pages in the best vein, and even to create satire with a portrait of
Muhammad b. al-Djahm al-Barmaki (g.v.; ed. T. Husayn, in al-Katib al-Misri February 1947, 55-64) and some rasālī in which he pokes fun at his closest friends, though without malice. In the following century his emulator, Abū Ḥasyān al-Tawfīdī (g.v.) further developed the genre with the Makhālib al-waṣairayn (ed. I. Kaylānī, Damascus [1961]) and, in the 12th/11th century, the Andalusī writer and poet Ibn Shuwaydī (g.v.) drew satirical portraits of great subtility (see Ibn Bassām, Dabḥa, i/s, passim); here we are concerned with an intellectual and literary truth in its most respectable connexion with the writings in verse described above. Perhaps we should also mention the Mabāmatī (g.v.), which contain a large proportion of true satire; it is only here that the translation of ẁαμμαξία by hidżī is justifiably “satire”. Satire of manners, which has scarcely been cultivated in Arabic (see al-DuQaQī, and ʻUkāya) has not resulted in comedy any more than mabhāma, but it will be noted that comedy makes its entry into the Arab theatre before the other dramatic genres (see Masraya).

Hidżī in verse, of more or less the classical type, has not disappeared even at the present day; leaving aside its too unfamiliar survivals in dialectal Arabic, we find in many poems invectives which would not be disowned by the ancient poets, although the subject matter has for the most part changed; now the themes are mainly colonialism, imperialism, foreign (even Arab) governments, and hostile political parties, which are the target for attacks in verse by poets, and pamphlets too are renewing the ancient tradition; the great difference lies in the fact that gross insults are mostly banished from this verse, the best examples of which recall the wittiest and subtlest writings of certain poets of the 2nd/8th century.

Bibliography: in addition to the sources given in the article: Poems of hidżī occur throughout the diwanī of the ancient poets and the great collections such as the Bayān of Ḍahīz, the K. al-Ṣhrī wa ʻl-ḥuwarā of Ibn Kuttāya, the Ḥāqānī, etc.; certain anthologies devote to it a chapter entitled bāb al-hidżī, in particular the Ḥamāsā of Abū Tamām, the ʻIshā of Ibn ʻAbd Rabbīh, the Musṭaṣrīf of ʻIshbīlī, etc.; in the same way, the critical works generally contain in bāb al-hidżī, particularly the Nakhr al-ḥadīth of ʻUkūdama, the ʻUmdu of Ibn Rāshīk, etc.—The principal works of orientalists were named at the beginning of the article; to them should be added: W. Ahlwardt, Über die Poesie und Poetik der Araber, Gotz 1856, 51-2; T. Husayn, Fi ʻl-adab al-ṣāhilī, Cairo 1927, 122-40, 171-81; F. Gabrieli, Estetica e poesia araba, in RSO, xli (1930), 293-300; ʻAbbās M. al-ʻAkkād, Ibn al-Kāmī, Cairo 1932, 217-43; M. Husayn, al-Ḥājī wa ʻl-ḥadījāfān, Cairo 1947; E. J. Webber, Comedy and satire in Hispano-Arabic Spain, in Hispanic Review, xxvi (1958), 1-12; R. Blachère, HLA, ii, 380-2, 417-25. (Ch. Pellat)

II.—PERSA

Though hidjzi is more specifically “satire”, this section of the article will contain general considerations on Persian humour.

Persian humour finds its expression in various literary genres: ḥadīw (satire), ḥawād (parody) etc. Amongst the rhetorical figures most widely used to obtain humorous effects are ṭadhim or “quotation”; where a poem by another author is taken as the basis and inserted in one’s own poem, macaronic verses (mulamma), a mixed composition of Arabic, Persian and sometimes Turkish elements, etc. Humorous or jocose poetry is moreover defined by classical Persian literary critics under various headings, with reference to its contents rather than to its form. So we have ḥayyībā (jocose poems), ḥufriyāt (blasphemous or heretical poems), ḥammiyāt (wine-poems), ḥasāliyāt (facetious poems) etc., and in prose the ḥalqī (pl. of ḥalq), i.e., facetiae.

It would be impossible here to make even a sketchy history of Persian humour. Almost all the poets of the classical tradition wrote in common with the style, which was already present in the Arabic literature of the early ‘Abbāsīd period, from which Persian took so many forms and ideas. One of the oldest Persian specialists in humorous verses was Sūzān of NAS (d. 569/1173-4 or 574/1179) who founded a sort of school of this kind of poetry in Transoxiana: Abū ʻAlī Ṣharīfī al-Samarqandī, author of the “Stick Kaṣdī” and, Ṣafī al-šarīfī Ḫāwāvī, Djamātī of Nakshāb, Lāmī of Bukhārī. By far the greatest of the Persian parodists and satirists is however the contemporary of Hāfīz, Ḫubāy-i Zākānī of Kāzvin (d. ca. 772/1371), whose masterpiece is the Abkhlāq al-āṣrāfī ("Ethics of the Aristocracy"), in prose mixed with verses, composed in 740/1340; the authorship of his famous long kaṣdī Muḥī u gurba ("the Cat and the Mouse"), is now doubtful (MINO). In the following century Abū ʻIṣbāq or ʻAbūl Ṣaḥrāb (active in the first decades of the 9th/15th century), called Alī maqī (foods), specialized in writing jocose poems concerning food (Kans al-igtiha), "Treasure of Appetite"; Diwān-i Afsīma, etc.). It is significant that he, a carder of cotton, was connected with the mystical order of Shāh Niʿmat Allāh of Māhān (near Kirmān) and showed some malamašt tendencies (parodies of his own master’s mystical poems). A specialist in "clothes" was ʻAbd al-Dīn Mahmūd Kārī of Yazd (first half of 9th/15th century), author of the Diwān-i Alīsīs ("Sartorial Poems"). For later times, we mention only Yaghmā (1782-1859), also coming from a poor family, a very popular poet of the Kādjar period. But, as has been said above, almost all the great classic poets (e.g. Sa’dī, and, later, Kā‘ānmī and others) indulged in writing fayyībā or hasāliyāt.

A specialist in the study of Persian humour is that represented by folk verses or folk tales, which are not generally included in the traditional histories of Persian literature. Their central character is that of the "fool of God" of the type of the Italian Bertoldo, with a different name in different places. In Iran we find Mullā Naṣr al-Dīn, Mullā Du-Piāza, Shāykh Bahdur, Mullā Muḥāfīzī, etc. He is rather a Persian-Islamic than a typically Iranian character (St. Dūjā in Arab countries, Nasrattīn Hoca in Turkey, Birbal in Muslim India, Pak Pandir, Pak Kadok and others in Malay and Indonesia etc.).

As regards classical Persian humour we must never forget that its stylistic background remains that (definable in general as decorative-symbolic) of all classical Persian literature. The abrupt insertion of ultra-realistic butts into otherwise non-satirical verses is produced by a singular vis comica. One of the most comic passages of Zākānī is, for instance, a nazm in Firdawsi’s style inserted in the chapter of the Abkhlāq al-āṣrāfī devoted to chastity; in the static decorative style of the Shāhnāma when it describes battles and duels, accompanied by a couple of moralizing verses, Zākānī describes here, in the most direct and asymbolic way, the homo-sexual intercourse between two famous heroes of the
Shāhnāma, Rustam and Hūmān. The stylized majestic decorativeness of the verses of Firdawsi applied to such an incongruous object creates almost automatically a powerful vis comica. We should also keep in mind that the stylistic bases of our Western humour generally differ from those of the classical Persian literature; a verse of the famous ḩājida in an by Amir Muṭẓizi, where the poet in love is compared to a chicken roasting on a spit, invariably produces laughter in an unprepared Western reader, who interprets this purely static image in a dynamic way. One of the elements of classical Persian humour is however simply the exaggeration of the background style. For instance in Zākānī’s works in prose mixed with verses the background style is that of Sa’dī’s Gulistān: but the exaggeration in the use of this style is clearly visible, e.g. the continuous interruption of even short sentences through minute “commentaries” in verse form.

Another element often present in Persian comical verse is the dynamic personification of inanimate objects which, for obvious reasons, plays only a secondary rôle in our modern Western humour. The complete lack of mythological trends in the Muslim world, the highly developed Neoplatonic static symbolism of its style may explain—by contrast—the comic force of such a stylistic device. The pots that become pregnant and give birth to infant pots in the famous laffia of Mullā Naṣr al-Dīn, or the personified “beard” of Zākānī’s Rishgīnāma might produce only a smile in a Westerner, but in the stylistic world of classical Persian literature the abrupt appearance of a ribald old character called Ṛgh al-Dīn Abu ’l-Mahāsīn (“Beard of the Religion”, “Father of Virtues” [maḥāsīn, also “beard” in Persian]) out of a hole in a wall is so uncommon “stylistically” that it creates laughter. And—here is another element of Persian classical humour—the vis comica is even augmented by the irreverent macaronic play on words implicit in the name of this character (ḵūr. Persian for “beard” is macaronically combined with din through an Arabic ṣada). The use of courtly and religious Arabic words or elements together with the most common, and often vulgar, Persian names (e.g. the Arabic article al- in the humorous “Dictionary” by Zākānī, called Ta’rifās, or Ṩiṣāb al-ṣadīq), makes even the most serious contemporary sources lack even in folk tales of the Mullā Naṣr al-Dīn type.

The whole may give sometimes the impression of social criticism or realism, but we should always keep in mind the stylistic motives that lie at the basis of all this. Generally speaking, classical Persian humour seems to be the by-product of highly refined urban milieus that contrast with the ignorant mulūds on one side, but, on the other side, also with the equally ignorant peasants (so often criticized by Zākānī); we are in a palaeo-bourgeois and rather bookish world, creating a sort of “clerks’ humour” equally anti-mystic and anti-popular.

This does not mean, of course, that social and sometimes even bitter social criticism is absent from Persian humour. Numerous elements of it are present, especially in Zākānī’s Aḥbāb al-ṣaghfīs and even more in the works of recent satirists. Last but not least, Persian writers of this genre supply us with extremely important information—not yet sufficiently studied—concerning the common life of the people of their time, on food, clothes, customs, social institutions, etc., which is so difficult to obtain from other, more serious, contemporary sources.

**Bibliography:**


(A. Bausani)

---

**iii.—Turkish Literature**

The characteristic of ḥidjād (ḥīdaw, mod. hīdaw) in Turkish literature is that, with rare exception, it is blended with humour. It has been expressed both in verse and in prose and was not confined to any particular literary genres.

In Ottoman Turkish literature the earliest example of satire is the famous Khar-nāme (the Book of the Donkey) by the 9th/15th century poet Sheykhī (g.s.) of Germiyan (?-833/i430?). This is a poem of about 124 couplets (the number varies in the different manuscripts) in maḥnawi form and in ḏaḥif metre, which is included in most dīwan (a good copy is in Istanbul Un. Lib., T.Y. 2408, fols. 60b-63b, which is better than that of the text in the dīwan published in fascimile by the Türk Dil Kurumu, Istanbul 1942, 64-70). A donkey, working for a master who has broken his word, by hard labour and ill-treatment, is one day allowed by his master to graze in the meadow. There he sees well-fed oxen enjoying life, and particularly envious their horns, which are like crowns on their heads. He goes to an old and experienced donkey and asks him the reason for this injustice. The old wise donkey explains to him that the reason why oxen are so privileged is that they work in the corn and barley fields whereas all that donkeys can do is to carry wood. Inspired by this explanation, the donkey rushes to a cornfield and begins to devour the green corn with delight. When he has eaten his fill he rolls on the ground and bays loudly. Hereupon the owner of the field appears, gives him a thorough beating and cuts off his tail and his ears.

This short poem contains in miniature all the elements of a classical maḥnawi. The sources do not agree to whom the work was dedicated. Although some MSS mention Murād II in the introductory part, the evidence is stronger for Mehmed I, who was treated and cured in Ankara by Sheykhī, a physician by profession, during the sultan’s Karaman campaign (818/h1415). The Sultan rewarded the poet by giving him the fief of the village Tokuzlar or Tokzu. As Sheykhī was on his way to the village, the former
owners of the region held him up, beating him and wounding him badly, and took away everything he possessed. The *Khar-nâme* is an indirect complaint against their rivals, poems of this type conceits and plays on words, the strong satire couched in subtle humour to make this little poem a masterpiece almost without parallel in this genre until Dıyâ (Ziya) Paşa's *Zafer-nâme* in the Tanzimat period.

During the 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries many alevî poets wrote satirical *hifâs* against their rivals and enemies, but the famous name for *hîdâ* in the classical period is Nefî (*q.v.*). This outstanding *hâşida*-writer composed a special book of satires, *Sîhâm-i kâdâ* (Arrows of Fate), which contains violent satirical poems in the forms of *hâşidas* and *hifâs* against leading personalities of his time, viziers, scholars, poets, government officials and his own father. The majority of these satires contain gross invectives and obscenities and reflect the violent and arrogant temperament of the poet. Nefî thus takes vengeance on his victims by exposing their vices and enumerating the injustices they had made him suffer. Nefî was very popular at the courts of Ahmîd I and particularly of Murâd IV, who enjoyed reading his virulentic attacks against political personalities also known to him. It is not surprising that this made Nefî many enemies. According to an anecdote reported in most contemporary sources, Murâd IV, on a stormy day in 1639, was reading the *Sîhâm-i Kâdâ* in the Beşiktaş Palace when lightnings struck nearby. Drawing an evil omen from this, the sultan tore up the book and forbade Nefî to write any more satires. But the poet could not resist the temptation very long. He wrote in 1044/1634 a violent *hîdâ* against Bayram Paşa, who was then deputy Grand Vizier. According to an anecdote about these enemies, jealous of the imperial favours of the Police. In the whole work, written in a refined style, always scintillating with subtle irony, remained unrivalled in modern Turkish literature are used in this work, Diya Dişdiye-i Fâdil Efendi (1875) and later Pâ'îb (1882) and Kânsü (1882) began the series; they were followed by Redja'izlde Ekrem's (1847-1914) 'Arâbâ Sveâîî (1889, published 1896) and Hüsân YâhÎmî's (1864-1944) *Sîs* (1897), *Sâîasîsî* (1900) and *'Omer Seyf al-Dîn* (1884-1920). At the turn of the century *hîdâ* in Turkish poetry is brilliantly represented by Me'mehâd Efref (1847-1912) who, after a year's imprisonment for his political activities, went to Egypt (1903) and wrote there his famous satirical *hâşidas* and *hifâs* in which 'Abd al-Âhâm II, his pashas, and his régime are mercilessly attacked in a very personal style where irony and sarcasm dominate.

A number of poets developed after the revolution of 1908 a new genre of satire in the form of pastiches or *nasâres*, with the same metre and rhyme as well-known *hâşidas* and ghâzâls of the great classics, particularly of Fudûtî, Nefî and Nâdim. Two names stand out: Fâdîl Âhmed Aykaç (born 1884), the author of the *Dinâmîn-i Fàddî* (1913), and Khâlîf Nîhâd Bostêpe (1882-1949), the author of *Sîhâm-i sîhâm* (1923). These two poets and a few other minor writers of this school wrote humorous satire mainly of a political nature, generally aimed at the individuals playing a prominent part in Turkey during the years 1908-1923.

Between 1908 and 1920 the essayist, short-story writer and satirist Nefî Khâlîl Karâv (*q.v.*) (1888-1965) produced the best specimens of political satire in prose. In many essays he attacked and ridiculed the governments of the Committee of Union and Progress, their leading personalities, and Istanbul society during the First World War and immediately after. His mastery of the language and his colourful, vivid and flowing style, always scintillating with subtle irony, remained unrivalled in modern Turkish until a new prose style was developed by the generation of young writers following the language reform movement of the 1930's. Most of his satirical essays have been collected in the following works: (1) *Sâkîn aldanma inana na man* (1915, in Roman script 1941); (2) *Kîrsînîn dedikleri* (1916, 1940); (3) *Aqğ* *Pâşâ'nın köprüsü* (1918, 1939); (4) *İstanbul'un hafızları* (1920); (5) *İstanbul'un hafızları* (1936, 1939); (6) *Sığaçubîlî sahan* (1922, 1940); (7) *Tandikâlar* (1922, 1941).

In contemporary Turkish literature, several writers make use of humorous satire to combat extreme traditionalism, bigotry and political intolerance. The most popular and successful writer of this school is Azîz Nèsin (b. 1915), the prolific short story writer, novelist, essayist and playwright (for a list
of his main works see Behcet Necatigil, Türk edebiyatı tarihi ve isimler sözlüğü, Istanbul 1964, 157), who is essentially known as a humorist but who actually aims at killing by ridicule social and political prejudices and the shortcomings of a society in transition.

In Turkish folk-literature social and political satire is one of the principal themes, and the tales of Naşir al-Dîn Khoja and Bektaşi anecdotes, folk tales, the stories told by meddârîs (public story-tellers) abound in satirical criticisms of public figures and social prejudices. Satirical interpolations in the improvised converses on set themes in the Ortaoyunu and the Karâğa is q.q.s are very frequent. These public performances have often been censored and at times temporarily suspended when the element of satire was thought to be dangerous.

In folk poetry a special satirical genre called tasgîlama has been developed. Tasgîlamas may have a great variety of subjects, but social injustices are one of their main targets (see İhlan Başgöz, Türk halk edebiyati antolojisi, Istanbul 1963, 16 and 129).

In Eastern Turkish (Çağhätay) literature the great 9th/15th century poet and writer All Şîr Nâwî is the most outstanding representative of satire. In many of the ghâsals and rubâ'îs in his four divânîs there are powerful satirical passages against hypocrites and bigots. In a typical ghâsâl he addresses the wâdîr (the preacher) in these terms: ‘What lies, what ridiculous behaviour, O preacher! Are you not ashamed of the community? They asked you to moderate people’s unceouthiness by counsels; who told you to kick and break the pulpit? . . . The tears on my cheeks are because of my hidden suffering and not because of the effect of your sermon, O preacher! To drink wine at night, and by day to tell people not to drink it, these are really nice virtues, O preacher!’ (TEDD, ii (1962), 43-4).

Examples of interesting social satire of minor literary value have been given by some late Eastern Turkish poets in Turkish literature.

In Adharbaydjan Turkish two writers stand out in hâjdâ: Mirzâ Fezî ʿAllî Aşqûzâda (1812-1878), a leading modernist and the first Turkish playwright, and Mirzâ ʿAllî Şîr Nâwî, who, together with some minor poets and writers of the humorous and satirical review Molla Nazreddin (founded in Tiflis in 1906), waged a relentless campaign against fanaticism and ignorance, and the conventional concepts of the old divânî literature.


But the best representative of the satire proper is Mirzâ ʿAllî Ekerb Şâbir (1862-1911), who, together with some minor poets and writers of the humorous and satirical review Molla Nazreddin (founded in Tiflis in 1906), waged a relentless campaign against fanaticism and ignorance, and the conventional concepts of the old divânî literature. His personal satires such as Kasîda-i şeyh ʿâşîh and Mukhabmas-i şeyh ʿâşîh are ‘complaints’ of the life and times at a juncture when owing to the rapid decline of Mughal power the feudal society of Dîhil’s society was disintegrating; and in the city it was precarious and undignified on account of the depredations of the Marâthas and the Dîkts and the invasions of Nâdîr Şîh and Ahmad Şîh Abdâbî. Most illustrative of these satirical and decline of the feudal society in Dîhil are Sawdâ’s Kasîda-i tahtîkh-i râşgâr, a satire on a nobleman who had fallen on evil times, and Muḥânwî dar ḥadîw-i Siddî Fulâd Khân, kowâlî-i Şâhîzâhânâbâd, which is also full of some personal venom. Sawdâ’s personal satires such as those directed against a satirist of lower calibre, Mir Şahîk, tend to be incisive, sardonic and vulgar. The most criticised of Sawdâ’s personal satires is Kasîda dar ḥadîw-i ḥâkîsh ki muṣûsâ ashîb, written from a Şîfî polemical viewpoint against the theologian Wall Allâh Dîhaltî (q.q.s.).

Sawdâ’s great contemporary Mir Tâkî Mîr (1722-1820) had a lyrical genius suited to the writing of ghâsals, but the element of social satire is also present in his ‘complaints’ like the Dar ḥadîw-i hâdwâ-i ūyûd.

It developed in the Lucknow school of poetry, but its use was limited. Here, in comparatively secure social conditions, social satire is rarely found. Instead we have personal exchanges between poets like Inshâ (1756-1817) and Muṣâbîl (164-1824). Inshâ, the better satirist of the two, had a frivolous virtuousity which his more dignified contemporaries lacked.

The satirical heritage of the Lucknow school produced a striking synthesis with counter-modernism under the impact of Western ideas and institutions in the verse of Akbar Allâhâbâdî (1846-1921), the pre-eminent social and political satirist of modern times.

Thematically Akbar’s satire is anti-West. It aims to ridicule, in isolated verses as well as in short poems like Dikhâ Darbâr, Barû-i bûtesa and Cûrûn Nûma, the glamour of British Indian life and institutions, and beyond it the very essence of Western civilization. He often directed his satire against Sayyid Ahmad Khân (q.q.s.) and the modernism of the ʿAllârîh movement. Akbar achieves his satirical effect by an intelligent cynicism, by reducing the sublime and the scientific to the ridiculous, by an amazing inventive ness in the interplay of rhymes, by coining and establishing a symbolic satirical vocabulary of his own, by an instinct for playing to the conservative gallery and by a passionate though pessimistic faith in the values of the Muslim past.

The tradition of political satire established by Akbar soon became a broad movement. The freedom movements organized by the Indian National Congress, the Khilâfat Conference and the Muslim
League produced a school of more sustained and topical satire. Its outstanding representative was Zafar All Khan, a political leader of shifting loyalties and the editor of the Zamin'dar. During and since the 1920's topical political satire became one of the regular and attractive features of Urdu journalism.

Prose satire in Urdu had its beginnings in the dastan literature of the early nineteenth century, especially in the Tijjami hizbub. From the prose dastan the satirical elements travelled to the modern novel and are discernible in Ibn al-Wahab, a novel in which Nadhhr Ahmad (1836-1912) seems to ridicule Sayyid Ahmad Khan's adoption of the Western style of living. Sarghars's (1845-1903) novels have also an element of social satire. Caricature, bordering on generalized satire, forms the subject matter and details of the novels of Sayyid Sadidjat Husayn, founder and editor of the humorous journal Awadh Panal.

Awadh Panal, modelled on Punch, was published in Lucknow in 1877 and continued until 1912. It was conservative in social outlook and opposed Sayyid Ahmad Khan's liberal and modernism. Much of its satirical content is directed against the Aliaghar movement and Western institutions. Awadh Panal established the tradition of prose satire in Urdu journalism, which is traceable in a number of journals that have succeeded it as well as in the columns of caustic political comment which are a permanent feature of Urdu newspapers.


(Aziz Ahmad)

AL-HIDJA—HURUF [see huruf al-Hidja].

HIDJA (a., from the verb hidjat, "to hide from view, conceal") is used of any object placed in front of a person or an object in order to conceal it from view or to isolate it. In medicine, it is a membrane which separates certain parts of the organism: al-hidjat al-huwai or hidjat al-djawal "diaphragm"; hidjat al-mustabjan "pleura" and hidjat al-bukhriya "b hymen" (al-Tahanawi, Kalsud; LA: Dozy, Suppl.).

Scarcely anything is known of the pre-Islamic use of this word; but the Kur'an, though it is found there only seven times, provides as valuable information on the basic and metaphorical meaning of the term as it does, to a certain extent, on its evolution. In general hidjat in the Kur'an means a separation: it is the veil or the curtain behind which Mary isolated herself from her family (XIX, 17); it is also the separate establishment (lately the gynaeceum) which was imposed at first only on the wives of the Prophet (XXXIII, 53; cf. XXXIII, 35), apparently on the advice of 'Umar. On the Day of Judgement, the saved will be separated from the damned by a hidjat (VII, 46), which is glossed as wall (sur) by the commentators, who deduce this interpretation from Kur'an LVI, 13. "It belongs not to any mortal that God should speak to him, except by revelation, or from behind a veil" (XXII, 54), a veil apparently intended to protect the elect from the brilliancy of the Divine countenance. (As for hiddan, it is certain that this custom was very little observed before the time of Muhammad, the veiling having been the prerogative of women of a certain rank, who used for this nafs, sir, sidjat, etc. ("Ali al-Hashshmil, Al-Mar'a fi 'l-gharr al-hidjat, 79-80, 146). The versifying of the Kur'an in which the wives and daughters of the Prophet are commanded "to draw their veils close to them" (XXXIII, 35 — dawat, dawjab) and "to the believing women ... to cast their veils over their bosoms" (XXIV, 31) probably date from the year 5 (Ibn Sa'd, Tabaddal, viii, 1734). Nevertheless 'Aisha is said to have worn the veil from the time of her marriage with Muhammad (ibid., viii, 59), which took place in Shawwal in the year 1 (al-Baladhi, Anad, 1, 403).

It is certain that this custom was very little observed in Medina. The Kur'an justifies it in the ground that thus "it is likelier [the believing women] will be known and not hurt" (XXXIII, 59). But with the expansion of Islam the custom spread rapidly in Arabia and elsewhere. It was adopted by almost all the women in towns, especially those belonging to the licensed classes; but neither the Bedounins nor the peasant women nor working women adopted it completely.

The wearing of the veil, being general in the towns,
where intellectual movements developed and spread, contributed to a large extent to the keeping of Muslim women in a sort of seclusion. At the end of the 19th century, however, under the influence of the reformist ideas of the Khedive Isma'il, who founded in Cairo in about 1290/1873 the first school for girls, some Egyptian women abandoned the veil. But the real champion of feminism was Kāsim Amin. In his work Taḥrīr al-ma'rū'a, in which is apparent the influence of Shāykh Ḥasan Ahmad ʿAbdūh's liberal interpretation of the Qurʾān, he denounced the necessity of keeping women in a state of subjection, stated their right to education and stressed the evils of the veil, which he considered to be "the vilest form of servitude". Nevertheless, he did not demand that it be totally abolished, but simply proposed that it should conform only with the strict demands of religion. As a jurist, he stated that there is in fact in Islamic law no text which justifies the use of the veil, which he considered to be "the vilest form of servitude". Nevertheless, he did not demand that it be totally abolished, but simply proposed that it should conform only with the strict demands of religion.

As Shārīf Eifni Nasif, better known by her pseudonym Hijattice, wrote in reply to Kāsim Amin’s articles, the veil is instituted: this allows thelearned to hide the sawing of the courtiers and intimates also. The veil is the curtain behind which the sovereign, giving up primitive customs, and the people. Finally, as the state declines, the dignitaries who have placed on the throne the heirs of the reigning dynasty sometimes seek to seize for the honour of mounting the steps and of occupying the places on the left and the right of the sovereign. At a signal from the vizier, everyone veiled himself and then the caliph, also veiled, began to speak. At the end of the address they withdrew their veils (al-Kalkashandi, op. cit., iii, 514 f.).

Introduction to Andalusia, North Africa and Egypt, this institution grew more complicated as court etiquette of the court to have any communication with the sovereign. In their turn the ruler’s intimates and intimates also place a frīḍidb, which signifies also the curtain behind which caliphs and rulers concealed themselves from the sight of their household. This custom, which appears to have been unknown to the early inhabitants of the Hijāzb, seems to have been introduced in Islam by the Umayyads, probably under the influence of the Sassanid civilization. The partition is also known as sidāra and sīr, but the custom is the same, and it finally developed into an institution (to be distinguished from the hijāzb, sometimes also called hijābj, which indicates the office of chamberlain [see Hijāb]).

According to the Ps.-Djakiz, Muḥā’īya and the majority of his successors were separated from their household by a curtain (sidāra) so that none of the latter could see the actions of the caliph when, under the influence of drink, he was no longer in control of his countenance. The first is adopted when nomadism is abandoned and the sovereign, giving up primitive customs, and the people. Finally, as the state declines, the dignitaries who have placed on the throne the heirs of the reigning dynasty sometimes seek to seize for the

cence of the world, was almost the object of worship. Because of this he was expected to hide himself as far as possible from the eyes of his faithful followers, who were conscious of the radiance of his countenance.

In Cairo, the official in charge of the curtain was called sāḥib al-maḏdlīs (al-Kalkashandi, al-Fadlī, i, 458; al-Makrizī, Khīṭāt, i, 386), a different office from that of sāḥib al-bār, or master of the door, who was the same as the Great Chamberlain. He was called also muṭānawwāl ʿl-sīr (al-Makrizī, op. cit., i, 411) and sāḥib al-sīr (M. Canard, op. cit., 374; Aş Kāzayla wa-ṭādiriyya, ed. of the Calendar, Beirut 1956). He was the Chief Eunuch and sometimes combined with the office of Master of the Curtain that of Chamberlain (M. Canard, op. cit., 374 n.). During receptions it was his particular duty to inform the vizier when the caliph was installed in his place and to give the order to his two assistants to raise the curtain in front of the ruler. The latter then appeared seated on his throne and facing the gathering. At the end of the audience the curtain was lowered and he then returned to his apartments (al-Kalkashandi, op. cit., iii, 495 f.). A sīr was also suspended in front of the door of the audience chamber when the ruler wished to ride in procession on the occasion of the New Year. The vizier and the important dignitaries waited outside, near to the sovereign’s mount. At the proper moment the curtain was raised and the caliph came out, preceded by his eunuchs, and mounted his horse (al-Kalkashandi, op. cit., i, 506).

The use of the frīḍidb was current in Fāṭimid receptions and solemnities, and its use during Ramaḍān should be particularly mentioned. On the second, third and fourth Fridays of this month, the caliph visited the mosque. On his arrival he ascended the minbar and sat under the cupola (kūbba). At his invitation, the vizier also ascended, approached him, publicly kissed his hands and his feet, and closed the curtains. The ruler was thus hidden as though in a litter (kawadda). He then pronounced a short sermon, after which the vizier opened the curtains (al-Kalkashandi, op. cit., iii, 511; al-Makrizī, op. cit., i, 451 f.); on the day of ḫaḍ al-fitr (q.v.), after the solemn prayer, the bāṭi, named one of the dignitaries who had been granted the honour of mounting the steps and of occupying the places on the left and the right of the sovereign. At a signal from the vizier, everyone veiled himself and then the caliph, also veiled, began to speak. At the end of the address they withdrew their veils (al-Kalkashandi, op. cit., iii, 514).

At the Shīʿī ceremony of mourning for the death of Husayn, the caliph, his face veiled, on a seat without a cushion, received the dignitaries, who were also veiled (al-Makrizī, op. cit., i, 432).

Ibn Khaldūn distinguished several sorts of hijābj which a state adapts to its needs as it develops. The first is adopted when nomadism is abandoned and the sovereign, giving up primitive customs, separates himself from the people and allows only his intimates to cross his threshold. With the development of the state and the complexity of its workings, a second hijābj is instituted: this allows only those who are initiated into the customs and etiquette of the court to have any communication with the sovereign. In their turn the ruler’s intimates and intimates also place a hijābj between themselves and the people. Finally, as the state declines, the dignitaries who have placed on the throne the heirs of the reigning dynasty sometimes seek to seize for
themselves the privileges of power. The dictator then sequesters the sovereign: he isolates him from his family and from his councillors by a hidjab, making him believe that his dignity demands that he be separated from them (Mukaddima, ii, 100-3, tr. Rosenthal, ii, 111-3).

III. In the eyes of the mystics, hidjab represents everything that veils the true end (al-Djurjani, Ta‘rifat, 86), all that makes man insensate to the Divine Reality. “It is a curtain interposed between the novice and his desire, between the marksman and his target” (Massignon, Haddad, 699). It is produced by the impression, on the heart, of the images of the tangible world, which hinder the manifestation of the truth. The man who is “veiled” (mahdjub) is he whose heart is closed to the Divine light, because his awareness is dominated by sensual or mental passion. “Your veil is your infatuation”, said al-Halladj (Massignon, Haddad, 325). The realization of the mystical union is impeded equally by the internal feelings which are centred on the soul, the reason and the spirit. The veil of the nafs is the passions and the desires, that of the heart is all observation which has no foundation, and that of the reason is its dwelling on intelligible meanings (al-Tahanawi, Kasbah, i, 276).

The opposite of the hidjab which is characterized by the contraction (kabd [q.v.]) of the heart is the ka‘af (revelation), which means, by contrast, its expansion (basp [q.v.]), its spreading open. Kabd and basp are involuntary states in which no human effort can produce or destroy, for they proceed from God (al-Hujwiri, op. cit., 374). However, when the lower soul is so weakened that it is incapable of overcoming obstacles, and when passion is annihilated, then all vain desires are effaced in the manifestation of the truth. The veil is rent and he who seeks God attains the fullness of his desire (al-Haddad, 325). The realization of the mystic separation, a supra-terrestrial protection, even to protect from bullets. They are worn round the neck, to render a barren woman fertile and to overcome obstacles, and when passion is annihilated, then all vain desires are effaced in the manifestation of the truth. The veil is rent and he who seeks God attains the fullness of his desire (al-Haddad, 325). The realization of the mystic separation, a supra-terrestrial protection, even to protect from bullets. They are worn round the neck, to render a barren woman fertile and to overcome obstacles, and when passion is annihilated, then all vain desires are effaced in the manifestation of the truth. The veil is rent and he who seeks God attains the fullness of his desire (al-Haddad, 325). The realization of the mystic separation, a supra-terrestrial protection, even to protect from bullets. They are worn round the neck, to render a barren woman fertile and to overcome obstacles, and when passion is annihilated, then all vain desires are effaced in the manifestation of the truth. The veil is rent and he who seeks God attains the fullness of his desire (al-Haddad, 325). The realization of the mystic separation, a supra-terrestrial protection, even to protect from bullets. They are worn round the neck, to render a barren woman fertile and to overcome obstacles, and when passion is annihilated, then all vain desires are effaced in the manifestation of the truth. The veil is rent and he who seeks God attains the fullness of his desire (al-Haddad, 325). The realization of the mystic separation, a supra-terrestrial protection, even to protect from bullets. They are worn round the neck, to render a barren woman fertile and to overcome obstacles, and when passion is annihilated, then all vain desires are effaced in the manifestation of the truth. The veil is rent and he who seeks God attains the fullness of his desire (al-Haddad, 325).
AL-HIDJAZ, the birthplace and still the spiritual heart of the Arabian Peninsula. As the site of the Ka'ba, the home of the Prophet Muhammed and the scene of Allah's revelations to him (manzil al-wahy), and as the capital district of the early Islamic state, al-Hidjaz is for Muslims as much the Holy Land (al-bilad al-mubaddasa) as Palestine is for Jews and Christians. Muslims are, in fact, even more zealous in guarding the inviolate character of their chief shrines; the areas surrounding Mecca (Makkah) and Medina (al-Madinah al-Munawwara) are sacred preserves (harams) which only Muslims are allowed to enter, and restrictions have often been placed on the penetration of non-Muslims into other parts of al-Hidjaz.

While agreeing in general that al-Hidjaz means "the barrier", the Arabic sources differ in interpreting its application. The common view is that the barrier is the mountain chain of al-Sarât [q.v.] separating the lowland of al-Ghawr or Tihama [q.v.] along the Red Sea from the interior uplands of Nadid and Iraq coming along Darb al-Sha'miyya was Dhat Akik, a more usual by-passed Djudda in order to save time. Three hours out of Mecca were the dome of the Prophet's last wife, Maymuna [q.v.], in Sarif, where she was married. North of Wadi al-Sayyid Dhat Akik is often mentioned as the limit of al-Hidjaz, although from this direction the road now winds down the mountains from al-Tâ'if directly to Mecca, so that the long loop to the north is avoided. The two Najilahs, now called simply al-Yamaniyya and al-Shamiyya, empty into Wadi Fâtima (classical Marr al-Zahrân), the fertile bed of which is crossed by the road from Mecca to Djudda.

Throughout the history of Islam travellers between Mecca and Medina have had a choice between two ways, one following the coast (al-Târîq or al-Darb al-Sultânî) and the other running east of the great harra (al-Târîq or al-Darb al-Shanjî), with variations in the itinerary for each way. Before the introduction of motor vehicles those choosing al-Târîq al-Sultânî usually by-passed Djudda in order to save time. Three hours out of Mecca were the domed tomb and mosque of the Prophet's last wife, Maymûna [q.v.], in Sarif, where she was married. North of Wadi Fâtima the road went through Usfân, the scene of the Prophet's raid on the tribesmen of Libyân [q.v.]. Next the road traversed the cultivated area of Khuylas set back some distance from the coast. Not far beyond al-Kadhôma the Red Sea would be sighted. Rabigh, though a port, had no proper harbour, ships anchored well away from the shore and transferred their cargoes to local sailing craft. As the barrier for pilgrims coming overland from Syria, Egypt, and al-Maghreb, Rabigh succeeded the now ruined village of al-Djuhûfa, which lies in a valley reaching the sea just south of Rabigh. Pilgrims coming down the Red Sea enter into ithrâm as their ships pass Rabigh. North of Rabigh is the reputed burial place of the Prophet's mother, Amina, at al-Abâwâ [q.v.], now called al-Maâ'idah.

From Rabigh secondary routes ran northwards through the mountains to Medina, providing a more direct but more difficult approach than al-Târîq al-Sultânî, which continued to hug the coast. From the port of Masûmâ a alternate route known as "the detour" (al-Malaff) turned inland, but the main road did not do so until it reached Badr Hûmayn [q.v.], where the Prophet humbled Kuraysh on the battlefield. The road from Yanbu', which has taken the place of al-Dijâr [q.v.] as the principal port for Medina, joins the road from the south at Badr, whence al-Târîq al-Sultânî ascends Wâdi al-Safîr towards Medina. In this valley 'Abd Allâh b. Sa'ûd of Nadîd won a signal victory over Ahmad Tusun and his army from Egypt in 1226/1811.

Now that an asphalt highway joins Mecca and Medina via Djudda, Rabigh, and Badr, it is easier and faster. A new highway runs through Usfân and the mountain passes farther north.

The usual course for al-Târîq al-Shanjî runs northwards down 'Aqîk Dhat 3'îrîk [see AL-3'ARîK]. Sometimes it goes through the old oases of Hâdâh and Sulaym on the eastern edge of the harra, and at other times it passes a little to the east of them. The oasis of al-Suwayrîkiyya (modern al-Suwayrîkiyya), also on the eastern edge of the harra, is even farther off the road. North of the modern mine of Mahd al-
Dhahab, now abandoned, al-Ṭarīq al-Sharkī proceeds for a space down another valley named al-Kā'īya and al-Dawādāmlīl to al-Riyāḍ, replacing the old pilgrim trail via al-Kunzūliyya and al-Kūfayya.

The northern section of al-Hidjaz may be taken as extending to the boundary between Saudi Arabia and Jordan, which stretches from a point south of al-ʾAkhāba [q.v.] over to the range of al-Ṭubayq. The occupation by the state of Israel of a position on the Gulf of al-ʾAkhāba has made it impossible for pilgrims to follow the old overland route from Sinai via al-ʾAkhāba. Among the ball ports are Ḥaṭl and Ṣaʿīda on the Gulf of al-ʾAkhāba, and al-Muwayliḥ, Ḍabāḥ, al-Wādīḥ, and Amlāḍī (orthography uncertain) on the Red Sea. From al-Wādīḥ tracks cut across the mountains to meet the interior highway at or near al-ʾUṭlā.

During the past century the heaviest traffic in the northern section of al-Hidjaz has been over the routes east of al-Šarāt, first the old Syrian pilgrim road through Tabūk and al-ʾUṭlā [q.v.] and then the Hidjaz Railway [q.v.], which in most places followed the pilgrim road closely. The railway was damaged during the First World War, and reconstruction did not begin until 1938/1946. In the meantime a paved highway was being built north from Medina to Tabūk and the Jordan boundary. The highway runs through Ḥaṭyar and Ṭaymā [q.v.] both of which lie a considerable distance east of the pilgrim road and the railway.

The southern section of al-Hidjaz has higher mountains, more rainfall, and much more cultivation than the other two sections. A road parallels the coast from Diʿadda through the ports of al-Līth, al-ʿUṣfūdha, and Ḥaṭl (Ḥaṭl Ibn Yaḥyā [q.v.], once regarded as the southern limit of al-Hidjaz) to al-ʾAkhīma, now reckoned as the beginning of Tiḥmāt ʿĀṣīr. The two lower parts of the valleys that flow seawards from high ground near the coast and the mountain ranges now being occupied in a general way by al-Ḥuwaytīt [q.v.], towards the coast and Banū Abī Ṭayyīla in the interior. Musayna [q.v.], Fazzāra, and Saʿīd ʿUḥdāmīyān have dissolved, but Bālī [see ʿĪlī and ʿĪlī, s.v. al-Balāwī] and Djuhayna [see ʿĪlī, Suppl.] remain as flourishing entities based respectively on al-Wādīḥ and Yānbū'

The tribes shown on the map for the southern section of al-Hidjaz have given way to the great confederations of Zahrān and Ḥaṭmīd [q.v.] in the highlands and numerous other tribes in their neighbourhood and in Tiḥmā. The borderlands between al-Hidjaz and Najd are occupied by elements of the modern tribes of Muṭayr, ʿUthayya, the Buṣūm, and Subay [q.v.], who have replaced such older tribal groups as ḤaṭCAFān and al-Hawzīn [q.v.]. In the far south is the tribe which bears the hoary name of Kaḥṭān [q.v.].

As the history of al-Hidjaz is intimately bound up with the history of Mecca and Medina and the many other places and the various tribes referred to above, it will not be recounted here. Suffice it to say that since the beginning of time al-Hidjaz was the official name of an independent polity for less than ten years, under the reign of King al-Husayn b. ʿAlī from 1334/1916 to 1343/1924. Since 1344/1925 the whole of al-Hidjaz has belonged to the domains of the House of Suʿūd.

Always a poor land inhabited by a people who chafed under the restraints of law and order, al-Hidjaz is now in many ways coming upon brighter times. The rapaciousness of the tribes, which for centuries made the overland pilgrimage a perilous undertaking, has been curbed and intertribal feuding
brought to an end. Improvements in communications by land, sea, and air; closer ties with the outside world; and developments in education, public health, and other fields are bringing easier life to many of the inhabitants. The revenue received by the Saudi Arabian government from the petroleum industry has freed al-Hijaz from its former dependence on the bounty of Muslims abroad.

**Bibliography:** See the bibliographies for **Hijaz Railway**, **Arab, Makka**, and **Al-Madina**. The topography of al-Hijaz is depicted with a relatively high degree of accuracy on a set of geologic maps (1:500,000) published by the United States Geological Survey (1958-62). Toponyms are given in the Latin and Arabic scripts, but the standard of accuracy for these does not match that of the topography. The areas discussed in this article are covered by geographic maps I-200B, I-204B, I-205B, I-210B, I-212B, I-216B, and I-217B in the series entitled "Miscellaneous Geologic Investigations". Corresponding geologic maps are also available. The data on the 1:500,000 maps are summarized on a map of the Arabian Peninsula (1:2,000,000) issued in separate English and Arabic versions by the USGS (2nd ed., 1963).

(G. Rentz)

**Hijaz Railway**, one of the two major railway projects (the other being the Bagdad Railway) of the reign of Abd al-Hamid II. Its ostensible purpose was to facilitate the hajj by means of a railway laid between Damascus and the Holy Cities, and its construction was used to further the Pan-Islamic policies and propaganda of the Sultan. It also served the more practical strategic and military purpose of transporting troops to the often turbulent Arab provinces of the Empire and thus establishing effective control over them. It had been contemplated for a long time. In May 1900, the Sultan, by an Imperial irādah, created two Commissions, one supervisory at Istanbul under 'Izzet Paša, a Damascene who was a member of the palace staff, and the other executive at Damascus under the šāli of Syria. At the same time 'Abd al-Hamid, himself donating a gift of £T. 5,000, appealed to Muslims all over the world for subscriptions. But not all contributions were voluntary: civil and military officials of the Empire were ordered to appropriate a part of their salary and a special stamp duty was levied on all classes and creeds. The balance sheet generally showed a surplus, and the scheme never suffered from lack of finance. Included in the project was a branch line from Dar'a to Haifa, for which the concession had been granted to a British firm in 1890 but which the firm had failed to complete. The few miles of line actually laid by the firm and the building material were purchased by the Hijaz Commission. Two other branch lines, one from Zarka to the phosphate mines near al-Šalt and another from Ma'ān to 'Akkāba (later abandoned in 1905, in consequence of the frontier dispute between Egypt and Turkey), were also planned. In 1901, the Italian engineer, La Bella, originally entrusted with the construction work, was replaced by the German engineer, Neisser, under whose direction the construction was completed, though beyond al-'Ula only Muslim engineers were employed. The Damascus-Medina line was surveyed by Muhktâr Bey, a Turkish engineer; it generally followed the old pilgrim and caravan road, deviating only occasionally to avoid hills and unsuitable ground. Its construction through a country mostly waterless, vividly described in T. E. Lawrence's *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* as an area of 'thronging suns' and 'feverish winds' where attacks of dysentery were a frequent cure, was a remarkable feat. Water supply presented the greatest difficulty and was partly overcome by constructing wells and working them by steam-pumps or windmills or by bringing water in railway-trucks. Considerable engineering difficulties were encountered near 'Ammān with its steep gradients (where the train while ascending to Kesir had to be taken up in two sections), and near al-'Āqabah al-Hijāziyah, where the line reached a height of over 3,700 ft. above sea level and immediately afterwards descended through some of the wildest country in the world, such as Baţān al-Ghil. Construction was made possible through the employment of military labour—three regular Nişām battalions and two specially enrolled battalions raised by conscription—totaling about 5,650 men, who received a special additional allowance for their work. Military labour was confined to simple navvying and the laying of the permanent way, while the more difficult work like constructing the bridges, station buildings, culverts and tunnels was given to Itarians, Greeks and Montenegrins.

The railway reached Zarka (203 km. from Damascus) in 1902, Kaťra (326 km.) in 1903, Ma'ān (459 km.) in 1904, Dhat al-Ḥadîd (610 km.) in 1906, al-'Ula (993 km.) in 1907, and Medina (1,320 km.) in 1908. The Dar'a-Haifa section (160 km.) was completed in 1905. The railway cost about £4,000,000, including the purchase of rolling-stock and construction of necessary buildings (Consular Reports). Between 1904 and 1917 the Dar'a-Haifa section was extended to Boşra, and branch lines from 'Akkā to Balad al-Shaykh (17 km.), 'Aţaul to Ludd (100 km.), Wādī al-Sūr to al-Awāz (155 km.), al-Tin to Bayt Hanum (39 km.) were added (Foreign Office Handbook, *Syria and Palestine*, London 1920, 69). The laying of the main tract (Damascus-Medina, Dar'a-Haifa), which averaged 382 km. a year—a rate of progress not achieved even by the Anatolian Railway—was the quickest in the history of the Ottoman Railways. With the exception of a few carriages which were made at the marine arsenal, the entire material was purchased from abroad; rails and sleepers were supplied by Belgian, German and American firms and the rolling-stock by Belgian and German firms. The length of trains was usually determined by the weight of the engine and the steep gradients of the 'Ammān and Yarmūk valleys. Originally hand-brakes were used but Hardy's system of automatic brakes was gradually introduced (Consular Reports). The gauge being 1.05 m., the carrying capacity of the railway was never great, and was considerably diminished by the necessity of taking large supplies of wood (originally coal was used) and water on each train. An additional problem was that boiler tubes were often damaged by the minerals in the desert water. In consequence, in 1914, only 15 engines were reported to have been fit for service (Admiralty Handbook, *Arabia*, London 1917, ii, 37-41). Only a small percentage of pilgrims, some 16,000 a year, used the railway (the great majority being Syrians and Kurds), for the bulk of the pilgrim-traffic passed through Harrāda. The journey from Damascus to Medina took about 26 hours, at an average speed of 23 km. an hour. The single fare was £2.30 sterling for third class passengers (Consular Reports). The main stations were Damascus, Dar'a, Haifa, Kaťra, Ma'ān, Tabûk, Ra'il al-Mu'āṣam, Ma'ādan al-Šālib, al-'Ula, Hadīyaa and Medina. Generally the stations were about 20 kilometres apart and were used as 'garrison forts', for...
protecting the line against the constant Bedouin attacks. During 1908, 128 attacks were reported; Bedouins cut telegraph wires, destroyed rails, damaged station buildings and robbed passengers.

The railway, ‘the unholy Prankish thing’ as they called it, threatened their vested interests in the pilgrim traffic in which the Grand Sharif and the walls of Hijaz were also involved (Consular Reports). Their combined hostility, the Young Turk Revolution and the Turco-Italian war brought construction to a standstill and the original plan for railway extension to Medina could not be carried out. The project for a line between Djudda and Mecca, for which a survey had been made in 1911, was shelved for the same reasons.

The Hijaz railway ‘belied the political hopes of its projectors’. Far from being the ‘backbone of Ottoman territory in Arabia’, it marked its uttermost eastern fringe. Expensive to build and difficult to maintain, it hardly contributed to the economic growth of the peninsula or to any appreciable increase in population along its course (Foreign Office Handbook, Arabia, London 1920, 26). However, it proved to be a great boon to the development of Haifa, which prior to the opening of the Dar'a-Haifa line was a small port outshone by its rival Jaffa. With the opening of the railway, Haifa developed steadily, diverting from Beirut the export of grain from the hawrān and the import trade with Damascus and Arabia. In 1909, the total value of Haifa's exports was £700,000; in 1912 it increased to £340,000; in 1907 its total imports excluding railway material amounted to £240,000; in 1912 it grew to £375,100 (Admiralty Handbook, Syria (including Palestine), London 1919, 304, 492). The entire railway was in operation until World War I, when Lawrence successfully damaged parts of the section between Ma'in and Medina which since then has remained out of operation. After the war, the ownership of the railway passed to the territories through which it ran, Syria owning Damascus-Dar'a, Dar'a-Samak; Palestinian owning Haifa-Samaq; Transjordan, Dar'a-Ma'an and Saudi Arabia, the Ma'in-Medina sections. (This was confirmed by the arbitral award of 18 April 1925, by the Swiss Professor M. Eugene Borel appointed by the League of Nations, Permanent Mandates Commission (League of Nations, Permanent Mandates Commission, Minutes of the Fifteenth Session, 189-90, 262, 279-80). This being refused, the Muslim Congress held at Jerusalem in December 1932 discussed the issue and reiterated the demand made in the earlier petitions. Meanwhile, Ibn Su'ud had modified his former attitude, and was willing to discuss the technical problems of re-opening the railway without pressing his own claim to ownership forthwith, while reserving his rights. In 1938, the British Government, desirous of winning the good-will of Ibn Su'ud in view of the situation in Palestine, was prepared partly to finance the repairs of the section lying in his territory and proposed the holding of a conference in the following year. The outbreak of the Second World War once again shelved the issue. The section between Ma'in and Medina is being rebuilt (1966) under a contract given to British firms. Bibliography: A detailed account of the railway is available in the Consular Reports preserved at the Public Record Office, London: F.O. 78, 195, 368, 371, 424; Auler Pasha, Hedschabsch, Gotha 1906; T. Guthe, Die Hedschabsch von Damaskus nach Medina: ihr Bau und Bedeutung, Leipzig (Eugard Gablers Geographische Institut n.d.); Muhammad Inshahullah, The history of the Hamida Hijaz Railway project (in Urdu, Arabic and English), Lahore 1908; Othin Nurlu, Abd al-Hamid-i Than i ve dewr-i saltaniat, Istanbul 1327/1911, 718-23; Sa'dh Pasha, Sa'id Pagahni hiddirah, Istanbul 1328/1912, ii, 376-9; Times Index, s.v. (Z. H. Zaidi)

**AL-HIDJAR, ancient ruin site in north-western Saudi Arabia (approx. 35°50' E. and 26°45' N.) near the small settlement of Ma'in Sāliḥ, some 70 miles (110 km.) south-west of Taymā. It has been identified as the Ḥiyra of Strabo and the Hegra of Pliny. The name al-Hijr has fallen into disuse and Ma'in Sāliḥ has been substituted. As used by the Bedouins of the region, the name refers to a flat area, about 3 km. from North to South and 2 km. from East to West, its northermost point being the land surrounding the Ma'in Sāliḥ station of the Hijaz railway. The plain, in which are located several Bedouin water wells, is surrounded by, and dotted with a number of sandstone cliffs and buttes. The tracks of the Hijaz railway cross the plain from North to South. The quite extensive ruins of the ancient commercial town of al-Hijr are approximately in the centre of the plain, where the railway tracks take a southwesterly direction. A large field dotted with a number of sandstone cliffs and buttes and the ruin field, however, is the large number of potsherds as well as remains of buildings and part of the town wall testify to the importance of al-Hijr in antiquity. Much more impressive than the ruin field, however, is the large number of structures carved into the cliffs all around the plain, and in particular on the rock called Kaṣr al-Bint. Most of these structures are family tombs, with loculi generally sunk into the floor, but occasionally carved out of the sides of the main chamber. Many of the tombs have elaborately carved façades, with finely chiselled pillars, lintels and cornices, sometimes ornamented withurns or representations of birds, often topped by a double set of steps ascending from the centre, almost indistinguishable from some of the tombs found in Petra. In the complex of rocks called Djabal Ihlīb, at the eastern edge of the plain, is another series of rock carvings consisting mostly of small niches with carved columns, urns, or bird figures, which probably had religious significance. At the entrance to a narrow canyon in Djabal Ihlīb is also a very large hall, referred to as Diwān or Māghīs al-Sulṭān, carved into the sandstone—about 10 metres wide, by 12 metres deep and 8 metres high—which also is considered to have been connected
with religious ceremonies. At the opposite end of the canyon, where the walls separate, there is a long cave, carved in the north face of the cliff, which is believed to have been used to bring water into the site.

Vast numbers of inscriptions have been found in al-Hijr: in Arabic, Aramaic, Thamudic, Nabatean, Minean, Lyhyanite, and even in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. No archaeological excavations have as yet (1966) been conducted in Mada'in al-Salih, but from what evidence is available it is held that al-Hijr was second only to Petra in the Nabatean period (see Nabat). The Kur'ān relates (VII, 71 ff.) that this region was inhabited by a godless people, the Thamūd (q.v.), who carved their houses out of rock. God sent the prophet Ṣalih to exhort them to mend their ways, but the people of Thamūd not only persisted in their idolatry, but also slew the camel which the prophet Ṣalih had miraculously conjured out of a cleft in the rock to give evidence of his divine mission. God then sent an earthquake that destroyed the town and its people. This story was the origin of the name Mada'in al-Salih (al-Salih's towns) now given to the area. Geologists see no evidence of an earthquake in Mada'in al-Salih; some believe that, because the Arabic term for earthquake can also be rendered as a "calamity from God", the town and its people may have been destroyed by another sort of disaster, such as a plague. There are other references to al-Hijr, or Mada'in al-Salih, in Arab legends: one mentions that this is the place where God ordered the patriarch Abraham to abandon Hagar and her son Ishmael, who are both said to be buried here. Another legend relates that when the Prophet Muhammad was going through the area with his army, on the occasion of the raid on Tābuk (9/621), he would not permit his soldiers to refresh themselves at the wells, because this was an accused spot. After having flourished during the Nabatean period, the site of al-Hijr seems to have declined rapidly. In the first half of the 4th/9th century al-ʾIṣṭakhri mentions it as being only a village with few inhabitants.

The first European to visit al-Hijr, and to bring back a well illustrated description of its monuments, was C. M. Doughty. Al-Hijr was later also visited by J. Euting, C. Huber, and (more recently) by H. St. J. B. Philby. The most complete account of the monuments of Mada'in al-Salih is that of J. A. Jaussen and R. Savignac, who visited the region in 1907.


**HIDJRA**, latinized as Hegira, the emigration of Muhammad from Mecca to Medina in September 622. The first stage of an event which has been termed "flight from friendly association" (cf. Kur'ān IV, 34/38) or "to avoid association with" (LXXIII, 10); there is often an explicit or implicit reference to a sexual relationship, as in the first Kur'ānic verse. The third stem ḥāḍara refers to a mutual ending of friendly relationships. Thus ḥāḍara proper does not mean "flight" as it has been traditionally translated but connotes primarily the breaking of the ties of kinship or association (cf. C. Snouck Hurgronje, *Twee populaire Dwalingen verbanden, in Verspreide Geschriften*, Bonn 1923, i, 297-305, esp. 305; also Lm. viii, 189-90).

The reason for Muhammad's leaving Mecca is the loss of support from his clan on the death of Abū Ṭālib (about 619) and his replacement as chief of the clan by Abū Lahab, who had commercial relationships with some of Muhammad's bitterest opponents. From the fact that after his visit to al-Ṭa'fīl (in 619 or 620) Muhammad had to seek the protection (džiūr) of the clan of Nawfal before entering Mecca, it is to be inferred that he had refused protection (Tābarī, i, 1205 from Ibn Ḥishāk; Ibn Ḥishām, 251, but only as a note by Ibn Ḥishām himself). After various attempts, including the visit to al-Ṭa'fīl, to find a suitable sphere for continuing to propagate his religion, Muhammad negotiated successfully with representatives of all the main Arab clans of Medina, finally concluding an agreement with them at al-ʾAqaba (q.v.) during the pilgrimage of 622 (June-July). This agreement is known as "the pledge of war" (bayʿat al-harb), since the men of Medina agreed to defend Muhammad by force of arms, if necessary. Even before this agreement Muhammad had begun to encourage his Meccan followers to go to Medina, and in all about seventy went in small parties, until of those willing to go only Abū Bakr, 'All and Muhammad with their womenfolk were left.

By this time Kuraysh are said to have become suspicious, and this was probably the case (though by no means all the stories which became attached to the Hijra are to be believed). Ibn Ḥishāk says that at a meeting of most of the clans it was agreed that chosen young men, one from each clan, should simultaneously attack Muhammad with their swords and kill him; in this way, since so many clans were involved, Ḥāšim could not exact revenge but would have to be content with blood money. The young men assembled at Muḥammad's house, but he slipped away secretly, leaving 'Ali in his bed to make them think he was still asleep. Whether this story is accepted or not, Muhammad must have slipped out of Mecca secretly in the company of Abū Bakr, since a later passage of the Kur'ān reminds men of it (IX, 40): "If you do not give him support, still God has already supported him when he came out as the second of two; the two were in the cave, and he was saying to his companion, Do not grieve; God is with us . . .". They spent three days in the cave, then accompanied by 'Āmir b. Fuhayra, a freedman of Abū Bakr, and a nomad as guide, and mounted on two camels, made their way by an unusual route to Medina. Their arrival at Kūbāh in the south of the oasis of Medina is dated Monday 12 Rabiʾ I by Ibn Ḥishāk, which in the accepted calendar corresponds to 24 September 622, but is a Friday. The reason for their going into hiding and avoiding the main road is presumably that when Muhammad left Mecca he would cease to be under the protection of Nawfal, but until he reached Medina he would not come under the protection of his followers there.

In the document sometimes called the Constitution of Medina (Ibn Ḥishām, 341-4) those who had thus made the ḥijra with Muhammad appear as the "emigrants (muḥāḏjirūn) of Kuraysh", and have collectively a position comparable to that of one of the Arab clans of Medina. As time went on the status of muḥāḏjir (fem. muḥāḏjirah) came to be greatly prized, perhaps sometimes placing people in a higher category in the ḍāhīma or stipend-list; and the status
was granted to others than those who had actually journeyed from Mecca to Medina in 622. Members of nomadic tribes could pledge themselves to Muhammad with the pledge of migration (bay'at hidjra) (Ibn Sa'd, iv/2, 66, line 3); they then settled in Medina, presumably as his clients (mawallit; cf. al-Buhkārī, Manākhī, 2), thus counting as belonging to the "clan" of muhādhirūn. Those who went to Abyssinia about 615 and remained there until fetched to Medina by Muhammad in 7/628 were counted as having made a hidjra, viz. to Abyssinia; perhaps this was part of the inducement to go to Medina. A consequence was that those who had gone to Abyssinia, returned to Mecca before 622 and then made the hidjra with Muhammad could claim two hidjras (cf. Ibn Sa'd, iv/1, 79 line 8; viii, 205 foot). The tribe of Muzayyin was given the status of muhādhirūn without actually settling in Medina (Ibn Sa'd, i/2, 38, 114); Aslam and Khūzā'ī were in a similar position. There is also evidence of other uses of the status of mukācir. (al-Māwardi, al-Āhkām al-sulā'īyya, ed. Enger, 220; tr. Fagan, 270).

Nāfi' b. al-Azraq, leader of the Khāridī sect of the Azārīka, held that only those who actually supported him were genuinely Muslims, and spoke of them as mukācirūn, who made the hidjra to his camp, which was dār al-hidjra (al-Asbā'ī, Māhkātī, i, 86–9).

Muslim dates are normally given according to the era of the hidjra (see ʿala'ī ridā) which may be distinguished from the initials A.H. (= Anno Hegirae). This era does not begin on the date of Muhammad's arrival at Medina, but on the first day of the lunar year in which that event took place, which is reckoned to coincide with 16 July 622. This result is based on the assumption that intercalary months did not occur after the hidjra, but this is by no means certain (see further tā'ākī).


HIDJRA [see RIDJAR]

HIPZ [see KIRĀ'A and KURĀN]

HIKĀYA (A.), verbal noun of ḥakhā, originally meaning "to imitate", but which, in consequence of a readily explained semantic evolution, came to acquire the meaning of "to tell, to narrate"; similarly the noun ḥikāya, starting from the meaning of "imitation", has come to mean more specifically "imitation," and finally "tale, narrative, story, legend". In classical Arabic the intensive form ḥākīya meant a "mimic" and modern Arabic has adopted the active participle ḥākit to translate "gramophone".

The radical h. b. y. w. is not represented in the Ku'ān but it is found in ḥādirr with the primary meaning of "to resemble" or "to imitate" (cf. ḥādir, s.v.), a meaning expressed and retained up to the present in the 3rd form, ḥād; this is the only meaning given to it in the classical dictionaries; the Lisān, which makes no mention of the meaning of "to relate" for the verb and "story" for the noun, states that both the first and the third forms have a slightly pejorative shade of meaning: "to try to imitate, to ape". The problem is therefore to discover by what process ḥakhā and ḥikāya have acquired the meaning which they now usually have; then we shall try to draw up a classification of stories and to establish the place occupied by those which are now called ḥikāya in the Arabic narrative or recreational literature.

I. — Once again al-Dājīšī provides a convenient starting point. In a well-known passage of the Bayān (ed. Hārūn, i, 69–70), he discloses that there existed imitators (kākiya) able, he says, not only to copy the mannerisms, gestures, the voice and the habits of speech of the different ethnic groups which formed the population of the empire, and more particularly of the capital, but also to reproduce with the most exact fidelity the mimicry and even the mannerisms of all kinds of people, the blind for example, and finally to imitate the calls of wild and domestic animals. Al-Dājīšī adds that these imitators created real types whom they endowed with all the characteristic traits of the groups that they were mimicking. This gift of imitation, which demands no ordinary power of observation, had long been exploited in the East by professional and amateur entertainers (see J. Korovitz, Spurei berichteischer Menschenbei den iiber Berlin 1905), and we find for example in the "Book of the crown" of the Ps.-Dājīšī (tr. Pellat, 149), an anecdote of a courtier who managed to restore himself to favour with a Persian king by means of a stratagem based on mimicry of the cries of various animals. A. Mez (Abulkāsim, ein bagdader Sittenbild, Heidelberg 1902, xv–xvi) has already remarked that the proliferation of mimics and the development of a form of entertainment much favoured by monarchs was certainly helped by the existence of Arabic dialects very different from one another and by the more or less successful attempts made by the non-Arab populations to speak the language of the conquerors. There were often mimics among the entertainers and the jesters who were regularly or occasionally admitted into the presence of the sovereigns, and al-Mas'ūdī (Murūjī, viii, 161 f.; cf. A. Mez, Renaissance, 386–7, Eng. tr., 408) confirms this in relating the success with al-Mu'ṭāṣidī of one Ibn al-Maghāzī who mimicked (yakhkā, yahākā, bi-kāya) all kinds of people, with an accompanying patter of humorous anecdotes (nādira). The hikāya, in fact, could not be a silent mimicry, and the performer was obliged to compose a little recitation or think up a story to add piquancy to his imitation. Thus one finds a well-experienced writer relating hikāya in such cases by "story", although one can understand that this term, originally applied solely to the imitation, later covered the gestures and the words, and finally the words alone, especially when authors began to commit to writing the words recited by the hikāya. This evolution, further encouraged by the carelessness of writers over the exact use of words, hides to a large extent the fact that the mimics, provided of which, however, is to be found throughout the Middle Ages; A. Mez (Renaissance, 399; Sp. tr. 505; the English translation, p. 423, misses the point) mentions one in 415/1024 and it is worthy of note that the performance in question entailed also shadow plays (khayāl). Although the modern theatre takes its origins from abroad, its historians have not failed to find ancestors for it precisely in the hikāya and the khayāl (cf. J. Landau, Studies in Arab theater and cinema, Philadelphia 1958, 1 ff.); they have also been induced to take into account the existence, in Turkey, of the meddah (maddāk [s.v.]) or mukhallīt (mukhallīd, corresponding exactly to the hikāya) who related anecdotes while performing amusing imitations and expressive mimicries and even
dressed up in accessories symbolic of the characters that he wished to imitate. This profession seems to have declined in Turkey as in other Muslim countries, particularly in Egypt, where, at the beginning of this century, a certain Ahmad Fahim al-Far had formed a company which presented in Cairo plays which were very popular, thanks to his skill in imitating the cries of animals and in reproducing different scenes (see J. Landau, op. cit., 3-4 and bibl. quoted). On the madadh of North Africa see maddas. We cannot omit to mention however that it is again a derivative from the root h.k.y./w., hikawyati, which is used in the East for a teller of tales, whose mirmicy is closely related to that of the early hikaya.

From the 4th/10th century onwards elements of mirmicy (see J. Horovitz, op. cit., 21-7) appear in the genre of the manahim [g.v.], which however the literary efforts of Badi' al-Zamàn and his successors have separated from the hikaya proper. On the other hand it was at the same period or at the beginning of the 8th century that a phase of the evolution which ended in the hikaya appeared in Arabic literature, which calls to mind the mahama while differing from it quite clearly in its technique—the Hikayat Abi 'l-Kasim al-Baghdâdi of Abu 'l-Mu'tahhar al-Azdi (ed. A. Mez, Abu'lkasîm). It marks a new though brief phase in the semantic evolution of the term hikaya. In his preface the author reproduces the very passage of al-Dâhibî mentioned above, and this reference justifies in his opinion the creation of a new type of work which would put on the stage a single character, typifying the mentality of the inhabitants of the capital; in his introduction Abu 'l-Mu'tahhar promises also a hikaya badawiyya, a picture of Bedouin manners, which has not survived. In the text which has come down to us, the scene is Bagdad, a bourgeois milieu. The hero, Abu 'l-Kasim, is a sort of vagrant who entertains this society and reels off jokes and sarcastic remarks in doubtful taste; after the evening meal the revellers sink into a drunken stupor, awaking only at the call of the muezzin; then Abu 'l-Kasim harangues them and castigates their wickedness, urging them to repent (cf. F. Gabrieli, in RSO, xx (1942), 33-45). The quotation from al-Dâhibî enables us to see the meaning that the author wishes to give to the name hikaya. It is a realist representation of the manners of Bagdad, a picture borrowed from real life, and this is why A. Mez has translated the title of this play by ein bagdader Sittenbild, it being quite impossible to translate hikaya by "story". In attempting to produce a "type", Abu 'l-Mu'tahhar displays a certain advance from al-Dâhibî, who in his studies of manners, notably in the "Misers", merely put together anecdotes with the meaning of "story which was invented, but which was borrowed from real life, or was at least true to life; we have no proof of this, but the Hikaya of Abu 'l-Mu'tahhar provides a sufficiently strong link in the chain, and we shall see that in Morocco hikaya has retained the meaning of a story which is more or less truthful so long as it is not unlikely.

It should not be forgotten that the term hikaya belongs also to the terminology of the sciences of tradition and that the expression hikayatu 'anshu 'l-hadith 'hikayat'â implies a literal quotation, a report on the authority of the hadith, more often than not in a narrative of the verbal form which would have been used at the time when the event narrated took place; the expression hikayat saust, "onomatopeia", preserves the primitive sense of the term; hikayat i'd-ro, or simply hikaya, means the exact repetition of a word used by a speaker with a vowel of declension no longer appropriate to its function in the new context, e.g., "ta'ayatu Zayaditi"—"man Zayaditi"? (instead of Zayd?u); but this hikaya is not permissible when the noun is followed by a qualifying element (see L. Machuel, Voc. des principaux termes techniques de la grammaire arabe, Tunis 1908, 27). The word appears again for example in the Fihrist (Cairo ed., 422, 429, 445, etc.) to indicate a textual copy as well as an account of the facts, equivalent here to riways. The same meanings are found in Hamza al-Isfahani (ed. Gottwald, 17, 64, 65, 201) and in the Agbân (notably i, 4), although in this last passage hikaya is used of the reproduction of words heard, without any claim to verbatim quotation. On the other hand, al-Zamâkhshari (Asâs al-balaghâ, s.v.) says that the Arabs use hikaya in the sense of "language", which they consider to be an imitation or a representation,
and this explains why in the Syrian and Lebanese dialects the verb hakā is normally used for “to speak”. In Spain, Dozy (Suppl. s.v.) notes ḫikāya also in the sense of “model”; but for him it is already primarily a “story”.

Thus it seems that it was from the 8th/14th century onwards that ḥikāya, whose primary meaning is now considered archaic, acquired the general meaning of “tale, story, narrative, legend”; it is current in the Thousand and one nights and appears in the title of the Kūth al-Ḥikāyat al-ṣadrīya wa l-ʿawwān al-ṣadrīya of al-Ḥārīrī, the edifice of Baybars, Wiesbaden 1956, from a MS of the beginning of the 8th/14th century; in this last collection however each separate story is still called ḥadīth, which is one of those general terms whose technical meaning tends to obscure its other uses. Thus we have here significantly combined three words which are evidently interchangeable: ḥikāya, ḥabar, and also ḥadīth, which might it be profitable to restore to the group of words used in Arabic for “story”.

The Kurʾān contains a certain number of narratives which are of a religious character and are to serve for the edification of the Believers; in the Holy Book “to narrate, tell” is expressed by ḥāṣa, ḥaddaṭha, and nābbaʾaʾ, three terms which tend later to become specialized, forming with their derivatives and those of other roots a collection of lexicographic material which deserves examination. In fact the diversity of the words used in the first centuries of Islam would seem to indicate that tales, legends and stories of all kinds were in vogue and that they were distinguished from one another with great precision; on the other hand, each of them through the centuries has undergone an evolution distinctive enough to merit a special article, so that we need not attempt to discuss here the history of all narrative literature: ḥāṣa is used in every kind of story, but this word has been applied particularly, through the use of the verb ḥāṣa and the noun ḥāṣa in the Kurʾān and of the professional ḥāṣa (q.v.), to edifying tales and stories of the prophets. It is to be noted however that nowadays it has been adopted to mean a novel, its diminutive ṣāṣaʾa, pl. ṣāṣaṣ, being in its turn used for a short story.

—[uṣṣa]a is Kurʾānic in the expression asṣīr al-ʿawwāna (the treasures edited by H. Wehr, Damascus—Djakarta, 1966), vii, 57, xvi, 62, xxii, 85/83, xxv, 65, xxvii, 70/68, xlv, 16,71, lxxiii, 13), which has a distinctly pejorative connotation when used by unbelievers inclined to compare the revelation with fables and old wives' tales to which no credence should be given. The difficulty which lexicographers have in finding the singular of asṣīr proves that this term, probably deriving from the Greek ἰδιότης or the Latin historia, had served to form a pejorative plural (cf. ābāḍīl) and that the corresponding singular had been forgotten or had never existed. Nowadays the term has been reinstated in the singular form uṣṣa in the particular meaning of legend or myth.

—nabaʾ has in the Kurʾān the meaning of “news”, “announcement” which it has retained until the present day (vi, 65/67, xxvi, 22, xxxviii, 67, xlii, 6, etc.); but it is also found that of an edifying tale, a story of a prophet (ix, 71/70, v, 30/37, vi, 34, etc.); in this sense it has been completely replaced by ḥāṣa and ṣāṣa.  

—ḥabar [q.v.] is also Kurʾānic, with a meaning similar to that of nabaʾ: “information, an account of someone or something”. In later literature this word was to have a great vogue and to be applied to a narrative of historical or biographical character.

Although a ḥabar need not necessarily be authentic in the eyes of the critics, in principle the term could not be used of a story presented as fictitious; it appears however parallel with ḥikāya in the title of the collection, edited by H. Wehr.  

—ṣira [q.v.] is found in the Kurʾān only with the meaning of “state” or “appearance”, but in literature it has also that of “conduct”, “way of life”, “biography” (especially of the Prophet); it is the term used for the romantic biographies of famous characters of antiquity or of the Islamic era [see ʿāntar, Baybars, etc.].

—ḥadīth (plural of ṣira) rather than of ḥadīth is used of legendary tales (xxviii, 46/44, xxviv, 18) and, in a general way, of lying talk. Independently of its technical meaning in the science of Tradition, ḥadīth is in general use for a story, a tale, a narrative; it is found so used in the Aḥbānī, the Fihrist, the stories published by H. Wehr and elsewhere.

—nādira [q.v.] in the Kurʾān is not only an image or a likeness, but also an example (xvi, 52-54, xxv, 35/33, etc.), indeed even a parable (xii, 72, xviii, 43/45). In later usage it is a proverb as well as a story invented to illustrate a doctrine or explain a circumstance of life; it is used to describe the apocryphes of Kaʿla wa-Dimma (q.v.) in, and in general, fables of animals.

Outside the Kurʾān we find in literature the following:

—risāya [q.v.], oral transmission of a ḥadīth, a poem or a story; this term, which retained this connotation in the technical language of tradition, grammar and criticism, was sometimes synonymous with ḥikāya in the sense of transmission and account of facts. In modern Arabic it has been adopted to mean a story, a novel, a play or a film.

—nādira [q.v.] has been used since the early Middle Ages for a witticism, an anecdote, especially a humorous one; the genre of the nādira contains enough typical characteristics to justify a separate article. In the article NADIRA will be found the rules which narrators were supposed to follow.

—samār, pl. asmār, is primarily a conversation, an evening gossip, for it comes from a root meaning “to chat in the evening” (cf. Kurʾān, xxiii, 69/67), but it is also found there with the meaning of “information, an account of someone or something”. In later usage it is a proverb as well as a story invented to illustrate a doctrine or explain a circumstance of life; it is used to describe the apocryphes of Mūsā Sulaymān maintains (al-ʿAdab al-baṣṣīrī, Beirut 1956, 16-7), stories can in principle be related only at night (see infra). It seems that samār is used mainly of tales of the supernatural, but also of reports, since Ibn al-Nadīm sometimes refers to authentic siyar and asmār (asmār sāḥka, Cairo ed., 242). After ḥikāya came to be used in a general sense, samār regained its earlier meaning of conversation at an evening gathering.

—khurāsī, finally, is said to be the name of an ʿUdhīr who was carried off by demons and who on returning related his adventures; nobody had believed him and the expression ḥadīth Khurāsī was adopted to express the meaning of “entirely fictitious talk”, “hambub”: however the Prophet himself vouches for the existence of the character and the authenticity of his statements (see al-Džāhīz, Hayawān, i, 301, vi, 210; al-Maydānī, s.v. ḥadīth Khurāsī). With the dropping of the first element of the expression, and through contamination by the root b.r.f., “to talk nonsense”, khurāsī became a common noun applied to a fabulous
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story. It is the word used by al-Mas'ūdī (Muraḍī, iv, 89 f.), in a well-known passage on the nucleus of the Thousand and one nights, to translate the Persians of Ṭabārānā and indicate stories in general. The Fihrist, which makes great use of it, seems to contrast it with samār, apparently attributing to it a more fictitious character. This term has remained current until the present with the meaning of "superstition", "fantasy tale", "legend". It is interesting to note that in certain Moroccan dialects hikāya denotes a story more or less truthful, but in any case probable, hikāra a story of marvelling, and bāṣṣa a historical account (see L. Brunot, *Textes arabes de Rabat*, ii, 163-4). In Tunisia (see W. Marçais, *Glossaire de Taboréna*, s.v.), we notice kharāfī with the meaning of "baseless talk" and kharṣīfī "boaster, humbug", while bāṣṣīfī still is a story-teller; elsewhere (cf. G. Boris, *Lexique du parler arabe des Marocains*, Paris 1958, s.v.), kharṣīfī is a story and bāṣṣāyī a short tale or anecdote.

II. — It would perhaps be rash to claim that the early Arabs, preoccupied solely with poetry and rhetoric, paid no attention to the tales of marvels and to the legends which are the common heritage of primitive man, but the brief semantic study given above certainly does not prove that they took a great interest in them, for, in fact, only the plural ḥikāyāt, and that which is a fictitious story, useless, and that which is a baseless talk, useless, and that which is a fictitious story, useless, and that which is a fictitious story, useless, and that which is a fictitious story, useless, and that which is a fictitious story, useless.

It is certain that, generally speaking, where the early Romans were familiar with stories and legends, it is best therefore to refer to the essential source for information on this literature in the first centuries. In his view this literature is divided into two broad categories: i. the borrowed stories concerning musicians and singers, tales of love, traditions about fakhr, hadjī, etc.; lexicographical (lughawī: mafrīāt); and ii. the genuinely Arab bāṣṣāyī which can be subdivided into: historical (akhirārī: stories concerning musicians and singers, tales of love, traditions about faṭḥ, ḥadi, etc.); heroic (bulaqī: Antar, Bakr and Taghlīb, al-Barrāḵ, etc.); religious (dinī: Ḫisās al-anbīyāt, etc.); lexicographical (lughawī: ḥadīṯ); and philosophical (al-Tawdbi wa l-esṣābī) about Ibn Sulayhād, the Risālāt al-Ǧurūf, al-Bahrānātī, l-Yafrī al-Ǧurūf, l-Taqqī, l-Ṭufayl, al-Sāḥib wa l-bāqīm of Ibn al-Habbārīya). From this classification it appears that for one thing the author does not take account of all the relevant literature, that for another some of his interpretations are mistaken (particularly about Ibn Sulayhād), and finally that he denies that the Arabs possessed any original stories of the supernatural. It is best therefore to refer to the essential source for information on this literature in the first centuries of Islam, the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadīm, who gives to the first fann of his eighth mákāla the title: aḥḥār al-musāʿamīn wa l-muḥharīfīn wa-ṣaṣām al-muṣaṣṣaṣnaṣa fi l-ʿasār wa l-bāḥṣā (the copyist uses at this very point the expression bāḥṣāt bāḥṣat al-musāʿamīn to indicate that he is copying verbatim); he first lists there the works concerning the aṣmār and the bāḥṣāt, treating separately the translations of texts of Persian, Indian and Greek origin; he includes in the fann traditions about Babylon and the Arcadians, then the love tales, the stories of the supernatural in which appear dīnna (s.v.) who have amorous dealings with humans (see also qurlī), and finally accounts of the wonders of the sea (see sagnān). Ibn al-Nadīm states that the first to compile collections of the proceedings of the Persians of the first period, i.e., the Kayānids, and adds that this material went on growing until the Sāṣānids;
later these tales were translated into Arabic, and Arabs added stories of their own. It is at this point that Ibn al-Nadim’s Book of Fabulous Tales of One Thousand and One Nights [see Alif Layla wa-Layla] and of the attempt of Diaghlyâri [q.v.] to collect a thousand tales (samar)—Arabic, Persian, Greek, etc.—by calling upon story-tellers (mussâmir) and making use of written collections, but retaining only those which seemed to him the most interesting.

M. F. Ghazi ([La littérature d’imagination en arabe du IVe au VIIIe siècle], in Arabic, iv/2 (1957), 164-78) has tried to make use of these pages of the Fihrist, but his work is not free from errors and the result is rather disappointing, for the titles listed by Ibn al-Nadim are not established with certainty and are liable to give rise to erroneous interpretations. It is evident that the great majority of the collections mentioned have not survived, having either been absorbed into the Thousand and one nights or relapsed into oral tradition where they have become more or less part of the folklore of the various Arabic-speaking countries. Here we have something rather strange. In the first half of the 4th/10th century, Ḥamza al-Isfahāni (ed. Gottwald, 41-2) declared that about 70 books of entertainment were very much read in his time; some decades later, Ibn al-Nadim gives a still longer list of them, asserting that the samâr and sâdhâf were very popular in the ‘Abbâsid period and especially under al-Mukhtar, which encouraged the bookseller-copyists to reproduce them and perhaps themselves to collect new tales. A. Mez (Renaissance, 242-3; Eng. tr. 253; Sp. tr., 311-2) attributes this infatuation for narrative literature, and for stories which a critic as experienced as Ibn al-Nadim considers feeble and lacking in vigour, to the decline of pure Arab taste in the 4th/10th century, but perhaps because everyone had work to do, but in certain hot regions gatherings of this sort were suited to the coolness of the long summer evenings. Tradition forbade story-telling during the day, perhaps because everyone had work to do, but primarily because to tell a story is an act which savours of magic; according to popular belief, any infringement of this prohibition was penalized by a fate which Arab scholars have never been able to consider worthy of the slightest esteem, seeing in it merely a trivial diversion incompatible with the tastes which a true Believer should profess. In other words this masterpiece of world literature, which was revealed to the Arabs themselves by orientalists, has remained foreign to Arab literature even though, while of foreign origin, it contains authentic ‘Irâkî and Egyptian elements (see N. Elisséeff, Thèmes et motifs des Mille et une nuits, Beirut 1949, 47 f.). The disdain felt by the educated classes for stories amply explains why Arab folklore has developed in a completely different way from that of other parts of the world, and why the phase of its being handed on in written form, in the golden age of Arabic culture, was followed by a return to an exclusively oral tradition, even though chapbooks, hawked in the markets, continue to circulate at popular levels. It is also remarkable that myths and legends never inspired Arabic writers, while a Firdawsi, although he had no more direct access than they to the original tradition, succeeded in employing materials equally well-known to the Arabs to create so superb an epic as the Shâhnameh. We must on the other hand refer here to the influence exercised in the West by the so-called Arabic stories, and we shall merely recall that, in imitation of Galland, several orientalists collected in their turn stories generally drawn from literary works or from popular works which echoed them: Pèdes de la Croix and his Mille et un jours, Paris 1830, Gaudefrey-Desmoynes and Les cent et une nuits, Paris 1912, and above all R. Basset, the eminent folklorist who in his Mille et un contes, récits et légendes arabes, Paris 1924-6, has made such instructive comparisons.

III.—To be fair, it must be said that some modern Arabic authors are trying hesitantly to revive the ancient themes in order to make of them truly literary works, but it is quite certain that, on the whole, folklore hardly inspires contemporary writers, who are more interested in imitating the West, neglecting this traditional material. The choice would not in fact be an easy one, for the world of today is more attracted by the hikāya in the sense in which Abu ‘1-Mutahhar al-Asdl understood it than by the myths of antiquity, and one even has the impression that the ordinary people have less and less the time to listen to the stories and tales which delighted their ancestors—at least when they did not consider it beneath their dignity to be interested in them.

The observation of present or recent conditions in North Africa and elsewhere gives us an idea of what may have been the form of this country, and R. Blachère (in Sévency, vi (1956), 83-4) has put forward the hypothesis that the Kur’ânic term asâdir was applied to stories which were told by men, while kūrâfat indicated those reserved for women. This is quite possible, but the two spheres are not everywhere so neatly distinguished as the observations of H. Basset (Essai sur la littérature des Berbères, Algiers 1920, passim), which inspired R. Blachère’s interesting hypothesis, would lead us to believe. Although, in general, adult men affect to disdain old wives’ tales, they are often prepared to produce from the depths of their memory stories heard in their youth and ostensibly forgotten. There are some who do not refuse to yield to the insistence of the researchers and to relate, even in the day-time, fantastic or supernatural tales; thus the author has been able to collect from both North Africa and the Middle East, examples from friendly storytellers, whose memories, however, were sometimes at fault. But such a search does not reproduce normal conditions and it can be said that traditionally two fields are to be distinguished: the tales of the supernatural, the ancient asmâr which correspond to the German Hausmärchen, are told by women, especially old women, while the heroic tales and historical legends are the province of men.

Women famous as story-tellers were booked long in advance and gathered round them each evening, after supper, in a village- or town-house, an audience consisting especially of women and children; the ceremony took place preferably in winter, but in certain hot regions gatherings of this sort were suited to the coolness of the long summer evenings. Tradition forbade story-telling during the day, perhaps because everyone had work to do, but primarily because to tell a story is an act which savours of magic; according to popular belief, any infringement of this prohibition was penalized by a supernatural punishment, the nature of which varied from place to place; in one place, the woman who told stories during the day would give birth to dwarfs or monstrous children, whereas her offspring would be killed by wild beasts, or she would be threatened with having children with ringworm, unless by
chance one could, as was believed at Fas, count eleven beams in the ceiling. Several ways existed to do this, which was the origin of the fable of Indian origin. There is no doubt at all that the formula of hikāya is regarded here as referring in a rather flowery style to the text; see also: Carra de Vaux, Les penseurs de l'Islam, i, Paris 1921; V. Chauvin, Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes ou relatifs aux Arabes, iv, Liège 1892; Pearson, 23806-914, suppl., 6339-52; A. Abdel-Meguid, A survey of story literature in Arabic from before Islam to the middle of the nineteenth century, in Isl. Quarterly, i (1954), 204-73; idem, A survey of the terms used in Arabic for “narrative” and “story”, ibid., 195-204—E. Montet, Le conte dans l'Orient musulman, Paris 1930; R. Blachère, Regards sur la littérature narrative en arabe au IVe siècle de l'hégire (VIIe s.f.-c.), in Semitica, iv (1956), 75-86, contains some original ideas of which use has been made in this article.—The bibliography of R. Basset, Mille et un conies... contains a long list of Arabic works which contain various stories.—For the field of Arabic dialects, see ARABIYYA, iii, 2-3, adding especially Artin Pasha, Contes populaires inédits de la Vallée du Nil, Paris 1895; E. Littmann, Modern Arabic Tales, i, Ar. text, Leiden 1905; S. Benchenek, Les contes d'Alger, Oran 1946; Dress Légey, Essai de folklore marocain, 1926; tend to be based on genuine fact in that they do not least losing their prophylactic character; in Berber for example, the story-teller says at least “Our tale is finished, but the wheat and the barley are not finished”. And even in such an abbreviated formula as this: tatā ta’ad, khlijjī ‘l-haddātā, “mulberry, mulberry, end of our story”, heard in Syria, some-thing of magic survives.

For men, R. Le Tourneau (Fès, 555-6) has observed the story-tellers (faduwā, pl. faduwān or fādwa) of Fès who “intoned to the rhythm of a square tambourine the deeds of Arabs of former times; the majority of the listeners (about fifty in winter, up to two hundred in summer) knew the stories already and rebuked the narrator or prompted him if by chance his memory failed him, but they took great pleasure in hearing for the hundredth time the story of journey of single combat, of deeds of treachery and daring, and allowed themselves to be lulled or moved by the endless repetition of stereotyped formulae”. The same writer relates that a shoemaker famed for his talent as a story-teller would take up his place on a chosen site between the ‘asr and maghrib prayers and “recited day after day a long story which he was able to make lively and sometimes poignant”. His repertoire however consisted of only three stories: ‘Antar, which lasted a year, the story of the Ismā‘īlīs (i.e., the Fāṭimids), which lasted six months, and the romance of Sayf Dhu ‘l-Yasa‘ī (sic = Yazan), which lasted four months. At the end of the session, a member of the audience made a collection and handed it over to the story-teller.

It is not possible within the scope of this brief article to study the popular tales which are gathered together wholesale in the cycle of the Thousand and One nights on the one hand and the great romances of chivalry on the other, and it is desirable that those collected up to now and those still to be collected should be submitted to an investigation at least as far-reaching as that which H. Basset has devoted to the Berber field; such a study would certainly be a very welcome in length which is exactly the solution of the numerous problems which remain unanswered. Mention should be made of the recent work of Mia I. Gerhardt, The art of story-telling, a literary study of the Thousand and One Nights, Leiden 1963.

Bibliography: The main sources are given in the text; see also: Carra de Vaux, Les penseurs de l'Islam, i, Paris 1921; V. Chauvin, Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes ou relatifs aux Arabes, iv, Liège 1892; Pearson, 23806-914, suppl., 6339-52; A. Abdel-Meguid, A survey of story literature in Arabic from before Islam to the middle of the nineteenth century, in Isl. Quarterly, i (1954), 204-73; idem, A survey of the terms used in Arabic for “narrative” and “story”, ibid., 195-204—E. Montet, Le conte dans l'Orient musulman, Paris 1930; R. Blachère, Regards sur la littérature narrative en arabe au IVe siècle de l'hégire (VIIe s.f.-c.), in Semitica, iv (1956), 75-86, contains some original ideas of which use has been made in this article.—The bibliography of R. Basset, Mille et un conies... contains a long list of Arabic works which contain various stories.—For the field of Arabic dialects, see ARABIYYA, iii, 2-3, adding especially Artin Pasha, Contes populaires inédits de la Vallée du Nil, Paris 1895; E. Littmann, Modern Arabic Tales, i, Ar. text, Leiden 1905; S. Benchenek, Les contes d'Alger, Oran 1946; Dress Légey, Essai de folklore marocain, 1926; tend to be based on genuine fact in that they do not least losing their prophylactic character; in Berber for example, the story-teller says at least “Our tale is finished, but the wheat and the barley are not finished”. And even in such an abbreviated formula as this: tatā ta’ad, khlijjī ‘l-haddātā, “mulberry, mulberry, end of our story”, heard in Syria, some-thing of magic survives.

For men, R. Le Tourneau (Fès, 555-6) has observed the story-tellers (faduwā, pl. faduwān or fādwa) of Fès who “intoned to the rhythm of a square tambourine the deeds of Arabs of former times; the majority of the listeners (about fifty in winter, up to two hundred in summer) knew the stories already and rebuked the narrator or prompted him if by chance his memory failed him, but they took great pleasure in hearing for the hundredth time the story of journey of single combat, of deeds of treachery and daring, and allowed themselves to be lulled or moved by the endless repetition of stereotyped formulae”. The same writer relates that a shoemaker famed for his talent as a story-teller would take up his place on a chosen site between the ‘asr and maghrib prayers and “recited day after day a long story which he was able to make lively and sometimes poignant”. His repertoire however consisted of only three stories: ‘Antar, which lasted a year, the story of the Ismā‘īlīs (i.e., the Fāṭimids), which lasted six months, and the romance of Sayf Dhu ‘l-Yasa‘ī (sic = Yazan), which lasted four months. At the end of the session, a member of the audience made a collection and handed it over to the story-teller.

It is not possible within the scope of this brief article to study the popular tales which are gathered together wholesale in the cycle of the Thousand and One nights on the one hand and the great romances of chivalry on the other, and it is desirable that those collected up to now and those still to be collected should be submitted to an investigation at least as far-reaching as that which H. Basset has devoted to the Berber field; such a study would certainly be a very welcome in length which is exactly the solution of the numerous problems which remain unanswered. Mention should be made of the recent work of Mia I. Gerhardt, The art of story-telling, a literary study of the Thousand and One Nights, Leiden 1963.
Varamin (622/1225) and in the Rawgat al- 'ukul of Muhammad b. Ghazi of Malatya (end of the 7th/13th century).

Two cycles of very popular fables also had remote Indian origins and underwent developments similar to those of Ka'ilat wa- Dimma. Notable among them were the Sindbad- nāma (Book of Sindbad), which should not be confused with Sindbād the Sailor of the Thousand and One Nights; this is the framework story of the Forty Viziers or of the Seven Viziers), the Bahāghār- nāma, similar to the preceding work (Book of the Ten Viziers), the Tūṭi- nāma (Book of the Parrot), all of them moralizing works, whereas the Kīsās-i čahār dārūgā (Stories of the Four Dervishes) are pure fiction. All of these texts were re-written several times by various authors in prose and in verse.

The ornamental style which, in these stories, varies with the contents, becomes purely an aesthetic sport in one literary genre which might be classed as hikāya, namely the mahāma (q.v.); the first mahāmāt in Persian, those of Ḥamīd al- Din (d. 559/1164), are simply translations from the Arabic of Bādi' al- Zaman al- Hamadhānī, who was however himself of Persian birth.

The task of collecting as many hikāyāt as possible and classifying them under various different rubrics was fulfilled in the enormous collection of Muhammad 'Awfī [see 'awfī], Djamānīsī al- hikāyāt wa- lauśamīsī al- riwāyāt, which collects together more than 2,000 stories and anecdotes (first half of the 13th/19th century); it was inspired by such Arabic works as al- Farājī bādī al- shīda of al- Tanūkī (d. 384/994), which was re-written in Persian by 'Awfī himself and others. Anecdotes of the humorous type were collected also by 'Ubayd- i Zākānī (8th/14th century), whose Risāla- yi Dilwāhī is merely a collection of hikāyāt, often obscene, in Arabic and in Persian.

The unequalled master of the hikāya is Sa'dī (q.v.) in his Gulistān (656/1258), which is basically only a collection of light moralizing hikāyāt in prose interspersed with verse, divided according to subject; it has been imitated more than once, among the best of the imitations being the Bahārīstān of Dāmī (d. 898/1492) and the Khābā- i Pareghān of Kānānī (d. 1270/1854).

This brief survey excludes the "novel", which, although it possesses some of its characteristics, cannot be classed as hikāya. The novel in its modern sense is practically non-existent in the classical literature, where its place is taken by long fabulous stories (dāštān) (generally not very highly thought of by the classical historians of literature), the earliest example of which is the Samak ' Ayār (585/ 1189) of Šādakā b. Abī Ḵāsim Ṣhīrāzī, full of the imaginary adventures of cavaliers who aspire to the hand of the princess, daughter of the emperor of China. This romance was followed by many others, some of them midway between learned and popular literature, which relate the extraordinary adventures of various heroes (e.g., of Amīr Ḥamzā [see Ḥamzā], uncle of the Prophet) and which were particularly popular in India.

It is possible to consider as collections of hikāyāt also the Tadbīrāt al- awwalīyār or semi-legendary "biographies" of saints, the most famous of which, in Persia, is that of Farīd al- Din ʿAṭṭār (6th/12th century), classifying them under various hisorical rubrics (see historical rubrics).

What all this heterogeneous material has in common is primarily a matter of style: the narrative style of the short tale, which in general appears in two main forms, the straightforward and the ornate. In the first case the narrative is advanced by extremely simple stylistic and syntactical means, with very rare use of subordinate clauses, or none at all, in a series of statements expressed in brief sentences which follow each other without any links. The attempts to make such a disjointed narrative more "complex" generally took the form of an elaboration in ornamentation. If the rhetorical ornaments are removed however, the basic style is found to be straightforward. The development is not necessarily from the plain to the ornate and the two styles may be found together in works of the same period and sometimes of the same author.

Thus, on the eve of the modern era, Persian narrative art found itself somewhat at a disadvantage when faced with the powerful influence of European novels and short stories, which in the West had a long history behind them: among the most difficult and fascinating tasks of modern Persian writers is to create a complex realism which surpasses the earlier realism attempted in the hikāyāt and a narrative style which, rejecting the use of complicated ornament, achieves a simplicity which is not merely straightforward narration; and they have sometimes produced some noteworthy results in this direction (e.g., Dāmālīzāda, Ṣādīk Hīdāyat, Ṣādīk Čubak, etc.).

Bibliography: J. Rypka, Iranische Literaturgeschichte, Leipzig 1939 (which contains references to the principal editions of the texts cited and further bibliography). (A. BAUSANI)

iii. — THE NARRATIVE GENRES OF TURKISH LITERATURE AND FOLKLORE.

The word hikāya, attested also in the form hikāyet (¢ Ar. hikāya) in Ottoman texts, means, when it is used with the auxiliary verb et., "to relate", "to narrate". It means a story, when it is accompanied by simple or compound verbs such as de-, söyle-: "to say", naklet-: "to relate". As a generic term, the word has not had, in the Turkish of Turkey, any specific sense, but has indicated each and all of the narrative genres: tale (masal < Ar. mathal), legend (memkule, efşane), anecdote (laufa, filare), story, novel, romance. It is only in recent scientific terminology that it has acquired the value of a precise technical term to indicate three clearly defined genres: in oral tradition, a lengthy story in prose alternating with verse passages (the hikāye of the ʿalīkh, see below), or a mimed story in prose performed by professional story-tellers (the hikāye of the meddāhs [q.v.]; in modern written literature, a novel [see below].

In the modern Turkish of Turkey, the word efşane (< P. afşāne) is used as a technical term to mean a legend; but, in the current language, past as well as present, it can have, with the words masal (< Ar. mathal) and hurafe (< Ar. hurafe), the pejorative sense of "a completely fantastic story, fabricated or superstition].

There should also be mentioned the uses, which nowadays have completely disappeared, of certain other terms. First the words compounded with nāme (Pers. nāma) added to the name of the hero or to the word denoting the main theme, to indicate large scale narrative works, usually in verse but sometimes also in prose: Iskender- nāme (the "Romance of Alexander"), Hamza- nāme (the "Geste of Hamza"), Ghazavīt- nāme ("Stories of holy wars"), Fath- nāme ("Stories of conquest"), Wildyet- nāme ("Hagiography"), Oğuz- nāme ("Stories about the Oghuz"),
et. This latter term has, in the Book of Dede Korkut, which, in the recension which has survived, was probably compiled in the 13th-14th century (see P. N. Boratav, Dede Korkut hikayelerinde tarihi olaylar ve hicânasânî'î tarîhi, in TM, xiii (1958), 31-62), the meaning of "epic episode composed and declaimed in honour of the main hero of the adventures related". In the same work are found also two terms, boy and soy, used together with the verbs which are derived from them: boy boyla-, soy soyla-; the former has the meaning of "to relate, in the epic style, a story which describes the memorable deeds of a hero", the second "to declaim (or sing or chant) the verse sections of an epic narrative". The term boy is, in addition, used in the titles of the twelve episodes found in one of the two manuscripts (that of Dresden, which is nearest to the lost original) of the Book of Dede Korkut; it accompanies the name of the hero and means simply "episode": Bamsi Beyrek boyl, "Episode of Bamsi Beyrek"; Basat Depegoz oâdur-dügi boy, "Episode [in which is related how] Basat killed Depegoz", etc. Boy and soy, synonyms, mean strictly "tribe", "clan", "family"; they were probably originally used to denote the stories and songs recounting the memorable deeds of a clan (cf. the term boy, "feast", "banquet", "wedding ceremonies"), used also for "wedding song"; see F. N. Boratav, Halk hikdyeleri ve halk hikdyeciligi, Ankara 1956, 52, 117, 120, 294-7). In the sense of "episode", the word boy has been replaced in the later epic narrative tradition of eastern Anatolia by the word kol ("arm", but also "branch", "detachment"); it denotes an episode in the great narrative corpus of the adventures of the noble bandit Koroghlu: Demirejügölgü kol, Ayva kol, etc. In the second, and more Ottomanized, manuscript (that of the Vatican) of the Book of Dede Korkut, the term boy is replaced in the titles by hikayet: Hikayet-i Bamsi Beyrek, etc.; even the title of the book (Kılıb-i Dedem Korkut) in the Dresden manuscript is, in that of the Vatican: Hikayet-i Oghusnâme-i Kazan Beg ve ghâryrih.

The terms hikâya (pl. hikâyâ) and menâhib (sing. menâhâbe) have been used in the same sense as the words formed with boy; but more often for prose works dealing with epic-religious themes; from the first is derived the word hikâyâ, the equivalent of the Arabic kahsâs, used of the teller (or "reader") of stories about the pre-Islamic prophets, the champions of Islam or the great mystic figures: Kâsâs-i emâniyâ, Menâhib-i khasâvâli-i Seyyid Bâbiî, Menâhib-i Hâdiy Behâdah, etc.; siyâr (sing. siyet; Ar. strob, pl. siyâr) is the term reserved for stories of the life of the Prophet Muhammad. As an example of technical terms used for specific genres of narrative literature there should also be mentioned mabtâl which means, in the tradition of ŞH'î circles, the account of the death of Husayn at Karbalâ'.

From about the beginning of the 10th/16th century, there spread through the territories of the Ottoman empire a tradition of popular poetry, that of the ḍâshiks [q.v.] (literally "lovers"). These poet-singers of the same type as the troubadours of the mediaeval West were the successors of the osan ("bards") of Oghuz poetic tradition. They composed and disseminated lyric poetry but they also carried on the epic tradition. They transformed the heroic epic into a new genre called ḍâshîye. This ḍâshîye retained certain formal and thematic elements from the epic tradition, inserting poems of their own composition at the points of the narrative which seem most suitable. The various processes and the successive phases of such a production—in part improvised while it is being recited—have been observed among ḍâshîkh-"writers" (= mu'asâmîf) of the present day (see P. N. Boratav, op. cit., 130-86, and more particularly 158-63).

A number of ḍâshîkh (that is, 'professional poets') are common to other Turkish-speaking peoples; to mention only a few examples: the episode of Beyrek in the Book of Dede Korkut has spread beyond the Oghuz area among the Karakalpaks, the Ūzbekê, the Karâkhs, and the Altays; various episodes from the Koroghlu cycle exist in Adharbâyjân, Türkmen, Ūzbek and Tobol Tatar versions (and even non-Turkish versions: Armenian, Georgian, Kurdish, Tadjik); the romance of the romance of the loves of Tâhir and Zühre in these two countries and in Ūzbekistan (see P. N. Boratav, L'épopée et la "hikâye", in Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta, ii, Wiesbaden 1964, 11-44).

The ḍâshîye vary in length. Those of Koroghlu form a vast cycle in which each episode (köl) is related independently and is in general of the same length as a full-scale hikâye. When recited by a skilled story-teller a lengthy hikâye may entertain his audience for several sessions (evenings), each lasting 3 or 4 hours. If in addition he is encouraged by an enthusiastic audience of connoisseurs, a good story-teller can always find a pretext to prolong his recital as much as he wishes, filling it out artificially with non-narrative additions: musical sections (instrumental and vocal) added at the beginning and in the middle of the story (when "pauses" are reached), anecdotes and short tales (= korâsvellî) introduced at random, etc.; the sessions may also be prolonged by interventions sung by talented members of the audience. The shorter ḍâshîye (lasting one or two hours) are known as serhâshtî (or serhâshtî or krasîde.

There are also recorded some extraordinary adaptations of the ḍâshîkh. Some 19th century manuscripts exist (see P. N. Boratav, op. cit., 206-10); also in the 19th
century, some lithographed editions were produced, very probably based on manuscripts; however, editions based on oral versions are also possible, without the intervention of copies circulating in manuscript; some quite recent editions (in Latin characters, hence printed since 1928) produced by this process are known (see P. N. Boratav, op. cit., 212-3).

There should also be mentioned the classical themes such as Leyla and Demna, Ferhad and Shirin, etc., which, without being completely assimilated to the hikaye, particularly in their verse sections, have nevertheless become part of the repertoire of popular hikayes which are distributed in the form of books sold in the streets by peddlars, first in lithographed then in printed form.

The classics of Arabic-Persian narrative prose such as Kalila wa Dimna, Tüsfîname, and the Thousand and One Nights have, since the beginnings of the Islamic Turkish literatures, existed in written recensions recorded in the various Turkish-speaking areas. The culmination of this literature, in the Ottoman area, at the end of the 18th century, is the famous collection Muhkâyeceli-1 ledümü-i ıdâhi of Aziz Efendi (see A. Tietze, in Orients, i (1948), 248 f.). But very few examples are known of the true popular story which has passed into a written version: there may have been a Dâstân-i Ahmed Efendi (ed. by A. Tietze, in the international catalogue of Aarne-Thompson), an anonymous work, probably 8th/14th century; a short verse tale by Şahîk Pasha (17th/18th century), which corresponds to the folk-tale type no. 1626 of the international catalogue. The collection Bâllâr Kâggî, containing 13 stories drawn from oral tradition, is a recent compilation, probably of the 19th century. On the other hand, the comic narrative literature, which seems to have drawn a large part of its subject matter from oral tradition, has appeared much more frequently in written versions. The collections of amusing anecdotes of Naşr al-Dîn Khojâja (q.v.) begin from the 10th/16th century to sprout the others because of their populare, is a comic genre, such as those of Bekâr Muştâfa or İndîli Câvûgh, both of them actual persons of the 11th/17th century, which at first were transmitted orally, were also to appear in modern editions in books peddled in the streets. The anecdotes concerning the adherents of heterodox sects (e.g., the Tahtâgül and the Kırîfbâqül), and also the “discriminatory” stories which different racial, regional or religious communities tell against one another, remained until fairly recently exclusively oral. Nevertheless there are to be found in some 11th/17th and 12th/18th century manuscripts jokes about the Râfdîs which appear again later, attributed to the Bektâşîs.

In Turkey, the modern novel and short story began as a kind of negation of the ancient narrative traditions, both classical and popular. It is nevertheless true that the first modern novels and stories were deeply influenced by works of these two ancient traditions. Although they succeeded in eliminating all irrational and supernatural elements, yet so far as style, forms of expressions and construction are concerned, the old narrative techniques of the story-tellers of scholarly literature and of the meydâns were to survive for a long time, right up to the period of the realist-naturalist novels of the beginning of the 20th century, for example in the works of the great novelist Mustâsîn Hüsâyn Rhâmi [Gürpınar] (q.v.) (1864-1944), who here follows his master Ahmed Midhat (1844-1913), the father of the modern novel in Turkey. The very titles of the early novels which appeared at the same time as the first works of Ahmed Midhat are significant in this respect: Mühâcûncü (1872-3) by Emîn Nîhâd, Sîyâset-i Sûnûvas (1873-4) by T. Abdî. At this time works of this genre were called “roman”, but also hikaye, as is illustrated by the title of an anonymous novel Hikâyə-i Ferdâne Khanım (1872-3); thus the word hikaye acquired a new meaning and it was thereafter to be reserved for the “story in written educated literature. The composite term kâşîk hikaye (short story) refers only to the length of the story.

Bibliography: In addition to the works cited in the article, see Köprüülüzâde Mehemd Fu'âd, Türkçe'deki hikâyâ hikâyecelişine dîdâ ba'dî reddâddâ (in T.M., i (1925), 1 f.; O. Spies, Türkische Volksbücher, Leipzig 1929; Mustafa Nîhât Özvân, Türkçe roman, Istanbul 1935; İbân Bâgîsî, Turkish folk stories about the lives of minstrels, in Journal of American Folklore, i lv (1925), 331-9; W. Eberhard, Minstrel tales from southeastern Turkey, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1955. Bibliographies in the above works and in Philologias Turcicæ Fundamenta, ii, Wiesbaden 1965; the latter work gives, in the relevant chapters, accounts of the narrative genre in the literatures of all the Turkish-speaking countries, followed by extensive bibliographies. For Turkish tales see the catalogue by W. Eberhard and P. N. Boratav, Typer türkischer Volksmärchen, Wiesbaden 1953. (Pervat Nâilî Boratav)
The basic material of the dastan-litterature was the cycle of Amir Hamza, written and recited in most Muslim countries from Turkey to Indonesia. Dastans characters fell broadly into three categories: the hero, the heroine and their chivalrous friends; ‘tricheurs’ (‘suyyūr’) who supported them and supplied some comic relief in the narrative; and the sorcerers or magicians (gāddāgar) who were their adversaries.

The dastan has a repetitive pattern of almost identical stock situations in which heroes aided by ‘suyyūr’ challenge sorcerers in a magical landscape with a labyrinthine monotony which draws on to enormous lengths.

The authorship of Dastan-i Amir Hamza is attributed apocryphonally to Akbar’s [q.v.] poet-laureate Fayyūl: It was rendered into Urdu from Persian by Ashk under the auspices of the Fort William College in 1215/1801. The entire dastan runs into seventeen volumes divided into a number of series. The first of these series is Nasb-i ‘araid Nāma. The most popular series is the seven-volume Taisīm-i Ḥoshrūbī, the first four volumes of which were translated from a Persian original by Mir Muhammad Husayn Diwāḥ, and the remaining three by Ahmad Husayn Kāmar.

An imitation of the Ḥamza cycle is the Bustān-i Ḵiyālī, a dastan of 4,000 pages composed in Persian by Mir Taqī Khān under the patronage of the decadent Mughal emperor Muhammad Shāh (1713/ 1719-1726/1728). It was translated into Urdu by Ḵayāl-Adān Dihlāwī and Mirza Muhammad ʿAskārī among others. In stylistic quality the Bustān-i Ḵiyālī is inferior to the Ḥamza group, though both rely on linguistic cadence, rhymed sentences and ornate phraseology.

Fasāna-i ‘aṣḡāb (1824), Mirzā Raḍiāb ‘Alī Bāg Sarū’s (1877-1867) short volume of inter-related stories, is thematically descended from the dastāns and has the same involved magical elements, but it is distinguished from them by its brevity, its occasional reflection of the actual life of the period and its primary pre-occupation with the concentrated decorativeness of style. These new characteristics, especially the last, were inherited by Pandit Rātan Nāth Sarshār (1846-1902) in his novels, which also reflect the influence of dastāns in love scenes and certain conventional situations.

Ḵāhār darwarh, originally a collection of inter-related stories in Persian, has wrongly been attributed to Ḵᵛājā Ḵusraw [q.v.]. It was composed probably during the 11th/12th century. It has been rendered into Urdu in two literary versions of considerable importance. One of these was Muhammad Husayn ‘Aṭā Khān’s Naw ḥar-i muṣraḥa composed in 1798 in a highly Persianized style. It was rendered into simpler and idiomatic Urdu prose by Mir Amman Dihlāwī and at the Fort William College in 1801, under the title Bāgh-u bāhār. Both these works probably mark the development in the original prose. Another Naw ḥar-i muṣraḥa of inferior literary quality was compiled at the Fort William College by Ṣairr in 1801.

Saṣf al-mulḵ wa Bādī al-ḏālamā, a story from the Arabian Nights, was first rendered as a maḥaṣṣālī by the Dakhani poet Ḡawwāṣī in 1035/1625. It was written as a prose romance by Ṣaḥān ‘All in the early nineteenth century.

Other remarkable specimens of the ḵāyā literature of the early nineteenth century include Ḥayyāt al-ḵulūb, Wall Muhammad b. Hāṭīz Mīrān’s rendering of Bākīr Maqṣūr’s work on the stories of the prophets; Ṣayḥkh Ṣaḥīḥ Muhammad ʿUṯmānī’s Sayyīr-i Ṣithrāt, ḡāmī al-ḵẖāyā (1825), an imitation of Ṣaḥīḥ’s Gulašlān, the Haft ḡulāmā, a collection of Ṣaḥīḥ’s ʿAlī Khān Wāṣṭī’s translated from Persian into Urdu by Mirzā Ḵaṭl ‘Alī Wīlā; Bīnī Ṣarāyān’s Ḡar ḡulāmā, translated from Persian in 1812; and two collections of prose tales Mor ṣanbāt and Raḥq-i ṣurāi compiled by Ṣaḥān ‘All about 1243/1823. Ṣaḥān, the translator of Dastan-i Amir Hamza, also wrote a prose romance, Gulašlā-i Ṣīm, in 1215/1804. Ḥayyāt Bākhṣ Bāydar (d. 1833) Ṣaḏīq-i maḥfī belongs, like several other tales written in the early nineteenth century, to the Ḥāṭim Tāʿī cycle. Ḥayyāt is also the author of Laylā Majdīnān and Gulašlā-dīnāḵ, which is a translation of Ṣhaykh Ḥaydār ʿAlāt’s Bāhār-dīnāḵ containing stories of feminine wiles and infidelity.

Ḥayyāt’s most famous work Totā kahānī, compiled in 1215/1801 at the Fort William College, belongs to another group in the ḵāyā-literature, that of stories of Indian origin. Dīyā al-Dīn Ṣaḥḥābī’s Tāʾī Nāma (731/1330) is the Persian version of a Sanskrit collection of seventy stories, Saka saptakāt. The central plot around which the stories are clustered evolves around a faithful parrot who keeps an unfaithful wife, whose husband is away on a distant journey, from adultery by relating to her a series of stories to keep her absorbed and out of mischief. A simpler abridged version reducing the number of stories to thirty-five was compiled in Persian in 1049/1639 by Muhammad Kādīrī. Ghaḏwālī’s Urdu maṭlaḥna-i Ṣāt Nāma (1049/1639) is based on Ṣaḥḥābī’s version, while Ḥayyāt’s prose Totā kahānī is based on Kādīrī’s abridgement.

Other stories of Indian origin compiled at the Fort William College include Singhāsana Bāṭīṭī by Kāzīm ‘Alī Diwān and Lālū Lāl; and Bayātī Pāṭī translated into Urdu by Ṣaṭṭ ‘Alī Wīlā with the help of Lālū Lāl. Wīlā also translated a Hindi romance, Māhā Māl.

Inghī’s (1756-1817) Kāhānī Rānī Kīthā aww Kawwār Uḍaybāh kā (1803) is a story of Indian origin in which not a single word of Arabic or Persian origin has been used.

A famous Indian cycle is of the quest of a rare flower Bakwālī, which is also the name of a woman. The story was rendered into Persian in 1124/1712 by Ḥaḍrat Allāh Bangālī, and from this version it was translated into Urdu by Nīḥāl Cānd Liḥīrī (eds. Ḵᵛājā Ḥaḍrat Allāh Bangālī). These works form a summary in JA, 1836. Earlier versions of this romance were written in Dakhani verse in 1035/1625 and 1151/1738. The most famous Urdu version of the Bakwālī romance is Dayā Shāhkh Nāsīm’s Maṭlaḥna Gulašlā-i Nāsīm composed in 1254/1838.

Hikayat in Malay as in Arabic means 'story, tale, narrative, historical account'. It occurs in the titles of many works and a number of the earliest 16th century hikayat texts show the history of the rulers of Pasai (Ht. Raja Ra' Jasa) and Ht. Iskandar Dhu 'l-Karnayn, the story of Alexander the Great as a missionary of Islam. The same translator Abd Allah, and also the Arab missionaries such as the Spanish 9uatoX6yoi Science and philosophy were concerned with the kind of the heavenly bodies, and also with the kind of things that occur among mankind to which it was desired to render perfect. A reflection of the sciences of the religious law, and also of the secrets that elude common knowledge, that is to say the secrets of the Divine Essence. It is then al-hikma al-mas'ukā 'anhk, "the science about which one remains silent".

On the other hand, "wisdom" from the beginning extended to the sense of "science", since the seven Sages included several scholars, Thales certainly being among them. The astronomer Cleostrotas was a philosopher, as was Anaximander, said to be the author of the first book about nature. The Sages were called 9uatoX6yoi Science and philosophy were founded at the same time, in a study of nature which was desired to render perfect. A reflection of the original unity appears in Ibn Sina's fine definition: "Wisdom (hikma) is the passage of the soul of man to the perfection possible for him within the two bounds of science and action". It includes, on the one hand, justice and on the other the perfecting of the reasoning soul, inasmuch as it comprises the theoretical and practical intelligibles (Burkhan, 260).

Distinctions became established in proportion as increasing knowledge called for specialization, but they were recognized as forming part of a whole. Thus the beginning of the Mañik the mañikriyyān presents hikma as the main stock from which spring directly the āyāl or al-9ulim al-āṣiyya, the fundamental sciences, such as the study of the world and logic, while medicine, agriculture and the other individual sciences are derived sciences, branches, fura'. The lost work, of which the Mañik is a fragment, was entitled al-hikma al-ma9qriyya, but we do not know what sciences it covered. Dju9dānī tells us only that the hukama? sibrā'iyān were under the leadership of Aflāātan (Ta'raflīt), Plato? Plotinus? Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī follows Ibn Sīnā and leaves the individual sciences, medicine, agriculture and the others, in their subordinate place.

The tradition of the inclusion of the sciences in wisdom seems indeed to have remained unbroken
from the Greeks to the Arabs. A short manual of medical ethics which forms part of the Corpus Hippocraticum affirms that "a philosopher is at the same time a philosopher is the equal of the gods". Similarly, 'All al-Tabari, a Persian physician of the 3rd/9th century, wrote in Arabic a compendium of medicine which is one of the oldest in that language, entitled *Firdaws al-hikma*, "Paradise of wisdom". Its arrangement is inspired by Oribasius and Paul of Aegina, not by al-Razi or Ibn Siná; the sources quoted are Hippocrates, Aristotle, and Hunayn b. Ishák [q.v.], a contemporary of the author. This little book also deals with the natural sciences, and concludes with a sketch of medicine in India; it was quoted by E. G. Browne, *Arabian medicine*, Cambridge 1922, and analysed by Meyerhof. Dābir b. Ḥayyān said on the subject of the [supposed] founder of alchemy: "Know that successive philosophers have made science benefit from the greatness of men whose existence is not dependent on man, and even attaining to faith in God in revelation. It goes beyond falsafa, which denotes only Hellenistic philosophy; it transcends science, *hikmat*; "Science consists in grasping those things which it appertains to human intelligence to grasp in such a manner that no error enters into it [...] and if this is done by means of certain proof and actual demonstrations, this is called *hikma*" ([ʿAhd, 143]). By bringing absolute rectitude, both in his search and in the application, "The truly Wise Man is he who, having formed an opinion on a question, speaks to himself as to others, which signifies that he has spoken the truth faithfully" (Safaṣat). 6.

Averroes seems to take *hikma* rather in the limited sense of "philosophy", as against "religion" (Faṣāl al-maḥbūl); nevertheless he calls it "the supreme art", *mishār al-ṣanādīd*; ibid, 5, line 7.


(A. M. GOICHON)
HILAL, the new moon, the crescent.

i. — IN RELIGIOUS LAW

The new moon is important in Islamic religious law, because, in the Islamic lunar calendar (see Ta‘wīl), it determines, among other things, the date of the pilgrimage (see Hadrī), and the beginning and the end of Ramadān (q.v.), the month of fasting (see Sāwim).

The Kur‘ān refers to the new moon in sūra II, 189 (a verse of indeterminate date; Gesch. des Qor., i, 181): "They ask thee about the new moons; say: 'They are fast times (ma‘dūdah) for the people and for the pilgrims.'" Another relevant passage is sūra II, 183 f. (to be dated shortly before the Ramadān of the year 2; Gesch. des Qor., i, 178): "O ye who believe, fasting is prescribed for you as it was prescribed for those before you—maybe ye will show piety—during a certain number of days (ayyām 'ma‘dūdah)." As the observation of the new moon even in a clear sky is subject to chance, as described, for instance, by Ibn Ḥubayr (162), whereas the terms ma‘addah and ma‘dūdah in the Kur‘ān seem to refer to an exactly determined date or period, it seemed indicated that the beginning of the month should be determined by calculation, and several systems of calculation came into being. An argument in favour of calculation (biṣād) was also drawn from sūra X, 5 (belonging to the third Meccan period; Gesch. des Qor., i, 158) which reads: "He who has made the sun a glow and the moon a light, and has given it determined stations (wa-kaddarāhā manādsīt), that ye may know the number of the years and the reckoning (biṣād) [of time]." Calculation was, however, rejected by the Sunnis, the Ṣa‘ūdīs, the Zaydis, and the "Twelver" Shi‘itis, whereas the Ismā‘īlīs adopted it, and whilst traces of it are found in the literature of the other schools, it has become a distinguishing feature of this last (and of the present-day Bohrās). It is, of course, generally agreed that the actual observation of the new moon at the beginning and at the end of Ramadān is decisive, and the difference comes down to this, that if the new moon has not been observed on the evening of the twenty-ninth day the majority consider the thirtieth day as still belonging to the month in question, so that both Sha‘bān and Dā‘īr (the twenty-ninth day the majority consider the thirtieth day as still belonging to the month in question, so that both Sha‘bān and Dā‘īr) may have thirty days, which can never happen under the rule followed by the Ismā‘īlīs.

There is an arbitrary interpretation of the words ayyām 'ma‘dūdah as referring to a fast of three days in each month which had allegedly preceded as a religious duty the fast during Ramadān; the interpretation aims at eliminating the seeming implications of the words in favour of calculation; the traditions in which it is expressed (Ṭabarī, Ta‘ṣīr, Būlāk 1321, ii, 76) can be dated between 5A‘īd (d. 114 or 115/732-33) and Ibn Abī Laylā (d. 148/765). The commentators Ṭabarī, Dījassās, Ibn al-‘Arabī, and Fāḍl al-Dīn al-Qādī al-Mudhahhab, Bālāq (d. 321), in his Sunan, mentions before (ed. Istanbul 1308 ff., v, 170) reject this interpretation, and Kuršābī (al-‘Aṣīrī) li-ṣāḥab al-Qur‘ān (Cairo, 1353/1934, ii, 256), does not even mention it.

The opinion of the majority is expressed in a tradition from the Prophet which occurs in two classical collections and in many other works of hadīth (for detailed references, see Wensinck, Hand- book, s.v.v. Fast (ing) and Ramadān; further, Kanz al-‘umādī, iv, nos. 6060 ff.); its main tīmād goes through Mālik—Nāfī‘—Ibn ʿUmar, and it can therefore be traced back to the second century of the kisra (cf. my Origins, 176 ff.). A typical version of it (in Mālik’s Muwatta‘, Kībat al-‘Aṣīrī) runs: "The Prophet spoke of Ramadān and said: 'Do not fast until you see the new moon, and do not break the fast until you see it; but when it is hidden from you (by cloud or mist), give it its thirty days (‘ instead of laḥā')." Because the expression fa-ba‘dūrā laḥā could be taken to mean not only the computation of thirty days from the last new moon but also the calculation of the mansions of the moon, it was replaced in other versions by fa-‘akhmiṣu ‘l-tīmād, "complete the reckoning" (an expression taken from sūra II, 185), or by "count thirty".

According to another tradition, going back (through Nāfī‘) to Ibn ʿUmar only, which occurs in the Sunan of Abū Dāwūd as a corollary to his version of the tradition from the Prophet, Ibn ʿUmar on the twenty-ninth of Sha‘bān used to have the new moon looked for, and if it was seen that was that; if it was not seen in a clear sky, he continued to eat on the following day, and if there were clouds or dust in the sky he started fasting; but he finished his fast [at the end of Ramadān] together with the rest of the people and did not follow that method of counting. This reflects two early, not necessarily conflicting, attitudes, the meticulousness typical of the pious and the desire to follow the community, i.e., the orders of the imām, and both have left other traces in traditions. It was as a counter-move against this tradition that the (latter) tradition of the Prophet was provided with the tīmād Mālik—Nāfī‘—Ibn ʿUmar. The Ḥanbali school has essentially adopted the doctrine attributed to Ibn ʿUmar, whereas the other orthodox schools of law follow the implications of the tradition from the Prophet. (That one ought to start fasting after the 29th day of Sha‘bān, if the view of the new moon was obscured by clouds, is also the doctrine of the "Twelver" Shi‘itis, expressed, e.g., in a tradition from Dījār al-Ṣāliḥ in Tāfṣīr al-Ṣahih al-Bayānī.)

Questions of detail concerning the observation of the new moon began to be discussed at an early date, e.g., what to do when it is seen in the forehead or in the afternoon at the end of Ramadān; see Abū Yūsuf, ʿĀṯār, no. 819, for a normative statement of Ibrāhīm Naḥṣāz (presumably authentic); Muwatta‘, Kībat al-Ṣiyārat, bāb 1, tradition 4, for the doctrine of Mālik; Kanz al-‘umādī, iv, nos. 6014 ff.; Shams al-Dīn Ibn ʿAqīl in his compilation of the traditions from the Prophet, provided with the tīmād Mālik—Nāfī‘—Ibn ʿUmar. The ʿHanbali school has essentially adopted the doctrine attributed to Ibn ʿUmar, whereas the other orthodox schools of law follow the implications of the tradition from the Prophet. (That one ought to start fasting after the 29th day of Sha‘bān, if the view of the new moon was obscured by clouds, is also the doctrine of the "Twelver" Shi‘itis, expressed, e.g., in a tradition from Dījār al-Ṣāliḥ in Tāfṣīr al-Ṣahih al-Bayānī.)

A detailed discussion of this opinion which, according to Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, was held by members of the highest group of Tābi‘īs, is found in the commentary of ʿAynī on Buḫkārī, on the tradition from the Prophet mentioned before (ed. Istanbul 1308 ff., v, 182). Among the somewhat later upholders of it are mentioned Muḥarrīr b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Yaṣār (d. 220), a companion of Mālik (Ibn Sa‘īd, v, 325; Ibn Ḥarīb, al-Dīwān al-muḥākhab, s.v.), Ibn Kūtayba (d. 270), and Ibn Surayjī (see, not Ibn ʿAṣirī) (d. 360), a famous Ṣāḥīfī scholar (Ṭādh al-Dīn al-Ṣubkī, Tāḥāb al-Sha‘rīyya, ii, 87-96; Ibn Hūbayra, K. al-‘Aṣīrī an-manā‘i l-Ṣāḥīf, Aleppo 1347/1928, 111); this last is said to have attributed a similar opinion to Ṣāḥīfī. But it was felt that astrologers should be given no part in determining the incidence of a religious duty, and an author as early as Ṭahāwī (d. 321), in his Sharḥ Ma‘ānī l-ʿAḥār, where we should expect him to discuss it, does not mention this point at all.

The “Twelver” Schīfs insist on the principle of observance of the new moon for the Muslims to count more strictly than the Sunnis. Their main authoritative traditions, found in their four classical collections, are: “The people of the kibla are only bound by observation (raʿya), the Muslims are only bound by observation” (from Dījaʿar al-Ṣādiq), and: “When you see the new moon fast, and when you see it break the fast; it is not done on the basis of description and surmise (wa-layṣa bi-l-taʿṣī wa-la ʿl-ṭaṣṣanī)” (from Muhammad al-Baḵīr). The same doctrine is formulated in their authoritative works of fīkḥ, from the spurious Fīkḥ al-Ridd (Ṭeherān 1315); the šīa al-Ridd d. 202, through the Muḥṣnī and the Ḥidāyā of Ibn Bābūya al-Ṣādiq (d. 381); in al-Diwasīmī al-Fikḥīyya, Teheran 1276), the Muḥṣnīa of al-Muṣīf (d. 413), the Tāṣṣīyā al-Dīqā (d. 419); the first Teheran 1271, the second Teheran 1274, the third Teheran 1274, the fourth Teheran 1271, in the second al-Diwasīmī al-Fikḥīyya), to the Sharāt al-Īṣlām of al-Muḥaṣṣṣī al-Ḥillī (d. 678) and later works.

At the same time, the older sources admitted various methods of calculation as alternatives if the new moon could not be observed on the evening of the 29th Šaʿbān on account of cloudiness. One method consists of counting from the day of the week on which fasting has started in the preceding year, and starting to fast on the fifth (or in a bisexile year, the sixth) day of the count; this method, which is based on the lunar year of 354 days, is still counted into account, is said to have been checked over fifty years and found correct, but is available only to him who knows chronology and the incidence of bisexile years. Another method consists of counting 59 days from the new moon of the month of Raḏjāb if it has been visually observed, and starting to fast on the sixtieth day. Traditions authorizing these methods by the authority of the Šīa of the “Twelver” Schīfs are found in the Kāfī al-Ḵudayn (d. 328; Teheran 1315) and in the Kīṣāb man lā yaḥdūruk Fāḥīṭh of Ibn Bābūya (Lucknow 1307) as well as in the Fīkḥ al-Ṣādiq and in Ibn Bābūya’s Muḥṣnī and Ḥidāyā. A third method consists of estimating the age of the new moon when it becomes visible for the Muslims by observing the opening of their ritual prayers; it contains the passage, a variation on the Kurʿān, sūras III, 189 and X, 5: “Say: ‘The new moons are fixed times for the people, their outward aspect (ṣāḥīra) serves to make known the number of years, calculation (ḫīṣāb), months and days, and their esoteric meaning (bāṭinuḥa) is My intimates who make known My way to My servants’.” (Annales, iii, 2129; cf. Madelung, Isl., xxxiv (1959), 41.) The method of calculation was introduced by the Fātimids in Ifrīqiya in 331, and in Cairo, after the conquest of Egypt, in 559 (REI, 1935, 178, with reference to Abū Bakr al-Mālikī, Riyaḍ al-muṣāfā; Makrīzī, Iḥṣāṣ; and Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAṣḵalānī, Ṭafṣīl al-ṣīr). There is no statement of principle on calculation in the Daʿārīm al-Īṣlām of the Schīa al-Kabīr Nūʿmān b. Muhammad (d. 363/974) or in Ibn Sādīq, who considers the determination of the new moon as decisive on the basis of the traditions from Šīa which are common to him and
to the “Twelver” Shi’as; but he emphasizes the rule which alone was of practical importance to him, that if the moon were great, he would announce the new moon, if it were small, he would be the one who decides when to start and when to break the fast (ed. A. A. A. Fyvie, i, Cairo 1970/51, 323); there may be some desire not to alienate the non-

Isma’ili masses here. The author of the Madjdilik al-Mustansiriyya (ca. 450/1058) argues at length in favour of the principle of calculation (madjdilik 19, 30, and 31; ed. Muhammad Kamil Husayn, Cairo n.d., 128 and note 64, 131, 133 f.); he says that ru’ya implies hisab, just as the zahir points to the batin; only the imam combines them both, and it is a miracle that the hisab has worked perfectly in the 150 years since the Mahdi introduced it (as the Mahdi ‘Ubayd Allah died in 322, this cannot be taken literally if the date 323 given for that event (see above) is correct); for the author, calculation comes down to the regular alternation of months of 30 and of 29 days, Ramadhan having always thirty. This is also the practice of the contemporary Bohras (Musta’lian Isma’ilis), and it results in their celebrating the Muslim festivals one day, or sometimes two days, earlier than the others (cf. Sh. T. Lokhandwalla, in Stud. Isl., iii, 1955, 132). The question does not arise for the Khodjas (Nizari Isma’ils), whose fast is essentially different from that of the orthodox Muslims (cf. Sied Wajiba Ali, The origin of the Khodjas and their religious life today, (thesis Bonn) Würzburg 1936, 68 f.; J. N. Hollister, The Shi’a of India, 389 f.).

Bibliography: in the article.

(J. Schacht)

ii. — IN ISLAMIC ART.

The crescent appears first as an emblem in the Islamic period in combination with a five- or six-pointed star on the obverses and reverses of Arab-Sasanian coins, such as the anonymous coins, including one probably struck for ‘Abd al-Malik in Damascus in 75/695 (G. C. Miles, Mithrāb and Annah, in Archæologica Orientalia in Memoriam Ernst Hertfeld, Locust Valley 1952, 156-71, pl. 28, No. 3; Fig. 1), the more numerous ones struck for the Umayyad governors of the East, (iii 84/1068, and for the ‘Abbâsid governors in Tabaristan, till ca. 978/1082 (J. Walker, A catalogue of Arab-Sassanian coins, London (British Museum) 1941, 130-60; G. C. Miles, Rare Islamic coins, New York 1950, i-15; idem, The incunabula of Umayyad coinage, in Ars Orientalis, iii (1959), 208-19, pl. 1, nos. 1-6; idem, Some new light on the history of Kirman in the first century of the Hijrah, in The world of Islam. Studies in honour of Philip K. Hitti, London-New York 1959, 98). This usage is due to the adaptations of pre-Islamic coin types, mostly those of Khusraw II, but also of Yazdigird III and Hormuz IV, where this marginal element had been customary. A crescent alone occurs also occasionally on the reverse of Arab-Byzantine coins (J. Walker, A Catalogue of the Arab-Byzantine and post-reform Umayyad coins, London (British Museum) 1956, Nos. 76-9, 81; Miles, Iconography of Umayyad coinage, pl. 1, Nos. 7-9, 12-4; Fig. 2). While this was the first official use of the hilāl, it had no historical consequences.

Another early use of the hilāl is to be found in the mosaics of the Kubbat al-Sakhra in Jerusalem of 72/691. It occurs there as the customary finial of Sasanian-type crowns, and more frequently, as a crescent suspended from Byzantine-type crowns where it is combined with a large pearl usually placed just above the horns (K. A. C. Creswell, Early Muslim architecture, Oxford 1932, i, pls. 11, 16-8; Fig. 8). Since this building seems to have been originally a victory monument (O. Grabar, The Umayyad Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, in Ars Orientalis, iii (1959), 33-62), these crowns, as symbols of the defeated enemies of Islam, reflect a pre-Islamic usage now introduced into a Muslim context. However, the preserved crowns, which had been placed in churches as ex-votos, show as the main suspended element a cross (H. Schlunk, Arte Visigoda . . . in Ars Hispaniae, ii (Madrid 1947), 312-6, figs. 328-30); as this could not be represented in a Muslim shrine, it had to be exchanged for another, more innocuous motif which had also a royal association (Sakrale Gewander des Mittelalters. Ausstellung im Bayerischen Nationalmuseum, Munich 1955, 17, No. 17, colour pl.). It is significant that the crescent has here a non-Muslim connotation.

The use of a hilāl as a decorative emblem on royal horses is also a continuation of a Sasanian custom (A survey of Persian art, ed. A. U. Pope, London-New York 1938-39, iv, pls. 176C, 2028, 229B; F. Sarre, Die Kunst des alten Persien, Berlin 1925, pl. 99). In these instances the emblem is made of valuable material or at least executed in fine workmanship. Possibly the earliest preserved example is one made of rock crystal, with the name of the Fātimid Caliph al-Zahir li-‘s-salām Dīn Allāh, 411-27/1021-36, which was later incorporated into a Gothic monstrance of about 1350, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg (cf. C. J. Lamm, Mittelalterliche Gläser und Steinschnittarbeiten aus dem Nachen Osten, Berlin 1929, i, 213, No. 22, ii, pl. 75; Fig. 7); the usage continues into the Seljuk period (6th-7th/12th-13th centuries) when bronze crescents are decorated with other designs (Fig. 10). The hilāl as equine decoration survived till the Ottoman period, when, as the crest of two boar tusks mounted in gold was captured in the Battle of Slinkaemen in 1691 (E. Petrasch, Die Türkenebots . . . Trophäensammlung des Markgrafen Ludwig Wilhelm von Baden, Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum, 1956, pl. 15).

The emblem also had early decorative uses in a human context. Its heavy-set shape with the points nearly touching to form an arch, as an exanad of gold and gilt silver jewelry (earrings or pendants), decorated with filigree and cloisonné enamel, the latter showing bird designs. This type of trinket was made in the 5th/11th or 6th/12th century, both in Egypt (where such work was found in al-Fustāt) and Spain (Marvin C. Ross, An Egyptian-Arabic cloisonné enamel, in Ars Islamica, vii (1940), 165-79; Mohamed Mostafa, The Museum of Islamic Art, a short guide, Cairo 1955, 36, 112, fig. 28; Katalog, Sammlung E. und M. Kofler-Truninger, Luzern, Kunsthaus Zürich 1964, pl. 137; Fig. 9). The same shape is to be found among the tooled decorations on Mamlūk bookbindings (8th/14th century; Fig. 6). The hilāl occurs also together with a seven-pointed star, as inlaid stone work, on the walls of Saint Sophia of Trebizond (Fig. 5), built by the Emperor Manuel I (1238-66). This Byzantine Church shows strong Seljuk influence in its wall decorations; so far no crescents of such an elaborate nature have, however, been found on contemporary Muslim buildings or objects of Anatolia, although a crescent-shaped element occurs in the pseudo-Kufic border of a Seljuk ‘Konya-carpet’ (Istanbul, Türk ve Islam Eserleri Müzesi, Nos. 692/5, see Oktay Aslan, Türkμh art, in Istanbul 1961, pl. VII) and there are a few crude masons’ marks of that shape on the stones of caravansarays (K. Erdmann, Das anatolische Karavansaray des 13. Jahrhunderts, Berlin 1961, i, 82, 134).
The occurrence in Trebizond in a near-Muslim context is significant, as it is the earliest so-far-known use of this emblem on a piece of Turkish terracotta. A Turcoman Turk territory since the Islamic conquest of Asia Minor (T. T. Rice, Decorations in the Seljuk style in the Church of Saint Sophia of Trebizond, in Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte Asiens. In Memoriam Ernst Diez, ed. O. Aslanapa, Istanbul 1963, 112 and pl. 8; examples from Anatolia of the pre-Islamic period are given in Fevzi Kurtoğlu, Türk bayrağı ve A Yıldız, Ankara 1967, chapter III, figs. 570-71). A round Turkish pennant, with or without a long sword on its lap, but always holding up a crescent moon which frames its face. The representations here and on the metal objects are analogous to the personifications of the sun, which has a radiating hollow disc before or in place of its face. The iconography reflects the explanation in the text which compares the sun to a king and the moon to the vizier or heir apparent. A Seljuk mirror, published in Saracenic heraldry, by L. A. Mayer, by the commune de la main du Louvre; here (Fig. 12) two female busts are framed by the horns of a crescent moon (Chau Ju-kua, in his account of Bagdad. The translators and commentators of the text have cogently argued that this moon must have been a crescent, since a circular emblem would have been taken for a sun (Chau Ju-kua; on the Chinese and Arab trade in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, tr. F. Hirth and W. Rockhill, St. Petersburg 1921, 135 and 137, n. 3).

Another use of the crescent started in the 6th/12th century when symbolic personifications of the planets, including that of the moon (kamar), were widely applied to metal objects. The earliest dated example is a small cast brass figure in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo (D. S. Rice, A Seljuk mirror, in Communications... First International Congress of Turkish Art, Ankara, 1959, Ankara 1961, 288-9, pl. 224). Here the emblem consists of a human figure seated cross-legged and holding a crescent whose two points meet before the face. Such representations of the crescent-shaped moon appear on many brass or bronze objects, where six planets are usually grouped around the central form; they are inlaid in silver, usually placed on the bottom of large trays, basins, on the covers of large vessels or pen-boxes and even on the back of astronomers of the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, made in Iran, the DJazira (Mosul), Syria, and Egypt (F. Sarre-Max van Berchem, Das Metallscheibchen des Arabischen Staatbibliothek zu München, in München. Jahresbericht für Kunstgeschichte, II (1907), 22, 27, figs. 1 and 13; G. Wiet, Objets en cuivre, Cairo 1932, pl. XLVII; M. S. Dimand, Unpublished metalwork of the Rasullid Sultans of Yemen, in Metropolitan Museum Studies, iii (1931), fig. 2, etc.). The crescent appears also at least as early as the second half of the 6th/12th century in connexion with the pertinent figures of the Zodiac, namely, in combination with Cancer as its domicilium, or with Taurus as the exaltation of the Moon and with Scorpio as its dejection. In the case of the planets' exaltations and dejections, the dragon symbolism of Džawazh, the pseudo-planetary node of the moon's orbit, is also introduced (Fig. 13); (W. Hartner, The pseudo-planetary nodes of the moon's orbit in Hindu, in Indian and Islamic iconography, in Ars Islamica, v (1938), 123-54, figs. 1, 2, 12-20; idem, Zur astrologischen Symbolik des 'Wade Cup', in Aus der Welt der islamischen Kunst, 1,1959, 259, figs. 4 and 14; D. S. Rice, The Wade Cup in the Cleveland Museum of Art, Paris 1955, 17-20, figs. 14b/5, pl. VIIIb). From the 7th/13th century on, illustrations of sultan, i.e., (1) and (2) Sunkur al-Acsar, and, after his death in 1309, his daughter Fatima (D. S. Rice, Studies in
Islamic metalwork, I, in BSOAS, xvi (1952), 564-78);
(3) CAI b. Hilal al-Dawla (died 739/1338); in
Bull, de l'Academie des Sciences de Russie,
reprint 1918, No. 6, 476, quoted in Mayer,
Turkish manuscripts ... Chester Beatty
Library, 52, pl. 27). On the other hand there cannot have been a strong religious association with the
hiid in the Muslim world, as the emblem occurs also on secular buildings, e.g., in the representation
of garden pavilions on a brass bowl of probable Mamluk workmanship of the 9th/10th century (D. S. Rice,
Studies in Islamic metalwork, IV, in BSOAS, xvi (1953), 502-3, pl. X), and on military flags and textiles as well (see below). There are also many renditions of moons and other buildings dating from the 10th/11th century to the 12th/13th century which lack the crescent finial, and the motif plays no role on prayer rugs or on tiles applied to the walls of mosques (K. Erdmann, Ka'ba-Friesen, in Ars Orientalis,
iii (1959), 192-7, where only two of eight illustrated examples show the hiid: figs. 3 and 4). This indicates that in Muslim eyes, and in particular during the Ottoman period, the hiid was not of great importance. It certainly does not seem to have had a major religious significance and was apparently applied mostly for decorative purposes.

The hiid occurs on the flags of Selim I (Fig. 18), of Khayr al-Din Barbarossa, the latter being later used as his tomb cover (both in the Topkapi Sarayi Muzesi), and on those captured during the battle of Lepanto in 979/1571 (Fig. 17). It had then no standardized form, for it appears both as a thin sickle, the ends of which are connected by a wide circular band, and as a heavy, circular form with the ends touching each other and covered with religious formulas; both shapes enclose either a star or the names of the Prophets or of the first four caliphs. It is significant that the crescent occurs on each flag several times, and even then it is only one of several motifs used, which include other celestial bodies (the sun and stars); weapons (the legendary sword of Ali, the double-pointed Dhu 'l-Fakhr [g.v.], which in turn can have a crescent-and-star pommel, swords with blades showing wavy edges, daggers); and religious slogans such as the gakida and Sura LXI, 12 (many examples in Fevzi Kurgolgu, Türk bayragae ve Ay Yildiz, figs. 42-52, 54-5, 64-5, 69; Sakisian, in Syria, xxii (1941), 60). Later evidence of the custom is provided by the hadidig after the battle of Lepanto. The crescent finial occurs also on the flags captured at the siege of Vienna in 1683 (Sakisian, fig. 2, flag in St. John Lateran, Rome; Kutoglu, fig. 60, in the Municipal Museum, Vienna) or in the battle of Slankamen of 1691 (Fig. 19; Petrasch, Turkheilfuge, fig. 1, a combination of crescent and star, and a flag on a state barge of Wehbl's Surname, written ca. 1720-25 for Ahmid III, shows a row of three large
suns, each separated from the other by two small crescent moons (Topkapi Sarayi Muzesi, MS Ahmed III 3593). Other Turkish flags, too, present the hilal only occasionally in small size and places of lesser importance or no hilal at all (Riza Nour, pls. XXIII, Kurtoglu, figs. 53A-B, 56-60, 80, 88). However, a number of flags from the 10th/16th to the end of the 12th/18th centuries display three, four, or even six hilals on a red or green ground, and in each case without a star or any other emblems (Riza Nour, pls. VIII-X, XXIV, and XXX; Kurtoglu, figs. 73, 74, 76, 87-90). On the other hand a flag as late as that made in 1793 for Selim III, in the Deniz Muzesi, shows only the imperial tughra and the Dhu 'l-Fakar (Kurtoglu, fig. 58; Sakisian, in Syria, xx (1941), 73).

A number of Turkish pole arms, horsetail standards (tugk) and ship lanterns of the 10th/16th century in the Palazzo Ducale in Venice have crescent-shaped finials, although contemporary Ottoman miniatures seem to indicate that these military and naval objects often lacked this emblem.

The earliest datable textile with a hilal is a pair of silk trousers made for Sultan Suleyman (Fig. 16), a context which precludes any religious significance of the emblem at that time; here, the heavy, fully circular crescent encloses a sun (or a large star) and the whole is surrounded by other stars (Tahsin Oz, Türk kumaş ve kadifeleri, Istanbul 1946-51, i, pl. XXVI). The motif continues to be used by subsequent sultans in varied forms, e.g. the crescent in combination with flowers; a triangular arrangement of three heavy crescents, each filled with one or two smaller identical shapes; or a sickle-shaped form covered with floral patterns enclosing several stars (Oz, i, pis. XXIX, XXX, XXXIII-II; ii, pls. LXII, L, LXV, LXIV, LXX, LXXX-VII).

The hilal was also occasionally used to decorate a ferdi; for instance, one of Mehemmed IV, which has a crescent filled with flowers on the onion-shaped top of the tughra (Türk ve İslam Eserleri Muzesi, T. 2242).

It has been claimed, for instance by B. V. Head, in his Historia numorum. A manual of Greek numismatics, Oxford 1911, 269-70, that the frequent use of the crescent and star among the Ottoman Turks was a demonstration of their claim to be the legitimate successors of Byzantium, especially of Imperial times, are said to have applied this emblem on the reverse as a symbol of Artemis-Hekate, because this moon goddess let her light shine unusually bright during a critical siege. There the crescent and star, however, is only one of many emblems found on the coins of the city under Roman domination from the 1st century B.C. to the early 3rd century A.D. (R. Stuart Poole, Catalogue of Greek coins. The Tauric Chersonese, Sarmatia, Dacia, Moesia, Thrace, etc., London (British Museum) 1877, 105, No. 99); it occurs also on the coins from Pontus of Mithradates (240-190 B.C.) and Mithradates Eupator (121-63 B.C.) and on those from Carrhae (Harran), a place famous for its cult of the moon god Sin, from Marcus Aurelius (161-180) to Gordian III and Tranquillina (244-244). In view of the enormous time gap between the early numismatic and later Ottoman examples, it seems unlikely that the pre-Islamic usage could have exerted an influence, particularly as the hilal is also to be found in the Islamic world before its use by the Ottomans. Byzantine influence is more likely in the case of the hilal-shaped Fâtîmid earrings, especially if the generally held assumption that the very similar Byzantine examples date from the 6th to the 10th century should prove to be correct (cf. Early Christian and Byzantine art, an exhibition held at the Baltimore Museum of Art, 1947, pl. LXII, Nos. 445, 485; ISFÄZ Finil exhibition of the Council of Europe, Athens, 1964, Nos. 417-8, 420, 434, 437, 440, 442-3, with Sammlung E. and M. Kofler-Truninger, Luzern, Kunsthauz Zürich 1964, pl. 131).

While the hilal remained one of many Turkish motifs and was till the end of the 12th/18th century never a formalized, official symbol, its role in the Western world was quite different. From the middle of the 15th century on, views of Oriental cities like Jerusalem, Istanbul and Algiers show the major buildings capped by a crescent (typical examples in many paintings of Carpaccio). Even more frequent was its use on Turkish flags and boats in pictures of military engagements (examples given by Sakisian, Syria, xxii (1941), 66-7; Du, May 1962). It was also given as a finial on the sceptres held by various Turkish sultans (Sakisian, fig. 5). Another use was as watermarks in European paper manufactured for the Levant in the 17th and 18th centuries, for instance, the combination of three crescents known in Venice as trelune (C. M. Briquet, Les filigranes, Paris, ii, 314-5, Nos. 5374-5; see also W. Nikolaev, Watermarks of the medieval Ottoman documents in Bulgarian libraries, Sofia 1954), which has actually been found in a Maghribi Kur'an discovered in Nigeria (N. Abbott, Maghrib Koran manuscripts of the 15th and 16th centuries, in American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, iv (1938), 62). The crescent appeared even in fireworks, as in that arranged by Louis XV in 1132/1720 for the Turkish Ambassador Yirmi Sekiz Mehmed Efendi [q.v.], who to his surprise was told that since each country was symbolized by a special emblem, a crescent—in this instance placed on a fiery tripod and surmounted by a crown—represented his pashâkh and Turkey (Sefârînâme-i Fransa, Istanbul 1283, 76; Paris sefârînâmesi, Istanbul 1306, 138).

It was only in the early 19th century, when Selim III created a military organization [see Nizam-i Cedid] in imitation of European troops, that an imperial flag consisting of a crescent and star on a red ground was officially adopted for the Turkish army and navy, analogous to the official flags of Europe. When this sultan was dethroned in 1807, his new army was abolished and its flag given up (but not by the navy). After the massacre of the Janissaries in 1826, the modern-type army was re-established by Mahmud II and in 1827 the flag instituted by Selim III was once more given to the army (Yacoub Artin Pacha, Contribution à l'étude du blason en Orient, London 1902, 158-9). An ornamental rendition of this sultan's tughra shows therefore a crescent and six-pointed star next to the name, but, characteristically, even here the design of a sun occurs elsewhere in the panel (Ankara, Etînafya Müzesi, No. 7603; Fig. 20). The flag of the Ottoman Empire was retained when Turkey became a republic in 1923.

The next country to adopt the hilal for its flag was Tunisia. Under Husayn I (1824-35) a red flag was adopted, bearing in its centre on a white circle or oval a red crescent turned away from the hoist and containing a six-pointed star. From the end of the reign of Ahmad I (1253-71/1837-55) on, a five-pointed star was substituted. Egypt used the white crescent on a red ground while the country was under Ottoman rule, but in 1923 the royal government selected a green ground and had the upright white crescent filled with three white stars between its horns. This
HILAL

design, with a horizontal crescent containing the three stars in a green circular field, was also placed in the centre of the national coat of arms consisting of a displayed eagle, which was adopted when the country became a republic in 1953. The national flag with the crescent and stars was used until the founding of the United Arab Republic in 1958. Pakistan took the so-called Muslim League flag in 1947 which was formed by a white crescent on the slant, turned away from the hoist, and a white five-pointed star on a green field; to this a broad white stripe along the hoist was then added. In 1952 Libya chose the flag of Cyrenaica (used there since 1947) which consisted of a white upright crescent facing away from the hoist and a five-pointed white star on the central stone, turned away from the hoist and placed on a green rectangle. The latest major Muslim country to adopt the hilāl was Algeria, which places a red crescent on the inner green area of its flag so that only its horns project into the outer white field, which also carries a red five-pointed star. This flag was officially adopted in 1962 but had already been in use during the War of Liberation. Even this list does not exhaust the countries which have adopted the hilāl for their flag. For instance the national flag of the Maldives Islands carries a white crescent turned away from the ship and placed on a green rectangle which is framed by a red stripe and edged by a narrow black and white stripe along the hoist. The Sultan's flag has the crescent combined with a white star. In Muslim countries (with the exception of Iran) a red five-pointed star on a green ground is superimposed on three horizontal stripes of green, orange and black. All this indicates that since the beginning of the 19th century the hilāl, usually combined with a star, has become the Muslim emblem par excellence.

Owing to the new symbolical importance of the hilāl, the emblem was also used on postage stamps of most Muslim countries. It was first introduced in Turkey in its first stamps, issued in January 1863. In view of the present-day identification of Islam with the hilāl and of the Department of the United States Government has designated this emblem as the appropriate symbol for the top of headstones which are furnished for Muslim veterans buried in national cemeteries, analogous to the Christian Cross, the Jewish Shield of David, and the Buddhist Wheel of Righteousness. For the same reason, a white five-pointed star and crescent turned away from the hoist on a red rectangular central field, surrounded by a wide white frame, with the words "Islam, Equality, Justice, Freedom" set on a slant in the corners, has been taken by the "Black Muslims" of America as their symbol.

Outside the Muslim world, it continues to be used for decorative purposes in many recent times. It is occasionally found on carpets (Amos B. Thayer, Turcoman rugs, New York 1940, pl. 21) and in Maghribi jewellery (Paul Eude, Dictionnaire des bijoux de l'Afrique du Nord, Paris 1906, 34-5, 52, 57, 91, 141, 181, 199, and 239). Rather crude versions are also at times used as camel brands, marks of ownership, or as a tribal emblem. A. Pacha, Contribution à l'étude du blason en Orient, 203-24; Henry Field, Camel brands and graffiti from Iraq, Syria, Jordan, Iran, and Arabia, Suppl. to JAOS, xv (Oct.-Dec. 1952), with extensive bibliography.

Bibliography: So far there has been no general treatment of all aspects of the subject. Publications on specific themes are given in the article.

HILĀL, eponymous ancestor of the tribe of the Banū Hilāl whom the Arab genealogists trace back to Muḍjar according to the following lineage: Muḍjar → Aylān → Kays → Khasaṭa → Ikrima → Mansūr → Hawāzin → Bakr → Muṣawiya → Ṣaṣa'a → ʿĀmir bin Hilāl. Its three main divisions were the Ahbādji, the Riyāḥ and the Zughba. This tribe naturally played its part along with the other groups of the ʿĀmir bin Ṣaṣaʿa in the pre-Islamic tribal struggles or Ayyām al-ʿArab (q.v.) and in the affairs connected with the beginning of Islam such as that of Bīr Maʿūnā (q.v.). It is likely that it did not support Islam until after Muhammad's victory over the Hawāzin at Ḥunayn (8/630), but, like the other ʿĀmir bin Ṣaṣaʿa, it did not participate in the ridda. It remained in the Najd, its initial habitat, longer than the other tribes of the same group who also inhabited it as their primitive domain. Although renowned for its courage, it did not win any particular fame during the conquests. During the first half of the 2nd/8th century, some of the Banū Hilāl (and Banū Sulaym) were invited to emigrate to Egypt where they soon became numerous. This exodus did not, however, diminish their turbulence, which increased considerably under the ʿAbbasids, especially when, in the 4th/10th century, these brigands joined forces with the Būyids to open the gates of anarchy. After defeating and driving back the Karmašins (568/978), the Fāṭimid al-ʿAzīz b. al-Muʿizz, seeking no doubt to deprive his defeated enemy of their best allies, had a large number of the families of the Banū Hilāl and Banū Sulaym deported into Upper Egypt. Moreover this move was in accord with Egypt's rôle as a centre of attraction for the nomads of Arabia and Syria. Continuing to pillage and to fight amongst themselves, the new emigrants had to be confined to the Ṣaṣaʿ and forbidden to cross the Nile. But when the Zirīd al-Muʿizz b. Bāḍīs had broken with his suzerain al-Mustanṣir (439/1047) and recognized the ʿAbbasid Caliph, al-Ḥārūn, the Fāṭimid minister advised his master to take revenge on the Ṣanḥājja by handing over Ifrikiya to the horde of the Bankū Hilāl, of whom, at the same time, he would rid himself. The chief organizer of the invasion of the Banū Hilāl, of which he also assumed command—and the man who reconciled the Riyāḥ and the Zughba—was probably the amīr Amin al-Dawla wa-Makdūnah Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. Mulīm. Better than the saga of the Banū Hilāl, upon which however he also draws, Ibn Khaldūn gives the fullest information on the composition and the principal leaders of the invaders. The most important
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Fig. 1 (a and b). Anonymous Umayyad *dirham* in Arab-Sasanian style with *mihrāb* and *sawāza* (?) on reverse. New York, American Numismatic Society.

Fig. 2 (a and b). Anonymous Umayyad *fals* from Hims in Arab-Byzantine style. American Numismatic Society.

Fig. 3. Copper "*dirham*" of the Zangid Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd. Mosul, 627/1229. American Numismatic Society.

Fig. 4. Copper "*dirham*" of the Zangid Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd I. Mosul, 585/1189. American Numismatic Society.

Fig. 5. Inlaid-stone composition. Trebizond, Church of Saint Sophia. Middle of 7th/13th century (After photograph of Prof. David Talbot Rice. Drawing by Frank A. Haentschke).

Fig. 6. Flap of Mamlūk leather binding with gold and blind tooling. New York, A. Minassian Collection.
Fig. 7. Rock crystal decoration for a horse with the name of the Caliph al-Zahir li-iżzāz din Allāh. Egypt, Fāṭimid period, 411-2/1021-32 (now mounted in a Gothic monstrance, Venice, ca. 1350). Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, KG. 695.
Fig. 8. Mosaic with a Byzantine-type crown. Jerusalem, Kubbat al-Sakhra, 72/691.

Fig. 9. Gold jewelry with filigree work. Egypt, Fatimid period. 5th-6th/11th-12th century. Paris, Musée du Louvre, MAO 139.

Fig. 10. Bronze ornament, probably for a horse. Iran, Seljuk period. 6th/12th century. Washington, Private Collection.

Fig. 11. Figure of Kamar, from an illuminated manuscript of ‘Adījib al-makhšūsī by al-Kazwīnī (“Sarre Manuscript”). Probably ‘Irāq, Djalā‘īrid period. End of 8th/14th century. Washington, Freer Gallery of Art, No. 54.33 recto.
Fig. 12. Pottery bowl with lustre decoration. Egypt or Syria, Fatimid period, 5th-6th/11th-12th century. Paris, Musée du Louvre, No. 7872.

Fig. 13. The Moon with the zodiacal figure of Cancer as its domicilium and two menacing double-headed animal heads as symbols of the eclipse-producing Djawzahr dragon. Detail from the “Vaso Vescovali”. Eastern Iran, Seljuk period, about 600/1203. British Museum.

Fig. 14. Arabesque composition with the abbreviated figure of hilāl. Syria or Egypt, Mamluk period. Early 8th/14th century. Modena, Museum, No. 2062 (Photograph by courtesy of the late Professor D. S. Rice).
Fig. 15. *Hadid* certificate in scroll form for the pilgrim Maymûna bint Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allâh al-Zardâli 836/1432. British Museum, Add. 27,566.
Fig. 16. Trousers (şalvar) of Sultan Süleyman, the Magnificent, made of light blue silk with gold and silver decorations. Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, No. 4414 (After Tahsin Öz, Türk Kumaş ve Kadifeleri, i, pl. XXVI).

Fig. 17. Turkish flag used in the Battle of Lepanto, 1571. Pisa, Chiesa San Stefano dei Cavalieri. Photograph by courtesy of Mrs. Lilly Stunzi.
Fig. 18. Flag of Sultan Selim I. Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi, No. 824.
Fig. 19. Turkish flag used in the Battle of Slankamen, 1691. Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum, No. D. 23. Photograph by courtesy of Dr. Ernst Petrasch.

Fig. 20. Tughra of Sultan Mahmud II (1223-55/1808-39). Ankara, Etnografya Müzesi, No. 7603. Photograph by courtesy of Dr. Hamit Zübeyir Koşay.
tribe, that of the Athbadi, comprised the Durayd and the Karfa. The Banu Mirdas formed the main division of the Banu Hilal. The division of the Banu Hilal that is unknown, must be added the Ḍâdi, also (according to Ibn Khaldûn and Ibn Bassâm) descendants of Āmir b. ʿṢaṣṣaʿa. Towns and provinces are said to have been allotted in advance by al-Mustansîr to Adî, also (according to Ibn Khaldûn and Ibn Bassâm) descendants of Amîr b. ʿṢaṣṣaʿa. The Banu Hilal, setting out in 442/1050-51, at first ravaged the province of Barka, which they left to the Banu Sulaym who had followed them, and they did not approach Ifrîkiya until the beginning of the 7th/13th century. Ibn Khaldûn compares the wave of half-starved nomads to a cloud of locusts. Al-Muʿizz b. Bâdîs did not immediately recognize the extent of this unforeseeable scourge; lacking an effective army, he even tried to enlist the invaders into his service by marrying one of his daughters to the chief of the Ryâh. But the ever-increasing pillaging destroyed this hope, and military action became necessary. The Zirid army tried to stop the nomads at Haydaran [q.e.r.] in the region of Gabês (443/1051-52) but, in spite of its numerical superiority, it was utterly routed. The countryside, the important villages and soon the towns fell into the hands of the nomad chief. Anarchy and insecurity spread further and further. While the pressure of the Banu Hilal round Kyûrâwân was increasing (446/1053-55), the capture of Bêja by Muḥîn b. Ṭahyâ al-Sînnabarî al-Mirdâsî consolidated the seizure of the valley of the Medjerda. Tripoli and its province had fallen to the Zughba. Al-Muʿizz married three of his daughters to Arab amīrs but this did nothing to check the continual devastation and was no more effective than was a return to Fâtûm obedience in 446/1054-55. Finally, on 27 Shâbaʿân 449/29 October 1057, the Zirid took refuge at al-Mahdiyya with his son Tamîm. On 1 Ramadân 449/1 November 1057, Kyûrâwân was sacked by the Banu Hilal, a disaster from which it never recovered. The presence of the Athbadi and the Ḍâdi is attested shortly afterwards in the central Maghrib where, allied to the Ḥammâdîs, they fought against the Zughba of Ryâh. To the Zughba, whose divisions as auxiliaries of the Ḥammâdîs, and the Ryâh, of the Zîrîs. In 457/1065, the Ḥammâdî al-Nâṣîr, at the head of a large coalition of Berbers and Banû Hilal (Ṣanḥâdja, Zanâta, Athbadi and Ḍâdi) formed against the other Arab groups (Ryâh, Zughba and Sulaym), suffered a defeat at Sabîba which was as serious for his dynasty as that of Haydaran had been for the Zîrîs. The consequences, however, were less abrupt and less immediate owing to the relief of the central Maghrib, which was much less favourable for the expansion of the nomadic Banû Hilal than the plains of Ifrîkiya. But, by 461/1068-69, the grip of the Banû Hilal was such that he had to abandon his capital, the Kaila, for Bougie (Bidfayâ) which he had just founded. In about 466/1072-73 the Zughba, driven from Ifrîkiya by the Ryâh, went to put themselves at the service of the Ḥammâdîs; before this they had proceeded to the sâle of Kyûrâwân, a phrase which symbolizes well the discomfiture of the Ṣanḥâdja. The Banû Hilal were too closely involved in the history of the last Zîrîs and Ḥammâdîs to be spoken of separately. In the general anarchy, certain of the chiefs of the Banû Hilal set themselves up as independent rulers, from simple condottieri like Muḥîr b. Zîyâd, who made himself a lair in the ruins of Carthage at La Malga (al-Muʿal-
in fact they themselves were rather re-converted to Islam by the strength of religious influences in the Maghrib—than they did to strengthening its Arab character. Indeed, whereas the Arabs of the conquest had been absorbed in the Berber population, especially in the towns—Islam is essentially urban—those of the 5th/10th century led, in all fields, to a promotion of nomadism which was absorbed so little that almost all the Arabic-speaking Bedouins of the present-day Maghrib are their descendants. Also, many large villages and towns have come under Muslim influence in consequence of the necessary *modus vivendi* which was soon established between the sedentary population and the nomads. In the East as in the West, neither ethnography nor dialectology have yet made it possible to discern a type specifically belonging to the Banū Hilāl, and it is perhaps too late to do this.


**The Saga of the Banū Hilāl**

The movement of the Banū Hilāl into Africa and the battles they had to fight in order to conquer the country form the historical basis for a collection of tales of heroism and love, the romance, or rather the saga, of the Banū Hilāl (*Strat Bani Hilāl*), which has come down to us in two versions (*al-Sira al-Shāmiyya* and *al-Sira al-Hijāzīyya*) and in three cycles.

The first cycle tells the story (more properly the saga) of the Banū Hilāl, the son of Banū Hilāl—Usbaḍa: Ḥadjabah and ‘Adjabah, the two wives of Hilāl’s son al-Mundhir, give birth in the same night to two sons, Dī‘ār and Dji‘abah. The latter goes away with his mother and later becomes sultan of the Najd. In the Bilād al-Sarw reign the amirs Ḥāzim and Rīżq of the line of Dji‘aab. Ṣiraj marries al-Khādr̲, the daughter of the sharīf of Mecca, whom he assists against the king of Rūm. He has a son by her, the swarthy Barakat, later named Abu Zayd (Zād). Ḥāzim’s successor is his son Sirḥān (Saḥān), who is succeeded by his son Ḥasān, who marries Khawmā, queen of the Yemen, after conquering the fire-worshippers of the land of Bardhahk̲h, against whom Khawmā had invoked his aid. With the aid of Abu Zayd, India is then conquered, after which Ḥasan passes with Khawmā into the Bilād al-Sarw wa-Usbaḍa.

The second cycle deals with the migration (*riḥla*) of the Banū Hilāl into the country of Najd; because of a famine, the Hilāl go from the Bilād al-Sarw into the Najd, where they are warmly welcomed by the prince Ḥanīm and his son Dji‘aab (Dijāyb, of the line of Dji‘abah) and by their tribe the Banū Zughba. The Hilāl triumph over the prince al-Haydah, who is the foremost of the seven rulers of the Najd; Ḥasan, who marries al-Nāfīlā, the sister of Dji‘aab, then reigns over the Najd with several viceroys. A struggle occurs between Dji‘aab, who kills two of Ḥasan’s brothers, and Abu Zayd; Dji‘aab yields and peace is restored.

The subject of the third cycle is the migration of the Hilāl towards the West (*taḥghirā*), and their wars with the Zanjāt ruler of Tunis; in the year 460/1068 Abu Zayd marches with his followers towards Tunis, in order to find a better place of abode than the Najd, where famine is widespread. Sa‘dā, the daughter of one of the Najd tribesmen, who is particularly attracted to Mir‘ī (Mar‘ī), one of the companions of Abu Zayd, works on their behalf. Abu Zayd then returns to the Najd and the Banū Hilāl start to move westards. After several adventures (the journey through the land of the Persians with the seven sultans and their battles in this country, the capture of al-Mariya, the daughter of the bādh Budayar, battles with al-Chadān, king of the Kurds and the Turkomans, with al-Baradwī B. Rāshid (i.e. Baldwin I, 1110-1118), al-Sarkasī Iben Nāsīb, al-Firmend, ruler of Egypt, al-Mādī, king of Bilād al-Sa‘īd, etc.), they enter the territory of the Zanjāt caliph. The latter marches against the Hilāl and kills two brothers of Dji‘aab. After al-Zanjāt has been killed with the aid of Dji‘aab, the struggle begins for possession of the seven thrones and the fourteen strong castles of the land of the west. Ḥasan and Abu Zayd are then treacherously killed by Dji‘aab. Their orphans try to avenge these assassinations. Under the leadership of Buraykī, son of Ḥasan and nephew of Dji‘aab, and of al-D joursya, sister of Ḥasan, they march against Dji‘aab and kill him, after he has stunned al-Djoursya with a kick. Buraykī, who then seizes power, governs tyrannously and provokes a general uprising of the Banū Zughba, in which he is killed by Naṣr al-Din, a son of Dji‘aab.

Of the two principal heroes of the legend, Abu Zayd and Dji‘aab, the latter had an historical existence; but he played only an insignificant role, thus resembling Roland, the main hero of the poem of the Carolingian cycle.

This short résumé records only the characteristic features of this tale, which is of the highest importance for the history of language, customs, and civilization, and which contains a great number of separate narratives.


**HILĀL B. AL-MUḤASSIH B. IBRĀHĪM AL-ṢABI’**

secretary and writer of the Buwayyahid period, belonging to a family of Sabean scholars and secretaries which had come from its native Harrān to settle in Baghdad and which included among its members the historian Thabit b. Sinan. Hilāl’s grandfather, Abu Isāb b. Ibrāhīm ([see al-Ṣa’īb*]), was director of the Chancery of Baghdad and it was in his service that Hilāl (b. at Baghdad in 359/969) began his
career in the time of the amir Šamsam al-Dawla (K. al-Wuzard*), 151). Little is known however of the details of his career, except that he became in his turn the Director of Chancery under the vizier Fakhr al-Mulk during the reign of the amir Bahāʾ al-Dawla; it was at this time, in 403/1012, that he embraced Islam, being the first member of his family to do so. When his master fell into disgrace (407/1016-7) Hilāl is said to have received from him 30,000 dinārs which he was allowed to keep under Muʿayyid al-Dawla, and it was on this capital that he lived until his death in 448/1056.

His administrative duties and his rank at the court of the Buwayhid amirs allowed Hilāl al-Šaḥib to write works which, while often adhering faithfully to the genre of adab, constitute, because of the documents of which their author has made use and the evidence reproduced in them, valuable sources of information. Hilāl is known particularly for his Kitāb al-Wuzard which he wrote in the time of the vizier Ibu Marina, i.e., during the latter part of his life, and of which there is preserved only the beginning, which concerns the viziers of the caliph al-Muḳṭadar. But the Rusūm dār al-khīṭāf, published in 1964, which deals with questions of protocol at the court and in official correspondence, also provides extremely important documentation. Of his History, which was a continuation of that of Thābit b. Sinān and covered the period up to 447/1055, there survives only a short fragment covering the years 389-93/999-1003. Finally the Ghurar al-balāgā, a collection, still unpublished, of models of private and official letters and containing also some texts of brevets of appointment. There are attributed to Hilāl various works which have not survived, notably a Kitāb Ašhār Badghād, cited by Yākūt, and a collection of anecdotes entitled al-Amādiḥ wa l-ayās which has been different from the K. al-Wuzard though part of its content was similar.
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In principle, the *hilf* did not diminish the autonomy of the tribes or the degree of equality between them; and they retained their respective dwelling places and their grazing-grounds. Its object was, as well as establishing a permanent state of peace between the tribes, also to unite them for purposes of common defence, for enterprises of *ghauw* [*q.v.*], for vengeance (ʔ statt), for mutual aid in the payment of settlements to third parties and for the common use of pasturage.

The agreement was sometimes accentuated by the fact that the two tribes adopted a common dwelling place or, more often, that one of the groups came and settled on the other's territory. The effects of this latter practice, reinforced by the continuation of the compact and by community of interests, usually led to the amalgamation of the groups. This was later sealed by the adoption of a common eponym, either real or invented. According to the author of the 'Iḥā, the Arab tribes which had not originally been made up of disparate elements united by a *hilf* were very rare.

The *hilf* in this sense was to be condemned in Islam, as a result of the pronouncement attributed to Muhammad: “There is no *hilf* in Islam”. It was indeed contrary to his principle, which was that all the ancient tribal distinctions should be fused into a single community and that this community must inevitably oppose all others, in order to absorb them or at least to subjugate them (the obligation of the *qāba*). It is true that another saying is reported which announces the survival of the *hilf*, but it must refer only to the *hilf-waḍa* which is in any case no longer permitted except between Muslims, or perhaps to the maintenance of those *hilfs* which had been concluded earlier.

It is not clear to what extent the new principle is adhered to in the specifically Arab milieu which continue to live according to the ancient traditions of tribal organization. There may however be mentioned the use among the Arabs of Transjordania of forms of agreement known as *ben*-ʿamma, the object of which is to establish a state of peace between tribes. One of these forms implies the recognition by the contracting parties of a common dwelling the representatives of the following clans are said to have gathered: Banū Ḥāshim, Banū ‘Umayr, Banū ‘Azd, Banū Bakr, Banū Ṣa‘d, Banū ‘Amr b. Shu‘b, Qaynaqah, Banū Iyākh. The name of this pact has given rise to widely differing interpretations: for some, a similar agreement had been concluded by several Quraysh tribal groups by the name of al-Ḥād and that this pact was forgotten very early, even though Islam did not repudiate the agreement. The Prophet is said moreover to have been present when it was concluded and to have said later: “I was present in the abode of ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḏu‘dān at such a pact that I would not wish to exchange for the “red cattle” (bāmur al-na‘am= the best camels), and if I were invited to [agree to it], now that we are in Islam, I would accept willingly”. The pact ended with the death of the last of the participants, but it was sometimes effectively recalled down to the Umayyad era and on certain occasions threats were made to bring it into operation. In the 3rd/9th century, al-Diḥāṣ drew arguments from it to prove the superiority of the Ḥāshims over the ‘Abd ʿShams (=Umayyads), who had not participated, and he considers it to be the noblest pact ever concluded through the Koran. The Ẓāhirī School (which had at his disposal a manuscript of the Munammah of Ibn Ḥabīb) has taken into account the tradition that there existed among the Qurayshis a *hilf al-ṣafā*, which lasted for several centuries and, regarding it as an “order of chivalry”, has attributed its restoration to the remorse felt by al-Zubayr after the war of the Fidūr.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Ḥāshim, Sira, ed. Ṣakkā, etc., i, 135-5; Ibn Sa‘d, Ṭabaqāt, i, 42; Diḥāṣ, in Sūrah, Rāʾis, i, 71-2; Yaḥyūbb, Historia, ii, 16; Ibn Ḥudaybi, Maʿārif, ed. ʿUkāhā, 604; Maṣʿūdī, Murūj, iv, 122-4; Aghānī, Beirut ed., xvii, 218-22; Ibn Abī Ḥaḍid, *Sharh Nāhij al-balāgha*, iii, 455; L, s.v. ʿfāl, Suhaylī, al-Rawḍ al-unum, Cairo 1332, i, 91; H. Lammens, La Mecque à la veille de l’Hégire, 144; M. al-Hājj al-Muṣṭafī, al-Ṣafā, Paris 1859, i, 47-8.

**CH. PELLAT.**

**AL-HILLA.** A town situated on the Euphrates midway between al-Kifā and Baghdād near the ruins of ancient Bābil. Not to be confused with several like-sounding places, it is sometimes called Hillat Bani Mazyad or Hillat al-Mazyadiyya after Sayf al-Dawla, ʿṢādaq b. Mansūr b. Dūbayṣ; Ali b. Mazyad al-ʿAsadī, who founded the town in 495/ 1102 (Kazwini gives the date 456/1044, but this is an error) on the west bank of Nahr Sūrā, the main
subsidiary of the Euphrates. In later times (6th/12th century) this waterway came to be known by the name of the parent stream, the former name gradually going out of use. An earlier settlement called al-Djamûlân existed on the intensively cultivated east bank, but the major built-up area was the new town along the river. At a spot which Yâkût describes as having hitherto been a gathering place for lions, Dubays settled with his troops, building magnificent dwellings and palaces. The town also contained a wide variety of markets and gave every indication of being prosperous. This prosperity continued well after the death of the founder, for after the decline of Kašr b. Hubayra, in the 6th/12th century, it became the half-way town along the pilgrim route linking al-Kûfa and Baghdâd. A large bridge of boats was constructed in order to facilitate movement across the river, presumably to take the place of the great Sûrâ Bridge which was located at the above-mentioned site. Ibn Djuibâr describes this bridge as having been moored by iron chains tied to wooden posts on each bank of the river. He found the town to be large and prosperous, of oblong shape, and protected on each bank of the river. He found the town to be large and prosperous, of oblong shape, and protected only by mud walls. Ibn Bâtîta, writing two centuries later, was also struck by this magnificent bridge, and by the prosperity of the town in general. His contemporaries, for example, Ibn Kâmil says: "The town was made up of Twelver Shi'is and that a religious shrine was situated there. The town continues to exist in modern times."

Bibliography: Ibn Djuibâr, 214; Yâkût, Mu'qâm, ii, 322 ff.; iii, 865; Ibn Bâtîta, ii, 97, tr. Gibb, ii, 324 f.; Kazwîni, 135; Le Strange, 71. (J. Lasser)

AL-HILLâ. (1) Dâimâl al-Din Hâfiz b. Yûsuf b. 'Ali b. Mu'tâhâr, called 'Allâma-i Hillî (the sage of Hilla) after his native city Hilla [q.v.], which was for a long time the recognized centre of the Shi'is when Sunni rulers were in authority in Baghdâd. He was born on 19 Râmâdan 648/15 December 1250, eight years before the capture of Baghdâd by the Mongols, and died 11 Mu'harrâm 726/18 December 1325. He came of a great family of Shi'î theologians, who were so much appreciated by the Shi'is that he was often described as Muhakkik-i Hillî and also known as Mubakkîk-i awlîyâ, was Nâdir al-Dîn Dja'far b. Hasan b. Bâbyû, born 638/1240, died 726/1326. He distinguished himself as the author of Sharh-i 'ilm, which came to be recognized as the authoritative work on Shî fi law (Fr. tr. by A. Querry, Russian tr. by Kasembe).


HILM (A.), a complex and delicate notion which includes a certain number of qualities of character or moral attitudes, ranging from serene justice and moderation to forbearance and leniency, with self-mastery and dignity of bearing standing between these extremes. The term, which is sometimes linked with 'ilm, more however from stylistic considerations and a taste for paronomasia than from any conceptual association, is basically contrasted with dâhil (see Dâhil-Iyyâ) and safâh or safâha; a derivative from the latter root appears in the expression safâhâ l-âbîdîn, which can be translated "to put the most imperceptible out of countenance, to make them lose their temper". The Arabic dictionaries give only fragmentary definitions of hilîm; in the LÀ, it is "levelheadedness and reason" whilst hilîm is glossed by "patient"; for the TÀ, hilîm consists of controlling oneself and not allowing any violent emotion or anger to burst out; for the MÜ, it is "the state of the soul which preserves its calm and does not easily allow itself to be carried away by anger" (see also Ibn Abî l-Hadîd, Sharh Nabî al-balâqî, iv, 290, 335 ruler of Persia, who, after renouncing Christianity, became a Sunni Muslim, but was ultimately converted to 'Allâma-i Hillî into a staunch Imâmi Shi'î. It was perhaps at his suggestion that Oldjeitî ordered the names of the Twelve Imâms and especially the formula, 'Ali wâli Allâh, to be engraved on the coins (see S. Lane-Poole, Catalogue of Oriental coins in the British Museum, London 1881, vi, 44 ff.;) hence it may be said that through 'Allâma-i Hillî's efforts Imâmi Shi'ism was for the first time declared the state religion of Persia (see H. Howorth, History of the Mongols, London 1888, ii, 550). His services were so much appreciated by the Shi'is that soon after his death his grave in Maqhdâm became one of the centres of veneration for those who go on pilgrimage to the tomb of Imam 'Ali al-Ridâ.

(2) Another eminent jurist-theologian of Hilla, often described as Muhammâd-i Hillî and also known as Muhammâd-i awlîyâ, was Nâdir al-Dîn Dja'far b. Hasan b. Bâbyû, born 638/1240, died 726/1326. He distinguished himself as the author of Sharh-i 'ilm, which came to be recognized as the authoritative work on Shî fi law (Fr. tr. by A. Querry, Russian tr. by Kasembe).
and passim). From these definitions it emerges that the lexicographers consider the basic element of *hlm* to be a sort of moderated detachment (though without the last of these going as far as the *ataraxia* of the Greeks, as T. Izutsu suggests in *The structure of the ethical terms of the Koran*, Tokyo 1959, 26; revised version under the title: *Ethico-religious concepts in the Qur’an*, Montreal 1966, 31, 69); but they make no reference to the pardoning of offences, whilst in the modern period (as probably for many centuries) the word *hlm* generally denotes the quality acquired by patience, leniency, understanding (cf. H. Wehr, *Wörterbuch*, s.v.), or even gentleness (ibid.; Beussier, s.v.). In a recent work, S. H. al-Shamma (*The ethical system underlying the Qur’an*, Tübingen 1959, 7) gives it simply the meaning of “good conduct”.

The problems posed by this word are however not so simple. I. Goldziher (*Muk. Stud.*, 1, 379 ff.; analysis by G.-H. Bousquet, in *Arabica*, vii(3), 246-9), in studying the concept of *djidhiliyya*, very justly contrasts *djihi* with *hlm*, which implies “an idea of physical solidity, and then of moral integrity and solidity, of calm dispassionate reflexion and gentleness in social intercourse. The *haltim* is the civilized man”, as opposed to the *djihi*, the “barbarian”. Goldziher adds that *muruwwa* (q.v.) allowed it to be known in what cases it was permissible however to resort to *djihi*, that is to say to allow oneself to be carried away by a somewhat crude spontaneity, which implies “an idea of *hlm*”, so simple. I. Goldziher (op. cit.), who had used only the word *hlm* in his whole work on its ethical side may very well be represented as a daring attempt to fight to the last extremity with the spirit of *jähiliyyah*, to abolish it completely, and to replace it once for all by the spirit of *hlm*”. Indeed, the notion of *hlm* is simply implicit in Islamic ethics and can be deduced a contrario from the use of the word *djihi* and its derivatives in the *Kur*ān; but it also emerges from certain verses, the most characteristic of which is certainly the following (XXV, 64/65): “The [true] servants of the Beneficent are those who walk the earth modestly and who, when addressed by the *djihi*, answer ‘peace!’”. In fact, to eradicate the tendencies of the Arab people, it was fitting to substitute a “civilization” for the “barbarism” of the *djidhiliyya*, to make the Arabs civilized men, capable of holding their instincts in check and of pardoning insults, in short of spreading abroad the virtue of *hlm* hitherto restricted to an elite; this reform of manners was to be favoured by the belief in the Last Judgement, which imposes a rule of life on earth, and in Allāh, Who combines in Himself all the elements of *hlm* and of responsibility for avenging men by chastising the guilty.

This analysis of Muslim ethics, suggested by Goldziher and restated more systematically by Izutsu, does not provoke any major objection, except that the Muslims do not appear to have consciously made *hlm* a directing principle of their conduct, even though their behaviour in fact corresponded with the definition of this multiple virtue and, in practical life, a true Muslim is necessarily *hlm*.

The proof of the survival of the pre-Islamic notion of *hlm* without any Muslim admixture is to be found in the first place in the facts put forward to explain the origin of the saying (al-Maydānī, i, 229): *aḥlam min al-ʾAhnaf*. This noble Tamimi (d. 57/656-7 [see AL-AḤNĀF]) still represents the typical pre-Islamic *sayyūd*, and the *hlm* which has made him proverbial contains the following elements: self-mastery, leniency in respect of his enemies, repression of anger, inclination towards the serious, discretion, and hostility to denunciation. After him, the man who seems to have been regarded as most *hlm* is Muʿāwiya; but, on the one hand, this caliph belonged to a dynasty which had not yet shed all its bedouin character and, on the other hand, an analysis of his *hlm* shows that he had made of it a political principle; he succeeded through his leniency in disarming certain of his enemies, and through his liberality in securing the submission of others, saying that war is more costly than generosity; such a *hlm* can in no way be regarded as a Muslim virtue (cf. H. Lammens, *Études sur le règne du calife omeyyade Muʿāwiyah I*). Al-Dījahri, who of all the ancient authors took the greatest pains to analyse sentiments and traits of
character, has no difficulty (Fadl Hāżīm *al-‘Abd Šams, in Rasā’il, ed. Sandūbī, 104) in destroying the legend of the Thus, he must in fact possess a
rules. In his Tahdīh al-akhbār (25), Miskawayh lists hilm among the qualities and defines it (232) as “the consultation of reason” (istishdrat al-‘ārīfī); al-Ghazālī, in his (book xxv) brings to reason. Ibn Sīnā introduces it into the system of Greek philosophy [see Fālāsīfī, at p. 766b]. Al-Harawi (K. al-Tāhā‘ir al-harrā‘iyīa fi l-‘āyāl al-barbīyya, ed.-tr. J. Sourdell-Thomine, in Bél., xvii (1961-2), 236, 240) regards hilm ba’d al-hudra as one of the qualities of the ruler. The author of a popular encyclopedia such as al-Ibshihi, in the 36th chapter of his Mustatraf (i, 252-65) groups together anger, hatred and jealousy, but links hilm with anger and defines it as the plenitude of reason, the mastery of self, the subjection of the passions, to the conclusion that each must try to acquire these qualities and to imitate the Prophet who was the most hilm of men.

Thus it appears that hilm is naturally regarded as a praiseworthy quality but not as a cardinal virtue in Islamic morality; in popular estimation generally restricted to self-control and the forgiving of insults, it is a quality whose effects are turned outwards; however, the thinkers and moralists tend to make the most of its importance to the passions, thanks to the intervention of reason, which must decide the conduct to be followed in any particular circumstance.

Bibliography: in the article. Also, Ch. Pellat, Concept of hilm in Islamic ethics, in Bull. of the Inst. of Isl. St., nos. 6 and 7 (Allgarb 1962-3).

(H. M. F.)

HILMAD (HILMAD), name of a river (the Etymandrus of Arrian, the Erymanthus of Polybius, the Haštūmāt of the Avesta, the Hīdmand of the Hūdād al-Šām) which, with its five great tributaries (Khūd Rūd, Tirīn, Arghāndāb, Tarnak, Arghāsān) drains all south-west Afghanistan (see map at i, 222 above). Rising in a valley at the convergence of the Khūd-Bābā and Sangāgī rivers, the river flows in a southwesterly direction through Hāwarāt, Ta‘riff, and Dihrawat to Khāṭa‘ ‘All, where it turns westward, and finally north, to lose itself in the lakes of Sīstan. It is navigable downstream from the important crossing on the Kandahār-Harak road at Girshk. The waters of the lower Hilmad have been used for irrigation since antiquity; after the Second World War an ambitious project was undertaken to use the waters of the Hilmad and its tributaries for irrigation west of Kandahār, but it has encountered many difficulties.


(M. E. YAPP

Ahmed Hilmı Efendi, 19th century Turkish translator. Born in Uskūdar, he was trained in the language chamber [see T.R.D.EM.44A] of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and subsequently held a number of official appointments. He is mentioned as having been Ottoman Consul in Tabriz and a member of the Embassy in Tehran, and in 1876 was elected a deputy in the first Ottoman parliament. He died in 1878 of typhus, contracted while caring for refugees from the Russo-Turkish war, and was buried at the Karacagahmet cemetery in Uskūdar.

Ahmed Hilmı played a pioneer role as a translator of books on history and economics. His major historical enterprise was a Turkish translation and adaptation of an English book (Chambers’ Historical questions with answers. Embracing ancient and modern history, London and Edinburgh 1865). Entitled Ta‘rīkh-i ‘umāmī, this work appeared in 2 vols. in Istanbul in 1865; a second, expanded edition was published in 6 volumes in 1293/1876-7. The second edition contained more extensive treatment of Islamic history, drawn from the Şahîf‘ al-ahbār of Münedjîmîmî (q.v.). Though not the first Turkish translation of a European historical work [see T.R.D.EM.44A], the Ta‘rīkh-i ‘umāmī was the first modern work on world history published in Turkey; its appearance, which was followed by the publication of numerous other translations and adaptations of works on European and world history, introduces a new phase in the Turkish awareness of itself and its place in it. It was published under the auspices of the official Translation Committee appointed in 1865, of which Ahmed Hilmı was a member (on this committee see Mahmud Kemal İlinal, Osmanlı devrinde son sadrasamlar, 3208; Ş. Mardin, The genius of Young Ottoman thought, Princeton 1962, 239). In addition, Ahmed Hilmı is said to have published a book entitled Ta‘rīkh-i Hind, and consisting, according to ‘Oğhnamî mi’lîlîfîsî, of a translation of a history ‘written in the ancient language of India’.

Besides history, Ahmed Hilmı was also interested in economics, and in 1286/1869-70, according to ‘Oğhnamî mi’lîlîfîsî, published ‘Ilm-i tedblîr-i ûrnerî, an economic treatise translated from the German.

Bibliography: Babinger, 364-5; ‘Oğhnamî mi’lîlîfîsî, iii, 49; E. Kuran, Ottoman historiography of the Tannús period, in Lewis and Holt, Historians, 424; B. Lewis, History-writing and national revival in Turkey, in MEA, iv (1953), 219.

Ahmed Hilmı, known as Shehêbdenerzade, a Turkish journalist who first achieved prominence after the revolution of 1908, when he returned to
AHMED HILMI — HİMAR

Istanbul from exile in Fezzan, and started a periodical called İttihat-ı İslam. He also contributed to İhbar, Taşvii-ı Efker, and, later, the weekly İhtimai [see HİBAR, iv, 156-7]. He died in 1913.

**Bibliography:** Babinger, 397; *Oldmânil müstillerleri*, i, 156-7.

**Tuğlul HİMLİ**, Turkish writer and politician. Born in Eskiğumna in 1869, he became involved in illegal political activities while still a medical student. After serving a brief term of imprisonment, he fled to Europe in 1895, and joined the Young Turk group in Geneva, where in 1896 he founded, with others, the Ottoman Revolutionary Party (*Oldmânil İktisâlî Firâq';*) he was particularly effective as a writer and propagandist with a simple and direct popular appeal. In 1900, together with Abd Allah Djawed and İshâq Süküt (*g.v.*), he made his peace with the Sultan and was appointed Secretary at the Ottoman Embassy in Madrid, but later reverted to opposition. Returning to Turkey in 1908, he held various official positions and became a member of parliament. Later he joined the Kemalists and was a member of the first Grand National Assembly in Ankara. He died in 1928.


**HİMLİ PASHA** [see HÜSAVİ HİMLİ PASHA; İBRAHİM HİMLİ PASHA].

**HİMAR** (A.), donkey (fem. *altûn* and *hîmâra*). The Arabs make a distinction between the domestic donkey (*ahlî*) and the wild donkey (*waqîghi, farâ*; *'ayr al-âina*). Domestic donkeys are used to turn mills, as beasts of burden and as mounts, but although the Prophet is said to have owned one, named Yâfur, and although the animal has been esteemed by famous persons, it is not ridden by Arabs of high rank, who even employ a formula of apology when they address an *afram-* or *'ayr-* (*ahlî*), etc.) when they utter its name. The zoological works provide details of its characteristics: it is able to find its way even if it has travelled a road only once before; it is sharp of hearing; its braying, provoked by the sight of a demon (wheras when a cock crows it is said to have seen an angel), carries a great distance, and is so disagreeable that a dog howls with pain on hearing it; in order to prevent it braying a stone should be attached to its tail; if it sees a lion it either stops or runs towards it, and this saves it; it is not very prone to illness but is very sensitive to cold; if someone who has been stung by a scorpion sits back on it the pain felt is transmitted to the donkey. The uses made of the different parts of its body are innumerable. From the juridical point of view it is not generally permitted to eat its flesh [see HAYAWAN, iv] and it is forbidden in principle to mate a mare with a domestic ass [see SÂQHI].

Wild asses are all so similar to one another that there is nothing to distinguish among them. The stallion is so jealous that it tears off with its teeth any part of its body which is used for other purposes and it will not separate, it is very easy to hunt the wild ass: the hunter hides in a ravine and kills the first one which had to live in freedom on the territory of the god. Nevertheless Islam, which turned against *waqf* and the consecration of animals to divinities (*V*, 103, VI, 135 f.), intended to put an end to these pagan practices. Henceforward, the sole territory to be strictly sacred was Mecca, its inviolability having been decreed by Allah Himself (*kur’an* XVII, 91, 92, 109, 110, 111; *al-‘Ayâ‘, umda, v, 60, and 92) By extension, under the terms of a special measure made on its behalf by the Prophet, Medina enjoyed the same religious prerogatives as the Meccan *bara‘am*. But the institution of *hîmâl* was not suppressed as such: Islam simply reduced it to its secular applications. It was, accordingly, to this practice that Muhammad and the first caliphs resorted in reserving for the mounts of the Muslim armies, both for the camels acquired by the Treasury and for the smaller herds belonging to the poorer Muslims, the use and possession of certain pasturages (in the places called *Nafî‘*, *Rabadjâh*, *Sharâf*).


(J. CHELHOUD)
to pass; the others, instead of turning back, stay together and are easily killed; but this detail does not correspond with the data of poetry collected by G. Jacob (Studien in arab. Dichtern, iii, 115). It is permitted to eat the flesh of the wild ass, except for the Ḥanāfīs.

Wild asses are considered to live much longer than domestic ones (up to 200 and even 800 years!), and the breed which enjoys the greatest longevity is that known as abghādrīyya; it owes its name to al-Abū Ḥādar, the stallion of Ardashir which, having reverted to a wild state, was said to have been the founder of this breed which is considered to be the most beautiful.

**Bibliography:** Diābiz Hayawān, index; idem, Bigāl, index; Ḫawznī, ed. Wustenfeld, i, 376; Damīrī, s.v.; Ibn al-Ḥaytrār, in Lecerc. Notices et extraits, i, 458; Polak, Persien, ii, 99; Reitemeyer, Beschreibung Ägyptens im Mittelalter, 73; V. Montefi, Faune du Sahara occidental, Paris 1951, 32; R. Mauny, Tableau géographique de l'Ouest africain au moyen âge, Dakar 1962, 282-3, 359-6.

**HEMAYA,** term used of practices and institutions of "protection" which are almost unrecognized by ḥibb but which were in fact important in classical Islamic society.

In one sense, where the synonym ḥafara [q.v.] is usually employed, himayā means, from the pre-Islamic period, the protection given, in return for financial compensation, by a nomadic tribe or group to the settled inhabitants or more particularly to travellers who are in the territory controlled by them; this ḥafara may be conceded in a regular manner by a head of state or may be seized by the group concerned.

In a second sense, which concerns more broadly the whole social structure of the mediaeval East, himayā is related to certain practices or institutions of Byzantium or of the late Roman Empire. There existed in the Muslim world, as in these empires, relations between patron and client; but we are not here concerned with the personal forms of this relationship (which in the early centuries of Islam were usually called the waalā of the mawlā [q.v.]) but rather with certain practical forms of "protection" of the property of men whose personal status was not, in this case, himayā is the aspect of protection by a superior which corresponds to the practice which from the point of view of the inferior is called talidīʿ or idīʿ. Fīḥk recognizes talidīʿ in a limited sense, which for it consists of "a fictitious sale resorted to by a person who wishes to protect his possessions from possible confiscation" (cf. Y. Linaut de Bellefonds, in Revue Internationale de Droit Comparé, x (1958), 513). More generally in the practice of the first three or four centuries of Islam, taldīʿa, literally "putting under protection", consisted of the "commending" by an inferior (who might be either a humble person or a person of some importance) to a superior of a possession of which the former remains the legal owner but for which, by virtue of a tacit agreement, the latter is to be responsible vis-à-vis the administrative authority and moreover particularly the tax authorities. It is true that the inferior rewarded by a fee the service rendered by the superior, but it must be admitted that, in accordance with the conditions under which the payment of the tax was made, he might often still find this advantageous. The right to receive this fee was itself the property of the superior and a himayā might be inherited like anything else which counted as property. It can thus be seen how in fact this could result in a sort of sharing of property between the two parties to the contract, and even, when the inferior party was not recognized by the superior, as was often the case, in an act of dispossess: the contract being merely a tacit agreement, it was impossible for the victim to prove his ownership against the assertion of a superior who appealed to the tax registers. And it can readily be understood how himayā, in this instance imposed by force or as a way of repaying debts, was one of the methods used by those in power to build up for themselves vast domains, in which the former owners of the land were little more than the prey of the new political or military aristocracy. Although from the 4th/10th century onwards there is no further mention of taldīʿa or of himayā in this sense, this is not because small estates were better protected, but on the contrary because on the one hand fewer of them remained and on the other the concession in new forms to the officers of the new military aristocracy of taldīʿa [q.v.] granting them all the administrative and fiscal rights over a district rendered useless to both sides the intermediate practice which until then had been current.

There existed at the same time as this himayā of land another which resembled, in greater or less degree according to circumstances, both taldīʿa and ḥafara. Important persons received or assumed the "protection" of a territory, essentially of the crops which grew from the military aristocracy, tried to regulate and discipline the practice. In the following century these himayād also disappeared as the result of the strengthening of the great governmental ḫāstās which conferred on the military chiefs more complete powers over their territories.

The name himayā was, however, to remain in use for several centuries longer as the designation of another, narrower, institution. Sometimes in towns undisciplined groups such as those of fustaʿwūn [q.v.] imposed on the merchants, for example, their "protection". But, in general, the term ḫumāt, plur. ḫumāṭ, was used for the chief of police of a quarter in a large town like Baghūd or Cairo, or of a small town; this official naturally levied for his services a himayā tax, the legitimacy of which was contested by the early jurists (on the grounds that the ordinary taxes were intended among other things precisely to meet the expenses of ensuring public order), but which had now become a tolerated custom. In the same way little local potentates continued to "protect" bridges, passes etc.

**Bibliography:** Sources and studies are given in Cl. Cahen, Notes pour l’histoire de la Himaya, in Mélanges Louis Massignon, i (1956), 257-303; see also M. van Berchem, Matériel pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, Jerusalem, i, no. 107, and the note by G. Wiet in JESHO, v (1962), 39.

(C. CAHEN)

Post-Classical

i. **The Middle East**

The term himayā, as meaning "protection", has been used in various contexts. In a popular sense, in the field of power politics, France for instance considered herself the "protecting" European power
of all Catholics in the Levant, while Russia claimed a similar role over all Eastern Orthodox subjects of the Ottoman Empire [see KOÖK-KEYMAHRA, Treaty of]. The term referred also to the status of non-Muslim members of the non-Muslim communities (Christian and Jewish) in the Ottoman Empire, especially in its Levant provinces, who in the nineteenth century enjoyed the consular "protection" afforded by a number of European powers, e.g., Austria, Great Britain, France, Italy, Russia [see BERÊTTLI, IMIYINEL].

More specifically, himayâ refers to various bilateral treaties between Britain and the shaykhy rulers of states on the western seaboard of the Persian Gulf, from Muscat (Maskat) and Oman (Umân) to Kuwait (the so-called "Trucial" Coast), in a system built up in the course of the nineteenth century on the basis of the general Treaty of Peace of 1235/1819. In return for British protection, rulers were bound by treaty to desist from acts of piracy or of war with one another. In concluding these bilateral arrangements, which gave Great Britain some jurisdiction over defense and the conduct of the external affairs of these states and principalities, the British government was motivated by the desire to protect and secure its maritime interests in the Gulf. Only since the end of the nineteenth century did other factors play a part, such as a strategic threat from the hinterland of Arabia or from other European powers (e.g., France). See the articles on the individual states: AL-BAHRAYN, DUBAYY, AL-KATAR, KUWAYT, Maskat, SHARDJAH, Umân, etc. Similar bilateral agreements exist between Great Britain and the rulers of states in South Arabia—what are referred to today as the Western and Eastern Aden Protectorates. Here too Britain's treaty obligation is to protect the independence of the various rulers who have such a relationship with her; the rulers on their part undertake not to cede any portion of their territories to another state or power, or to enter into agreements with them without consultation with Great Britain [see ÂDAN—ii, and cross-references there].

The protection exercised by Great Britain over Egypt was based not on a bilateral agreement but on a unilateral British act following the outbreak of the First World War; the Declaration of 28 December 1914 formally terminated Ottoman suzerainty over Egypt (until then an autonomous province of the Ottoman Empire, ruled by the dynasty of Muhammad 'Ali but recognizing the Ottoman Sultan as its suzerain) and legalized the status of the British occupation begun in 1882. The new status was subsequently recognized by article 147 of the Treaty of Versailles. The Protectorate was ended, as it had begun, by a unilateral Declaration of the British Government (22 February 1922). See MISR.


(F. J. VATIKIOTIS)

ii. — North Africa

(I) In North Africa, in the modern period, this term has been used officially of the protection exercised by a foreign Christian power over certain individuals, then over states.

(a) In Tunisia, the principle of the protection of individuals arose from the earlier system of the Capitulations (imtiyâzât) granted to various European powers throughout the Ottoman Empire.

In Morocco, so far as France was concerned, this right of protection goes back to the treaty concluded in 1767 between Louis XV and the 'Alâwî sultan Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh. The protected persons were those natives (Muslims and Jews) who were in the service of the French consuls (secretaries, interpreters, guards) and of the French merchants (brokers, smugglers). This protection conferred absolute freedom of movement, exemption from dues and taxes and a guarantee against any arbitrary action by the local authorities.

During the 19th century, several agreements of the same type were concluded with other European powers, beginning with England and Spain. In 1880, Morocco was forced to accept the Convention of Madrid which laid down definitively the conditions of the protection. This applied to diplomatic personnel and to the employees of European merchants: brokers (simâsâr) and agricultural agents (mukhdâlî). One so protected was described as himâyâ, whereas a Moroccan was only ratîyya, "subject to the common law".

Those possessing this privileged status were able to escape from the normal taxes and from the judicial system, and were protected from arbitrary action and the extortion of money; thus they formed a sort of state within the state. For their part, the foreign powers desired only that the protection should be used to increase their political following. Thus we see the protection extended to wealthy individuals, high officials and even to ministers. In 1883, the powerful gasrif of Wazzân [q.v.], al-Ḥâjjî 'Abd al-Sâlîm, leader of the great religious brotherhood of the Tuhâmiyya-Tayyibiyâ (dâr al-damâna), requested and obtained the status of French-protected persons for himself and for his family. When he introduced protection in 1917, the only aim of the great statesman, the sultan Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh, was to protect trade in his kingdom with foreign nations and thus to increase the revenue from customs. As he saw it, the benefit of protection was to be restored to the State, inasmuch as it was enjoyed by the inhabitants living in the few ports which were open to trade with the Christian countries. But the gradual increase in the number of protected persons, in the country as well as in the towns, and their evasion of their responsibilities to the state, was an important factor in the decay of the Moroccan state which reached its final stage at the beginning of the 20th century. Thus the protection of individuals prepared the way for the establishment of a protectorate over the state itself.

(b) The French protectorate in Tunisia lasted from 1881 to 1956 and in Morocco (apart from a zone conceded to Spain in the north) from 1912 to 1956. During these periods the other foreign powers gradually renounced their rights of protection over individuals.

**Bibliography:** Michaux-Bellaire, Le Gharb, in Arch. Mar., xx, 201; G. Kampffmeyer, Weitere Texte aus Fes und Tanger, in MSOS, xvi (1913), ii, 70-1; Le Tourneau, Fès avant le Protectorat, 178. (II) Among the Berbers and Arabs (especially nomads) of North Africa there existed numerous forms of protection, occasional or permanent, exercised over individuals or groups, the latter more especially in the regions (bâdât 25-sâbîna) where the government was unable to ensure security.

(a) Protection of individuals. (4) Here, as
everywhere, a guest was accorded protection for three days [see ḥārāqā]. (a) If a stranger, generally a merchant, wished to cross safely a tribe's territory, he addressed himself to a dignitary, often a descendant of the Prophet (ṣāhīf) or of a saint (mārābī), who would give him one of his servants as an escort, in return for a fee, or gave him to carry an object well known in the region as belonging to him: an iron-tipped staff, a burnous, a rosary, etc., which served as a kind of passport for the traveller. The same form of paid protection was also applied to the periodical trading caravans which plied, for example, between Tāfīlāt and Fez and Marrākush. This protection was agreed, by contract, by the whole of a tribe which supplied an armed escort.

The name of the iron-tipped staff, masīrāq (= classical misrāb) was ultimately used of all forms of protection, and it was said: X fi-masīrāq-Y, “X is under the protection of Y”. The Berbers of Morocco used in the same circumstances the word āmār, “hunting spear”.

If a burnous was given, the Moroccans called the protector kāsi, literally “one who has clothed” or ssif; sīfa referred both to the protection and to the fee. These last two terms derive from the Berber kāfas, literally “one who has clothed” or protector, the iron-tipped staff, wished to cross safely a tribe's territory, he agreed, by contract, by the whole of a tribe which requested a protector to intervene to put an end to their conflict. From the classical form ḥuzūf, “banish”, the verb has the double sense of “banish” or “protect”. Another procedure was that of the shield, a sort of blackmail in which the person entreated could not, without incurring dishonour, refuse to intervene. The same method of intimidation was also employed when begging the protection of a saint. In all cases a protector who proved false was publicly exposed to ignominy.

A different method of protection was when a person under a threat begged a dignitary to grant him shelter and assistance. One case would be that of a man who, as the result of a crime, had been forced to flee from his tribe in order to escape the vengeance of the family of his victim. He would present himself before the man whose protection he desired in the ritual attitude of the supplicant: prostrating himself on the ground between two knapsacks, his teeth and his arms crossed behind his back like a bound prisoner. He was thus in a state of ṣūdāg and said to the dignitary: āna masūdāg fih “I implore your help”. These terms come from the Berber ṣīf, theverb ṣīf has the double sense of “banish” and “implore assistance”.

Another procedure was that of the ḍr. A person who was the victim of an arbitrary action (maṣṣālam) requested a protector to intervene to put an end to his miserable state. During a ceremony consisting of various rites, the supplicant said: ḍrī iḥb, “let my disgrace be yours [if you do not see that I obtain justice]”; or: āna fi ḍrāk, “my disgrace is yours”. This procedure of a formal summons to act, under threat of the transfer of the ḍr, often came to resemble a sort of blackmail in which the person entreated could not, without incurring dishonour, refuse to intervene. The same method of intimidation was also employed when begging the protection of saints.

In serious cases such as that of the defeated imploring the mercy of their conquerors, the ritual of supplication was often accompanied by the sacrifice of a valuable animal: a bull, a camel or a horse; its throat was cut (ḥākiba), or it was ham-strung (fargiba, from the classical form urbāb). Finally, surrounding the sa'īyas [q.v.] covering the tomb of an important saint, there existed an area of sanctuary (ḥaram, hāmā, see ḥamā), where persons who were being pursued could find a sure refuge.

(b) Protection of groups. From the time of the second Arab invasion in the middle of the 5th/11th century, the group of the Ma'ākīl [q.v.] gradually occupied the pre-Saharan zone up to the Atlantic coast. They imposed their protection on the settled Zanāta in the oases and the ṣāhīf, extorting a tribute known as ḥasfāra, “protection due”, or tīnaya. Until the 20th century their example was followed by powerful nomadic Berber tribes in southern Morocco: Ayt-Khabbāsh, Ayt-Ṣaṭṭā. From the first quarter of the 7th/13th century, during the period of anarchy which preceded the disappearance of the Almohads, a Zanāta nomad tribe, the Banū Marin, had overrun northern Morocco and imposed on the settled population a ḥasfāra in return for ensuring their protection and the safety of the roads.

(c) There existed also institutions of mutual protection. In the majority of the regions in which the authority of a central power was not effective, the tribes were divided into two opposing groups, historically stable, known as ṣiffīs or laffīs. When a tribe belonging to a specific laffī was attacked by a tribe of the opposing laffī, it automatically received help from the other tribes of its laffī.

There existed also pacts (ṣakād) of mutual protection between two groups which were usually already ethnically linked. These were solemnized by a ritual fraternization marked either by a solemn exchange of items of clothing (burnous or sandals), or by a co-lacoration (usually symbolic only) making each member of one group the foster-brother of those in the other. The latter procedure was known as ṣadaljūba, from the Berber verb ṣjadū “to suck”.

It should be noted that the majority of these forms of protection were found in early Arabia and that many of them were condemned by Islam. It would, however, be rash to conclude from this that these practices were all imported into North Africa by the Arab conquerors. Any coincidence is due to independent, but parallel, efforts made by separate peoples to impose a minimum of order and justice in anarchical societies.

On the death of Yazid the governorship of Hims fell within the orbit of the Empire. There is no doubt that the name of the town is attributed to an eponym: Hims ramus, who preferred to dwell at Rastan (Arethusa). The crossroad of empires, Hims emerged from obscurity when, in the time of Domitian, it received the name of Emesa. Under Antoninus Pius, in the 2nd century A.D., Hims began to strike coins, but the town did not occupy a leading position among the towns of the Roman Orient until the young high-priest of the Sun Heligabalus was made Emperor by his troops (217 A.D.). Ruling under the name of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, he had as successor another citizen of Hims, his cousin Alexander Severus who fought the Sassanians. In 272 Hims saw the defeat of Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, conquered by the Roman legions.

The varied soil, made up of alluvium and disintegrated basaltic concretes, favours agricultural and pastoral activity thanks to the richness of its water resources. Already in the 2nd millennium B.C. the Egyptians had dammed the Orontes and were perhaps the first to organize the irrigation system which has been perfected in the course of time. In the Middle Ages a canal led the water of Salamiyya to irrigate the cultivated land on the east of the town. A modern water system was constructed in 1938 below the last channel. Another canal leads off from the dam and branches out into several secondary canals which permit irrigation between the Orontes and Hims.

Hims is on an important crossing of routes. It is situated on a shelf, the Hims gap, which is the easiest passage from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean via Palmyra and which since remotest antiquity has been the channel for the produce of Mesopotamia and nowadays enables the pipelines from Kirkuk to run petroleum to Tripoli and Baniyas; it is situated also midway along the route joining Aleppo and Damascus. Before the construction of the railway the journey to Damascus took five days on horseback. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The crossroad of empires, Hims emerged from obscurity when, in the time of Domitian, it received the name of Emesa. Under Antoninus Pius, in the 2nd century A.D., Hims began to strike coins, but the town did not occupy a leading position among the towns of the Roman Orient until the young high-priest of the Sun Heligabalus was made Emperor by his troops (217 A.D.). Ruling under the name of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, he had as successor another citizen of Hims, his cousin Alexander Severus who fought the Sassanians. In 272 Hims saw the defeat of Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, conquered by the Roman legions.

The varied soil, made up of alluvium and disintegrated basaltic concretes, favours agricultural and pastoral activity thanks to the richness of its water resources. Already in the 2nd millennium B.C. the Egyptians had dammed the Orontes and were perhaps the first to organize the irrigation system which has been perfected in the course of time. In the Middle Ages a canal led the water of Salamiyya to irrigate the cultivated land on the east of the town. A modern water system was constructed in 1938 below the last channel. Another canal leads off from the dam and branches out into several secondary canals which permit irrigation between the Orontes and Hims.

Hims is on an important crossing of routes. It is situated on a shelf, the Hims gap, which is the easiest passage from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean via Palmyra and which since remotest antiquity has been the channel for the produce of Mesopotamia and nowadays enables the pipelines from Kirkuk to run petroleum to Tripoli and Baniyas; it is situated also midway along the route joining Aleppo and Damascus. Before the construction of the railway the journey to Damascus took five days on horseback. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak. The single-track D.H.P. railway, built in 1902, ensures connections with Bayrut through Rayak.
is said to have been conferred on al-Nu‘mān b. Baṣhīr (d. 65/684), but many authors maintain that it went to his son Khālid b. Baṣhīr who had built a palace at Hims. In 126/744, on the death of Yazīd III, Marwān II [q.v.] intervened in Syria with the support of the Ka‘yṣ. He attacked Sulaymān b. Hīshām, who was assisted by the Kalbīs. In 127/754, Sulaymān, defeated, fled to Hims and from there to Kūfā. Hīms held out for a time against Marwān II but he finally took the town. In order to prevent the town, whose gūnd then numbered 20,000 Yamāns, from being used as a base of operations for the Kalbīs, he razed the walls. In 128/756 order was restored.

In 132/750 there appeared in Syria ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbīl Ṭālib [q.v.], who was to overthrow the last Umayyad, Marwān II. From that date Syria fell under the control of ʿIrāk. In 137/753, the ʿAbbāsīd caliph gave Aleppo, Kinnarān and Hīms to Ṣāliḥ b. ʿAbīl Ṭālib [q.v.]. ʿAbīl Ṭālib b. ʿAbīl Ṭālib [q.v.]. The ʿAbbāsīd period was a dark one in the history of the town; the population, mostly of Yamān origin, rose up against the Ka‘yṣ and provoked numerous punitive expeditions from the time of Ḥārūn ar-Raʾshīd (170/786-193/809) onwards. Hīms was prosperous at that period, for its revenues, according to al-Diānshūyārī, amounted to 320,000 dinār and 10,000 camel-loads of grapes. The last punitive expedition took place under al-Mustāfīn ibn Marwān in 250/864, put Aleppo, Kinnarān and Hīms under the same governor.

When the ʿAbbāsīd caliphate weakened, Abūdād b. ʿṬullūn [q.v.], the governor of Egypt, extended his authority over Syria until 264/878. The ʿṬullūnid power was to maintain itself until 286/898. In 269/883, Abūdād b. ʿṬullūn named as his representative the amīr Luʾūn ibn Kullāb who imposed the authority of the sultān al-Mustāfīn ibn Marwān upon the Kaysīs and provoked numerous punitive expeditions. The Karmātīs [q.v.] appeared at this period and sowed trouble throughout the region. In 290/903 their leader Ḥusayn, known as ʿAbīl Shābīb, came to Hims from Damascus. In order to avoid extortions the townspeople agreed to the reading of the ḥusnā in the name of the new master. The latter seized Ḥamāt, Sālābīsya and Maʿarrāt al-Sharqīyya, and provoking numerous punitive expeditions. The Hamānīs took up arms against him.

In the middle of the 10th/11th century Hīms sought the support of the Hamānīs of Aleppo to avoid falling into the power of the ʿIkshīshīd governors of Damascus. In 333/944 the Hamānīs were victorious at the battle of Rastān on the Orontes and Sayf al-Dawla [q.v.] seized Hīms, which was to remain in the hands of his dynasty until 406/1016. In 356/967, on the death of Sayf al-Dawla, Hīms had been governed for a year by Abū Fīrās [q.v.]. The illustrious poet attempted a rebellion against Saʿd al-Dawla but was defeated, taken prisoner, and executed on 2 Dhuʾ al-Muḥarram 1/137/4 April 628.

In the following year Nicephorus Phocas occupied Hīms during his victorious campaign in Syria, transformed the great mosque into a church, had divine service celebrated there, and then set fire to it. In 362/973 Nicephorus Phocas departed and the Hamānīs governed the town again. In Rādīb 364/March-April 975, the Byzantine general John Trizimīs succeeded in occupying a large part of Syria and levied tribute from Hīms, Damascus, Bayrūt and Baʿlabakk. At this time there appeared a Turkish amīr, Alpātkan Baṣālūr, who revolted at Hīms against the Hamānīs of Aleppo; having failed to receive the Byzantine reinforcements on which he was counting, he was forced to withdraw. Three years later Saʿd al-Dawla granted him Hīms as a fief. The memory of this amīr has been preserved by a Kūfī inscription, the sole remaining trace of a minaret which it was demolished in 1312. Hīms remained one of the staxes in the Arabo-Byzantine rivalry and was set on fire by the Greeks in Rabīʿ II 373/September 983.

In 385/995 the Emperor Basil II established his authority over Aleppo, Shīyazār and Hīms. This town was taken only after a lively resistance; it was then devastated and then placed under the authority of the Byzantines as dux of Antioch. In 390/1000, on the orders of the basileus, the town was burnt.

In 406/1016 Ḥamānīd power came to an end and Aleppo fell to the Mirdāsīs [q.v.]. Ten years later Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās [q.v.], amīr of the Banū Kitāb, was in control of Hīms, then, in 420/1029, Shībīl al-Dawla [q.v.] regn b. Mirdās governed the town.

From the middle of the 5th/11th century the Fatimids extended their power into Syria, and Hīms did not escape them. A pro-Fatimid amīr, Khalāf b. Mūlaʾīb [q.v.], was in command at Hīms in 475/1082 and caused much trouble by his brigandage and depredations. In 483/1090, in response to a complaint about him from the Seldūk princes and commanders in Syria, the sultan Malik Shāh wrote instructing them to attack and remove him. Hīms was taken after a siege. Khalāf was captured and sent to Isfahān. The town was given to Tāḍāl al-Dawla Tūṭūnshī. Then in 487/1094 it passed to his son Riḍwān, ruler of Aleppo. Riḍwān’s abag, the amīr Dījānāh al-Dawla Ḥusayn, after quarrelling with his ward, took refuge at Hīms and made himself independent there in 490/1097. Later, when the Franks arrived, he was to join forces with Dūkķāsh against them.

After the capture of Anṭākiyya (491/1098) the Crusaders made a first attack southwards; they sacked Maʿarrāt al-Nuʿmān but besieged Hīms in vain. The town was then under the amīr Karadʒīa, a former mamlūk of Malik Shāh, representing Dījānāh al-Dawla. Contrary to a legend accepted by d’Herbelot and later by Pococke and Le Strange, the Franks did not succeed in capturing the town, which they named Tarrasīh although they knew the name Tarīsīh. Dījānāh al-Dawla was assassinated by three Ismāʿīlīs inside the great mosque of Hīms. Prompt action by Dūkķāsh, the ruler of Damascus, forestalled a Frankish attempt to take advantage of the situation by attacking Hīms, and brought the city under Damascene control. Ibn al-Aṯīr’s story, which puts the murder of Dījānāh al-Dawla a year earlier than all the other sources, and thus places it at the moment when Dījānāh al-Dawla was preparing to attack Raymond of Saint-Gilles, together with his account of Raymond’s immediate attack on Hīms, may be dismissed. The following year Dūkķāsh died and Ẓahir al-Dīn Tughtakīn succeeded him, leaving Karadʒīa as governor of Hīms. From this period Hīms became a huge military camp against the Franks, an assembly-point for troops, an arsenal, a depot for heavy siege equipment and in addition it supplied large contingents for the war.

In 506/1112, Khayrkhān (Karākhān) succeeded his father as master of Hīms. Two years later Nadīm al-Dīn lī Gāhrīī appeared outside Hīms but Khayrkhān overcame his opponent in Shābān 508/ January 1115.

In 512/1122 Ẓahir al-Dīn Tughtakīn b. Būrī [q.v.] took Hīms and imposed his suzerainty upon Khayrkhān. Five years later the abag of Damascus
attacked Hims once again but had to retreat before Khayrkhan, who had received reinforcements. In the middle of 570/beginning of 1175, Saladin took Hims and Hamât. Four years later, when he reorganized northern Syria, he gave back the town to his cousin Nâşîr al-Dîn Muḥammad b. Shirkhâl. In the siege of Damascus by the Franks of the Second Crusade, Hims served as a rallying-point for the Franks of the Second Crusade, Hims served as a rallying-point for the under the command of the prince of Damascus al-Ashraf GhÂzÂl. In 581/1186, al-Malik al-Mudâjdâd Asad al-Dîn Shirkhâl II succeeded his father at Hims. In 602/1205, he fought the Hospitallers of Hîshân al-Akrâd [q.v.]. In 604/1207, he had to appeal to the Ayyubid prince of Aleppo, al-Malik al-Zâhir Ghâfî for aid. The following year al-Malik al-Mansûr İbrâhîm took command at Hims; several times he had to push back the Provençaux of Tripoli and the Hospitals of Hîshân al-Akrâd, and to assure a better defence he supervised the maintenance of the town walls and restored the Bab al-Masdûd. In 623/1226, Hims took part in the quarrel of the Ayyubid princes, İbrâhîm being the ally of al-Malik al-Ashraf Mâsâ successfully defended the town against the Mongols. In 658/February 1260, the town was taken by the Mongols, Mâsâ recovered his possessions and took command of Hims and temporarily there was an independent Hims. In 661/1262, with him the Asadi dynasty, which had ruled at Hims for almost a century, was extinguished. The town lost its independence; from this time forth it was commanded by a deputy governor and was sometimes dependent on the amir of Hämât and sometimes on the ruler of Damascus.

In 680/1281, Hims won the victory of Kalâwûn [q.v.] over a coalition of Armenians and Mongols. From the reign of Muḥammad b. Kâlâwûn onwards Hims played no further political rôle; it was governed by an amir of a thousand troops and, later on, the command was given to an amir of ṣâbibâna. None of these princes were able to profit any lasting advantage on the history of the town. In the citadel, the nûdîb was a mamlûk of the Cairo sultan. At this time an official pigeon-house was installed at Hims to ensure postal contact with Kârâ in the south and Hämât in the north. In Rabî‘ I 699/December 1299, Ghâzân crushed the Mamlûks at Hims but did not remain in the district. According to the geographer al-Dinâqî, Hims was at that time the smallest governorship in Syria and comprised Shamša,
Shumaymis and Salamiyya; the niydba of Hims was included in that of Damascus. The anarchy prevailing in Syria in the 9th/10th century does not seem to have arrested the economic life of Hims, if the Mamluk decrees of 817/1414 and 844/1440 are to be believed, for these indicate the important position held by the weavers in this town where wool and especially silk had been worked for centuries, rivalling Alexandria in the quality and beauty of its products. Timur Lang (q.v.), after taking Aleppo in 803/1400, seized Hims and stifled smuggling from Syria to Damascus. During the following century no event of importance occurred at Hims, the territory of which was exposed to the depredations of Bedouins. In 926/1520 the town was menaced by the powerful tribe of the Al Fadl b. Nu‘ayr; it was relieved with the assistance of Sibây, the governor of Damascus, who on this occasion seized an abundant booty consisting particularly of camels and sheep. When, in 927/1516, the Ottoman sultan Selim had subjected Syria, Hims became one of the five niydbas attached to Tarābulus. On the death of the Sultan in 926/1520, the governor of Damascus, Djanbird al-Ghazali [q.v.], proclaimed himself independent and seized Tarābulus, Hims and Hamāt. The post of governor of Hims was given to the muhaddam Ibn al-Harīfsh. We have a picture of Hims in the 10th/16th century by Pierre Belon, who, as a town with good walls of beewn stone and with a citadel built, he says, by the Romans. Although the surrounding walls were almost intact, the town within the walls was quite ruined. Within the walls, says the French traveller, “there is nothing beautiful to be seen except the bazaar and the bazestan in the Turkish style”. Under Suleymān I and Selim II several surveys of lands, of the adult male population, and of the tax-returns were made for the towns and provinces of Syria (for Hims, see B. Lewis, The Ottoman archives as a source for the history of the Arab lands, in J.R.A.S., 1951, 152-3). Through the Ottoman fiscal regulations we have information on the economic activity of Hims at this period. The yoghourt brought to the town by the Turkomans was exported as far as Damascus; the watermills for corn and sesame were numerous, and the oil-presses were very busy. Grapes remained one of the country’s main resources. There were good harvests of rice which had just been added to the products of the cultivated marshland for feeding the town. The main industry was weaving. Hims was one of the largest centres for silk, the neighbouring mulberry trees feeding the silkworms, and here were made mottled fabrics, run through with gold thread, which were exported as far as Istanbul. At Hims, camels and cattle in transit from Damascus towards Aleppo met the flocks of sheep and goats coming down from Aleppo and Hamāt for Damascus.

In the course of the centuries, the Ottomans destroyed the gates in the town walls one after the other and in 1785 Volney could describe Hims as “a town, formerly strong and well populated, now no more than a fair and large bled village where there are no more than 2,000 inhabitants, partly Greeks and partly Muslims. There resides an agha who holds on sub-lease from the pasha of Damascus all the countryside as far as Palmyra. The farming lease was given to the pasha for 400 purses or 500,000 livres, but it brings in four times as much” (cf. Voyages, 1823 ed., iii, 18-9). The agha was of a local family. In 1246/1831 Hims was seized by adventurers and then fell into the power of İbrahim Pasha who, until 1256/1840, was to represent the authority of Muham-
a starch-works, a glucose factory, a sugar factory (1949) and a vegetable-oil factory which treats cotton and sunflower-seed (1951). Finally, from the far distance it can be seen the petroleum storage-tanks shining in the sun, while tall chimneys indicate the presence of an important oil refinery. The oil is transported by pipe-line from Kirkuk to Tarabulus or Baniyas but, to meet the needs of the country, some of it is refined at Hims.

Situated at the crossing of important routes, an agricultural and industrial centre, Hims plays a leading rôle in the Syrian economy.

ARCHAEOLOGY

The rectangular enceinte of antiquity had almost entirely disappeared in 1895 when M. van Berchem passed through Hims. Of the gates only the names remain, a few stones still indicating the position of some of them. Starting from the north-east there are around the town the following gates: Bab Tadmur, where a Bab al-Masjid, on the western side, left a few blocks of stone indicating the site of the Bab al-Sibâ'; not far away was the Bab al-Turkman. The Bab al-Masjid, on the western side, restored several times during the Middle Ages, still bears the appearance of a well-maintained fortified work with the remains of the bases of columns; a square tower stood on each side of the gate. The road which leads back in a northerly direction is called Shari Mughbir, thus preserving the memory of the vanished moat. Another gate, the Bab Hûd, opened into the wall before one arrived at the north-west corner, which was marked by three round towers that are still standing. Finally, in the north face near the great mosque there opened the Bab al-Sûk which no longer exists.

The Citadel: In the south-east corner of the town, dominating the town with its silhouette, the citadel rose up on a mound 275 m in diameter. The origin of this tell, which seems to be artificial, is thought to be Hittite or Aramaean. Numerous travellers describe it up to the beginning of the 19th century. During the Egyptian occupation (1831-40), Ibrahim Pasha destroyed it and left the citadel in some of it is rather the tomb of Khalid b. Yazid b. Mucawiya who built a palace nearby or even that of Khalid b. al-Siraj which has now disappeared. At the north front a particularly important tower, repaired in 1952, exists in part and bears two inscriptions of 594/1198 and of 599/1202 in the name of the Asadi al-Malik al-Mudjahid Shirkuh. There remain of the Ayyubid and Mamluk citadel three characteristics: the minaret, partly shaded by a vine, is used for prayer in the open air. The prayer-hall and the mastaba, partly shaded by a vine, is used for prayer in the open air. The prayer-hall and the mastaba, partly shaded by a vine, is used for prayer in the open air. The prayer-hall and the mastaba, partly shaded by a vine, is used for prayer in the open air. The prayer-hall and the mastaba, partly shaded by a vine, is used for prayer in the open air. The prayer-hall and the mastaba, partly shaded by a vine, is used for prayer in the open air. The prayer-hall and the mastaba, partly shaded by a vine, is used for prayer in the open air. The prayer-hall and the mastaba, partly shaded by a vine, is used for prayer in the open air. The prayer-hall and the mastaba, partly shaded by a vine, is used for prayer in the open air. The prayer-hall and the mastaba, partly shaded by a vine, is used for prayer in the open air.

The mosques: Most of the ancient mosques in Hims still preserves about twenty hammams, some of which have been made into bus garages. Although the Khân al-Sabîl, where the traveller Ibn Djubayr stayed, seems to have disappeared, there remains a Khân Asad Pasha and a Khân al-Harîr, which in fact is a hawârîyya where silk has been sold for centuries. The Khân, paved in the Middle Ages, are now tiled, and not only the cloth bazaar but also those of the goldsmiths and of their neighbours the cloth-makers are very busy. The sâk of the goldsmiths is in the centre, where the vegetable and dairy-produce markets are on the edge of the commercial area, together with the basket-makers, the saddlers, the metal-workers and the blacksmiths.

Places of pilgrimage are numerous outside the old town (see al-Harawi, Ziyadât, 8-9); the most frequented is the Dâr al-Mutâ, situated in the northern suburb. The fame of this sanctuary goes back at least to the Ayyubid era and retained its attraction under the Mamlûks. Khâlid b. al-Walîd, who died at Medina, and his wife Faḍâ'ah are said to be buried there; Yâkût wonders whether this is not rather the tomb of Khâlid b. Yâqûb b. Ghann, the Kuraysh who
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conquered the Dījarra [q.v.]. The original mausoleum was situated by the side of a mosque; it was all demolished and rebuilt in the Ottoman style on the model of the mosques of Istanbul by Naqīm Pāgha, the governor of Syria. The sultan Ābd al-Ḥamīd devoted 6,000 dinārs to works which were completed in 1331-1313. The prayer-hall is almost square (52 m x 50 m) covered by nine cupolas, of which the central cupola, which is 12 m in diameter, rises to 30 m and rests on four strong pillars. A public park has recently been made of the vast cemetery which surrounded the monument. Some of the burials date back to Roman times, as is testified by the sarcophagi found there.

Among the maṣār, those of two Ayyūbīd princes, the Masjīd al-Khūṭr to the south of the town, where the Ayyūbīd prince of Ijāmat (mashhad) of Khalid b. al-Aṭīr, and the prayer-hall is the Malik Djaqīlīyya, dated by an inscription of 842/1437. Finally, the existence of two large ruined dwellings may be indicated: the Bayt al-Mālāh and the Bayt Mālāh, vestiges of former prosperity.

The ten churches at present in Hims, none presents any great archeological interest, neither the Greek Orthodox church of Mār Elyān nor the former seat of the Syrian Catholic Patriarch Umm al-Zannar, since the buildings are modern.

Outside the walls many water-mills grind grain on the Orontes; the most ancient are the Tahun Tafcun al-Khusuba, dated to 975/1567 by a Turkish inscription, and the mill of al-Mimas Zannar, since the buildings are modern.

The battle was fought out at the depression (wāḍī) of Hims near the tomb (mashhad) of Khalīd b. al-Walīd. The Mongol army numbered 80,000, of whom 50,000 (according to one version) or 44,000 (according to another) were Mongols. The rest were Georgians, “Rūmīs”, Armenians, Franks and Muslim apostates (murtadda). As they advanced, the flank of their mawdūz wa-tārikh majdīn Hims wa-ṭārikhā, in ASAS, x (1961), 5-56.


HIMS (The battle of). The first great trial of strength between the Mamlūks and the Mongols took place more than twenty years after the battle of ‘Ayn Dijālt [q.v.]. The battle was won by Kalawīn, the real architect of the victory was undoubtedly Sultan Baybars [q.v.], who, in the seventeen years of his rule (685/1281-692/1293), built a war-machine which, in spite of the decline it underwent during the four years following his death, proved to be strong enough to break one of the mightiest armies which the Mongol Ilkhāns ever put into the field.

In the battle of ‘Ayn Dijālt the Mamlūks were a new and unknown enemy to the Mongols, who were, therefore, taken by surprise. By the time of the battle of Hims, however, the Mongols had become well acquainted with this army by a long series of encounters, so that they came to Hims very well prepared. As Baybars al-Mansūr justly remarks, never before had the Mongols marched on Syria with such huge armies; hence the victory of Hims was far more remarkable than the preceding ones (fol. 1172b-13).

The battle was fought out at the depression (waṭī) of Hims near the tomb (mashhad) of Khalīd b. al-Walīd. The Mongol army numbered 80,000, of whom 50,000 (according to one version) or 44,000 (according to another) were Mongols. The rest were Georgians, “Rūmīs”, Armenians, Franks and Muslim apostates (murtadda). As they advanced, the flank of their mawdūz wa-tārikh majdīn Hims wa-ṭārikhā, in ASAS, x (1961), 5-56.
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and of a number of Mamlûk amîrs with their private armies. At its head were placed the bedouins of Syria, the band of Qâsâ b. Muhammâ. The maysara, strengthened as a result of the warning of the Mongol deseter, consisted of the Zâhiriyâa of Baybars under the command of Sunîr b. Al-Âshkâr, and of a number of Mamlûk amîrs with their private armies. At its head were placed the Turcomans and the troops of Hîsân al-Âkrâd. The diâllâh, which served as the vanguard of the kalb, consisted of the viceroy (wâdîâb al-salâmâna) and other amîrs with their private armies as unspecified number of Qâibânî’s mawâlân. Sultan Kalâwûn was in the kalb, under the Royal banners, having with him 4,000 picked soldiers of the kalâb, 800 Royal Mamlûks and an unspecified number of his own mawâlân. The composition of the ġânâhîn is not mentioned in the sources. Shortly before the battle the Sultan chose 200 of his own mawâlân and, leaving his banner, went with them to the top of a hill overlooking the battlefield. Any tâfî [m.], which had been shaken by his orders a reinforcement.

The maysara of the Tatars dealt at first a heavy blow to the Muslim maymana, but could not shake it. The Egyptian maymana counter-attacked quickly, and routed the Tatar maysara. On the other side of the battlefield the maymana of the Tatars succeeded in inflicting a heavy defeat on the Egyptian maysara, and with it was routed the left part of the centre (ḏanâb al-kalb-al-sayyar). Both the defeated maysara wing and the victorious Tatar wing had no idea of what was going on at the other end of the field, and they went on with their flight and pursuit. Part of the routed Mamlûk maysara reached Şâfâd another part reached Damascus, and a third part arrived as far as Gâza. The pursuing Tatars halted after a while, dismounted and waited for the rest of the Mongol army to join them, but as their fellows did not appear, they decided to go back to the battlefield. (The features common to all battles between the Mamlûks and the Mongols are discussed above, s.v. HARR, pp. 187-8). There the Muslims went on winning, but their strength was already failing. Fortune was, however, on the side of the Muslims, for the Mongol commander, Man-Kutîr, wrongly concluded that the army confronting him was still very strong. In fact, however, Kalâwûn and his army had only 300 (or 500 according to one version) or 1,000 (according to another). With this small force Kalâwûn attacked the Tatars and defeated them. Meanwhile the victorious maysara of the Tatars returned to the battlefield. In order to conceal the whereabouts of his army from the returning Tatars, Kalâwûn ordered his drums to be silenced and the Royal banners folded. His ruse succeeded, for the Tatars passed by him without noticing anything. As soon as they had their backs to him he attacked them from the rear, and inflicted upon them a heavy defeat. The number of the Tatars killed during their retreat far exceeded the number of those who died in the field of battle.


**HIMYAR** [see YAMAN]. **AL-HIMYARÎ** [see IBD. AL-MUN’IM AL-SAYYID AL-HIMYAR].

**HINÀ, BANû (HINÂWî),** a settled tribe of inner ʿUmân, southeastern Arabia, in earlier times of considerable political and military importance and, since Shaʿbân 1373/May 1954, again prominent by one of its members, Qâibân b. Alî b. Hîlîl, became an ʿÎdî mawla of ʿUmân. Banû Hinà (mostly ʿIbdâls) were one of the two leading factions in the civil war of the early 12th/18th century in ʿUmân. Led by Kaṭâfî b. Mubîrâk (known as al-Ḵuṣayyîr, “the Short”) they and their allies were opposed by a group led by the Banû Gâhîrî (mostly Sunnîs). Since that time all the tribes of ʿUmân have aligned themselves with these factions as Hinâwîs, usually groups of traditionally southern descent, or as Gâhîrîs, generally tribes of inner ʿUmân.

The chief settlements of Banû Hinâ are al-Ğâhîfât, residence of the shaykhly section known as Aġwâl Zakrî, and Balad Sayt. A section known as al-Mâlghârîm inhabit the Diâbâl al-Kawr area, while other members of the tribe share the village of Sayfân with the Banû Shukâyî. The profession qaṭîb, “Abî b. Zâhir b. Ghuṣûn, is established at Muṣâyţî, the chief village of al-Ḥubûs tribe (3,000), where in 1364/1945 he was acting as wâli of the Sultan of Muscat and Oman. Many of the group of Banû Hinâ who occupied the lower section (al-Sufâla) of Nazwa moved to al-Ğâhîfât after the events of 1377/1957 (see ʿUmân).

Nearly all the members of the Banû Hinâ make their living on small agricultural holdings in inner ʿUmân. Lucerne and wheat are the principal crops grown in addition to the date palm.


**HINÂTA (a.),** embalming. The root is common to the Semitic languages and meant at first “to change colour”, especially in ripening fruit (hînta, “wheat”) and then the stain left by fragrant oils etc. Both senses are preserved in Arabic and Hebrew. Hântâ (Ar.) is explained as one who follows the trade of hînta; Samʿâni explains both hantî and hâmntî as corn-chandler. Aramaic alone seems to have hadînta meaning embalmer. Hântî is perfume or scented unguent, but always in connexion with death; “when Arabs prepared to fight, they put hantî on themselves and made themselves strong for death” (“Abîd b. Al-Âbrâs, 1913), 77. Ṭâbît b. Ḳays, who carried the flag of the Anṣâr, anointed himself, put on grave clothes, dug a hole in which he sank to his shins and fought from it till he was killed. This custom is thrown back to Ṭamûd; when they knew that destruction was certain, they anointed themselves and put on skins as grave clothes. The practice was not confined to fighters, for a poet says “every one alive will be anointed (for death)”; it was not entirely utilitarian, for when a man is at the point of death there should be some
perfume "to honour the angels". Martyrs, including a pilgrim killed by a fall from his camel, were not anointed. The Gospel provides parallels, "She has anointed my body for the burial" and the spices carried to the tomb.

Hanūf was of different kinds; "the best hanūf is camphor" is contradicted by "camphor and hanūf" and "put hanūf on my head and beard and camphor on the places of prostration", which are the parts of the body that touch the ground during prayer, the forehead (forehead and nose), palms of the hands, knees and toes. Hanūf is either sweet rush or some mixture, musk, ṣanbar (probably saffron), camphor, Indian reed and powdered sandal wood. Some insisted on dry camphor and others forbade saffron for males. As a scent with the dead, musk is more pleasant than camphor but the latter is better for drying the body, keeping it cold, hardening it and keeping away insects. Camphor should not be put in the water with which the body was washed but in the body after the hands have been dried. Some said that hanūf must be put on the body; some that it might be between the grave clothes but not on them; others allowed it on the clothes and on the bier. How was hanūf to be used? All the terms employed are ambiguous but there are so many that there is no doubt as to what is meant. It was put on the eyes, nose and ears, on the belly and under the chin and armpits, on the navel, between the thighs, behind the knees and on the soles of the feet.

Some would close the orifices of the body with cotton wool, some put it in the anus and one writer adds that the object is to keep out worms. A theorist forbade the extravagant use of cotton wool, for the corpse should look like one and not like a bundle. But cotton wool should not be put in the nose, throat or anus. There was a custom of putting a knife or a riblet on the body after it had been dried. Some said that hanūf must be put on the body; some that it might be between the grave clothes but not on them; others allowed it on the clothes and on the bier. How was hanūf to be used? All the terms employed are ambiguous but there are so many that there is no doubt as to what is meant. It was put on the eyes, nose and ears, on the belly and under the chin and armpits, on the navel, between the thighs, behind the knees and on the soles of the feet.
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Persian literature are therefore covered under two separate headings, namely, 'Sind' and 'Hind'.

(3) Geographical position, boundaries and area. Muslim geographers, following Claudins Ptolemy, divided the inhabited quarter of the earth (al-rub' al-mashā'īn) into seven climes, each running parallel to the equator from east to west, and covering the area north of the equator up to the Island of Thule as described by Ptolemy. India was usually placed between the first and the third climes. In the Iranian system of climes, which divided the 'world into nine by drawing several circles of equal size and placing six of these around the fourth in such a way that they touched each other, India was placed in the second hikmāt (al-Masudī, Murādī, i, 181). Although the Muslim geographers were acquainted with the Greek division of the land-mass into three continents: Asia (Asiyā), Europe (Urāfa) and Africa (Labīyā), they did not use it much. Al-Birūnī, however, describes India as part of "the northern continent" (meaning thereby Asia) and bordering on the 'Great Ocean' (al-Bahr al-'jam, the Indian Ocean) (A. F. I. [for this abbreviation and others employed in this article, see Bibl.], i, 197; Șīfā, 5). His image of India was of a plain surrounded on three sides (north, west and east) by lofty mountains forming a part of the long range of mountains that extended from China in the east and crossed the whole of Asia and Europe latitudinally, reaching as far as the lands of the Franks and the Galicians. India was placed to the south of this long range and the waters (rivers) of this range flowed down through the Indian plains (A. F. I., i, 198). Al-Birūnī was the only Muslim geographer who conceived of India as having been a sea in the geological period and perhaps the first scientist to present this concept. He arrived at this conclusion by observing the different types of stones, round and big, near the mountains (of the north) and both above and under the surface of the earth, but becoming smaller further away and finally getting pulverized into sand near the mouths of the large rivers and near the sea. He says, "... if you consider all this, you could scarcely help thinking that India has once been a sea which by degrees has been filled up by the alluvium of these rivers;..." (op. cit., i, 198).

Again, according to the Muslim geographers and navigators India lay on the great mediaeval sea-route between the Persian Gulf and China. The Arab navigators of the early Middle Ages divided, for navigational convenience, the seas lying along this route into 'the seven seas'. These were: (1) Bahir Fars (the Persian Gulf); (2) Bahir al-Lāwri (after the ancient name of Gujarat, Lār [Larke of Ptolemy], from Sanskrit Lalā, see Sauvaget, Abbâr, 35, note 4-3); this was the portion of the Arabian Sea stretching between Oman and the Laccadives; (3) Bahir Harkand (Bay of Bengal, from Sanskrit Hārketiṣya representing Eastern Bengal; kand may be due to the influence of the Iranian kand meaning 'town'; in M. Filliozat's view it may have some relation with the Tamil word Lānākandam, one of the nine divisions of the world as described by the Indians, see Sauvaget, Abbâr, 35, note 4-2); (4) Bahir Kalah (the Strait of Malacca; Salahat, from Malay selat, salat, meaning 'strait', see Abbâr, 4); (5) Bahir Kardandj (Panduranga?); (6) Bahir Sanf (the Sea of Champa; the Kingdom of Champa lay between the sea and the Kingdom of Thal, i.e., the Sea of Prakrit, 16); (7) Bahr al-Sin (the Sea of China).

(d) Boundaries and area: For the Merchant Sulaymān, India was more extensive than China, in fact twice its size (Abbâr, 26; cf. Ibn al-Fakih, 16), and according to al-Ya'qūbī, India extended from the region of China in the east up to Daybul in Sind, and from Trāg up to the Arabian Sea and Hījiqās (1, 93). Al-Masūdī [q.v.] describes India as a vast country comprising land, water and mountainous regions. The limits of India, according to him, extended up to 'the kingdom of the Maharādī' (Sumatra) in one direction and adjoined Khorāsān, Sind and Tibet in the other. Sind was the borderland between 'the kingdom of Islam and Hind' (Murādī, i, 162-3, 349); its boundaries are described as follows: Ar ḫūsh (the Ocean of India, the Arabian Sea (of the west), Daybul to the south) and the regions adjacent to China in the north (Tanbīk, 32). Al-Ī斯塔ḵrī gives the measurement of India's length from Makrān, across Kannawī up to Tibet as being about four months' journey, and its width, from the Sea of Fārs across Kannawī, as being about three months' journey (cf. Ibn Ḥawqāl, Šīrāz, 16). As for its boundaries, to the east lay the Sea of Fārs, to its west and south 'the Kingdom of Islām' and to its north, China. Tibet, according to this author, lay between China and India, (the land of) the Kharulghus and the Topkhumuzz and the Sea of Fārs. Part of it was in India and part in China (al-Ī斯塔ḵrī, 16, 19). Sind, according to al-Ī斯塔ḵrī, included Makrān, Tūrān and al-Budha. To the whole of its east lay the Sea of Fārs and to its west Kīrman, the desert of Sīkān and its districts. To its north lay the country of al-Hind and to its south a desert stretching between Makrān and al-Kufs, on the rear side of which lay the Sea of Fārs. The Sea of Fārs encircled these lands on the eastern side and to the south of this desert, because the sea stretched from Şāymūr (Chaul, in the Kolaba district of Bombay) towards the east roughly up to Tīz of Makrān; then it turned round this desert until it formed an area around Kīrman and Fārs (Jafri, 7). Exactly the same boundaries of...
Sind are given by Ibn Hawkal (Jafri, 12), who included in India, Sind, Kāghmīr and a portion of Tibet (Sūra, 9). Describing India's boundaries, he says that to its east lay the Sea of Fārs, to its west and south Khūrāsān and to its north China (Sūra, 12). According to him parts of Tibet lay in India and parts in China (Sūra, 15).

An exaggerated account of India's limits and boundaries is, however, found in Marvazi who says: "Their lands are numerous, with extensive features, and the outlying parts of them are far-flung, stretching from the borders of Makrān up to Tibet, so that they are considered the extreme bounds of the world. On cultivation and procreation cease and the existence of animals comes to an end" (Marvazi, 39). The anonymous author of Ḥudūd al-ʾDālam gives the following boundaries of Hindustan: east of it lay the countries of China and Tibet; south of it, the Great Sea, west of it the river Mīhrān (Indus); north of it, the country of Shākanān and some parts of Tibet (Ḥudūd al-ʾDālam, 86); and the boundaries of Sind given by him are: east of it is the river Mīhrān; south of it, the Great Sea; west of it, the province of Kirmān; north of it a desert adjacent to the Marches of Khūrāsān (Ḥudūd al-ʾDālam, 122).

The apparent disparity between al-ʾĪṣṭakhri and Ibn Hawkal on the one hand and the author of Ḥudūd al-ʾDālam on the other as noticed in the above accounts with regard to the boundaries of India, is not actual but due only to a difference in the way of looking at the maps used or drawn by them. Generally speaking, if the maps and the descriptions are read correctly, the Sea of Fārs or the Great Sea (Indian Ocean) lies to the south of India; China and Tibet to the north and east; Kirmān, Sīdījāstān, Kḥūrāsān, etc., to the west; and the relative positions of Sind and Hind are correct. Again, according to the reckoning of al-ʾĪṣṭakhri and Ibn Hawkal, the length of India from the borders of Makrān up to Tibet would be about 3600 Arabian miles or 3840 geographical miles (counting 1 day's journey to be an average of 30 Arabian miles). Similarly, the width of India from the Indian Ocean (Sea of Fārs) across Kānnavājī would be about 2700 Arabian miles or 2880 geographical miles.

(6) Regions: The western, north-western, southern and eastern regions of India were thoroughly surveyed by the early Muslim geographers and travellers both for political and for commercial reasons. Among the early writers Ibn Khurradāddibhī, the Merchant Sulaymān, al-Balādhūrī, al-Masʿūdī, al-Yaʿqūbī, Kudāmā b. Dīaʿfar, Ibn Rusta, Ibn al-Fakīh, al-ʾĪṣṭakhri, Ibn Hawkal, al-Mukaddasī, al-Khwārizmī and al-ʾIdrīsī give topographical accounts of western and southern India. Of these, those of al-Balādhūrī, al-ʾĪṣṭakhri, Ibn Hawkal and al-Mukaddasī are of special importance with regard to Sind and the Panjab. They not only furnish us with information on important cities and towns of these regions, but give distances and describe roads; their maps of these regions are of great value. The majority of the later Muslim writers seemed to have borrowed from them. The itineraries given by al-ʾĪṣṭakhri and Ibn Hawkal covering the region of India and some new areas not mentioned by the Muslim writers up to his time. Al-Bīrūnī was critical of the Indian method of measuring distances; so he uses the farshakh for his measurements. The Arab geographers also used the (Arabian) mile in their topographical accounts. Al-Bīrūnī gives the distances between important towns and ports of India and gives an approximate idea of the coastal regions by naming the important ports. From his topography one can get a sufficiently clear idea of the road-systems of India of this period. His information covers practically the whole of northern and central India as well as the western and eastern regions and parts of southern India. Moreover, his account is original and covers for the first time a detailed account of Kashmir. From the accounts of the Muslim geographers some idea about the regions of the country may be formed. Roughly speaking the following regions are described by them: (1) Sind, covering the region between Daybūl, al-Mansūra and Mūltān, including the lower course of the Indus; (2) Turān (covering parts of Turān or Kirmān and south Khurasān and to its north China); (3) Utrakhar (the coast along the coast of Sind and Baluchistan); (4) al-Kaṭṣmīr al-uṣūf (or al-Kaṭṣmīr al-ʾKhāridjī (the Panjab and the Himāchal Pradesh); (5) Dījazār al-Maydīn and Kaṭ or Kīš (Kachh and Kathīwār); (6) the land of al-Dijur or Dījarāt or Lāra-dešā (Gujarat and parts of Rajastān); (7) Mālīw (central India); (8) al-Kumkam (Konkan, Maharashtra); (9) Mīlbār or Manīlā (Keralā); (10) Kanara (Kanadā); (11) Māhī (Mahārāshtra); (12) Sūra (along the coast of Sind and Baluchistān); (13) Ṣūrān or Uwārīrāh (Orissa); (14) Bankāla (Bengal); Kāmrūr or Kāmīrūr (Kamarupa, Assām); (15) Gangāsāyāra (mouth of the Ganges); (16) Assām; (17) Naypāl (Nepal); (18) the mountains of sulphur 'or Ḥimān-mānīa (the Himalayan ranges); (19) Kaṭmīr al-dāḏgīlī or al-Kaṭmīr al-ʿulāt (Kashmir Valley); and (20) the country of Kanādī or al-Kanāndī, 'or Madhyadešā. It was so called because it was the centre of India from the geographical point of view in that it lay halfway between the sea (Indian Ocean) and the mountains (the Himalayas), and was in the middle of the hot and the cold provinces and also between the eastern and the western frontiers of India (A.l., 119).

(f) Ports and towns: Some of the important ports on the western coast of India with which the Arab navigators were acquainted and which are described by Arab geographers and travellers in their accounts are: Daybūl (mediaeval main port of Sind, near modern Karachī), Barīḏi or Barāḏ (Broach), Sīnān (Sāndān, 50 miles north of Thana, Bombay), Sūbārā (Sopara, near Bassein, in the Thana district of Bombay), Tānā (Thana), Shāymūr (modern Chaul, in the Kolaba district of Bombay), Sīdījāstān or Šāykhān (modern Chach), and the main mediaeval port and the capital of Sind, Ibn Bīṭāṭa, 363-4; but Nānair identifies it with Shādāshīvagad (Nainar, 74)), Hannaur (Honavar), Mānḍārāv or Manḍā (Mangalore), Ḥill (the name of the mediaeval kingdom, Ili or Elī, has left a trace in Mount Delly. The mediaeval port is probably now represented by the village of Nileshwar, a few miles north of the promontory, cf. Gibb, Ibn Bīṭāṭ, 364), Pāndāraya (identified with Panḍanarī or Bārūva (the region facing Ceylon on the Indian coast); (12) al-Maʿbar (the Coromandel Coast, Madras); (13) ʿUrsān or Uwārīrāh (Orissa); (14) Bankāla (Bengal); Kāmrūr or Kāmīrūr (Kamarupa, Assām); (15) Gangāsāyāra (mouth of the Ganges); (16) Assām; (17) Naypāl (Nepal); (18) the mountains of sulphur or Ḥimān-mānīa (the Himalayan ranges); (19) Kaṭmīr al-dāḏgīlī or al-Kaṭmīr al-ʿulāt (Kashmir Valley); and (20) the country of Kanānūr or al-Kanāndūr, or 'Madhyadešā. It was so called because it was the centre of India from the geographical point of view in that it lay halfway between the sea (Indian Ocean) and the mountains (the Himalayas), and was in the middle of the hot and the cold provinces and also between the eastern and the western frontiers of India (A.l., 119).

The main sea-ports of the east coast of India described by the Muslim geographers are: Ballībul (probably Negapatam; it was from here that the Arab sea-route to the east bifurcated. Arab boats lay at anchor here for some months; then, those bound for China sailed straight to the Nicobar Islands, and others, going to Bengal and Assam, sailed north), Kandī (Conjeevaram) and Samundar or Sumundar (an important mediaeval Indian port visited by the Arabs. V. Minorsky places it south of Baruva and north of Ganjam, see Ḥudūd al-ʾDālam, 244. However, the more probable identification is with the Sunur
Kāwān (Sonargaon) of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, see Gibb, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 271).
The number of inland cities and towns described by Arab writers is too large to be mentioned here fully. We may, however, enumerate some of the more important towns: Mandāra/Mansūriyya (the Arab capital of Sind); ruins of the town 25 miles to the north-east of Haydārābd, Sind; Nirn (at the site of the present Haydārābd, Sind); Māltān, Kannawedī, Nahrwāra/Anbālā (Patan, Gujarāt); Asāwāl (Asāpallā, near Ahmedabad, Gujarāt); Kanbāyā (Cambay) and Mālwā (Mand or Udījadīn); then, Tānjōre, Rāmēshgār (Rameshwaram), Mandārānīn (Mandāpputtān, Mandapām), Sonnāt (Sonnath), Dāhār, Uzayn (Udījadīn), Māghār (Mewār), Mahārā (Mathura), Kālāndār, Kālīrī (Gwalior), Kāgūrārā (Khaḍjūrāh), Aḥjīdhā (Adhijhada), Bānārāsī (Varānasi), Bāṭlpūtra (Patna), Munkīrī (Monghyr), Kūzdrār (Khozdrār), Arūr (Rohri), Parāsvar (Peshawar), Dījēlām (Jhelum), Sālkūt (Sialkot), Rādjkīri (Radjīpur), Sunnām, Mirāt (Merut), Tānēshgār (Thanesar) and Adhīstān (Srinagar); then Uvvārīh (Uryaḍēśa), Prayaḵ (Aluhammad), and Vayhind (Oihn, which lay between the Indus and the Kabul river, just above their confluence, Ṣulād al-Qāμ), 253-4); then, Dili (Deli), Dalwatābd the proposed capital of Muhammad b. Tughluk (Gibb, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 204), Hānsī, Sūkāwān (Satgaon), Surun-kāwān (Sonargaon), Koel (old Aligah) and Maitra (Madura).

(g) Islands: The word ḍastra was used by the Muslim geographers both for an 'island' and a 'peninsula'. Thus, al-Maṭḥ (Kathiarāv), Kūlām Malāy (Quilin), etc. are described by some as 'islands'. Among the islands of India, the Maldives (al-Dibadāṭ) (meaning 'the Islands' from Sanskrit Diva, with the Perso-Arabic plural termination -ad[dt]), the Andaman and the Nicobar (Lanahādāṭ) Islands are described in great detail. The Maldives were famous for boat-building activities and for the craftsman-ship of their artisans. These islands were ruled by a queen, who had a capital on the Island called Aḥbīrīya (probably Ptolemy's Eirthn, see al-Idrīsī, India, 24 and [comm.] 174).

Arab merchant boats on the way to China also called at the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. The inhabitants of the former are described by Sulaymān as cannibals, having curly hair, ugly faces and long legs and those of the latter as being white in colour and having scanty beards (Aḥkār, 5, 8).

(b) Climate, Soil and Crops: On the basis of the information provided by the Muslim geographers one can form a rough idea of the climatic conditions, the soil and other topics relating to physical geography. The climate of India is generally described as hot and some geographers compare it to that of Ethiopia and describe the common features between them. Al-Bīrūnī describes the Hindu division of the year into three parts; 1. Varaḥkāhā, beginning with the month of Aḥšāḥdā; 2. Ṣīṭakālā (i.e., the winter); and 3. Uṣghnākālā (i.e., the summer). But his actual description of the climatic conditions seems to pertain mainly to northern India. He says, "the rains are the more copious and last the longer the more northward the situation of a province of India is, and the less it is intersected by ranges of mountains". Mūltān had no rains but in Bhāṭal and Indravēdī (Antarvedi, the old name of the lower Doab, extending from about Etawah to Allahabad, 231) it rained for four months heavily and incessantly, beginning from Ṣāhādā, as though buckets full of water were being poured out. Around the mountains of Kashmir up to the peak of Dīdārī it rained heavily for two and a half months, beginning with Šravāṇa; on the other side of this peak, there were no rains. Hence, Kashmir had no ṣarājkāhā but continuous snowfall during two and a half months, beginning with Māgha, and shortly after the middle of Chaitra, it melted away in for a few days, melting the snow and cleaning the earth. This rule, he says, has an exception; however, a certain amount of extraordinary meteorological occurrence was peculiar to every province of India (op. cit., i, 211-2).

The rainy season was considered to be the most important season of India by almost all Muslim geographers. Sulaymān describes the rains as being very heavy (Aḥkār, 15). The soil of India is usually spoken of very highly by the Muslim geographers. Passages relating to cultivated lands and agriculture are also found in their writings, as are those pertaining to waste-lands, mountainous regions and deserts.

Seasonal crops are also described by Muslim geographers. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, describing those of northern India, mentions the following as the grains of the kharīf crop: al-ṣubhārī (a kind of millet) in abundance; al-shāmāk, Panicum frumentaceum, (called to-day sānā or sānād in the eastern districts of Uttar Pradesh, and sānaw in its western districts and in Panjab); it was cooked with buffalo milk and formed the food of the 'good and poor people'; al-māṣ (Indian peas); al-māḥā (moong); lābyā (haricots); al-māt (moth); and barley. The grains of the rabi crop were: wheat, chick-peas and lentils. Rice had three crops in the year and India produced a type with large grains. Sesame and sugar-cane were cultivated in the kharīf season. Referring to the food of the people of Nahrwāra (Patan, Gujarāt) al-Idrīsī says that it consisted of rice, chick-peas, beans, haricots, lentils, Indian peas, fish and animals that died a natural death (al-Idrīsī, India, 60-1).

(i) Mountain ranges: Not all the Muslim geographers had an overall view of the mountain ranges of India, though many of them describe ranges that they knew either through first-hand knowledge (which was very rare) or through earlier original sources. The Himalayas, the mountains of Kashmir, the Kamarupa Mountains (Kāmarūṇ), the ranges of the Western Ghats, the hills of Kathiarāv (Girnar Hills, Maruṣi, 43), the mountains of Thana (Tāhā) and a few other mountain ranges of India were known to many, but few go into the details of these ranges or describe their exact locations or directions. A very early attempt, though based on Ptolemy's account, was made by al-Kūhwārizmī, who gives the geographical positions of many of the Indian ranges (see Śīrāl al-arād). Following the same Ptolemaic system and sources, al-Idrīsī also gives the Ptolemic names of many of the Indian mountains (e.g., Ḫindarān, Gr. Ouindion = Vidhya Mountains) and adds some additional ones known to the Arabs.

A clear picture of India's mountain ranges is, however, presented by al-Bīrūnī and by the Hудād al-Qāام. Al-Bīrūnī describes mainly the mountains of the north, north-west and the north-east. Describing the Himāvanta (Himalaya) he says that the mountains formed the boundaries (north, north-west and east) of India. In the middle of the snowy
Himavanta lay Kashmir, and they were connected with the country of the Turks. "The mountain region becomes colder and colder till the end of the inhabitable world and Mount Meru" (A.I., i, 258).

Al-Biruni conceived of the Himalayas as extending longitudinally; the rivers that arose on their northern side flowed into the Caspian Sea, the Aral Sea, the Black Sea or the Baltic, whereas those that arose on the southern slopes passed through India and some flowed into 'the great ocean' (Indian Ocean), either singly or jointly (op. cit., i, 258). The mountain region of Kamru (Kamarup, Assam), according to him, stretched as far as the sea (i, 281). He also describes some Tibetan ranges, on the authority of a certain traveller. From Bhōtēshar (bhauta-śvara, lord of the bhautas, or Tibetans, A.I., annotations, i, 318) to "the top of the highest peak is 20 farasāh. From the height of this mountain, India appears as a black expanse below the mist, the mountains lying below this peak like small hills, and Tibet and China appear as red. The descent towards Tibet and China is less than one farasāh" (op. cit., i, 201-2).

He describes Kashmir as being surrounded by "high and inaccessible mountains" (i, 206). Kulārdjak mountain is described as a cupola, and here the snow and inaccessible mountains "comprise the Himalaya, Karakorum, Pamir and the ranges north longitudinally; the rivers that arose on their southern slopes passed through India and some flowed into "the great ocean" (Indian Ocean), either singly or jointly (A.I., i, 258). The mountain peak of Kamru (Kamarup, Assam) is described as stretching as far as the sea (i, 281). He also describes some Tibetan ranges, on the authority of a certain traveller. From Bhōtēshar (bhauta-śvara, lord of the bhautas, or Tibetans, A.I., annotations, i, 318) to "the top of the highest peak is 20 farasāh. From the height of this mountain, India appears as a black expanse below the mist, the mountains lying below this peak like small hills, and Tibet and China appear as red. The descent towards Tibet and China is less than one farasāh" (op. cit., i, 201-2).

He describes Kashmir as being surrounded by "high and inaccessible mountains" (i, 206). Kulārdjak mountain is described as a cupola, and here the snow and inaccessible mountains "comprise the Himalaya, Karakorum, Pamir and the ranges north longitudinally; the rivers that arose on their southern slopes passed through India and some flowed into "the great ocean" (Indian Ocean), either singly or jointly (A.I., i, 258). The mountain peak of Kamru (Kamarup, Assam) is described as stretching as far as the sea (i, 281).

Besides these two main river-systems, among the other large rivers of India described by the Muslim geographers are: the Narmada, SarsutI (Sarasvati), the Brahmaputra; the Meghna, called "the Blue river" by Ibn Batūta (Gibb, Ibn Batūta, 272); a Nahr al-Tīb is also mentioned by some (al-Idrisi, India, 111-2, tentatively identified by me with the Godavari or the Kistna). There are many other smaller rivers and rivulets described by them, the details of which it is not possible to give here.

(k) Flora: Among fruits, the citron is specially described (al-Masūdī, Murūdī, i, 238). According to Ibn Batūta sweet oranges were found in abundance in India, but the sour variety was rare. There was a third variety with a taste between sweet and sour and about the size of a citron (al-īm) (Ibn Batūta, iii, 120). Jack-fruit (Ar.: al-īqāt wa l-ībarr, Malayalam: chakka; Hindi: kaṭhal) is mentioned (al-Idrisi, India, 34; Ibn Batūta, i, 127). Mango (Ar.: al-anbā, Hindi: ām; Marathi: amb), and the condiments prepared from it are described in detail (al-Idrisi, India, 34, 35; Ibn Batūta, i, 125-6; Iṣṭākhrī, 173; Ibn Hawkal, 320; al-Muḥammadī, 482). It is compared with peach in taste. Maḥvūd (Bassia sparsifolia or B. amara) was, according to the lattī (iii, 129), found in abundance in Delhi and some other parts of India. Jāman (Ar.: al-yamānā, Eugenia jambolana) is described by many Arab geographers (Iṣṭākhrī, 173; Ibn Hawkal, 320; al-Muḥammadī, 482; al-Idrisi, India, 42; Ibn Batūta, i, 128). Figs and grapes were rare in India according to the Arab writers. Among some fruits mentioned by Ibn Batūta (iii, 125-9) are tēndā (tendā is Diospyros ebenum or pluotinosa); kaṣrā (kaṣera is a fibrous root eaten as a fruit, Scirpus kysor, see Fr. tr. at iii, 129). Al-Kalḵašandī (Spies, 49) describes several fruits: sugar-cane, bananas, date-palms, peaches, mulberries, jujube, quince, pears, apples, and green and yellow melons. Sugar-cane (kaḥs al-sukkar) is usually described by the writers on Sind and Makrān, where sugar-candy (Ar.: al-fanidh, spiced sugar-candy: ἵππεια) was manufactured from it in abundance.

Of the plants and woods, bamboo (al-ḳasb or ḵhayawūrīn) is described as growing in abundance in the mountains of Thana (Maharashtra), see al-Idrisi, India, 62-3; the plant whose bark was used by the ancient Indians as paper is called by al-Masūdī bāṣhī (Murūdī, i, 202), but al-Biruni gives the correct spelling, tārī (tār, Borassus flabelliformis),
A.I., i, 171. This was not the same as bhoojjattar-bark which came from a tree said to be a kind of birch (Betula khoujpra) used in making babu-snakes (Shakespeare, s.v.).

The betel leaf (Ar.: tarnbili, Hindi: pān; leaf of Piper betel) was according to al-Mas'udi (Murādī, ii, 84) very popular with the Arabs of Yemen and Hīdżār, and especially in Mecca. The coconut tree and the pepperplant (al-fūjī) are described by many. Al-bahābām (Brazil-wood, Caesalpinia sappan) was found in many parts of southern India (Al-Biruni, India, 63-4). Indian cotton is described as being superior to that grown in Baghdad (al-Kalkašandī, Spies, 93). Aloe-wood (al-'ud) grew in abundance in the mountains of Kamarūp (Assam) (al-Ifrīṣī, India, 64) and the Indian variety is described as the best in the world. It was called Bahkālī (of Bengal) and Samandarūk (of Samundar, see above), see al-Bīrūnī, Shi'ī, 128. The banyan tree is mentioned by many writers (see al-Mas'ūdī, Murūdī, ii, 81-3).

A variety of vegetables and aromatic plants are mentioned, e.g., cucumber, pumpkin, egg-plant, turnip, carrot, asparagus, ginger, onion, garlic, fennel, thyme, cardamom, tamarind (Ar.: thamar) and the Indian variety is described as the best. Among other plants, thyme, cardamom, tamarind (Ar.: thamar) and the pepperplant (al-fūjī) are described. For making ornaments, etc. Strange (al-Bīrūnī thought it a commodity used for making ornaments, etc).

(ii) Fauna: A variety of Indian wild and domestic animals are mentioned, but the elephant occupies the most important place in the geographical accounts for its various qualities and its great size (Ibn Khurrādaḏbih, 67; al-Ifrīṣī, India, 36; Ibn Rūsta, 134; Marwāzī, 46-7; Buzurg b. Shahrīyāt, ʿĀdīḏb, 163-5; al-Mas'ūdī, Murūdī, iii, 11-20). The Indian rhinoceros (al-baktī) is also described for its commercial value. Its horn was a very precious commodity used for making ornaments, etc. Strange stories connected with it are also mentioned (see Ibn Khurrādaḏbih, 67-8; al-Mas'ūdī, Murūdī, i, 385-7; al-Ifrīṣī, India, 30-1).

(ii)—ETHNOGRAPHY

The Indian sub-continent has been divided since 1947 into the two nations of India and Pakistan, with populations of 439,234,771 and 93,720,613 respectively (all statistics refer to 1961). The 82,536,614 Muslims of Pakistan comprise 89% of the total population (97% in West Pakistan and 80% in East Pakistan), the only sizable minority being the 4,386,623 caste Hindus and 4,993,046 scheduled castes in the latter Province. India's population contains 46,939,357 (10.69%) Muslims.

The proportion of Muslims is greatest in the areas of the Indian sub-continent as follows:

1.23%. Diammu and Kashmir contains 2,432,067 ed. M. J. De Goeje, Leiden 1906 (BGA, iii); Marwāzī = Sharāf al-Zamān Tāhir Marvāzī on China, the Turks and India, Ar. text ed. with Eng. tr. and commentary by V. Minorsky, London 1942; Nainar = S. M. H. Nainar, Arab explorers' knowledge of southern India, Madras 1942; Shakespeare = J. A. Shakespeare, Dictionary of Hindustani and English, and English and Hindustani, London 1849. (S. MAQBUL AHMAD)

Bibliography: in the text, where it has been convenient to employ the following abbreviations (for further to those listed at the beginning of the volume):

Baluchistan and Sind, where the density is often less than 10 per sq. mile, matched in India only in western Rajasthan. The net increase in population, and the consequent high densities in certain regions, pose the most severe problems of land shortage and create a need for urgent economic development.

Several physical types can be distinguished in the sub-continent. There are few Muslims amongst the Mongolid peoples in the Himalayan region or amongst the Veddoid tribal peoples in the hills of central and eastern India; most are either of the short-nosed, dolichocephalic Mediterranean type associated with the pre-Aryan population, or of the taller, fairer and dolichocephalic Mediterranean type. These latter types are mixed in the various regions, though the former predominates in the south and the latter in the north-west, and it would be erroneous to give the terms Dravidian and Aryan to them, these being best used for the two main families of languages spoken in the sub-continent.

Muslims in each language area speak the regional tongue, but many also have a knowledge of Urdu, particularly in West Pakistan, the Gangetic plain, and those parts of India where Muslim princes ruled before 1947. Diacritical features, such as dress, headgear and type of beard may distinguish Muslims from others; so may diet, styles of poetry and music and other secular cultural traits. On the other hand, some social features are common to all inhabitants of both nations.

The overwhelming majority of the population of the sub-continent is rural (82% in India and 87% in Pakistan). Pastoralists are found in the more arid zones; estates growing rubber, tea and coffee exist in both countries and have an economic importance stronger links with urban markets and with wider economic activities. In India, their importance varies partly with the statuses of the Hindu castes from which many were converted, and partly with the degree to which they have been able to maintain and wherever necessary adapt economic and political positions acquired before and during the period of British rule to conditions in independent India. In Pakistan, of course, Muslims fill virtually all economic and political roles.

The urban population lives both in small towns which function as markets and administrative centres, and in the larger cities. Pakistan has three of these, viz., Karachi (1,926,000) [see KARACHI], Lahore (1,297,477) [see LAHAWR] and Dacca (556,712) [see DHAKA]. India has 12 cities with over half a million inhabitants of which the largest are Bombay (4,152,056) and Calcutta (2,927,289). The process of industrialization has produced a growing managerial and professional middle class and a skilled labour force drawn from different strata of the rural population. This is larger in India than in Pakistan, where industrialization started to a large extent only after 1947, and it supplements the traditional urban classes of traders and artisans, notably those of the Memon, Bohorah and Khodja communities, whose members play an important
part in the economy of western India and Pakistan. The most important social distinction among Muslims is between the Ashraf, Muslims of foreign ancestry, and those descended from local converts. The division among Ashraf between Sayyid, Shaykh, Mughal and Pathan is recognized throughout the sub-continent. Sayyids are those reckoning descent from the Prophet through his daughter Fatima; Shaykhs are said to be descended from the early Muslims of Mecca and Medina; the Mughals entered the sub-continent in the armies of the dynasty of that name; and the Pathans are members of Pashto-speaking tribes of north-west and Afghanistan. Muslims of this twofold role, pirs have considerable spiritual and secular influence, particularly in West Pakistan where many of the society which surrounds Muslims in India.

Cross- or parallel-cousin marriage amongst many castes. The Sayyid is hypergamous; they observe rules of restricted interdining or divorce and polygamous marriages support, by a liberal interpretation of Qur'anic injunctions, a general policy in favour of male collaterals, except when the former have themselves married agnates. Pakistan law has now started to replace such customary law by Islamic personal law in this and other domestic contexts. For example, new provisions safeguarding divorce and polygamous marriages by councils of prominent men.

Social distinctions in Pakistan, as well as being between Ashraf and non-Ashraf are also between groups of different socio-economic status, especially between landowners and artisans. The Sayyid is given the highest social status and the Musalli the lowest according to values attached to their occupation and descent; but there are no ritually-based restrictions on social intercourse of the kind existing in the society which surrounds Muslims in India. Hence, stratification in Pakistan is based more on property being divided amongst both sons and daughters, customary procedure has normally excluded daughters in favour of male collaterals, except when the former have themselves married agnates. Pakistan law has now started to replace such customary law by Islamic personal law in this and other domestic contexts. For example, new provisions safeguarding divorce and polygamous marriages support, by a liberal interpretation of Qur'anic injunctions, a general policy in favour of increased women's rights.

The vast majority of Muslims are members of the Sunni sect, and of these some two-thirds of the Muslim population of both countries adheres to the Hanafi legal school, those belonging to the Shafi'i being found mainly among Mappillas; Sunnis with Wahhabi tendencies exist in Uttar Pradesh, East Pakistan, and in the northwestern areas of West Pakistan. There are, in addition, smaller groups of Sunnis, of which the most important are the Memons, to be found in the major cities on the west coast, the Mahdawis of Gudjarat and the Dikris of Baluchistan. Lastly, mention must be made of the Ahmadiyya sect whose two branches, the Lahawri and the Kadiyan (the latter now settled in Rabwah, West Pakistan) are proselytizers overseas and active in the educational and social fields at home. Of the Shi'i, the bulk of the Ijna'-'ashariyya division is found in Uttar Pradesh and thereabouts, with Lucknow (Lakna) as the main centre. Of the Isma'ili, Bohoras and Khodjas (including the Agha Khani sect) are found in most major cities, especially in western India and in West Pakistan.

At a district level from these divisions lies the network of allegiances held by a very large number of Muslims to pirs. Some of these pirs are members of bai'char Shi'i orders, of which the most important are the Chishtiyya, the Suhrawardiya, the Kadiyya and the Naqshbandiya (qq.v.); others are members of bi'char orders (see IBAHATIYYA); and yet others are not formally adherents of any order, but are simply ascetics with personal followings. The orders are centred at major shrines, such as those of Khwaja Mu'in al-Din at Admari and Shaykh Farid al-Din Shakarganj at Peshawar for the Chishti order; but besides these there are many minor shrines whose guardians (sometimes the descendants of the person buried there) have taken on the duties of a pir. These include the instruction and spiritual guidance of disciples (murids) who may enter the order or may remain as lay disciples, and the provision of aid for secular problems such as illness and family difficulties to both disciples and other followers. The roles of spiritual guide (mureghid) and of general helper are combined in the pir, but a person can have only one pir as his mureghid, whereas he can go to various pir for aid. As a result, the role of pir has considerable spiritual and secular influence, particularly in West Pakistan where many
of the main shrines are situated, and where Sufism first entered the sub-continent. Distinct from these activities is the worship at the mosque. Most villages in Pakistan have a mullah and there are often several mosques, one of which is used for the Friday prayers. In many cases, however, the mullah has less influence than has the pir. Formerly, there was considerable syncretism of Hinduism and Islam, particularly in the Pandjâb and its environs and among the less educated; there are references to the mixed composition of devotees at shrines and to the image of saints being given both Hindu and Muslim aspects. Since 1947, however, this pattern has greatly diminished, though examples of it are still to be found in rural India.

Detailed ethnographies of the Muslims of the subcontinent are rare, and a great deal of research needs to be carried out before an authoritative account can be given of the social organization and culture of Muslims there and of their relations to fellow citizens of other religions.


(A. C. Mayer)

iii. Languages.

The presence of four great language families in the sub-continent is due to several waves of invasion by different ethnic groups in prehistoric and early historic times. The oldest such family appears to be the Mundâ (which, with Khati spoken in the Assam hills and classified with the Mon-Khmer family, is sometimes regarded as "Austro-Asiatic"; but not enough is known about the affiliations of Mundâ for this interpretation to be acceptable to all scholars), spoken by over 6 million speakers, of whom the Santali, with over 3 m. speakers, are the most numerous. Small though the numbers are, the Mundâ languages are important in Indian linguistic history, partly as providing the linguistic substratum for some languages now classified in other families, and partly as a source of borrowed words and constructions in other, more important, languages. These languages have had no connexion with Islam.

The Dravidian (Sanskrit Drâvidâ-) family extends mainly over southern India, and its original connexions with language families outside India have not been determined. It is generally assumed that the Dravidian speakers occupied a much more extensive area of India, including the north and north-west, before the Aryan invasions; both the presence of a pocket of Dravidian speakers, the Brâhui, in Balochis-

than, and the linguistic evidence of early Dravidian influences on Sanskrit, are consistent with this assumption. The problem of the language of the inscriptions of the seals found in the Indus Valley civilizations of Harâppâ and Mohenjodâro is not at present soluble; internal philological evidence from the Rigveda suggests that these cities were those overrun by the early Aryans ca. 1500 B.C., but this neither proves nor disproves that their civilization was Dravidian. There are now some 108 m. speakers of Dravidian languages: 30 m. Tamil, in Madrâs; 17 m. Malayalam in Kerala; Kannada (Hosapura) 17 m., in Mysore; 38 m. Telugu, in Andhra; rather under 1 million speaking Tulu, and another 3 m. speaking the "tribal" Dravidian languages in north Madrâs, Ûrûs, and districts of central India, of which Gondi, with 14 m. speakers, is the most important; recent figures for Brâhui are not available, but there are probably less than 50,000 speakers. Of these languages Tamil, Telugu, Kannada and Malayalam alone have any written literature, but in these four the literature is rich and, at least in the case of Tamil, goes back to the early centuries of the Christian era. Brâhui is the only Dravidian language to be spoken exclusively by Muslims; some others are spoken by small Muslim minorities, e.g., Malayâlam by the Mâppilla [q.v.] community in Kerala; Tamil by some Muslims in Madrâs state and in Ceylon, having a small Islamic literature (see Tâmîl); Kannada and Telugu to a lesser extent in Mysore and in the former Hyderabad state [see HAYDARABÄD], where the preferred language of Muslims is Ûrû or Dakhîn (see further below).

The Indo-Aryan languages [q.v.], the Indian branch of Aryan or Indo-Iranian, the most easterly representative of the Indo-European language family, were introduced into India during the Aryan conquest of the second millennium B.C. The earliest literary remains show little difference between the Indian side, as represented by the hymns of the Rigveda, and the Iranian side, as represented by the Gâtähas of the Avesta. The Rigveda represents a north-west Indian linguistic development; a more central variety of the Indo-Aryan speech became elaborated and "purified" (sam-vatâ or a[v]a-) into [classical] Sanskrit, the language of the sacred texts of Hinduism. The position of Sanskrit in India has been comparable to that of Latin in Europe: a language cultivated for religious and literary purposes, and consequently enjoying a high prestige; its artificial form has been preserved to the present day, and its influence has been considerable and constant on all the other languages of India, Dravidian as well as Indo-Aryan. Sanskrit has had a little importance for Islam in India: several rulers have patronized Sanskrit poets and Sanskrit learning; translations have been made at their orders from literary and religious works [see, for example, DÄRÄ GURÜH]; and a few Sanskrit inscriptions refer to the works of Muslim rulers and others. From colloquial dialects originally contemporary with Sanskrit arose the Prâkrit ("natural") speech (including the language of the Avestan inscriptions; cf. one of the sacred languages of Buddhism; Sauraseni and Ardhhâmâ-gâdhi, the languages of Jainism), which by about the end of the first millennium A.D. had become the early stages of those different modern Indo-Aryan languages which are now spoken all over north India and Pakistan.

There are some 320 million speakers of Indo-Aryan languages in India. The following figures, reduced to round millions, are based on the 1962
census returns: Marathi, with Konkani, 35 m.; Urdu, 23 m.; Pandjabi 21 m.; Gudjarati 20 m., Bhili 24 m., Rädjátáhiñi dialects 15 m.; Pahári speeches 44 m.; Sindhi 14 m. These figures do not, of course, include speakers of Urdu, Bengali, Pandjabi and Sindhi in Pakistan. For most of the languages the areas in which they are spoken is obvious, as since 1936 India has been organized on a system of "linguistic states": thus, Gudjarati is the language of Gudjarat, etc. Hindi [q.v.] above includes both Western Hindi and Eastern Hindi, which properly belong to different groups of the central speech; Urdu [q.v.] is linguistically a form of Western Hindi, separated by higher vocabulary and by script (see further below); Western Hindi, written in the form of script called Nágarí or Devanágarí, is now the official language of the Indian Union, and it may be suspected that the figure given above has been somewhat inflated by Indians anxious to show the national language as their mother-tongue, as the 1961 census seems to have been carried out without any discrimination on the part of the recorders. Hindi and Urdu [see also the art. HINDUSTÁN] have as their homeland the western U.P. (United Provinces [scil. of Ágrá and Awadí] = Uttar Párdha), especially the upper Ganges dásbáh around Máríthá ("Méerut"); but they, or their lowest common denominator, the Hindustání, are spoken over the whole of northern and western India and western Pakistan as a lingua franca, and Urdu (or, in the south, its archaïc sister Dákhni) is the common language of Indian Muslims. All these Indo-Aryan languages, Urdu not excepted, are influenced to a greater or lesser degree by borrowings from Sanskrit. The most important of these languages, in the Islamic world, are firstly Urdu, Bengali, Sindhi, and in Britain and India, national and official languages of West and East Pakistan, both with a considerable amount of Muslim literature of all genres; Sindhi is most usually written in a modified variety of the Persian script by Sindhi Hindúus as well as by the Muslims of Sind, but has little literary cultivation; Hindi, on the other hand, although thought of usually as a "Hindu" form of language, has a considerable Muslim element in its extensive literature, both mediaeval and modern under Islamic influence and modern under 19th and 20th century Muslim writers, and indeed some modern writers have published virtually the same works in Hindi and Urdu forms; Pandjabi is used beside Urdu as the speech of Muslims in the Pandjáb, although the bulk of Pandjabi writing is Sikh inspired and in the Gurmukhi script; Gudjaráti is the common speech of Muslims in Gudjarát as well as an impure Urdu with many Gudjaráti loans, but except for a little religious and sectarian literature is not much cultivated by local Muslims for literary purposes; Gudjaráti is also the Indian language adopted by the Parsí community.

The Iranian branch of Indo-Iranian is represented in Pakistan by Balcíñ with perhaps 1 m. speakers, an archaïc variety of Persian; and by Pagháñ [q.v.] with about 2 m. speakers, an archaic variety of Persian; and by Pashto [q.v.] with perhaps 7 m. speakers, an archaic variety of Persian; and by Pashto [q.v.], with about 2 m. speakers in Pakistan and many more in Afghanistan, with a considerable literature of its own in a script modified from that of Persian, and in some use also as a lingua franca in the north-west; it has borrowed much from Indian sources. There are also a few minor Iranian tongues, known collectively as Ghalá, in the Pámír region. By far the most significant of the Iranian languages in India, however, is Persian itself. Nowhere now a mother-tongue of any community in the sub-continent, it was for long the medium of communication of the Muslim élite and the major literary vehicle of Islam in India, the official language of the Mughal court as long as it lasted and of some independent states (e.g., Háraldarábád) until the present century, and in the late 18th century even the proceedings of the English courts of the East India Company were recorded in Persian; it was a necessary subject of study for the educated Hindú as well as for the Muslim until English became the ascendant language in India, and it was probably through the Hindú scribes—mostly of the Dásbáh class—during the Mughal administration that large numbers of Persian words and expressions became current in north Indian languages; the Indian contribution to Persian literature is considerable [see IRÁN, Literature], the various histories compiled under the Muslim rulers being the prime source of Indian history for the mediaeval period. Persian is also the usual language of Muslim inscriptions in India, except for the pre-Mughal period in Bengal [see SINDH]. Besides its importance in its own right, Persian has exercised a deep influence on the vocabulary of all Indo-Aryan languages (and indeed to a lesser extent Dravidian languages also), most especially Hindi and Urdu; but whereas Hindi, especially the mixed variety which emanates from Indian official sources, draws its culture-words and expressions of modern abstract concepts from Sanskrit, Urdu continues to draw on Persian for such expressions, including a vast corpus of words borrowed or derived from Arabic. The effect of these progressive changes has been to make modern Hindi and Urdu almost mutually unintelligible, although they are essentially the same language; Hindi has probably advanced further than Urdu in the direction of unintelligibility to the uneducated peasant. Urdu, and to some extent Bengali, Pandjabi, and Gudjaráti, have also borrowed from Persian certain of its literary genres; the gházál, for example, is not known in Hindí or Maráthí literature. Of other Indo-Iranian languages, lying between the Iranian and the Indo-Aryan branches, are the Dardic and Káfír languages [q.v.], although the former are probably to be looked at as a group of Indo-Aryan languages which, isolated from the innovations of IA in the plains, have developed on their own. Of the finely divided sub-continent languages in the north-west of Pakistan and Kashmir, are numerically insignificant, and have no literature, except for Káshmíri [q.v.] itself, which has 2 m. speakers in India and perhaps 1 m. more in Pakistan.

The fourth language family represented in the sub-continent is the Tíbeto-Burman, introduced particularly in north-eastern India by migration rather than by invasion. It includes Tibetan itself and some closely related Himaláyan languages, a group of eastern 'pronominalized' Himaláyan languages with a Mundá substratum, the Boro and Nágá groups in Assam. These are all minor tribal languages of no numerical significance and of no importance for Islam, except only for Búlít spoken by Muslims in the north of Kashmir and written in a form of Punjabi script and made to look more familiar by some. One language spoken in the extreme north of Pakistan has not yet been related to any other language family; this is Burushaski [q.v. in Supplement]. Of the non-Indian languages spoken in the sub-continent by far the most extensive is English, which, introduced by the East India Company, quickly became the important language of commerce and later of general communication for the educated
Indian. It is still an official language of government in both Pakistan and India, is the general vehicle of higher education and hence the vehicle for the diffusion of European culture and ideas in both dominions, and is indeed the only pan-Indian language (the known English has more appeal than the unknown Hindi for the south Indian). There is extensive publication in English in both India and Pakistan, including a vigorous daily press; there are many specialist and popular Islamic publications, and probably English is of more account than are Persian and Arabic in maintaining touch with the doings of the rest of the Islamic world. In the 18th century Portuguese was an important language of trade, which lingered on in Bengal, in the face of heavy English competition, until the 1820s (T. W. Clark, *The languages of Calculutta*, 1760-1840, in *BSOAS*, xviii (1956), 433-74); it was in use also in the ports on the west coast of India, and was in official use beside Konkani in Goa until the departure of the Portuguese; there is a considerable Portuguese loan-word element in most Indian languages. French was used as a language of administration in the former French possessions, but had very little effect on Indian languages beyond providing for some a window on European culture; this aspect has in fact been extended in independent India through the French cultural centre in Pondicherry.

The Arabic element has been referred to above in connexion with Persian, which is linguistically the source of most of Arabic borrowing; but Arabic is of considerable importance in its own right as the language par excellence of Islam. It has been studied in the madrasas as the essential linguistic tool of Islamic studies since the first establishment of Islamic power in India, and has been the vehicle of much writing in India on Kur'anic exegesis, hadith, fiqh, tasawwuf, and grammar. The earliest inscriptions of the Dihli sultanate are in Arabic, and Arabic was used in preference to Persian in the inscriptions of pre-Mughal Bengal; but it never seems to have been used as the language of an élite as was Persian, and as a spoken language seldom went beyond the purpose of theological discussion. The exception was among the bands of Arab mercenaries who were much in demand at some courts. Some Semitic or Hamitic language was presumably once spoken by the Habshî [q.v.] community, but no study of the modern Habshî communities, even at Djandjira, has been made by a competent scholar to determine the affinities of their present language.

Indian languages are little spoken outside the subcontinent (Ceylon, of course, is taken as belonging to the Indian linguistic area; the main language is Sinhalese, an Indo-Aryan language, and the Dravidian Tamil is spoken by Indian immigrants in the north) except by emigré communities: Gudjarâti and some Hindi/Urdu by Indian communities in East Africa, a dialect of Eastern Hindi by Indians in Fiji, Pandjâbi by Sikhs in various parts of the world but especially in south-east Asia and eastern Iran, Tamil by some labouring communities in Malaya, while Sanskrit and Pâli are studied, if not spoken, in east and south-east Asia and the East Indies as the sacred languages of Buddhism. The only Indian language to have reached Europe is the Gypsy or Romani, with European, Armenian and Syrian branches; whether recent Indian and Pakistânî immigrants to Europe and America will retain anything of their own cultures after another two generations is doubtful.

**Scripts.**—The native Indian scripts are all arranged on the same principle: they are syllabaries, not alphabets, in that each unit of writing is either a vowel or a consonant-cluster followed by a vowel; all vowels other than a are expressed by signs above, below, before or after the consonant-characters; where consonant-characters are written without vowel-sign the vowel a is considered to be inherent in the character. There are thus three categories of symbol: vowel-character, vowel-sign, and consonant-character; there are also modifiers by which nasality as a feature of the vowel may be indicated, or which replace a nasal before a consonant of the same class, or which indicate that a consonant is to be pronounced without the inherent vowel. Since consonant-articulations may be clustered and consonant-characters cannot be written in series without implication of a separating vowel, it follows that consonantal ligatures are a feature of the writing system: thus the Sanskrit ādiśva- "totality" is written with two characters, ā and ṛṣvā. The Indian syllabaries have been arranged since antiquity in an order based on strict phonetic principles (see W. S. Allen, *Phonetics in ancient India*, Oxford 1953).

All these Indian alphabets are written from left to right. Two main graphic varieties of the script, Nāgarî and Sārdâra, have been responsible for the main forms of the characters in the modern scripts, with much mutual influence, and regional development has altered the form of the characters, and introduced a few new principles, so that now many scripts in use for contiguous languages are mutually unintelligible. The simplest form, Nāgarî or Devānāgarî, is in use for Hindi, Marâthî, Nepâli and generally for Sanskrit; Gudjarâtî is a modified cursive form of this; Bengali and Assamese differ somewhat in appearance from Nāgarî, many characters having a Sārdâra origin; and Pandjâbî in the Gurumuki script has even more of the Sārdâra element. All these have the appearance of being written below a straight line which forms the head-stroke of the characters. Other scripts, as a result of having been early written on palmrya leaves, have developed a cursive form to avoid splitting the writing material with straight lines: such are Urdu and the southern scripts, all of them used for Tâmil, Telugu, Kanarese and Malayalam; the Sinhalese script is a near relation of these, and the scripts in use for most south-east Asian languages (Burmese, Mon, Siamese, Cambodjan, Javanese, Cham), and for Tibetan, are all Indian in origin. Specimens of most of these scripts are illustrated by Grierson, and their palaeographic relations described by Bühler (see Bibliography).

The Perso-Arabic script entered India with the conquest and has been, of course, studied by Muslims in all ages for its value in the literature of Islam; at first, however, it was used only sporadically for writing in the languages of India (e.g., the Hindi poems of Amir Khushru [q.v.]). Necessarily modified to embrace the peculiarities of the Indian consonantal system [see, for example, p.t, p.m, p.n, s.t, s.m, s.n, s.b, s.q?]; it later became used for some Indian languages in common use by Muslims, especially Urdu, Pandjâbî, Kaśîmî, Pashtû, Sindhi; a very small amount of writing in this script in Bengali is known, Bengal Muslims normally using the same script as, the Bengali Hindus; and it has hardly ever been applied to Gudjarâtî. There are some works in Hindi in this script—their language and subject-matter having prevented them from being regarded as works of
Urdu literature. In addition to the articles on the individual languages, see further KHATT.

Bibilography: Indian languages have been widely studied in the last two centuries, and there is an enormous literature. References to the languages most germane to Islam will be found in the individual articles on these in this Encyclopaedia, especially BENGALI, GUJRATI, HINDI, HINDUSTANI, KASHMIRI, PASHTO, SINDHI, TAMIL, URDU. For the linguistic affiliations of these see DRUIDIC AND KAFIR LANGUAGES, INDO-ARYAN LANGUAGES, IRAN — LANGUAGES.


iv. — History

This article aims at being no more than a guide to the numerous articles on individual topics of the Muslim history of India and Pakistan to be found elsewhere in the Encyclopaedia, and to relate these to a chronological framework.

The pre-Muslim history of India is mostly outside the scope of this Encyclopaedia; aspects of the culture of this period, however, are relevant in the development of Muslim scientific knowledge and in the peculiarly Indian developments in Islam and Islamic institutions. For the scientific aspect an account of the relevant culture of pre-Muslim India will be found in DIOGRIYAVÍ, iii; for its religions, Hinduism and Jainism, see HINDU and ĽAVAN, and for the Indian aspects of mysticism which are relevant to Islam see TÁSAWŁR. References to the state of the land at the time of the various occasions of Islamic conquest will of course be found in the articles on the major Muslim powers and regions of India, especially DILÍ SULTANATE, BANGÁLA [in Supplement], GUJRATÁ, SINDH, DAKHAN.

Muslim history in the sub-continent begins with the Arab invasion and capture of Sind in 57/671-2, which thereby came under first the Umayyad and later the 'Abbásid caliphs; this period is, however, no more than a curtain-raiser, since caliphal authority was almost extinct by 257/871, although two Arab principalities in Sind endured for a little longer. For this period see MUHAMMAD B. KÁSHÍ, and references under AL-MÁHDIÁTÁ and UMAYYAVÍ, for the Arab principalities see MANŠÎRA and MÚLTÁN, and also under DÁYUBL.

Hindú rulers in the west and north-west of India were not slow to see the dangers to themselves in the establishment of an active Muslim state at Ghazna in the 4th/10th century; the first conflict between Hindú and Muslim powers came when a ruler of the Príthvírác invaded the territory of the Ghaznavids. For the Ghaznavids see SEBÚKTÍGÍN, but the balance of power was soon reversed and Sebúktígin became the aggressor, compelling the cession of Kábul. Sebúktígin's empire was consolidated and extended by his successor Múhammad, who between 389/999 and 417/1027 entered India fifteen times on marauding raids, the chief towns plundered being Wahínd, Múltán, Nárdín (Taráqar), Thámésar, Bárán, Mátáru, Kánnáwád, Gwáliáry, Kállýndar and Súmnáth, although permanent occupation of the captured territories never seems to have entered his mind, and in consequence Islam was not established there; except in the Pándjáb which became the Ghaznavids' frontier province and in which, in Láháwr (Lahore), they established their capital after losing Ghazna to the Gúdrís. For the history of these years see especially the articles GHAZNAVIDS, SEBÚKTÍGÍN, MÁHMÚD B. SEBÚKTÍGÍN, GUJRATÁ, and PÁNDJÁR.

The Ghaznavids' successors, the Gúdrís, were the next pre-eminent Muslim power to harass India from the north-west, although at first they were not the pre-eminent of their eastern province, Shíháb al-Dín (later Mu'ízz al-Dín) Mu'mammad b. Sám, merely continued the Sháhí tradition of Múhammad of Ghazna by making rapid local incursions: thus in 571/1175-6 he supplanted the Ismá'ílí rulers of Múltán by an orthodox governor, and later took the fortress of Ucch [q.v.]; in 575/1180-9 he marched through Múltán and Ucch to Páfán in Gujrátá, where his exhausted army was defeated. Sínd and Dáyubl were acquired the next year, and in 582/1186-7 Láháwr was finally added to the Gúdrís' territories, this last conquest ending Ghaznavid rule in India and placing the Gúdrís in a favourable strategic position for assault on upper India. A Gúdrí army was defeated in 587/1191 at Taráqar [q.v.] by a Cáwáhn force under Príthvírárga, but a further Gúdrí army was successful at the same place in the following year and Hántí and Díhlí (Déli) [q.v.] were occupied. Míráth and Kóyl [the modern 'Alígarh] [q.v.] and the territory south-west as far as Agímar [q.v.] soon capitulated to the invaders under their local commander Kút b Al-Dín Aybák, and Mu'ízz Al-Dín returned in 592/1195-6 to take Bayánlá. Thereafter affairs were left in Kút b Al-Dín Aybák's hands, and he, after defeating attacks by local Hindú rulers, occupied Bádáún in 594/1197-8, Kánnáwád the following year, Gwáliáry in 597/1200-1 and Kállýndar in 599/1203-3; he was appointed wálí 'ad-dí Hindásár by Mu'ízz Al-Dín shortly before the latter's death in 603/1206. For the political role of the Gúdrís in India was still limited, and Aybák was more concerned after Mu'ízz Al-Dín's death with maintaining his position wálí-i-dis Tádí Al-Dín Ylídís, the Gúdrí governor in Ghazna, than with extending, or even consolidating, the Gúdrí possessions in India; indeed, at this time certain local Hindú rulers were accepted as tributaries. But the Gúdrís nominally controlled wider possessions in India than those administered by Kút b Al-Dín Aybák, for two other local governors, who like Aybák
were Turkish slaves, were established in remoter provinces: Nāsir al-Dīn Kābāca in Māltān and Sind and Muhammad b. Bakhtiyar in Bengal. At Kūtb al-Dīn Aybak’s death in 670/1270 he was succeeded by his son Arām Shāh, but Aybak’s son-in-law Iltutmīṣ was set up at Dihlī by a group of army officers; after he had overcome initial opposition he was able to consolidate his Indian position to the extent of securing the main strategic points of north India. Under his Islamic government received a settled form in north India, and he may be regarded as the founder of the Dihlī sultanate. For events in Bengal see Bāngāḷa [in Supplement], Lakhnawtī, Muhammad B. Bakhtiyār, and Khālidī. For events in Māltān and Sind see Sīndh. For the establishment of the Dihlī sultanate see Dihlī Sultanate and Iltutmīṣ.

For the rule of Iltutmīṣ at Dihlī see Dihlī Sultanate. For his early struggles for possession see also Nāsir al-Dīn Kābāca and Tāqī al-Dīn Yıldız; by his victory over Kābāca, Iltutmīṣ established his authority over Sind in 623/1226; he also recovered Bengal, where the successors of Muhammad b. Bakhtiyār had for some time enjoyed virtual independence. He was succeeded in 634/1236 by his daughter, the only female ruler in Muslim India [see Kādiyyā], and later by his third son Nāsir al-Dīn Māhmūd [q.v.] (644-64/1246-66), although in this reign de facto power was exercised by Gīyāḥ al-Dīn Balbān as muḥtār. The latter, who later succeeded as sultan, was engaged in ceaseless military activity to consolidate Dihlī as the principal power in north India against the local Hindū dynasties, especially those of Mewāṭ; he suppressed an attempt at independence by the Bengal governor Tughrī in ca. 680/1281-2; and had to maintain constant strong garrisons on his north-western frontiers, where skirmishes with the Mongols, although not a serious threat to India, were frequent. Sind, however, seems to have been more prosperous—particularly in the hindsight of historians writing after the Timurid invasions of the end of the 8th/14th century—and he is remembered by them as the sultanate’s founder. For the events of this period see Khālidī; ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muhammad Khālidī; Gīyāḥ al-Dīn Balbān; Khālidī; Rāqṣāthān, Tīlīgāṅā. For Bengal, where from about 696/1298 the province had been divided into an eastern and western part with capitals at Sānār-gāṅa and Lakhnawtī respectively and where Dihlī had not reasserted its suzerainty, see Bāngāḷa [in Supplement], Lakhnawtī, Sonārgāṅa. With Islam threatened by the excesses of Nāsir al-Dīn Kūtb al-Dīn, a ādīdī was declared against him by Gīyāḥ al-Dīn Malik, the governor of Dipalpur, who succeeded to the sultanate as Gīyāḥ al-Dīn Tughlūk in 720/1320. An account of the events leading to the Tughlūk succession is given in Gīyāḥ al-Dīn Tughlūk 1; see also Nāsir al-Dīn Khūṣrāw. Further military activity consolidated and expanded the territory of the sultanate: the Pāṇḍya kingdom of Madurār (Ma’bar) was annexed, Dīlīnagar in Orissa (Utiśā) invaded, and Bengal, then suffering from civil war, partly re-annexed; for this expansion see Madurā, Tīlīgāṅā, Utiśā, Warangal. Tughlūk’s son Dījvānā Khān, entitled Ulūg Khān, who succeeded his father in 725/1325 as Muhammad b. Tughlūk, was the general who brought about this consolidation; yet after his accession his oppressive rule led to many rebellions, some of which resulted in a permanent loss of hegemony: Ma’bar (735/1334-5), Golbargā (740/1340), Warangal (746/1345-6), and Dāvatābtād, which he had earlier attempted to make a second capital, in 748/1347. This last loss led to the proclamation of an independent sultanate under ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Bahman Shāh in the Deccan. By the close of his reign (752/1351) Bengal was again independent [see Fāhr al-Dīn Mubārak Shār], and the Sūmār dynasty in Sind had been succeeded by the Sammas of Thaftha restored Dihlī’s hegemony over Sind, against the Sammas of Thaftha restored Dihlī’s hegemony over Bengal, in 754/1353-4 and 760/1365; but that province, reunited since 753/1352, retained its independence under Ilyās Shāh [q.v.], whose successors remained in power for another half-century. He prolonged expedition to Sind against the Sāmmas of Thaftha restored Dihlī’s suzerainty over Sind for a short time only, although in expeditions against Kāntā and Ḫāfawā [q.v.], he was more successful. His reign was generally peaceful and prosperous—particularly in the hindsight of historians writing after the Timurī invasions of the end of the 8th/14th century—and he is remembered
as an innovator in agriculture and especially irrigation, a remitter of the harsher taxes (but as an upholder of the necessity of levying duties from Brâhmins: see Dârâ, 6 a.), and as a constant public builder; but he was mild to the extent of culpable leniency, and his delegation of authority to his subordinates eventually weakened the royal power. For his reign see Firuz Shâh Tughluk, Dihli Sultanate, and Tughlukids; for the events in Sind see Sind, 4; for the events in Gujarat see Gujarat (b); for the position in Bengal see specially Ilyas Shâh and Sikandar B. Ilyas; for his agricultural policies and irrigation works see Farâhâ, v; Nafr; and references under Dîmânā; for his buildings and other public works see Dînh, Dînâpur, Hîsâr Firûza, Sârnînd.

Some half-dozen kings of the Tughluq line followed Firuz after his death in 790/1388, none (except the last: see below) for more than a year or two. The Dihli sultanate was in a state of political disintegration, and many provincial muqta's achieved virtual independence at this time. Even before Firuz's death the muqta's Malik Râjdâ of Karwand near Thânnâr had been able to act independently of Dihli after about 784/1382 [see Fârûkîds, Hândesh]. The Bahmanis of the Deccan strengthened their influence (although Râjdâ was raised by the Bahmanis, the second sultan, who succeeded in 759/1358, bringing in careful and extensive administrative reforms; for these see Muhammad Shâh i Bahmani. The constant skir mishing with the neighbouring Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagara flared up in 786/1385 in the first major battle between Hindus and Deccani Muslims; accounts vary, but it seems that the boundaries drawn between the rival powers were more in Vijayanagaras favour and that consequently the Bahmanis cannot have had the better of the argument. For this campaign and the conflicting evidence see Vijayanagara. Some five years later the Vijayanagara ruler extinguished the Muslim dynasty of the small southern sultanate of Madurâ [q.v.]. In Mâlâwâ [q.v.] the governor, Dîlâwâr Khân, had failed to remit to Dihli the revenue collections of the defeated state; although Khân was not decisively defeated, he was not declared himself independent until 804/1401 [see Dîlâwâr Khân]. In the eastern provinces of the sultanate, disaffected Hindus were rejecting all obedience to Dihli when the (Habshi?) eunuch Malik Sarwar, Khâja Dîâhân, was sent there in 796/1394 to control them; having done this he occupied Dînâpur as sulân al-ahâwâ and there made himself independent of Dihli [see Dînâpur, Shârkids; also Isâwâ, Koylî]. Disorder had similarly arisen in Gujarât, where Zafar Khân had been sent by Dihli in 793/1391 to establish the Tughluq authority; he pacified the province, but remained there as a virtually independent ruler during the confused Tughluq rivalries in the north; yet he did not assume the royal prerogatives until 810/1407 (although his son Tâtâr Khân had had himself proclaimed king five years previously for these events see Gujarat and Muzaffar Shâh i Bahmani).

In 800/1398 Pir Muhammad, governor of Kâbul and grandson of Timûr, attacked India, capturing Ucch and Mûlân [q.v.]; the chiefs and nobles of Dipâlpur had also submitted to him, but later revolted and killed his governor. This seems to have been made a casus bellî by Timûr in 801/1398-9: Dipâlpur and Shânper, where the rebels had taken refuge, were then taken, and the king proceeded through Pâñâlpatt to Dihli, chastising the Dîalis [q.v.] on the way: the sultan (Mâmmûd Tughluq) fled, Dihli was occupied, and was given up to pillage, plunder and wholesale massacre. On his withdrawal in the spring of that year, the Dihli sultanate was left in virtual anarchy and moral, political and financial bankruptcy, although Mâmmûd Tughluq had returned to his capital city without an empire after the Timûrid armies had withdrawn; de facto authority seems, however, to have been exercised by Mâmmûd's minister, the Hâshâ Khân [q.v.]. The Sayyid Khâdî Khân held Multan longer; but the Timûrids made some gains in the localities as governor owing allegiance to Timûr or to his son Shâh Rûkh. In addition to the now fully independent Muslim states mentioned in the last paragraph, many minor Muslim governors had become more or less independent, and the local Hindu chieftains, particularly those of the Dô'âb, had thrown off all pretence of recognizing the suzerainty of Dihli. Mâmmûd Tughluq's military governor of the Dô'âb, Dawlat Khân Lodi—who after the death of Mâllû came to occupy the same position in the state as Mâllû had—gained some small success in re-asserting the authority of Dihli over the neighbouring states; he and Khâdî Khân were the chief contenders for power in the north, and after the death of Mâmmûd Tughluq in 815/1412 or 1413 (the evidence on this point is conflicting) Dawlat Khân was raised by the Timûrids to the sovereignty of the second sultan, who succeeded in 795/1398, bringing in careful and extensive administrative reforms; for these see Muhammad Shâh i Bahmani. The constant skirmishing with the neighbouring Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagara flared up in 786/1385 in the first major battle between Hindus and Deccani Muslims; accounts vary, but it seems that the boundaries drawn between the rival powers were more in Vijayanagaras favour and that consequently the Bahmanis cannot have had the better of the argument. For this campaign and the conflicting evidence see Vijayanagara. Some five years later the Vijayanagara ruler extinguished the Muslim dynasty of the small southern sultanate of Madurâ [q.v.]. In Mâlâwâ [q.v.] the governor, Dîlâwâr Khân, had failed to remit to Dihli the revenue collections of the defeated state; although Khân was not decisively defeated, he was not declared himself independent until 804/1401 [see Dîlâwâr Khân]. In the eastern provinces of the sultanate, disaffected Hindus were rejecting all obedience to Dihli when the (Habshi?) eunuch Malik Sarwar, Khâja Dîâhân, was sent there in 796/1394 to control them; having done this he occupied Dînâpur as sulân al-ahâwâ and there made himself independent of Dihli [see Dînâpur, Shârkids; also Isâwâ, Koylî]. Disorder had similarly arisen in Gujarât, where Zafar Khân had been sent by Dihli in 793/1391 to establish the Tughluq authority; he pacified the province, but remained there as a virtually independent ruler during the confused Tughluq rivalries in the north; yet he did not assume the royal prerogatives until 810/1407 (although his son Tâtâr Khân had had himself proclaimed king five years previously for these events see Gujarat and Muzaffar Shâh i Bahmani).

In 800/1398 Pir Muhammad, governor of Kâbul and grandson of Timûr, attacked India, capturing Ucch and Mûlân [q.v.]; the chiefs and nobles of Dipâlpur had also submitted to him, but later revolted and killed his governor. This seems to have been made a casus bellî by Timûr in 801/1398-9: Dipâlpur and Shânper, where the rebels had taken refuge, were then taken, and the king proceeded through Pâñâlpatt to Dihli, chastising the Dîalis [q.v.] on the
Timur's reign, but its truth seems confirmed by the actions of other southern rulers: an understanding of mutual assistance between the rulers of Gudjarat, Malwa, Khándose, and Vidaijanagara against the Bahmani kingdom, and a demand from these rulers to Firuz to keep the peace. Firuz was able to maintain excellent relations with the Hindu of the Deccan, taking wives from several prominent Hindu houses, not excluding Vidaijanagara (being persuaded, although a Sunni, to contract mut'a alliances in this respect: Shi'i doctrines were at this time penetrating into the Muslim world), and spending much of his reign in the conquest of Mandasor, "recovered from the Bahmanis [see also MAHIM]. His strict but impartial justice, and through him the example of the religious teachers of Bafwa and Sarkhedj near Dihli, as noticed above, was not safe from his ambition (844/1440-1). But he was a good Muslim and a great builder and patron of the arts, and in his time Islam did not become a centre of Islamic propaganda until the 15th century. The policy of constant pressure on Gudjarat's Muslim neighbours; his interest in Malwa has been described above, but he was also involved against Khández and the Bahmanis.

The small state of Khandesh, where Malik Radia had been succeeded by his son Hushang Shah [q.v.] in 808/1405, was accused of parricide and attacked and carried off by Muẓaffar Shah of Gudjarat [see drān]; he was reinstated in 811/1408, and thenceforth transferred his capital from Dhar to Mándu [q.v.]. He invaded Gudjarat several times in the early part of his reign, although when in 824/1421 Hâshim in search of Mahmud Shah Khâldji in 840/1436. In spite of an attempt by Ahmad Shah I of Gudjarat to secure the throne for Mas'ud, a son of Muhammad Ghuri, Mahmud consolidated his position, and during his long reign (33 years) the Mâlwa sultanate reached its greatest extent. He several times attacked Citawr and花了 with Malwa through a royal marriage; but on the temporary division of the state between Malik Radja's two sons on his death in 840/1436, he exacted tribute from the rulers of minor Hindu states to the north of his dominions (Bundi, Kofa, Kumbhalgarh, etc.) and, while engaged in the conquest of Mandasor, "recovered from the idolaters" the city of Aḏḏîrê [q.v. (861/1457); disputes over Kalpi led to occasional war with the sultanate of Dâwânpur; he caused the aḫila to be read in his name in Bayânâ; several times he invaded the Deccan to attack the domains of the Bahmani minor Niẓâm Shah, once (865/1461) being utterly defeated, but able later to despoil Bârâr and to defend his outpost at Kherlâ [q.v.]; and even Dihli, as noticed above, was not safe from his ambition (844/1440-1). But he was a good Muslim and a great builder and patron of the arts, and in his time Islam was already well established in the coastal towns [see for example MANGROL]. He extended the Gudjarat dominions southwards into the northern Konkan coast from 834/1421 by the capture of Thânâ [q.v.] from the Bahmanis [see also MAHIND]. His strict but impartial justice, and through him the example of the religious teachers of Bafwa and Sarkhedj near Dihli, as noticed above, was maintained under Muhammad Shah I in the early 15th century. The policy of constant pressure on Gudjarat's Hindu neighbours was maintained under Muhammad I (846-55/1440-51) and Kutb al-Dīn Ahmad Shah (855-62/1452-8), the latter having once entered into a Muslim alliance with Mahmud of Malwa against Citawr. With the accession of Mahmud I in 862/1458, Gudjarat entered the period of its greatest prosperity; for the attempt at usurpation by Shams Kân Nâgârwâr before Mahmud's accession see NAGAWR. For the general history of Gudjarat in this period see, in addition to the references above, GUDJARAT.

The small state of Khández, where Malik Râdja (= Ṣâdja Ahmad) had been appointed to an ḥâlî by Firuz Shah and where he had established himself sufficiently to act independently of Dihli since ca. 784/1382, early sought alliance with Mâlwa through a royal marriage; but during temporary division of the state between Malik Râdja's two sons on his
death in 801/1399 the elder brother, Nasir, dissatisfied with lack of support from Malwa against Ahmad I of Gujarat who had intervened on behalf of the younger brother Hasan, had to recognize the overlordship of Gudjarat, 820/1417. A Khândesh attack on Nandûr bâ in 833/1429 provoked Gudjarat reprisals, and an alliance with the Bahmanis was sought by marriage; but when his daughter complained that her husband was neglecting her, Nasir Khân invaded the Bahmanis' northern territories; however, his army was defeated and only the threatened assistance of Gudjarat led to a Bahmanis withdrawal. ʿÂdî Khân (d. 844/1444) and Mubârak Khân (d. 861/1457) accepted Gudjarat suzerainty, but in 904/1498 ʿÂdî Khân II failed to pay tribute and was chastised by Mahmûd Bâghr. After the death of ʿÂdî Khân II in 909/1501 a disputed succession caused the intervention in Khândesh of the stronger neighbouring powers. None of the Fârâkî rulers was recognized as equal by the sultans of Gudjarat, Malwa, Abhmãdãgar or the Deccan, and were known as Khân rather than Shah. For Khândesh in this period see Fârâkî and Khândesh, and references under GUDJARAT and MALWA.

Bengal, where rival sultanates had been established in the late 7th/13th century at Lakhnawti (capital later transferred to Pândûrî) and Sonârâgâw, had been reunited about 953/1545 under Ilyâs Shah, and after the Fârâkî Tughûlids' vain attempts to recover the province (see above) was never again molested by Dihlî. The Ilyâs Shahi succession had degenerated into a number of puppet kings under the influence of the Hindî minister Râdîâ Gâneîs of Dinâdîpur, and was terminated by the accession of Gâneîs's son the Muslim convert Dâlíâ al-Dîn Muhammad in 818/1415; his reign seems to have been a time of relative prosperity for Bengal, to judge by the magnificence of the monuments and the evidence for the growth of sea-borne trade with China; and he has the rare distinction of receiving praise for his justice and equity from both Muslim and contemporary Hindî sources. There was, however, a continual threat to the western regions from the Dijawnpur sultâns, and the evidence of coins dated Ŝâkâ 1339-40 (= 819-20/1416-18) of Dânudhâla and references under SHARKIDS and HABSHI.

In Sind itself at this time the Sammâ dynasty was still ruling, isolated, independent, and little troubled by or for their neighbours; Sind history for long is purely local with no great concern either for the rest of India or for Islam, and until the late 9th/15th century at this time the Sammã dynasty was still ruling, isolated, independent, and little troubled by or for their neighbours; Sind history for long is purely local with no great concern either for the rest of India or for Islam, and until the late 9th/15th century at this time the Sammã dynasty was still ruling, isolated, independent, and little troubled by or for their neighbours; Sind history for long is purely local with no great concern either for the rest of India or for Islam, and until the late 9th/15th
century few details of it are known beyond the list of its kings—and even here the chronology is uncertain. The last Sammās were, however, connected by marriage with the sultanate of Gujrat. Mughals of the Arghūn clan began to exert some influence in lower Sind in the last quarter of the 9th/10th century. By the time of Ahmad, the proximity of Vidjayanagara to Gulbarga caused him to move his capital to Bidar. Three of the Arghūn clan began to exert some influence in the long reign of Nanda, Dīn Nizam al-Dīn lower Sind in the last quarter of the 13th century, marriage with the sultanate of Gudiarat. Mughals of its kings—and even here the chronology is uncertain. Shah Beg Arghūn of Kandahar occupied some forts in northern Sind, and eventually, after the death of the last of the Sammā Dīms in 933/1527, the Arghūns became rulers of Sind. For details of this period see SINDH, SAMMĀS, INDIA.

Kashmir, like Sind, had at first little connexion with other Islamic powers in India, although the reign of Shihāb al-Dīn (755-75/1354-73)—here again the chronology is uncertain—saw the arms of Islam victorious over most of Kashmir's immediate Hindu neighbours and the rise of Kashmir to the status of a great power, although the rule within its borders was characterized by religious toleration. Under Sikandar (ca. 791-875/1389-1413), however, a fierce policy of persecution of Hinduism, banning of Brāhmāṇs, iconoclasm, and immigration of Muslims from other regions made the country a predominantly Muslim state, earning for Sikandar the title of Butshikhan ("Breaker of Idols"). That policy was strikingly reversed under the greatest of the Kashmir sultans, Zayn al-ʾAbīdīn (823-75/1420-70), who recalled the exiled Brāhmāṇs and permitted the observance of Hindu practices by that community. It provided the ordinances of their sacred books were observed; he abolished the dīya and illegal taxes and cesses, and was active in building public works, including bridges and canals; he was a patron of the arts, especially literature and music. Kashmīr was still little involved with other kingdoms of India, although the sultan maintained friendly relations with the Hindu chief. Kārlī had been converted to Islam, his patron of the arts, to take the name of Dīwarī. Khwāja Ahmad Sirhindī, who succeeded his father in 945/1440, was compelled to intervene in Dīawnpur, where his ineffective elder brother was incapable of dealing with large-scale rebellion by the Hindū saṃīdārīs fomented by Husayn Shāhī from his exile in Bihār; Bār-bak was replaced, and Sikandar forced Husayn to flee to Bengal; he had brought Bihār again within the sphere of influence of Dīlī by 899/1494. After occupying Sambhāl [q.v.], and holding court there for four years, he turned his attention to the subjugation of the smaller Rājpūt states near Dīlī, especially the territories of Gwalīyar, founding a new capital at Agrā [q.v.] the better to conduct his campaigns: thus Dholpur fell in 907/1502, Mandṛayl in 910/1505, Utrār in 915/1509, Narwar in 919/1508; Candērī [q.v.] was virtually governed as a dependency of Dīlī (although nominally on behalf of the pretender to the throne of Mālwā, Sāhib Khān "Muhammad Shāh") from late 919/1513 after Sikandar's intervention in the Mālwā domestic struggles, although it later passed into Rājpūt hands. Sikandar Lōdī, perhaps the greatest king of the dynasty although his fierce intolerance of Hindūs and destruction of their temples was hardly the way to command a popular support, fell in Agrā (921/1517) poisoned by his eldest Dīlī Khān, but at the suggestion of a prominent faction of the nobility, the small kingdom was partitioned and Ibrāhīm's younger brother (?) Dīlāl Khān was established on the revived throne of Dīawnpur. The moderates, however, condemned this policy, and Dīlāl Khān became the figurehead of a rebellion against Dīlī fomented by members of the Lābānī and Fardūlī clans in Bihār and Dīawnpur. Dīlāl Khān, before his surrender and death, had fled for refuge to Gwalīyar, giving Ibrāhīm the pretext for annexing it in 923/1518; but the rebellion had caused Ibrāhīm to suspect even the loyal nobles, whom he dismissed and degraded indiscriminately. Defection spread; and when the son of Dawat Khān Lōdī, the powerful governor of Lāhaw, reported to his father the disaffection of the Hindus and Mughals of Mīr Khān, his effective overthrow by the Mughal Bābur for help. A similar request had come from Ibrāhīm's uncle, ʾAlām Khān Lōdī, who had hopes of gaining the Dīlī throne. It soon became plain that Bābur's intervention in Indian affairs was prompted more by his own interest than that of the Lōdīs; ʾAlām Khān failed to take Dīlī on his own, Dawat Khān died in flight having been dispossessed of Lāhaw by Bābur, and Bābur's army moved on through the Pāngāb to encounter and defeat the Dīlī Afghāns at the battle of Pāṅpat in 932/1526. Within the next four years the whole of north India had become subject to the Mughal power. For this period see DĪLĪ SULTANATE; LŌDĪS, BĀHRUL LŌDĪ, IBRĀHĪM LŌDĪ; MUGHALS; BĀBUR; LĀHAW, FĀRĪNĀT, PĀNḠĀB, SIRHIND.

In the Deccan the last of the Bahmani kings had fled from Bīdar a year after the victory of the Mughal Babur for help. A similar request had come from Ibrāhīm's uncle, ʾAlām Khān Lōdī, who had hopes of gaining the Dīlī throne. It soon became plain that Bābur's intervention in Indian affairs was prompted more by his own interest than that of the Lōdīs; ʾAlām Khān failed to take Dīlī on his own, Dawat Khān died in flight having been dispossessed of Lāhaw by Bābur, and Bābur's army moved on through the Pāngāb to encounter and defeat the Dīlī Afghāns at the battle of Pāṅpat in 932/1526. Within the next four years the whole of north India had become subject to the Mughal power. For this period see DĪLĪ SULTANATE; LŌDĪS, BĀHRUL LŌDĪ, IBRĀHĪM LŌDĪ; MUGHALS; BĀBUR; LĀHAW, FĀRĪNĀT, PĀNḠĀB, SIRHIND.

In the Deccan the last of the Bahmani kings had fled from Bīdar a year after the victory of the Mughals in the north, although the old Bahmani sultanate had been partitioned nearly forty years previously. Its history from the reign of Ahmad Shāh Wali is largely one of faction between local and foreign Muslims. Ahmad soon (826/1423) devastated Vidīyanagara, and then annexed Warangal, whose rājā had assisted Vidīyanagara against the Bahmani sultans; but Dīlī continued to the Dīlī throne. Many of Bābur's tribe of Afghāns came to India during his reign, and, by dividing his territories before his death among his relations and most influential nobles, he brought the Dīlī sultanate into an Afghān confederacy. Sikandar Lōdī, who succeeded his father in 824/1419, was compelled to intervene in Dīawnpur, where his ineffective elder brother was incapable of dealing with large-scale rebellion by the Hindū saṃīdārīs fomented by Husayn Shāhī from his exile in Bihār; Bār-bak was replaced, and Sikandar forced Husayn to flee to Bengal; he had brought Bihār again within the sphere of influence of Dīlī by 899/1494. After occupying Sambhāl [q.v.], and holding court there for four years, he turned his attention to the subjugation of the smaller Rājpūt states near Dīlī, especially the territories of Gwalīyar, founding a new capital at Agrā [q.v.] the better to conduct his campaigns: thus Dholpur fell in 907/1502, Mandṛayl in 910/1505, Utrār in 915/1509, Narwar in 919/1508; Candērī [q.v.] was virtually governed as a dependency of Dīlī (although nominally on behalf of the pretender to the throne of Mālwā, Sāhib Khān "Muhammad Shāh") from late 919/1513 after Sikandar's intervention in the Mālwā domestic struggles, although it later passed into Rājpūt hands. Sikandar Lōdī, perhaps the greatest king of the dynasty although his fierce intolerance of Hindūs and destruction of their temples was hardly the way to command a popular support, fell in Agrā (921/1517) poisoned by his eldest Dīlī Khān, but at the suggestion of a prominent faction of the nobility, the small kingdom was partitioned and Ibrāhīm's younger brother (?) Dīlāl Khān was established on the revived throne of Dīawnpur. The moderates, however, condemned this policy, and Dīlāl Khān became the figurehead of a rebellion against Dīlī fomented by members of the Lābānī and Fardūlī clans in Bihār and Dīawnpur. Dīlāl Khān, before his surrender and death, had fled for refuge to Gwalīyar, giving Ibrāhīm the pretext for annexing it in 923/1518; but the rebellion had caused Ibrāhīm to suspect even the loyal nobles, whom he dismissed and degraded indiscriminately. Defection spread; and when the son of Dawat Khān Lōdī, the powerful governor of Lāhaw, reported to his father the disaffection of the Hindus and Mughals of Mīr Khān, his effective overthrow by the Mughal Bābur for help. A similar request had come from Ibrāhīm's uncle, ʾAlām Khān Lōdī, who had hopes of gaining the Dīlī throne. It soon became plain that Bābur's intervention in Indian affairs was prompted more by his own interest than that of the Lōdīs; ʾAlām Khān failed to take Dīlī on his own, Dawat Khān died in flight having been dispossessed of Lāhaw by Bābur, and Bābur's army moved on through the Pāngāb to encounter and defeat the Dīlī Afghāns at the battle of Pāṅpat in 932/1526. Within the next four years the whole of north India had become subject to the Mughal power. For this period see DĪLĪ SULTANATE; LŌDĪS, BĀHRUL LŌDĪ, IBRĀHĪM LŌDĪ; MUGHALS; BĀBUR; LĀHAW, FĀRĪNĀT, PĀNḠĀB, SIRHIND.
northern campaigns between 829/1426 and 831/1428 brought Māhūr [q.v.] under subjection and secured also of Mamlūk [q.v.]; thus the Bahmanis, with a casus beli by demanding allegiance from the rādā of Kherāt [q.v.], a Bahmanī tributary. A Māhūr army was defeated in 831/1428, and an alliance with Khandēsh was effected by a marriage between the two houses; but a rash attack on Gudjarat the next year led to a Bahmanī defeat and the loss of Thāna [q.v.]. Ahmad died in 839/1436; at the end of his life he had shown great partiality for foreigners, especially Persians, and he seems to have accepted Shī‘ identity under the tutelage of Khaliṣ Allāh “Batelijkān” [q.v.]. He was succeeded by his eldest son, ‘Allā al-Dīn Ahmad, under whom the foreigners rose to greater power after their victory over an invasion from Khandēsh. In 847/1443 the Vidjayanagaras forces—in which large numbers of Muslim mercenaries had recently been recruited—invaded the Deccan but were eventually overcome. Three years later the foreigners were inveigled into a disastrous campaign in the Konkān by the Dakhni adventurer Dākhlīn. Many of them (including 1200 sayyids) were butchered in the massacre of Cākan. Before the king’s death in 862/1458 the Deccan had been twice more invaded by Mālāwī, and an attempted rebellion in Tīlingānā subdued by a recently arrived foreigner, Māhmūd Gāwān [q.v.]. The next king, Humāyūn, in a reign of three and a half years, endeavoured to strike a balance between Dakhnīs and foreigners and to consolidate the kingdom; his ruthless persecution of adherents of his rebel brother earned him the title of Zālīm, “the Tyrant”, apparently unjustly. A regency followed until ca. 870/1466 with Māhmūd Gāwān as wālsī, not without further trouble from Mālāwī when the infant king’s dominions were defended with the help of Māhmūd Bāgrā of Gudjarat. Māhmūd Gāwān was sent on an extensive campaign to the western province (Gulbargā and Bīdar) in 871/1466, where local Hindu chieftains were causing heavy loss to Muslim merchantmen and pilgrim-vessels by piracy—probably with encouragement from Vidjayanagara; the country was laid under tribute, and the provincial governors became established through his Hindu ministers, especially Māhīnī Rāl [q.v.], in spite of interventions against him by Sīkandār Lōdī of Dihlī and Muṣafar II of Gudjarat; but Mādīnī Rāl’s growing power caused Māhmūd to flee to Gudjarat later for protection. Muṣafar took Māndū in 924/1518, massacred the Rāḍūpūt garrison, and restored Māhīnī Rāl. Māhīnī Rāl and the Rāṇā of Mālāwī later invaded Mālāwī, defeated the army and captured the king, who was generously restored to Māndū; but the northern part of Mālāwī was annexed by Mālāwī. Māhmūd offended Bahādur, the new sultan of Gudjarat, by sheltering a rival; Bahādur captured Māndū in 937/1531, and annexed Mālāwī to Gudjarat. In 941/1535 Māndū was taken by Humāyūn in his war with Bahādur, but the following year a former officer of the Khandīqīs, Māhīnī Kān, assumed the royal title as Kādir Shāh. The latter was dispossessed by Shēr Shāh Sūr, who left Shudhā’āt Kān as governor of Mālāwī in 952/1545; his son Bāyāzīd, known in popular legend as Bāz Bahādur, succeeded him in 960/1553 and, refusing to acknowledge the restored Humāyūn, assumed the royal title; he surrendered Mālāwī in 968/1561 to an army sent by Akbar. For this period see MĀLĀWĪ, MĀHMUD, and references under GUDJARAT, BAHĀDŪR SHĀH GUDJARAT, MĀHĪNĪ RĀL, HUMĀYŪN, SHĒR SHĀH SŪR.

In Gudjarat the 54 years reign of Māhmūd I, 862/1458-9/1511, brought the sultanate its greatest prosperity and extended Islam into southern Rāḍī-putnā, Sūrāth and the northern Konkān; in 865/1461 he secured ‘Uthmān Kān in Dīlār [q.v.]; in 871/1467-70 overcame Dūnāgār [q.v.], extended Islam into Sīndh and Kāch in 875/1472 and next put down piracy in Dīwārskā [q.v.]; in 887/
In the campaign was opened against Pavagah and Câmpânur [q.v.]. In 913/1508 he was allied with the Mamlûk of Egypt in a naval campaign against the Portuguese, who had arrived in the Indian Ocean in 1498. Muțaffar II, who succeeded in 917/1511, was soon involved in a clash with Mâlâv (capturing Mânûd in 924/1518 from a Râjput faction and restoring Mâhmuûd II there) and with Râgâ Sangrân of Cîtarw in Mêwâ [see IJârâ]; there was some diplomatic intercourse with the Portuguese, now established at Goâ, who first sought permission to build a fort at Diw (Dîn) and later twice tried to take Diw by force. Bahâdur Shâh, 932-43/1526-37, attacked the Nizâm Shâhî of Adbhmadnâd in 935/1528 to settle a territorial dispute with Khânâdesh, conquered Mâlâv in 937/1531, lost Bassein to the Portuguese in 941/1534 and the following year gave them permission to build a fort at Goâ; from 941/1534 he was engaged in a long war with Humayûn until the latter returned to face the Sûr threat. After Bahâdur's murder by the Portuguese in 943/1537 the history of the sultanate is largely one of puppet monarchies and rival factions of nobles. In 944/1538 an Ottoman fleet attacked the Portuguese at Diw, but received only lukewarm support from Gujdarât; the Portuguese power increased, and the Muslîms of Diw and Bâharâk [q.v.] were massacred in 953-4/1546-7. After the death of Bahâdur Shâh the community rose to some power, as did the Mirzâs [q.v.], who had taken control of Sûrat, Bâfhôd, Bâharâk and Cîmpânur; they were defeated in Akbâr's conquest of Gujdarât in 980-1/1572-3. For this period see, in addition to the references given above, GUJGARAT, BAHDUR SÎN GUJDAG, MÂLAV, HUMAYUN; for the Portuguese in the Indian Ocean see SINĐÂNAB, also SEIMD SOMEHAM PASAH.

In the neighbouring state of Khânâdesh a disputed succession eventually led to 'Adî Khân III being installed as ruler in 914/1509 by Mâhmuûd Bâg-zA, who had overthrown the opposition by the Nizâm Shâhî forces supporting a rival claimant. 'Adî Khân married the daughter of the next Gujdarât sultan, Muțaffar II, and their son MuhammAD I (926-43/1520-57) co-operated in many campaigns with his uncle, the last Gujdarât ruler, who was recognized from 936/1528 by the title of Shâh, and was designated his heir-apparent; he died, however, before he could reach Gujdarât and claim his second throne. The reign of his successor Mubârâk II saw in 960/1552 a defeat of a Mughul army and in 972/1564 the compulsion to accept Mughul overlordship: chaos in Gujdarât, the annexation of Mâlâv by the Mughuls, and the growing concern of Adbhmadnâd with her southern neighbours, had so altered the balance of power between the great sultanates that the position of Khânâdesh as a buffer state was no longer tenable. Khânâdesh at first connived at the Mughul manipulation of the Adbhmadnâd throne, and joined the Mughuls in the siege of Adbhmadnâd in 1004/1596, but later the Mughuls, having been opposed by the last Khânâdesh ruler Bahâdur Shâh, besieged him in Askârkat and Khânâdesh became a Mughul province in 1006/1601. For this period see FÀRÓQID, KHÂNÂDESH, BAHÂDUR SÎN GUJDAGAR, ASIN, BURHANPUR, THÂL-NER, and references under AKBAR.

In Bengal a succession of Hâshbih rulers had succeeded the Ilyâs Shâhî in 892/1486, of whom the second, Sayf al-Dîn Firûz (d. 895/1489), re-established order; but later Hâshbih rule became intolerable, and a Tîrîmîlî sayyid, 'Alî al-Dîn Hâshbih, was brought to the throne in 900/1493. He disbanded the Hindî infantry, expelled the Hâshbih, and transferred the capital from Gawr to Ikdûl; he recovered the provinces lost in the six preceding reigns, and in 905/1500 invaded Assam: his army had been reinforced by the influx of the disbanded Dîwânpur forces after Sikandar Lôdí had driven Husayn Shârkhî from Bîhâr to the protection of Bengal. In the years 928-29/1522-6 there were extensive military campaigns in the Tripura and Arakan regions as well. Husayn Shâh's reign saw also a great development of Bengali literature, a liberal attitude towards the Hindus and the growth of the syncretistic Satyapîr sect.

In the reign of his son and successor Nusrah Shâh (925-38/1519-31) many Afgânis arrived in Bengal from Dîlî after Bâbûr's defeat of Tūhrâm Lôdí. After 934/1528 there were clashes with the Portuguese on their first appearance in Bengal [see CHITTAGONG]. His brother Ghiyâb al-Dîn Mâhmuûd, who had usurped the throne from his nephew in 939/1533, was early faced with a rebellion by a brother-in-law who claimed himself with the Afgân Shîr Khân [see SÎR SÎN SÛR] and defeated the governor of Monghîr (Mungîr [q.v.]). Shîr Khân later invaded Bengal, whose army pressed Portuguese captives into service; but on the fall of Gawr in 945/1538 Shîr Khân assumed the royal title in Bengal—only to lose it later that year to Humayûn. For details of this period see BANGLA (in Supplement), DIWÎ SULTANATE, HÂSHBIH, HUMAYUN SHAY, LAKHNAVÎ, LÔDIS, SHÂRRKIDS.

In north India after Fânîlpât Bâbûr's first task was consolidation and extension of his authority, for many who had supported him as an ally against Lôdí oppression turned against him when it became obvious that he intended to remain. Thus he first occupied Dîlî and Aghrâ in 932/1526, moved his forces eastwards down the Ganges to Dîwânpur and, by his defeat of Rânâ Sanga of Cîtarw, secured his western territories against Râjâstân the next year; by the defeat of an eastern Afgân force in 935/1535 he extended his paramountcy up to Bengal. For the events of his reign, his character and his Indian policies, see BÂBÂR. After his death in the following year he was succeeded by his son Humayûn, whose first act on his accession was to assign Kâbul, then under Sher Khân, to his brother-in-law, Kandânâ, and to make smaller assignments to his younger brothers. A force of Afgân supporters of Mâhmuûd Lôdí, brother of the last Lôdí king, which had taken Dîwânpur inphpi/1531, was defeated, although the ablest soldier among them, Shîr Khân the future Sûrî emperor, was enabled to continue his preparations against the Mughul power through Humayûn's preoccupation with again securing his western frontier against the ambitious Kâmânân. A brother-in-law, MuhammAD Zâmân Mirzâ, gave Humayûn further trouble in offering his services to Bahâdur Shâh of Gujdarât, and the latter's refusal to surrender the rebel led to war between the Mughuls and Gujdarât, and to their first conquest and occupation of that province in 945/1535-6. For details see BAHÂDUR SÎN GUJDAGAR; GUJDAGAR; HUMAYUN; MÂLAV; MÔDÖ; MUGHULS. A rebellion to put a younger brother on the Mughul throne caused Humayûn's return to the centre, whereupon Mîlî Khân profited by his withdrawal to proclaim himself ruler of Mâlâv as Kâdîr Shâh [see MÂLAV]. Humayûn continued to be troubled by rebellious or independent-minded relations after his return to the centre [for these see MIKîR], and Shîr Khân was able to consolidate his position and occupy all the south of Bîhâr [q.v.]; he was soon able to besiege Gawr, the Bengal capital,
but by the time Humayún had at last made up his mind to crush Sher Khán the latter had occupied Rohtasgāh [q.v.]. Humayún marched to Gwālīr and occupied a deserted city, and then found that Sher Khán had cut his line of communication to Dīhlī; on his retreat he was defeated first at Cawsa in 946/1539, later near Kannawād the following year, and fled towards Sind since he found no welcome in his brother Kāmrān’s territories. Expelled from Sind by the Aṛghūn ruler, Shāh Husayn, he eventually arrived at the court of Shāh Tāmāḥ [q.v.] of Tráns for the start of his fifteen years’ exile. For details of all these events see AFGHANISTĀN, v, 2; HUMAYŪN; MĪRZĀS; MUGHALS; SHER SHĀH SŪR.

Meanwhile, Shēr Shāh had assumed sovereignty over Humayūn’s former possessions, and had regained the Pandājb by driving Kāmrān back to Kābul, establishing a fortress at the northern Rohtās [q.v.]. In 948/1542 he conquered Mālwā from Kādir Shāh, who fled to Gudjārāt, and in the next year laid waste Rāyśan in revenge for its rājdā’s massacre of Muslims at Čandārī [q.v.] and established his authority in Rājdāşṭān, being killed in an explosion there at Kālindjār in 951/1545. During his periods at the capital he set about reorganizing the revenue system of the country. His reforms are described s.v. DĀRĪBA, 6 b. He was succeeded by his younger son Islām Shāh, who burned stephens to suppress the fruits of his elder brother. This revived tribal strife among the Indian Afghāns. The Niyāzī tribe, in particular, rebelled in the Pandājb and at first allied themselves with the malcontent Gakkhaī [q.v.] community, but later intervened in Kāshmir affairs and were killed by the Čakk tribe there, Islām Shāh having regained the Pandājb. A revolt of a different kind was suppressed by the execution of one Shāykh ‘Alī, a follower of these teachings of Sayyīd Muhammad of Dīwanpur [see AL-DĪWANNĪRĪ], which put an end to the Māhdāwī [q.v.] movement in India. On Islām Shāh’s death in 967/1554 he was succeeded by an infant son who was within days murdered by his mother’s brother Mubāriz Khān. The latter ascended the throne as Muḥammad ʿĀḍīl Shāh, and retained it only by the generalship of a Hindu administrator named Hēmṉā; two years later, with the consent and support of Shāh Shēr Shāh’s son Mūsā, he deposed the ruler of Kāpur, who had restored the throne by rising in rebellion in their own provinces, and all three were calling themselves Sultān—ʿĀḍīl Shāh in Mālwā and the tract from Aṛgrā to Dīwanpur, Sikandār from Dīhlī to Rōhtās in the Pandājb, and Ibrāhīm in a Pandājb region further north still—when Humayūn, who had regained Kābul, took advantage of the tribal squabbles among the Sūrs to reconquer his former empire. The army of Sikandār was defeated at Sirhind in 962/1555, and Humayūn went on to reoccupy Dīhlī without opposition. Within six months he had died after a fall from a height, and his elder son Akbār, then not fourteen years of age, succeeded to the Mughal throne. For details of this complicated period see DĪHLĪ SULTĀNĀTE; HUMAYŪN; ISLĀM SHĀH SŪR; SHER SHĀH SŪR; SIKANDĀR SHĀH SŪR; SŪRS; and, for domestic affairs under the Sūrī dynasty, also DIHLĪ; NĀRNĀWI; ROHTĀS; ROHTĀSΓĀH; SAMSĀRĀM.

On Akbār’s accession the three Sūrs ex-monarchs were still active, although Muḥammad ʿĀḍīl was shortly afterwards killed in a clash with Bahādur Shāh of Bengal; Sikandār was the most dangerous, although Muḥammad ʿĀḍīl’s old minister, Hēmṉā, was also campaigning against the Mughālāns, ostensibly on their behalf but in reality and most privately on his own account. Hēmṉā soon occupied Dīhlī, but was killed in the battle between his followers and Akbār’s smaller force at the familiar plain of Fānpāt in 964/1556. Sikandār Sūr resisted until mid-964/1557 before surrendering. The Mughal generals quickly recaptured Aḍīmīr, Gwālīyar and Dīwānpūr [q.v.], the young emperor remaining under the influence of the “hārām party”, his former nurses and foster-mother and their husbands and children, at Āgrā. Since Akbār’s tutor, the general Bāyār Rām Kān [q.v.], was a Shīʿa he was unpopular at the court, and in 967/1560 Akbār, driven by the persuasion of the “hārām party”, announced that he was assuming charge of the government; within two years he was able to free himself from the hārām influence as well. Mālwā had been occupied in 968/1561, rebelled the following year, and was finally subdued by Akbār in person in 971/1564; his generals in that year crushed an attempt at Afgān resurgence in Bihār. In the next few years Akbār had to contend with rebellions on the part of the Uzbek faction at court, and of his distant relations, princes of the house of Timūr, the Mīrzās [q.v. of Kāṭah (later Robilīkhand), who had received small assignments after the Mughal restoration; the latter invaded Mālwā and made their way to Gudjārāt, where in the local disorder they possessed themselves of much land, especially in its southern provinces. Meanwhile, the Radjāpts were defeated in Citawr (975/1568) and, in the two following years, Rānathbūr and Kālindjār. The heir, Salīm (later Dāhāṅgīr), was born in 977/1569 at Sīkri, where in 979/1571 Akbār founded his new capital, later known as Fathpur Sīkri [q.v.]. Next Gudjārāt was conquered—one party in the civil strife had invited his assistance, and the sultanate was showing itself incapable of dealing with the Portuguese threat on its coast and its interference with the Moḥcān pilgrim traffic in 980/1572-3. Good relations were established with the Portuguese to protect the pilgrim traffic; but about this time Akbār began to have his doubts about the sufficiency of Islam.

Soon after this, Dāhāṅgīr Kān Kārārānī [q.v.], who had succeeded to the Bāṅglā throne, refused to acknowledge Akbār’s supremacy, and invaded Bihār. Akbār marched against him, drove his Afgān army out of Bihār and into Aḍīl Shāh’s territories, but later rebelled and was finally defeated and killed in 984/1576. For the affairs of Bāṅglā and Bihār at this time see BANGLĀ (in Supplement), and references under DĀHĀṅGĪR KĀRĀRĀNĪ. Khāṅdēgh, the buffer state between the Mughal empire and the Dēcčān, was occupied in 985/1577. In 988/1580 the first Jesuit mission reached Āgrā; religious toleration was preached in the court, largely as a result of the influence of Abu ‘l-Fadl ‘Alāmillā and his brother Fāydī [q.v.], but that toleration now appeared to exclude Islam. Many Muslims, believing their faith in danger, supported the idea of replacing Akbār by an orthodox sovereign; first Bihār and later Bāṅglā, where a faction of Kākšāl Turks had become prominent, rebelled and the Kākšālīs proclaimed Akbār’s younger brother Muḥammad Ḥakīm, the ruler of Bāṅglā, as their sovereign. The latter indeed was occupied in Hindūstān, but was repulsed by Akbār and made his submission, and the rebels in the east were put down gradually by Akbār’s generals. In 990/1582 he promulgated his syncretistic faith, the Din-i Ḩiḥā [q.v.], and two years later introduced an Ḩiḥā [q.v.] era. The year 994/1586 saw the annexation of Kāshmir, and a first abortive attempt on Ahmadnagar. Early in 995/1588 Sind, Ustād and Kāḥīlīwād had made their submission, and within
another three years Barār, the first of the Deccan provinces which were the object of Mughal ambition, had been ceded to Akbar; the fortresses of Gawilgadh and Narnála followed, in 1009/1600 Abmadnagar was taken by storm, and the following year Ásrāgha [q.v.] fell. Akbar died in 1014/1605, his last few years having been clouded by disagreement with Salim, the heir-apparent. For India in Akbar's time see AKBAR, MUGHALS, MUHAMMAD ḤĀRĪM, and references under the various cities and provinces mentioned above. For his revenue system see DA'RĪA, 6 b, and FĀDĪR MALL. For religious tolerance in his reign see PĀRĪ, FĀYDĪ and DĪN-I ĪLĀH. For the art and literature fostered in his court see HIND, Architecture; HIND; 'ABD AL-RAJĪM, KHĀN-I KHĀNĀN; TĀṢĪR, India.

Salim succeeded, as Dījāhāngīr, to a powerful empire, and was soon challenged by his own son, Khurram [q.v.]; his rebellion was promptly put down and the rebels severely punished—including the Sikh [q.v.] leader Guru Ardjun Singh, whose execution provoked the constant hostility of the Sikhs to the Mughal power. In the north Shāh 'Abbās [q.v.] of Persia laid claim to Kandahār, and Dījāhāngīr moved to Kābul to be near the potential trouble, at the same time sending armies against the Rānā of Mewāl; operations were also commenced against the Deccan from Burhānpur, but the former Ḥāṣbī slaver Malik 'Anār [q.v.] developed guerrilla tactics for use against the Mughals by trained bands of Maratha soldiers, and by 1019/1610 had recovered Abmadnagar and expelled the imperial forces. Further attacks on the Deccan proved useless and the Mughals in fact lost more territory, which was not regained until 1030/1621 when prince Khurram, the future Shāhjahān, who had been placed in command of the Deccan force, met with some success at last. The following year Kandahār fell to Shāh 'Abbās, and Khurram, ordered to retake it, went into open rebellion against his father; he moved quickly through Central India and Uṛśā to Bihār, and Malik 'Anār profited from the disorganization by taking Bīdar. Khurram's activities in the distant provinces of the empire led him at one point to join forces with the Marathas, but he was eventually reconciled to his father. Dījhānghīr died in 1037/1627 and was buried in Lāhawr, which he had raised to the status of a capital city. For details of his reign see DĪJĀHĀNGĪR, MUGHALS, and NŪR DĪJĀHĀN, and also AGRĀ and LĀHAWR, and references under MALIK 'ANĀR; for his great artistic interests see HIND, Architecture; BUSTĀN, KĀHΜĪR, SĪRĀNΓA; for his elaborate coinage see SIKKA, and for paintings in his reign, TĀṢĪR, also MAḤĀR, MAṆṢŪR.

Shāhjahān's reign too started with a war of succession, and after that a rebellion on the part of Khān Dījahān Lōḍī [q.v.], who defected to Abmadnagar; this led to a renewed conflict with the Deccan kingdoms, Abmadnagar being invaded in 1039/1630 and finally surrendering to the Mughals with the capture of Dāwalāthād [q.v.] three years later. The Mughals now had to take account of the Marāḥāsh [q.v.], some of whom had now joined the Mughal forces but who were always a potential source of danger. Attempts to take Bīdājūpur were at first unsuccessful, but a peace was concluded with that kingdom, in exchange for the promise of tribute, in 1045/1636. Shortly afterwards Prince Awrangzīb was appointed viceroy of the Deccan, and Shāhjahān returned north, where he began building Lāhawr and Dihīl. In 1047/1638 Kandahār was ceded to the Mughals by its governor 'Alī Mardān Khān and held for eleven years, after which it was retaken by the Persians; it was not recovered until 1059/1649 and 1063/1653. Before these an attempt to subdue Bālk had been a failure. After these northern campaigns the Mughals again directed their efforts to the conquest of the Deccan until the sickness of Shāhjahān in 1067/1657 led his four sons to quarrel among themselves for the throne. The third son, Awrangzīb, was victorious over his brothers Dārkī Shukhī, Sīrānī Shukhī [q.v.] and Mūrkī Bālkhī [q.v.], and assumed the imperial title, with the regnal name of 'Ālamgīr, placing his father in confinement in the court of Agra where he died in 1076/1666. For Shāhjahān's reign see SHĀHJAHĀN, MUGHALS, and references under MARĀḤĀS; for events in the north see also KANDAHĀR; for the Deccan see DAKHĀN, also BIDĀJūPūR, NIṢĀM GHRĀNĪ, and references under HAYDĀRĀBĀD; for Awrangzīb's early career as governor of the Deccan see AWранGZīB. For Shāhjahān's buildings see, in addition to HIND, Architecture, AGRA, DĪHĪL, LĀHAWR, TĀṢĪR MAḤĀR.

Before Awrangzīb had assumed the throne, the western Deccan had already been troubled by Shīvādī [q.v.] the Marāḥāsh adventurer, who had encroached more than once on the imperial dominions, and had met with success against the 'Ādī Shīhī armies as well. He was attacked by the Mughal armies, to whom he surrendered in 1076/1666, concluding a treaty which gave him the right to collect one-fourth (awthī) of the revenues in Bīdājūpūr; this was no doubt agreed by Awrangzīb with a view to weakening the Bīdājūpūr resources, but its effects were far-reaching as the right to awthī was arrogated by Shīvādī's Marāḥāsh followers wherever they later conquered; for details see MAḤĀRĀSH, also references under HAYDĀRĀBĀD, ii. When various Afghan tribes (Yūṣufzays, Afridis) rebelled beyond the Indus in and after 1082/1671, Awrangzīb went to Hasan Abdāl [q.v.] for two years, which gave Shīvādī even more scope to continue his depredations in the Deccan. He assumed the insignia of royalty, and abandoning an alliance with the 'Ādī Shīhī, he joined forces with the Kūth Shīhī to invade the Madrāsh coastal tracts (the "Carnatic" of British historians; see KĀRNĀTĀKA) and Mahīsur ("Mysore") in 1085/1674, taking from the 'Ādī Shīhī a number of their southern districts. When he died, six years later, he had created a nation out of the Marāḥāsh who had been the former subjects of the Abmadnagar and Bīdājūpūr sultanes, and who were to be Awrangzīb's strongest and most persistent rivals for the rest of his life—indeed, of the Mughal empire as long as it lasted as a power, and of the British in India as well. Awrangzīb moved to the Deccan in 1093/1682, and remained there in constant warfare until his death 25 years later. After exacting a peaceful treaty with Golkonḍā he captured Bīdājūpūr in 1097/1686; Golkonḍā fell next after a siege of nearly a year; and within the next few years all the former forts of the 'Ādī Shīhī and Kūth Shīhī sultanes had been taken, and many forts recovered from the Marāḥāsh, to enlarge the Mughal empire to its greatest extent. The years 1101-9/1690-8 were spent trying to wear down the fortress of Dījīndī ("Ginge"), where Rāḍī Rām, son and successor of Shīvādī, had set up new headquarters; years of petty sieges against minor Hindī kings followed, but the army was becoming exhausted and a retreat was at last made to Abmadnagar, where Awrangzīb died in 1110/1697. For his reign see AWранGZīB, MARĀḤĀS, MUGHALS,
references to his bigotry under DJIZYA, iii; for the important digest of Muslim law made at his behest see AL-KAHFIYYA. For his projects concerning buildings see HIND, Architecture, DIHLI and LIMAHW.

The Deccan sultanates, the last two of which were extinguished by Awrangzib, grew out of the chaotic BahmanI empire, its provincial governors having gradually asserted their autonomy since about 805/1400. Their history is a record of continuous strife among them, with occasional uneasy alliances but rarely the community of interest to combine and stem their common enemies. The final success of the Bahmans in Bidar were the Barid Shāhīs, whose domination over the later Bahmans has been noticed above. Their sultanate was gradually whittled away in the north and west by Bidjapur, against whom they were allied on several occasions with the neighbouring sultanates. The Rāyārī [q.v.] dōlah was a continuous bone of contention between Bidjapur and Vidjayanagara [q.v.], and the only occasion on which the four southern sultans seem to have been united in a common cause is in 972/1564-5 when their confederacy finally crushed the power of Vidjayanagara at the battle of Tālikofa [q.v.]. Bidar was finally annexed by Bidjapur in 1028/1619. For details of this sultanate see BARD Shawsh, also BAHMAHS and BIDAR.

The Barid Shāhī sultanate of Barar was remote enough to stand aside from part of the Deccan conflicts, although there were occasional border clashes with the Nizam Shāhīs of Ahmadnagar. In 933/1527 Barar was invaded by the Nizam Shāhīs and the Barid Shāhīs; the ruler, ʿAllāʾ al-Dīn ʿĪmād Shāh, fled to Khāndehār from where he invited the help of Ḍaḥ ḩūd Shāh of Gūḍrārat, who promptly invaded the Deccan [see BAHĀDUR SHAH GUJRĀR]. The ruler was restored, and Barar was for some time left unmoslem while the larger sultanates were quarrelling among themselves. In 969/1561-2 Daryā ʿĪmād Shāh, the son of ʿĀlī al-Dīn, had been succeeded by his infant son Burhān, and the minister Tufāl Khān took de facto control over the sultanate. The latter stood aloof from the confederacy which defeated the Vidjayanagara kingdom, and plundered the Nizam Shāhī dominions while their ruler was at Tālikofa. In 973/1566 the Nizam Shāhīs invaded Barar in order to punish Tufāl, but strife between them saved the ʿĪmād Shāhī state from destruction at that time. Eventually the Nizam Shāhīs, intent on strengthening their position to match that of the ʿĀdīl Shāhīs who had annexed many former Vidjayanagara possessions in the south, again invaded Barar in 981-2/1574-5, capturing Tufāl Khān in Narnālī and forcing the surrender of Gauḍīgarh; with the imprisonment of Tufāl Khān and Burhān ʿĪmād Shāh, the Barar sultanate was extinguished and absorbed in the Nizam Shāhī dominions. For the detailed history of this sultanate see ʿĪMĀD SHAHS, GAULGARH, ILĪKPUR, NARNĀL, as well as references under NIZAM SHAHS.

The Nizam Shāhīs, like the Barid Shāhīs and ʿĀdīl Shāhīs, were Sunnis, although after about 944/1537 Burhān I adopted Shiʿism. The ancestral home of the Nizam Shāhī kings was at Pathri in Barar, the claim to which led to several Nizam Shāhī raids on ʿĪmād Shāhī territory. For the most part, however, the Nizam Shāhīs were in a constant state of dispute with their larger neighbours, the ʿĀdīl Shāhīs and the Kūṭ Shāhīs, in turn, one sultanate always eventually being compelled to intervene in a war between the two others lest the balance of power be upset to the disadvantage of the non-belligerent party. In this strange way the rival sultanates were in fact able to keep going where the Bahmans failed, and to destroy the powerful Vidjayanagara kingdom to their south. To give an account of these three sultanates seriālīm would involve unnecessary repetition and, since the political history of each is so closely bound to that of its neighbours, would fail to show clearly the events in the Deccan in relation to a chronological framework; the purely domestic affairs of each sultanate are less relevant to the history of Islam in India, for each produced more history than it could consume locally."

Yūsuf, the founder of the ʿĀdīl Shāhī dynasty, had been a Shīʿī and established that form of Islam in his dominions. On his death in 915/1502 his son ʿIsāʾī was a minor, and a regent reintroduced the Sunni faith; this was politically to the disadvantage of the "foreigners", who were as powerful a faction in Bidjapur as they had been in the Bahmanī sultanate, and were on this occasion successful in returning to power and reintroducing Shīʿism. But the state was torn by political rivalry, and was not powerful enough to prevent the Portuguese from capturing Goa [see SINDABUR] later that year. Their troubles with Vidjayanagara immediately followed when that state, in 916/1510, annexed the Rāyārī [q.v.] dōlah. Four years later Bidjapur was strong enough to defeat Amir ʿĀlī Barid, who had established a provincial governor at Gulkarga—now virtually part of the Bidjapur state—on behalf of the puppet Bahmani king. Shortly after this the ʿĀdīl Shāhī sultan, in reward for extracting a Persian ambassador from detention at Bidar, had received recognition of his royal title from ʿShāh Ismāʾīl, the Ṣafawī sultan. By 927/1519 Bidjapur was in a position to try to recapture the Rāyārī dōlah, although the attack failed; the Hindu king had been incited to take the dōlah by Amir ʿĀlī Barid, against whom Bidjapur sought an alliance with Ahmadnagar, marrying the sister of the Bidjapur king to the ʿĀdīl Shāhī sultan. But the princess’s dowry, the fort of Shīslapur [q.v.], was never ceded to Ahmadnagar, and so in 931/1525 the Nizam Shāhīs, in alliance with Barar and Bidar, invaded Bidjapur but were defeated and driven out. The war with Bidar, against whom Bahadur Shah's attack on the Deccan, has already been mentioned; Ahmadnagar and Bidjapur were on this occasion united against the invader, but even on this occasion Amir ʿĀlī Barid had tried to interfere between them and Ismāʾīl ʿĀdīl Shāh marched to Bidar to punish him. Bidar fell, but was restored to the Barid Shāhīs on condition that Kalyānī and Kandhar [qq.v.] were ceded to Bidjapur, and that assistance should be given to recapture the dōlah. Rāyārī and Mudgal were regained shortly, but the Barid Shāhīs did not in fact cede the two northern forts. In 937/1531 Bahadur Shāh of Gūḍrārat had annexed Mālwā and Burhān Nizam Shāh, alarmed by his growth of power, offered allegiance to him and obtained from him recognition of his royal title; Bahādūr's aim was to enlist Burhān's support against the Mughals, but secretly Burhān suggested to Humayūn an attack on Gūḍrārat. Later that year Burhān's insolence to Ismāʾīl ʿĀdīl Shāh, who was attempting to force the promised cession of Kalyānī and Kandhar, led to further Ahmadnagar-Bidjapur war, in which the Nizam Shāhīs were defeated; but next year, 938/1532, an agreement was reached between these two powers permitting Ahmadnagar to annex Barar and Bidjapur to annex
Golkonda. The campaigns started, but were cut short by the death of Ismail Adil Shah, in 942/1534, whose first two sons had been killed by Murtaza, and who died shortly afterwards. Ibrahim succeeded to the Bidjarpur throne, Ibrahim reintroduced the Sunni faith, dismissed the "foreigners", and introduced Kannada and Marathi as court languages in place of Persian—thus allowing the employment of many Hindus in the administration. A few years afterwards Burhan Nizam Shah was converted to Shi‘ism, and consequently relations worsened between him and Ibrahim; in 947/1540 Burhan marched again on the Adil Shahi kingdom and annexed Sholapur, then drove Ibrahim out of Bidjarpur, occupied the town, and set off in pursuit of Ibrahim; the latter received reinforcements and drove the invaders to Dowlatabad, where Burhan bought peace by relinquishing his claim to Sholapur. Smearing under his defeat he persuaded Diamadh Kuth Shih and the rajah of Vidjayanagara to join a confederacy against Bidjarpur in 950/1543. These three powers, together with Ali Barid, invaded Bidjarpur that year and the next without success; on a third attempt Ali Barid decided to support the Sunni Ibrahim rather than the Shih Burhan, causing the latter to invade Bidar and taking three strongholds on the Bidar-Bidjarpur border. In the consequent troubles in Bidjarpur a disaffected minister and the king's younger brother, Abd Allah, sought the aid of Portugal at Goa, but were claiming the Konkan coast. A rebellion in the Konkan was crushed by Ibrahim. Further attacks on Adil Shahi territory were made by Burhan, with Vidjayanagara support, in 954/1547 and 959/1552, the Rayur dorph again being annexed to Vidjayanagara on the latter occasion. In 961/1553 Burhan died and eventually his son Husayn gained the Ahmadnagar throne after a war of succession. Diamadh Kuth Shih had similarly been succeeded by his youngest brother Ibrahim. At this time the Adil Shahis actually turned to Vidjayanagara for assistance in 962/1555, against a rebel noble Sayf ‘Ayn al-Mulk, and, alone waged war against the Portuguese in the northern Konkan. Ibrahim Adil Shah died in 963/1558 and was succeeded by his son Ali, who restored the Sunni faith and expelled the "foreigners". On Ali's enlisting Vidjayanagara aid again, this time for the recovery of Sholapur, his kingdom was again attacked by the Nizam Shahi and Kuth Shahi forces; but the Kuth Shahi opposition was suddenly withdrawn: the Kuth Shahis could not risk supporting a Sunni state against a Shih one. Ali's demands for the return of Sholapur and Kalyani became more insistent, and in 967/1559 it was Ahmadnagar which was invaded, by the Adil Shahis, Kuth Shahis, and a large Vidjayanagara contingent; a Barar army soon joined in, invading Ahmadnagar from the east. The Kuth Shahi ruler later withdrew and the ‘Imad Shahi contingent changed sides, but still Husayn Nizam Shah had to sue for peace from the Vidjayanagara commander who had now become the dominant party in the confederacy. Bidjarpur and Vidjayanagara continued the campaigns for the next few years; but the Hindu army of Vidjayanagara offended allies and enemies alike by their excesses on their campaigns, including desecrating mosques and violating and enslaving Muslim women; their arrogant rajad now demanded large tracts of land from both Golkonda and Bidjarpur. On this the Muslim rulers sank their differences, and in 972/1564-5 marched on Vidjayanagara and defeated an army led by the battle of Talirofa [q.v.]. The Vidjayanagara empire was destroyed and its lands divided among the victors. The Muslim alliance did not last long: the Nizam Shahis, where Husayn was succeeded by Murtaza, and the Adil Shahis were soon at war again in 1558. In 1560-70 they again united against a common enemy, the Portuguese. The Adil Shahis attacked Goa, the Nizam Shahis Cewal ("Chaoul"); but the Portuguese were so adroit at manipulating dissensions in their opponents' forces, and in playing off one enemy against the other, that both towns held fast against overwhelming odds and the attackers were forced to conclude peace treaties. Ali Adil Shah turned to the former Vidjayanagara territories for easier conquests, and it was this agrandisement of the Bidjarpur lands which caused similar ambitions on the part of Ahmadnagar, whose ruler annexed Barar in 981-2/1574-5, as mentioned above. A general state of warfare persisted between Ahmadnagar and Bidjarpur for some years to come, not without internal troubles such as the rebellion of a Nizam Shahi prince in 987/1579 who fled to Akbar; later wars of succession in Ahmadnagar between 996/1588 and 999/1591 ended in the accession of that prince as Burhan II. In Bidjarpur the minor Ibrahim II had succeeded ‘Ali I, and the Habshi Dilawar Khan rose to supreme power, re-establishing the Sunni faith (for the Habshi factions in both sultanates see ‘Habshi’); during the Bidjarpur internal struggles, the Ahmadnagar forces contested Naldrug [q.v.], and the kingdom was again being annexed to Vidjayanagara on the north and west, but its remains fell slowly to the Marathas, who had risen under Shivaji; and Maratha depredations slowly nibbled away the kingdom on the north and west until its remains fell to Awrangiz in 1609/1686. The Kuth Shahi kingdom of Golkonda was also troubled than its neighbours after the battle of Talirofa, and knew a long period of peace and prosperity under Muhammad Kuli
Kutb Shāh during which the city of Haydarābād [q.v.] was built and adorned; for six years (1070/1660-9) a Persian embassy from Shāh 'Abbās resided in Haydarābād. That peace was preserved under Muhāammad Kutb Shāh, 1020-35/1611-26, although in 1024/1615 the Dutch established themselves at Masulipātam, on the Madrās coast, and the English there seven years later. The next ruler, 'Abd Allāh Kutb Shāh, was able to extend his dominions to the south, with the help of his minister Mir Dīumla [see Muḥammad Sa‘īd]; but the Mughals were already active to the north, and in 1045/1635–6 Shāhdāštā Shāhīs offered the payment of tribute from Golkānda. Mir Dīumla became increasingly powerful in the eastern provinces, and in a quarrel between himself and the king appealed for aid from prince Awrangzīb; this led to the first Mughal siege of Golkānda in 1066/1656, which was bought off. In 1078/1667 the Marāthā Shīvāġī exacted tribute, and was indeed provided with money and troops to recover some of the Kutb Shāhī forts which had been annexed by Bījāpūr. The accession of the last king, Abu 'l-Hasan Kutb Shāh, in 1083/1672, was followed by the rise to power of two Brāhman ministers; their position in a Muslim kingdom, the assistance given by Golkānda to Bījāpūr against the Mughals, and the fact that it was in any case a Shi‘ī kingdom, were all sufficient cause for Awrangzīb to renew the attack in 1096/1685; the capital, and the kingdom, fell to the Mughals two years later. Awrangzīb had conquered the Deccan, but destroyed the balance of power; for Bījāpūr and Golkānda no longer stood between the Mughals and the Marāthās, and the southern states became an easy prey for disinherited adventurers from the north. This enormously complicated phase of Indian history is partly covered by the articles 'Adil Shāhs, Barīd Shāhis, Bīdar, Bījāpūr, Dakhan, Dawlatābād, Gauḷgaṃ, Golkānda, Ḥabībī, Haydarābād, Ilīpur, 'Īmād Shāhs, Kalyānī, Kandhār, Kutb Shāhs, Marāthās, Mugal, Mughals, Muḥammad Sa‘īd Mir Dīumla, Kaldruj, Narnālā, Nīzām Shāhs, Rāyvānī, Shīlāpur, Šīndurūn, Tallikotā, Viṣṇa-Vanagara; some references under Shī‘a; and articles on the major dynasts of the five Deccan sultanates.

The Mughal empire lasted barely five years as an empire after Awrangzīb’s death. There was again a war of succession. The accession of Bahādur Shāh I, whose five years’ reign was a constant struggle to retain the Mughal authority in his dominions: Kām Bakhsh, a younger brother, usurped Haydarābād; the Rājdūpts, especially in Mawārī [see Mūḍhur], were in rebellion against Mughal authority; a rebellion of Sikhs [q.v.] broke out in the Pandjab; and he provoked resettlement in Dīhī and Lāhawr by commanding the introduction of Shī‘ī forms in worship. The emperor Dījahāndār Shāh [q.v.] succeeded in 1124/1712, soon to be supplanted by Farrukhsīyār [q.v.] supported by the Sayyids brothers of Bārhā [q.v. in Supplement], the effective kingmakers of the Mughal empire for some years to come. Attempts to quell the rebellions of the Rājdūpts and Sikhs were partly successful; the Dīsā [q.v.] and their Ghilzais, and the Afrīdīs of Badaji, who too soon were attacked, received revenue concessions. Farrukhsīyār attempted to remove the Sayyids, and was consequently deposed by them in 1131/1719. Neither Ra‘īf al-Darāḏāt nor Ra‘īf al-Dawla retained the throne for more than a few months before the Sayyids produced Muḥammad Shāh [q.v.]; but there was so little faith in the monarchy, and less in the Sayyids, that provincial governors and nobles were able to assume independence of Dīhī more or less as they desired. Kānr al-Dīn Cīn Kīlī Khān, entitled Nīzām al-Mulk [q.v.], opposed to the Sayyids, abandoned his province of Mawārī and established himself first at Asīrgāf; for a time he returned to Dīhī as minister, but retired again to the Deccan ostensibly on hearing of Marāthā depredations there. His deputy in the Deccan had been ordered by Dīhī to oppose him; he defeated this deputy at the battle of Shaḵarkheardā [q.v.] in 1137/1724, and made himself independent in the Deccan with Haydarābād as his capital. Dīhī abandoned his province of Malwa and established a position of great strength with the title of Āṣaf Dīhā, since then borne as a hereditary title by his descendants, the Nīzāms of Haydarābād. The Marāthās—who were supported in their activities against Dīhī by the Nīzāms—appeared now in Mawārī, Gudjarāt, and Būndelkhand. The Dīsās grew in power, and an imperial officer, 'Āli Muḥammad Mūn, had become practically independent in Kāṭah (later Rohilkhānd [q.v.]) to the east of Dīhī. Bādī Rāo, the Peśhwā [q.v.] of the new Marāthā empire, was recognized as governor of Mawārī in 1148/1735, and constantly demanded from the Mughals fresh territory and tribute. Shortly after this Nādīr Shāh [q.v.], who had become ruler of Persia, raided Afghānistān and occupied Kābul, and large numbers of Afghān refugees took refuge with the pro-Afghān 'Āli Muḥammad Mūn in Rohilkhānd. Nādīr Shāh’s advance on Indīa continued, and in 1151/1739 Dīhī was sacked by his army and a general massacre of the inhabitants began; after collecting what treasure he could—enough to keep Persia free of taxes for three years!—he restored Muḥammad Shāh to his throne and left, annexing Kābul and the trans-Indus provinces on the way. Dīhī was left stupified and desolate.

The province of Bengal was less disturbed than the centre. Its government after the time of Awrangzīb, together with the provinces of Bihār, Uṛīsā and Allābādābād, was held first by Dīja‘ār Khān, known better as Muḥṣīd Kuli Khān [q.v.]; his son-in-law Shūdījā al-Dawla [q.v.] after him had handled the province well; but the successor of Shūdījā, Sarfarāz Khān, a weakening, was supplanted in early 1153/1740 by 'Alīwīrdī Khān [q.v.], who was twice successful in recent Dīhī's attempts Malwa to rebel against his king in Bengal. The Marāthās were, however, successful in Uṛīsā, which was surrendered to them in 1164/1751. ‘Alīwīrdī Khān was succeeded in 1171/1765 by Sirādī al-Dawla, who was defeated the following year by Clive at Plassey.

Nādīr Shāh was murdered in 1160/1747, and an opportunist commander of his, Aḥmad Khān, took over the royal possessions and the royal title as Ahmad Shāh Durrānī [q.v.], and advanced with an army through the Pandjab to Dīhī; defeated by Dīhī on an army, the Afghāns retreated. They returned two years later to besiege Lāhawr, and the revenue of part of the Pandjab was ceded to them. A third invasion, in 1165/1751, brought them Mūnlā and the remainder of the Pandjab; in 1170/1757 a fourth invasion took Dīhī by conquest, and, in 1175/1762, two years later a Durrānī army came to expel the Marāthās from the Pandjab, and by 1174/1761 the Marāthā power in the north was broken at the third battle of Fānpat in which the Durrānīs were joined by Mughal, Awadh and Rohilla troops. These Rohillas, the Afghāns of Rohilkhānd, had more than once risen against Dīhī and the virtually independent province of Awadh, and had been on a previous occasion subdued by Marāthā troops invited by Dīhī.
The Durranis on their numerous visits had acted as the rulers of the Mughal empire; when they were absent the real power was manipulated by the governor of Awadh, Sadar Djang [q.v.], the nephew and successor of Sa'dat Khan [q.v.], a Persian Sji'hi. The titular monarch at the time of Panipat was Shâh 'Alam II, who had tried to gain control of Bihâr and Bengal without success. He came under British protection from 1765 to 1771 when he was recalled to Dihîl after the Marâthas had again risen to power; but Awadh, under Shughâl al-Dawla, the Di'âs of Bhatpur, and the Rohilla leader Nadji' Khan held the balance of power, rather than any remnant of Mughal authority. On an occasion when the Marâthas were engaged elsewhere the Rohilla Qâhil Khan, in 1788, attacked Dihîl and seized and blinded Shâh 'Alam II, and the Marâthas leader Sindia continued his virtual domination of Dihîl. In 1803 the Marâthas army was thoroughly defeated by the British general Lord Lake, and under British protection Shâh 'Alam II was restored to his barren title and hollow empire: although titular monarchs remained until the deposition of Bahadur Shâh II in 1857 after the Mutiny, the Mughal empire had ceased to exist. For the period of the later Mughals see MUJHHÖLSö BAHADUR SHAH I, DHĀJHANDAR SHAH, PAKRUCIHYAR, MUHAMMAD SHAH, SHAH 'ALAM II, BAHADUR SHAH II; GHÂFS, MARÂTHAS, RÂDZHUTs, SIKHs; NIZAM AL-MULK; NADIR SHAH; AHMAD SHAH.

To the west of the Nizâm of Haydârâbâd, and to the south-west of the Nizâm of Haydârâbâd's dominions, in Mahisur ("Mysore"), a ruler who established himself about 1750 was Haydâr 'Ali [q.v.], who fought against the local Marâthas, against the Nizâm, against the Nizâm, or with the French, against the British, and carved out for himself a large kingdom. He died in 1782 and was succeeded by his son Tipu [q.v.], who was killed in a British attack in 1799. For the history and its events see BAHAWALPUR, BHOPAL, DIJHPr, DURRANJ, KHYAR, MUKPUR, see also BALôÇTIStAN.

The arrival of the Nizâm of Haydârâbâd's dominions in Mahisur ("Mysore"), a ruler who established himself about 1750 was Haydâr 'Ali [q.v.], who fought against the local Marâthas, against the Nizâm, against the French, against the British, and carved out for himself a large kingdom. He died in 1782 and was succeeded by his son Tipu [q.v.], who was killed in a British attack in 1799. For the history and its events see BAHAWALPUR, BHOPAL, DIJHPr, DURRANJ, KHYAR, MUKPUR, see also BALôÇTIStAN.

After 1857 there was in effect no Muslim rule in India. For the history of the Muslim community thereafter see MUSLIMs. The community was educationally backward and thus at a disadvantage in matters of government in comparison with the Hindus. For aspects of the betterment of the community see especially AHMAD KHAN, ALI GHAR, DEOBAHAND, DIJAM'TYÀ, DIJAM'TAS, DHARDI, INDIA (in Supplement). For Muslim involvement in politics see HIND, INDIA; INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS; MUSLIM LEAGUE. For events leading up to the division of what has hitherto been called India in this article into the two dominions (later republics) of India (Bhârat) and Pakistan, see PAKISTAN, also DIWAN, MUHAMMAD SÀLT; LIYARAT 'ALI ISRÀL; MUHAMMAD ISRÀL; FOR THE CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN see DUSTOH X AND HUKUMA V.

It is perhaps not quite correct to say that there was no Muslim rule in the sub-continent before 1947, since the British government did recognize independent "Native States", some of which were under autonomous Muslim rulers, where the British retained the right to intervene if requirements of public safety demanded it and were represented by Resident-Governors appointed. Haydârâbâd was the largest of the Muslim states, but there were many smaller ones. See, for example, BAHAWALPUR, BHOJÀL, GUNAÀRÁH, KASHMIR (under a Muslim MaharâJh and but with a predominantly Muslim population), THAYRÔF, RÄMPUR. See also BALôÇTIStAN. Bibliography: A separate bibliography to cover the various aspects of the Muslim history of the sub-continent would be enormous and would duplicate the detailed bibliographies of the many entries referred to above; reference should therefore be made to the special bibliographies given under each article. (J. BURTON-PAGE)

V. — ISLAM

(a) Growth of Muslim society

The growth of Muslim society in India took place through four processes—conquest, conversion, colonization and migration. It is difficult to say what proselytizing agencies worked in Sind, but we are told that at the instigation of the Umayyad Caliph 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz an announcement was made that whoever embraced Islam in Sind would be accorded all the rights enjoyed by the Arab rulers themselves. Some tribes of Sind consequently embraced Islam, Dâhîr's son, 'Dây Singh, being one of them. But when the Umayyad political control weakened in Sind, they went back to their original faiths. Mu'âddâsi found that the impact of Islam was confined to only a few towns. In Makrân, he writes, the people were Muslims only in name.

The rise of Ghazna under Sultan Mahmûd (388/998-1030) marked the beginning of a new era in the history of Indian Islam, yet Mamûd's invasions created a gulf between Islam and Hinduism. Notwithstanding the fact that the ruler of Baran, Rai Hardat, had embraced Islam with 10,000 of his followers at the hands of Mahmûd ('Utbi, 505; CUSAPI), the general effect of his invasions was not favourable (al-Birûnî, Kitâb al-Hind, tr. SACHAU, 22).

The establishment of the Ghaznavid hold on the Pandjâb linked India with the cultural centres of mediaeval 'Adjam. However, the real growth of Indo-Muslim society took place after the Ghurid conquest of northern India. References to conversions at the hands of Shihâb al-Dûn Muhammad Ghuri (d. 602/1206) or of his slave-officers are few and far between (Minhâdjî, 152; Firishtà, i, 59). The Sultans of Delhi did not devise any agency for conversion, and minor acts of royal favour, as recorded by Ibn Ba'tûtah (iii, 179; tr. von MİLK, 82), could hardly act as incentives to change one's faith. When Muhammad b. Tughlûk (725-52/1325-51) embarked upon his Deccan experiment, one of his objects was to prepare the ground for the spread of Islam in that region (Nizâmî, Salâfîn-i Dihîl kây madhâhi radjhadâm, 338-45). He exhorted the saints and the 'ulama' to go to different parts of the country to propagate Islam. But if Muhammad b. Tughlûk helped in the expansion of Islam in the south or in the growth of Muslim society in that region it was done indirectly. Muslim society grew in India through conversions which took place voluntarily at tribal levels, and often through the peaceful persuasion of Muslim mystics.

The social set-up of India in the 5th/11th and the 6th/12th centuries was based on the principle of caste. According to al-Birûnî the caste Hindus lived within the city walls and enjoyed all the privileges of city life, the non-caste people were compelled to live outside the city walls and were denied all civic amenities, as they were physically polluted was one of the basic principles of the Hindu social system.
When the Muslims conquered these caste-cities they threw open their gates to everybody, with the result that... of thought and enquiry. A subtle conflict between the Aghari and the Mu'tazili attitudes is, however, discernible in the religious thought of the period.

With the introduction of Ibn al-'Arabi's works (Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam and al-Futūkhāt al-Makhbīyya) in India during the 7th/13th century there was a stir in Muslim religious thought. Since the pantheistic ideas of the Great Shaykh were in consonance with the spirit of the Upānīṣad, they became identified with the movement of rapprochement between the Hindu and the Muslim attitudes. The rise of mystic poetry in Gharda at this time and the composition of the Ṣadūqīn of Dzjr al-Dīn Ṣūrī [94]—which was first quoted in the mystical gatherings of Shaykh Naṣir al-Dīn Čirāgh (675-725/1276-1336)—further strengthened the influence of Ibn 'Arabi's thought. Eminent scholars, like Sayyid 'All Hama- dans (d. 786/1384), Ṣafarid Dīn Ḥishâwi (d. 795/1392), and Shaykh 'Ali Makhdūmi (d. 835/1424), wrote commentaries on the Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam, and Shaykh 'All Makhdūmi even attempted a commentary on the Kur'an (Tafsīr al-Rāhmiyān wa tāyṣir al-Mannān) in the light of Ibn 'Arabi's ideas. It became the theme of Mas'ūd Bāk's (d. 800/1397) poetic compositions and inspired also his prose-work, Mirād al-Ṣārīfīn. Ibn al-'Arabi's ideas have become fairly popular in Muslim religious circles when Ibn Tarmiyāya and those of Ibn Tarmiyāya. The orthodox section of Muslim society in India had so far tolerated the acceptance of pantheistic ideas by the mystics as a basis for their spiritual experience, but now that it became the basis for the organization of small social groups—as one finds in the Futūkhāt-i Firāz Shāhī (Aligarh ed., 8-10)—they viewed it as a serious threat to the very structure of the ghar'a and its function as the regulator of the Muslim conscience. The āqāma of the Futūkhāt al-Makkiyya—this period to combat the tendencies released by the pantheists. The production of an enormous literature on ṣīḥ during the 9th/14th century—more than in any other period of Indian history—was inspired by a desire to provide a defensive ideological apparatus against the upsurge of pantheistic ideas which seemed to weaken the external structure of faith.

While accepting ṣīḥ as the basis of all spiritual experience, Shaykh Naṣir al-Dīn Čirāgh emphasized close adherence to the Kur'an and the sunna and discontinued many mystic practices (e.g., prostration before the ṣīḥ), which did not conform to the externals of the ghar'a. He did not agree with many of the ideas of Ibn Tarmiyāya (Ṣhawry al-madājil, intr. 29-31), but he met the challenge of the time by making a serious effort to bridge the gulf between the formalist scholars and the mystics. That a mystic of his eminence should be styled “the second Abū Ḥanīfa” shows the extent to which in his own person he had succeeded in bridging the gulf. His disciple Sayyid Muhammad Ghāzī Darāz criticized the thought of Ibn al-'Arabi, and even planned to write a book in refutation of his ideas (Makhbūt-i Shāh Muhīb Alāih, Aligarh University MS, 90).

For some time the balance seems to have been in favour of Ibn Tarmiyāya's school of thought, but the
views of Ibn al-"Arabi, which provided the necessary ideological meeting-ground for Islam and Hinduism, making a definite impact and the stream of religious thought began to flow in that direction. The 9th/15th and the 10th/16th centuries saw a mushroom growth of new sects, ideologies, philosophies and attitudes in India, most of them based on a pantheistic approach to religion. The Bhakti movement, the Šaṅkarī order, and the Rauśhanīyya sect were the expressions of the same attitude, which laid greater emphasis on the spirit than on the form of religion. Shaykh Muham-

mad Chawth of Gwalior translated Širīk Ḳumand into Persian, and thereby introduced Hindu mystical ideas and Yogaic practices into the Šūfī discipline. Bāyāzīd Ṣansārī, the founder of the Raušhanīyya movement, laid greater emphasis on the interiorization of religious rites and practices than on outward con-
formity to the externals of religion. When Akbar appeared on the Indian scene, the ideas of Ibn al-"Arabi held sway. In his eagerness to evolve a common religious outlook, Akbar made certain experiments with the ideological support of panthe-

istic philosophy, which hurt the religious susceptibility-

ibilities of the orthodox section and produced fears that in the process of evolving an amalgam of differ-

ent religions the individuality of Islam might be jeopardized. Had Akbar not intervened, Indo-

Muslim religious thought would probably have proceeded on entirely different lines, but Akbar's at-

tempt to assume the leadership of these syncretic forces provoked a severe reaction, which expressed itself on one side in the production of hadīth and juristic literature by scholars like Shaykh ʿAbd al-

-

Ḥakīk Muḥaddīdh and on the other side gave birth to the powerful movement of the Naḵṣbandī Shaykh ʿAbd al-Sirhindī. (g.s.), popularly known as Muqaddidi-y Ḳaft-ī Thānī. Under the influence of his teacher Shaykh ʿAbd al-Wahlāb Ṣuttaḏ, Shaykh ʿAbd al-Hakīk had followed a very cautious and non-committal policy towards the ideas of Ibn al-"Arabi (Khāṣṣīr al-ahkārī, 263), but Shaykh ʿAbd al-Sirhindī published abroad his tirade against Ibn al-"Arabi's pantheistic approach to religion and mysticism. He considered it an expression of an immature spiritual experience, frustrat-

ing the impact of the ray of spirituality on religion, as it facilitated the absorption of ideas and prac-

tices by Muslims which ran counter to the monotheistic ideals of Islam. He condemned on that account the religious experiments of Akbar. Drawing his inspiration from the Kurānīic verse, "For you yours, and for me my religion" (CIX, 6), he declared against an admixture of Muslim and non-Muslim—

Hindu, Buddhist, Djiyn and other—ideas by Akbar. He succeeded in winning over large numbers of Mughal nobles to his side, and through them he sought to bring about a change in the atmosphere of the court. Djiyn Ĥānī had to give up Akbar's policy of meddling in religion and making religious experiments, while Šāhjdāhān and Awaṅrgīb came definitely under the impact of Shaykh ʿAbd al-Sirhindī's ideas. Šāh Kālmāl Allāh of Delhi (1606-

1142/1650-1729) wrote to a disciple, who was trying to reconcile the two concepts whose underlying reality was one and the same. Though some other followers of the Muṣaddid, like Ṣaḥīb Mīr Nāṣīr ʿAndālīb (Nāṣīr-ī ʿAndālīb, Bhopal 1310), Ṣaḥīb Mīr Dard (Iṣm al-khiyāl, Delhi 1308), and Ghulām Yābīya (Kaṭīmāt-ī Ḳhākī, MS, Allahābād) did not agree with his point of view, Šāh Wall Allāh, so far as he was concerned, closed the controversy which had been raging in Indian Muslim thought for several centuries. Šāh Wall Allāh's son Šāh Raffī al-Dīn rebutted... the arguments of Ghulām Yābīya in his Da-wāzh-e ʿulā (MS no. 1699 Bankīpore), and paved the way for the return of pantheistic ideas as the basis of spiritual experience.

Šāh Wall Allāh of Delhi (d. 1763) was a seminal personality in the intellectual life of the Indian Muslims. He exercised a profound influence on the religious thought of his contemporaries, and many of the religious movements of the period, though differing in their approach, drew inspiration from his outlook and insight. On one side the orthodox school of Deoband, which aimed at resuscitating the traditional and classical values of early Islam, clung to his ideology, on the other hand Sir Sayyid Ahmad ʿKhān, who stood for a complete reorientation of religious thought in the light of Western rational-

istic tendencies, looked to him for support and guidance. Šāh Wall Allāh was the last great thinker of the Middle Ages who realised the need of re-interpreting Islamic thought in the light of reason and pointed out that the codification of shari'a's laws should be related to the specific requirements of a particular
region and should take into consideration the social, religious and legal practices of the society concerned. This dynamic religious approach opened fresh avenues for the re-interpretation of the basic religious values. On being asked which of the four schools of Sunni fiqh he belonged to, he said: “I try my best to combine all the points of agreement in all the schools, and in matters of variance I adhere to what is proved by the genuine hadith—which, thank God, I can do. If anybody asks me for a fiqih, I give it according to where I have mine.” They were encouraged to recourse to any school of Sunni law which suited the circumstances was of great significance to the succeeding generations. It may be pointed out that in its attempt to bring its laws into consonance with the spirit of the modern world, Egypt was guided by this very principle.

The new spirit of idrīsīd which Shāh Waliy Allāh wanted to awaken could be possible only if religious thought was extricated from narrow and sectarian controversies. With this aim in view he translated the Kurʿān into Persian and his two illustrious sons—Shāh ‘Abd al-Kadr and Shāh Rāfiʿ al-Dīn—translated it into Urdu, so placing the main source of Muslim religion within the reach of all Indians. Besides, he and his sons popularized the study of hadith and prepared many thought-provoking commentaries on it. The literature produced by his followers, particularly Mawlānā Muhammad Ismāʿīl Shāhīd (d. 1831), breathes the spirit of Wahhābī ideology.

The infiltration of western influences into Muslim society created a stir in the Muslim mind in the 19th century. The superiority of the West in technique, science, and industry was an established fact, but the Muslim mind could not be induced to be the supplanter of the Mughal rule in India and could not, therefore, be accepted. This created a conflict in the Muslim mind which is revealed in the strange but significant position taken up by Shāh ‘Abd al-Azīz, the eldest son of Shāh Waliy Allāh. On the one hand he praised English efficiency in art and industry (Mafâzātī, 51) and permitted the study of the English language (Fatwâd-i ‘Aṣīfī, 195) and on the other side he issued a fatwâ declaring all land under British occupation as dar al-barb (Fatwâd-i ‘Aṣīfī, 17). This position was, however, maintained by the succeeding generations. Those who studied the English language and sciences willingly accepted British rule, and those who refused to accept British rule totally refused to learn the English language and literature. As was inevitable, two diametrically opposite tendencies developed in Muslim religious and social attitudes, one represented by the ‘Aligarh movement under Sayyid Ahmad Khan, the names of Mawlānā Abu ‘l-Kalām ʿĀzīz (1888-1958) and Dr. Muhammad Ikbâl (1876-1938) are particularly noteworthy. Mawlānā Abu ‘l-Kalām ʿĀzīz was deeply influenced by Dīmāl al-Dīn Āfghānī (d. 1927), Muhammad ʿAbduh (d. 1905) and Ṭalāqī Râdī (d. 1935) and he enthusiastically broadcast through his journals al-Hilâl and al-Balâgh the same spirit of religious enquiry and dynamism which Āfghānī and his school of thought had tried to infuse into the Middle East. But the greatest contribution of the Mawlānā is his incomplete commentary on the Kurʿān (Tarjumān al-Kurʿān, 2 vols.), which marks the beginning of a new era in the history of Muslim exegesis. The Mawlānā discarded the apparatus of philosophic disquisition of the Muʿtazilites and the spirit of rationalism developed by Sayyid Ahmad Khan and others of his school of thought. He condemned a natural, direct and unsophisticated
approach to the study of the Kur'ān and declared all attempts at resolving the conflict between religion and science as irrelevant, since scientific problems, according to him, were not the domain of religion. But it was difficult for the Mawlawī to escape the spirit of the age in which he lived. His humanistic approach and theosophic attitude give an idea of the mental climate of the period.

Dr. Muḥammad ʿIkbāl, who had made an intensive study of western and eastern religions and philosophies, emphasized the reconstruction of Muslim thought in the light of the problems posited by the modern world. He looked upon religion as a powerful factor in the evolution of a man's personality and the betterment of human society. "His Islam," writes Smith, "repudiated the conception of a fixed universe dominated by a dictator God and to be accepted by servile men. In its place he would put a view of an unfinished growing universe ever being advanced by man and by God through man." He criticized those eclectic elements of religious thought which made man parasitical and indolent. He preached a life of self-assertion and self-realization. "The moral and religious ideal of man is not self-negation but self-affirmation" he declared. ʿIkbāl's thought had a very deep impact on the contemporary Muslim religious attitude.

Another great conflict in Indo-Muslim religious thought took place in 1918 when Mawlawī Ḥusayn ʿAḥmad ʿĀmān (1879-1957), who taught ḥadīth at Deoband for several decades, attempted a reconciliation of religious thought with the national trends in the country and declared that religion did not constitute any basis for separate national individuality and that the Hindus and the Muslims of India were one nation. Dr. Muḥammad ʿIkbāl opposed this view and the controversy (Mas'āka-i Deobandi) continued for years and found reflection in political life also.

(c) Muslim religious movements

A number of Muslim religious movements have appeared in India during the last 700 years. Abūl-Faḍl refers to 14 mystic orders, and the author of Dabistan al-madhābīn to a number of religious groups, all of whom thought in the light of the problem posited by the modern world. Significantly enough, most of these movements were inspired by mystic ideas and even where orthodoxy initiated them, it was often through the medium of mysticism that they reached the people. Considered as a whole and from the broad point of view of their impact on Indian life, these movements reflect four distinct attitudes and tendencies: the intellectual, the political, the social, and the mystic.

Movements for Expansion: Five important mystic orders—the Ćīṭīyya, the Sukhrāwārdīyya, the Firdawsīyya, the Kādiriyya and the Shāṭṭārīyya—worked and adopted many Hindu and Buddhist rites, like the practices of bowing before the šaykh, presenting water to visitors, circulating ṣanbāl, shaving the head of new entrants to the mystic circle, audition parties (samāʾ) and the Cīliy-i-maʿākūs (the inverted ẓilla). This identification with the surrounding conditions helped them in attracting non-Muslims to their fold. Besides, almost all the principal saints of these sīsīsīs were believers in the pantheistic thought which also provided common ground for intellectual contact with the Hindus.

Movements for Reform: In the 11th/12th century the general drift and direction of the Muslim mind was towards the reform of Muslim society from within. The Nakhshbandī sīsīla, which was introduced in India by Shaikh Bākī b'Allāh (971-1022/1563-1603) during the closing years of Akbar's reign, reached its high-water mark under his principal disciple, ʿShaykh Ahmad Sirhindī, whose disciples, according to Dījahāngīr, operated in every important town and city of India. The efforts of ʿShaykh Ahmad Sirhindī were directed towards the reform of Muslim society. He was not concerned, as were the mystics of the preceding era, to expand the faith amongst non-Muslims. He aimed at consolidating it by reforming it and removing its un-Islamic trappings. An uncompromising monotheist, he did not agree with those religious experiments of Akbar which he had made with the ideological support of the pantheistic thinkers and which had elements which ran counter to the very basis of the orthodox Islamic concept of tawḥīd. He condemned the prevalence of bidʿās (innovations), which meant to him dissuasion from looking to the Prophet as the source of all religious guidance and inspiration. He permitted the exercise of ḵiyās and ʿidāthād, provided it was within the framework of the Kur'ān and the sunna. He condemned those uṣūlmā and ẓāfīs of his day who encouraged deviations from the sunna under the garb of ʿidāthād. He approached the rulers, the ẓāfīs and the uṣūlmā in order to bring about a change in their outlook on life. It was a propaganda and the efforts that Dījahāngīr abandoned Akbar's policy of making religious experiments, the ẓāfīs came closer to the ḡarīʿa and rejected the doctrine of waḥdat al-wujūd, and the uṣūlmā turned to the revival of religious learning.

Era of Regeneration: The 11th/12th century was an era of regeneration in Indian Islam. Shāh Wall Allāh (1114-97/1703-9) and Shāh Kāmil Allāh (1060-1142/1650-1729) were the two outstanding figures who attempted to revive the original teachings of Islam—one at the intellectual, and the other at the spiritual level. Shāh Wall Allāh gave a new impetus to the revival of the religious sciences. He laid the foundation of a new school of scholastic theology; bridged the gulf between the jurists and the mystics; softened the controversy between the exponents and the critics of the doctrine of waḥdat al-wujūd and awakened a new spirit of religious enquiry. He addressed all sections of Muslim society—rulers, nobles, uṣūlmā, mystics, soldiers, traders, etc.—and tried to infuse a new spirit of dedication in them. His seminary, Madrasa-i Ḳaḥīmīyya, became the nucleus of a revolutionary movement for the reconstruction of religious thought in Islam and scholars flocked to it from every corner of the
country. His concentration on fiqh and tasawwuf and his attempts to make them complementary was determined by his conviction that through a dynamic use of these two active principles both the structural and the spiritual aspects of Muslim religious life could be resuscitated and a healthy balance (lawizum) between the form and the spirit—which had been shattered during the preceding years—could be maintained. His work was continued by his sons and successors. His example to which he and his family contributed to the revival of Muslim religious sciences may be judged from the fact that the majority of Muslim institutions all over India from the 12th/13th century onwards owe their existence to their efforts. Shah Kalim Allâh’s work was in a different direction. He revived and revitalized the Cîghtî (q.v.) order on the lines of the saints of its first cycle, checked the growth of its esoteric tendencies, sent his disciples near and far to propagate the Cîghtî mystic ideals. The rise of a number of Cîghtî Hayâyâhs in the Pandjab, the Deccan, the North West Frontier, and Uttar Pradesh was due to the efforts of his spiritual descendants (Niîâmî, Ta’îrîkh-i-madâkh-i Cîght, Delhi 1953).

Era of Reorientation: The 19th century saw the reorientation of Muslim religious thought as demanded by the new problems arising out of the interaction with the West. Three different reactions to this situation are discernible in the religious movements of this period—(i) to reorientate religious thought on traditional lines, or (ii) to evolve a new ‘Imî-i Kâlam to meet the situation and to accept whatever the West could give; or (iii) to attempt to steer a middle course. The Wahhâbî and the Farâ’îdî movements were inspired by a desire to resuscitate classical Islam through the reform of Muslim society and the restoration of its political power. The movement initiated by the ‘ulamâ’ of Deoband aimed at revitalizing Muslim society through the revival of religious learning, and looked with a feeling of distrust towards western thought and learning. The ‘Allâghar movement, organized by Sâyyid Ahmad Khân, tried to meet the challenge of Western education by accepting European education and giving a new orientation to Muslim social, educational, and religious ideals. There was considerable opposition to Sâyyid Ahmad Khân and his social and educational ideals and religious views, but ultimately the movement succeeded, and it was through ‘Allâghar that Indian Islam became acquainted with the West and its achievements in the realm of thought. The establishment of the Nadwat al-‘ulamâ’, which stood for effecting a compromise between the excessive “this-worldliness” of ‘Allâghar and the excessive “other-worldliness” of Deoband, was in fact an off-shoot of ‘Allâghar, and Mawlawâ Shibli (1857-1914), who played a prominent part in its establishment, was one of those who were closely associated with the ‘Allâghar movement. Shibli’s idea of writing a series entitled “Heroes of Islam”—which included Ghurzâlî, the caliph Mu’âmmâr and Abu Hanîfâ, and which was responsible for reviving interest in the history of Islam—was inspired by Sâyyid Ahmad Khân, who also asked Hâllî, another friend of his, to write a masâ’das, in order to awaken the Indian Muslims from their stupor by presenting a vivid story of their rise and fall. The Dâr al-Mu’âshânî of A’âmarghâr, which has published a number of outstanding religious works, is an offshoot of the Nadwa and is run mainly by its alumni.

The Dîjamâråt-i Islâmî, an organization of considerable religio-political significance, established by Mawlawâ Abu ‘l-’Allâ Mawddî in 1941 with a view to providing guidance to both the modernists and the classicalists (Mawddî, Tâ’âzîmât, Karachi, 1947), has checked the permeation of Communist ideas in the Muslim youth, but its attitude towards the jurists and the fa’îsîs of Islam has been resented in Muslim religious circles.

Towards the end of the 19th century a new religious movement was initiated by Mîrzâ Ghûlâm Ahmâd (1839-1908) from Kâdîyân, known as the Ahmâdiyya (q.v.), which soon assumed the shape of a new sect of Islam. The Mîrzâ claimed to be an avârat of Kirghiz as well as Jesus returned to earth and the Mahdî; also the burîs (reappearance of Muhammad). The movement has spread to various parts of the world, with a small band of converts in Britain, on the continent of Europe and in the United States.

The purely religious and spiritual movements of the Indian Muslims during this period centred round three great figures, Shah Ghûlâm ’Allî of Delhi (1156-1240/1743-1824), Mawlawâ Asârî of Thânâ Bhawan (d. 1943), and Mawlawâ Muhammâd Iyâs of Delhi (d. 1944). The influence of Shah Ghûlâm ’Allî reached distant parts of the Muslim world (Aûšûr al-’andâd, chapter iv, 18), through his disciples, such as Shâykh Khâlîl al-Kurdi. Mawlawâ Asârî has many works to his credit, big and small, dealing with various aspects of Muslim life (’Abd al-Bârî Nadawî, Dîjârî al-Mudâjdâdîm). He also strove to popularize and strengthen the Cîghtî order. Mawlawâ Muhammâd Iyâs set up a centre for moral and spiritual instruction at Delhi, and started a brisk religious activity. His movement (Abu ’l-’Hasan ’Allî Nadawî, Hâjirât Mawlawâ Muhammâd Iyâs aur un ki dinî da’awâ, Lucknow 1949) has spread to different Arab countries, and his followers, who go about far and near in small groups known as gîmâdâts, concern themselves only with the purification of religious life. The Mawlawâ first applied his method of religious persuasion to the Maywâts (Gazetteer of Ulwâr, London 1878), an illiterate and half-converted tribe living in the eastern regions of Delhi. This is, in fact, the only significant Muslim religious movement in India at present.

(d) The Shî’îs: Ikhân-’ashârîs and Ismâ’îlîs

Long before the influence of the Ikhân-’ashâriyya (q.v.) spread in India, the Ismâ’îliyya (q.v.) entered the country and started brisk religious propaganda. In the last quarter of the 4th/10th century, Fâtîmid political power was established in Multan, and was overthrown by Sultan Muhammâd of Ghâzna in 396/1006. Undeterred, the Ismâ’îli missionaries spread out into Sind, the Pandjab and Gudjarât, and by their strenuous efforts retrieved much of their lost political prestige. When Shîhâb al-Dîn Muhammâd of Gûr appeared on the Indian scene, he found the Ismâ’îlîs quite powerful. In 572/1175 he dislodged them from Multan and many of them “went underground living in the guise of Hindus” (Ivanow, Brief survey of the evolution of Ismâ’îlism, 230). Embittered and annoyed, the Ismâ’îlîs entered into an alliance with the Khokars and assassinated Shîhâb al-Dîn (602/1206) at Damyak on the Indus. The Sultanate of Delhi found itself committed to an anti-Ismâ’îlî policy, and when Iftikârîs secured a manshur from the Abbâsîd Caliph the secret Ismâ’îlî opposition became open and aggressive. During the reign of Râdîyya (634/1237-1238) and his successors—Karnâd, Mawlawâ Nîr Tûr—gathered together his supporters from Gudjarât, Sind, and the Doab and organized a coup d’état to establish Ismâ’îlî power
at Delhi (Tabafrdt-i Ndsiri, 189-90). The Sultans of Delhi adopted stern measures against all forms of Ismā‘īlism. The Ibāḥīs (Amir Khusrav, Khaṣṣā‘īn al-futūh, ed. M. Wahid Mīrā, Calcutta, 207; Futūḥāt-i Shirāzī, ed. M. Hāshim ibn Mūsah al-Hillī, 7-8), some consider Ismā‘īlīs (M. Hāshib, The Campaigns of ‘Alā‘uddīn Khān, 12; Ḥodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim history, 282-3). I. H. Qureshi holds a different view, see art. Ibdāṭiyya and references there given), were severely dealt with by ‘Alā‘ al-Dīn Khādījī (695-726/1296-1315) and Fīrūz Shāh Tughluk (754-90/1351-85). According to ‘Isbā‘ī, ‘Alā‘ al-Dīn Khādījī published the Bohorsbār also (Futūḥāt-i Shī‘a, 301). Fīrūz Shāh Tughluk refers to some extreme Shi‘i groups of Delhi as Rawdāfī and says that they reviled the first three Caliphs and Ḥadīrāt ʿA‘īsha, the wife of the Prophet, and considered the Kurān as mulkhabáṭī ʿUljámīn (Futūḥāt-i Fīrūz Shāhī, 7). Sayyid ʿAbd al-Dīn Buḥkhārī, popularly known as Makhdūm-i Dāhijānīyān (d. 756/1354), has given an account of some Shi‘a sects in his conversation embodied in Sīrād-i Hidāyā (MS India Office D. P. 1038). Though some Shi‘a families trace their pedigree to him, he himself, like Sayyid Muhammad Gūsū Darāz of Kulbargā (Jiwaṣ্মī al-kalim, 10, 20, etc.), seems to have been opposed to Shi‘a doctrines. The Sīrāt-i Fīrūz Shāhī (MS Bankipore, 547) also deals with some Shi‘a sects known in India during the 8th/14th century.

In the 19th/15th century appeared the Shi‘a states of the Deccan—the ʿAdlī Shāhīs of Bīḍājār (895-1083/1480-1666), the Nizām Shāhs of Ahmadnagar (896-1043/1490-1633), and the Kūtō Shāhī of Gokonda (971-1083/1521-1687)—and their rulers propagated Shi‘a teachings and practices in the south. Muhammad Kūlī Kūtō Shāhī was the first maṭṭhīya-gū (reciter of elegies) in Urdu. Shi‘a influence increased in northern India when the Sāfawīd power was established in Iran (907/1502) and particularly after the return of Humāyūn (962/1555) from that country. The emigration of Shi‘a from Persia to India continued during the reign of Akbar and reached a significant stage when Ḥanjāṅrī came to the throne. The great Shi‘a scholar and divine Kādī Nūr Allāh Shī‘ahštārī was hanged to death by the order of Dīwārī Ṭāhir Khān for writing Bā‘aṣf al-Huṣaynī (16th century). The propagation of some of the Shi‘a views created resentment in the mind of the Sunni scholars and there appeared a large number of works—such as Risālā Radī-i Rawdūfī by Shaykh Ahmad Sīrīndī, the Islāt al-ḥukā‘ī, by Shāh Wāli Allāh, the Radd al-Shī‘a by Mulla Muhammad Muḥsin of Kāshmir (d. 1311/1757), the Radd-i Rawdūfī by Shāh Kālim Allāh and Ṭūḥā Ḥmā‘ṣiḥṣiḥ by Shāh ‘Abd al-Azīz—of which some were followed by the Ḥanāfī school.

During the 12th/18th century Shi‘a states were established at Mūrshīdbād (in Bengal), Awadh and Rāmpūr (in Uttar Pradesh) and Ḥāyypur (in Sind) and these states played a very important role in the spread of Shi‘ism in India and the popularization of its various religious practices. Separate Shi‘a ecclesiastical and their distinct corporate religious life began with the efforts of Sayyid Dildār ʿAllī of Naṣrābād (d. 1235/1819). The Shi‘a of India commemorate the martyrdom of the Imām Ḥusayn by exposing tazvīyas (miniatures of the tomb of Imām Ḥusayn), holding mājlisās in imāmābārās, and reciting elegies during the first ten days of the month of Muharram. The imāmābārās have a very important place in the cultural and religious life of the Indian Shi‘as. (For accounts of Shi‘a in India, see Muḥāməd al-Ḥusayn al-Muṣaffar, Ta‘rīḥ al-Shī‘a, Nāṣirī 1352 A.H., 232-60; J. N. Hollister, The Shi‘a of India, London 1953).


The ʿImārīs and the Bohorsās (qv.) represent the best-organized Shi‘a communities in India (see also S. C. Misra, Muslim communities in Gujrat, Asia Publishers, 1964). They emphasize esoteric (bāṭinī) discipline and believe in an hierarchical system which controls and regulates the entire life of the community. The ʿImārīs, according to their own tradition, originally belonged to the Lohanā caste of Hindus. A Persian Ismā‘īl missionary, Pir ʿṢadr al-Dīn, converted them to Ismā‘īlism. Among his successors, who organized the Ismā‘īl communities in the Punjab, Sind and Kashmir, were Seth Sham Das, Trikam and Seth Tulsī Das respectively, all bearing Hindu names and enjoying the title of muḥī (chief). ʿṢadr al-Dīn called the Prophet of Islam the aṣāvat or incarnation of Brahma, Adam the ismāʿīl of Shī‘a law, and the ʿImārīs of India during the 8th/14th century. The ʿImārīs of India during the 8th/14th century. The ʿImārīs of India during the 8th/14th century.


The Muslim religious literature produced in India does not merely furnish the indispensable background to the active religious life of Muslim India, but it also supplies the key to an assessment of the influence of Indo-Muslim religious thought on the Muslim world. ʿUrsīnic studies, particularly bīrāḍī and tājwīd, have been very popular in India even so early as the 6th/12th century, when in small places like Aror (near Multan) one could receive instruction in reciting the Kurān according to its seven recognized methods of recitation (Styar al-ṣīrīn, 103). Referring to three experts in bīrāḍī during the reign of ʿAlā‘ al-Dīn Khādījī (695-715/1295-1315) Dīyā al-Dīn Barānī says that “their equals were not to be found in Kurārūm or ʿIrāk”. This Indian tradition of specialization in bīrāḍī continued throughout the ages. Dārā Shī‘kūh (1024-6/1615-59) found more than five thousand hāfīs living in a single quarter of Lahore (Mafṣafāt-i Shī‘ā Ḥabd al-ʿAṣīr). But tafsīr literature made little progress in India during the early period, as the works produced at the time catered for limited tastes; some were written for the ʿulāmā, others for the ʿṣāfs; thus the Taṣfīr al-Rāḥmān wa tāṣfīr al-Mannān of Shaykh ʿAllāh Māḥīmī was inspired by a desire to find Kurānic support for the pantheistic ideas of Ibn al-ʿArabī, and the Bāḥr-i mawṣūlāt of Shīhāb al-Dīn Daulār-
taba'i (q.v.) was an essay in rhetoric, beyond the comprehension of the ordinary man. A disciple of Shaykh Nizam al-Din Awliya, Khwaja Kásim, is reported to have written the (lost) Lāṭ‘īf al-’aṣfīr with the specific purpose of making the thought-content of the Kur‘ān popularly intelligible (Sīyār al-a’wilīyā, 2:270). It was Shāh Wālī Allāh, through his Persian rendering of the Kur‘ān, and his sons, Shāh Rafī‘ al-Dīn and Shāh ‘Abd al-Kādir, through their Urdu translations, which popularized Kur‘ānic thought and made its thought-content available to the people. His Fa’āl al-kabīr, on the principles of tafṣīr, was the first work of its nature written in India. In this he protested against subjective commentaries on the Kur‘ān and laid down the principles which should guide one who undertakes this task. Shāh Wālī Allāh having prepared their ground, many commentaries on the Kur‘ān appeared in India during the succeeding centuries. A comparative study of his works—Fāṣīh al-Rahmān, al-Fa’āl al-kabīr and Huddudīt Allāh al-bālīgha—with the literature on exegesis produced in India, and even elsewhere, during the last two centuries, would reveal the extent of Shāh Wālī Allāh’s influence on Muslim religious thought.

It was in the sphere of haddith literature that Indian Islam made a remarkable contribution. In terms of the use of books, the Persian scholar Fārābī was the first to try and resurrect the science of haddith in the 10th/16th century when it was dying out in the Arab world. The earliest contribution of India to haddith literature is the Maqārī al-anwār of Raḍī al-Dīn Ḥasan al-Sāghānī; then comes the Kams al-umnūd of Shaykh ‘All Muttaqī (d. 757/1357) in which Suyūṭī’s Diwān al-ma’drif, Anwār al-Rafyān—was more scientifically rearranged. According to Abu ‘l-Ḥasan al-Bakri: “The whole world of learning is indebted to ‘Allāmā Suyūṭī, but Suyūṭī himself is under obligation to Shaykh ‘All Muttaqī”. The systematic study of haddith literature in India was initiated by Shaykh ‘Abd al-Hādī Muhaddith of Delhi and was developed by Shāh Wālī Allāh. Shāh Wālī Allāh’s main emphasis was on the Mu’āwītā of Ḥāfiz al-Mālik because it fitted in with his juridico-theological thought and was of great value in making the teaching of the Haddith to the Indian Muslims throughout the centuries were properly edited and their contents analysed, the religious aspirations of the Indian Muslims throughout the ages could be more specifically studied. While the law books seem to ignore completely the specific problems of Muslims in the Indian environment, the fatwā collections throw considerable light on this aspect. On ṣalāt al-fikhr, the Musallam al-iqṭūt of Muḥīb Allāh Bihārī (d. 1225/1707) is a work of great merit.

Probably on no other aspect of Muslim religious life was more literature produced in India than on mysticism. The ma’ṣūrī literature (collections of conversations of mystic teachers)—e.g., Fa’ālī al-fu‘ād, Khayr al-majālīs, Ma’dādī al-ma’ānī, Sirājī al-ḥidāya, Lāṭ‘īf i Kuddāsī, Durr al-maṣūrī, Anwār al-Rahmān—is a mine of information on the religious life and attitudes of the Muslim community as shaped in the Indian milieu. The earliest Persian work on Islamic mysticism, Kasāfī al-ma’āṣīh of Shāh Wālī Allāh, was produced in India, and the place it enjoyed in religious thought may be judged from the remark of Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn al-Awliya that for one who had no ṣūr, the Kasāfī al-ma’āṣīh was sufficient guidance. The letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī, known as Maktūbāt-i Imām Bābdīnī, have a place of their own in the Muslim mystic literature of the world. The Shaykh gave a new depth and a new content to mystic terms, which he explained and elucidated in the light of his own spiritual experience. The fact that these letters were translated into Turkish and Arabic shows the reception they had in the Muslim world. On the theoretical aspects of mysticism, works like the Fa’ālī al-qīmūs of Rāfi‘ Muhaddith and the Ma’ṣūrī al-shumūs of Kadi Ilhamī, have a value of their own. A11 Muttaki (d. 975/1567) in which Suyūṭī’s letters of mystic teachers)—has been more scientifically rearranged.

Moreover, it may be traced in the works of Dīmāl al-Dīn Afghānī, Muḥammad ‘Abdul and Rashīd Riḍā. In this work he made a serious attempt to rethink the whole system of Islam without completely breaking with the past. “Perhaps the first Muslim”, remarks Dr. I.ḥālī, “who felt the urge of a new spirit in him was Shāh Wālī Allāh of Delhi” (Reconstruction of religious thought in Islam, 97). His other work, Islālat al-khaflāt, is another outstanding contribution to a clear understanding of the significance, historical rôle and religious meaning of the institution of kīda. He looked upon the patriarchal caliphate of Ansār as normal .and went on to see its spirit working as an operative principle in the social and political life of the Muslims.

(1) Influence of Islam on India and vice versa

Islam made a deep impact on the religious thought and social behaviour of Indians. The development of monotheistic ideas and the consequent re-orientation of Hindu religious thought—as evinced in the Bhākti, the Sikh and the Arya Śāmāj movements—was greatly inspired by Islam. It is true that monotheistic ideas were present in some Hindu scriptures also, but they were covered by a polytheistic veneer. Islam made possible the transition of Hindu thought from polytheism to monotheism. Another significant change in the religious behaviour of the Hindus brought about by contact with Islam was the belief that every individual could approach God without the help of priests and that for one who had made possible the transition of Hindu thought from polytheism to monotheism. Another significant change in the religious behaviour of the Hindus brought about by contact with Islam was the belief that every individual could approach God without the help of priests and that for one who had...
and learning should be available to all without any discrimination is the result of Islamic influence. The Hindu social system had refused to the common man any access to religious texts. Islam encouraged the universalization of religious knowledge amongst the Hindus. The emphasis on congregational prayer amongst the social Muslims had its effect on the Hindus also. The Hindu temples constructed before the advent of Islam provided space for individual prostration before the deity; while the temples constructed subsequently contain more space and seem to have been influenced by the Muslim idea of congregational prayer. Hinduism, as we know from the account of al-Biruni, was not a proselytizing creed. In fact, it was more inclined to excluding people than to admitting them into its religious fold. From the 8th/14th century onwards we find that Hinduism also adopted proselytizing methods.

Islam was also, in its turn, deeply influenced by Indian surroundings and Indian religious attitudes. Many of the mystic practices—meditation, concentration, control of breath, *tasawwur*—were borrowed from the Hindu Yogis and the Buddhists. Through his *Bahar al-bayâdî* and the *Djauâdir-i hamsa*, Sayyid Muhammad Ghawî of Gwâliyâr popularized Yogic practices amongst the Muslim mystics. Some of these adjustments to Indian conditions were necessitated by the circumstances in which the saints had to inculcate their mystic doctrines among the masses. For instance, it is stated that Shaykh Farîd permitted some of his disciples to practice *dhikr* in the Pandjâbi language (*Kaghâli Kalîmi*, Delhi 1308, 25); Shâh Fakhr al-Dîn of Delhi (1126-99/1717-84) said that in India the *khutba* before the Friday congregation should be read in “Hindawi” (*Fâtir al-faydîn*, Delhi 1315, 23), and Sayyid Muhammad Gisû Darâz considered Hindu poetry emotionally more effective in his audition parties than Persian poetry (*Djauâmî al-kalîm*, 173). At another popular level we find excessive faith in magic, sorcery, miracles, grave-worship, and the superstitious belief that epidemics could be averted through the performance of certain practices inconsistent with Islamic teachings. Since there was always a danger of idolatrous habits entering the religious life of the Muslims, Muslim religious leaders—both the Sufis and the jurists—were frequently warned the people against adopting such practices. Sayyid Muhammad Gisû Darâz objected to the adoption of Yogic practices and Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindî directed his powerful and incisive criticism against all kinds of innovations. The fear underlying this attitude was that the idolatrous background of many Hindu institutions would affect the monotheistic character of Islam. When a Hindu wrote to Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindî that *Râma* and *Râkîm* were the same, he objected to it and said that *Râma* was a human being and could not therefore be considered identical with the Allâh of Islam. Shâh Wall Allâh and Shâh Ismaiîl Shâhid fought against the adoption of all those Hindu practices with which idolatrous leanings and ideas were associated. An attempt was made at a higher level of Hindu and Muslim religious thought was made by Dârâ Shukoh. As an individual scholar of comparative religion, Dârâ Shukoh occupies an unirivalled place in Indian history, but his thought did not make any great impact on the contemporary Muslim religious attitude.

It was in the sphere of social life and customs that the influence of Hinduism on the Indian Muslims was the most far-reaching. Since most of the people were converts from Hinduism, it was not possible for them to break away completely from their social background. In varying degrees and at different levels the Hindu traditions and customs were consequently transferred to the Muslim society. In certain rural areas, where conversion was not complete, many of the local customs, even some religious practices of Hinduism which had become a part of their social life, were accepted. In ceremonies connected with marriage, birth, mourning etc. the impact of Hindu traditions was quite remarkable. In certain Muslim families of Awadh and the Pathân, the Muslim law of inheritance was ignored in preference to the customary law. Though Islam had softened the caste ideas of Hindus, considerations of family and *khâfa* in matrimonial matters found ready acceptance in Muslim society also. If a survey is made of the forces and factors which have brought Indian Islam closer to Hindu society, it will be found that the pantheistic thought of the Muslim mystics, which found its reflection in the theosophical thought of the *Upânisâhads*, has invariably brought Islam and Hinduism closer, while the idolatrous connotations and concepts associated with many Hindu institutions pulled them apart. This was to some extent implicit in the situation. “The *Upânisâhads*”, writes S. Radhakrishnan, “no doubt, shattered the authority of these gods in the world of thought, but did not disturb their sway in the world of practice” (Indian philosophy, 1, 453). Similar has been the case with reference to Hindu festivals and many of the heroes of ancient India. In the case of many of the festivals, though based on Indian climatic changes—the Indianising process has forced their acceptance by the Muslims, but their polytheistic religious associations have made them subject to the criticism of the orthodox.

**Bibliography:** Only a select bibliography of works which throw light on the various aspects of Indian Islam is given below. 'Abd al-Ḥâyy al-Ṭakâfî al-Islâmiyya fi *l-Hind* (Damascus 1958, 102-250) contains the most comprehensive bibliography of Muslim religious literature produced in India.

(a) Arab geographers, travellers, etc.: see section i of this article. Relevant extracts from the works of all important Arab geographers and travellers along with Urdu translations are given in *Hindustân *Arûb ki nazar mayn*, 2 vols., Dâr al-Musannâfîn, A'zamgarh, 1960-2.


VI. — ISLAMIC CULTURE.

The transplantation of Islamic culture on the Indian sub-continent began with the incorporation of Sind into the Umayyad Caliphate after 95/713, and came to be represented by such scholars as Ḥadīth as Abū Ma'shar and Abū Turāb (c. 171/788), and by the poet Abu l-ʿAṯār.

Sind became the main channel of Indian studies in the early ʿAbbāsids times, especially through the active interest of Yahyā al-Barmakī. The fragmentary renderings of Hindu scientific works touched, however, merely the periphery of the external Arab equipment of learning; their influence on the Arab lexisque technique was slight; and the movement of translations from Sanskrit, which in any case had completely ignored the total corpus of Hindu scriptural and speculative literature, came to an end as the political grip of the ʿAbbāsids over Sind loosened. The transmission of Hindu mystical ideas into ʿSūfīsm has been argued for and against, through the controversial Abū ʿAli al-Sindī (q.v.) and al-Ḥallāḏī (q.v.) who travelled through Sind. Not much evidence of a recognizable form of the culture of Sind under the ʿImāmī influence (c. 666/977) has survived.

Parallel to the conquest and occupation of Sind were the peaceful commercial and missionary activities of Arab traders on southern Indian coasts; and theories have been hazarded of the possible inspiration of the Muslim presence on the great Hindu movements led by Ṣhankaracāryā (788-830) and Rāmānuḍa (d. 1137). These may be discounted in the absence of any direct evidence, and because every element of the teachings of these Hindu thinkers can be traced to purely Hindu sources.

With the occupation of the Panḍīb by the Ghaznavīs (q.v.) and its later surrender to the Ghurids (q.v.) Lahore as a centre gave Muslim Indian culture the Persian contours it has largely preserved throughout the centuries, continually accepting and modifying certain additional Indian features. The pattern of Ghaznavī culture as it developed on the Ghazna-Lahore axis shows a transition from an Arabic intellectual base (al-Bīrūnī [q.v.], al-ʿUthmānī [q.v.]) to Persian (Bayhaḵī, Gardīrī and al-Ḥudūḏī (q.v.) and a shift of emphasis to ʿSūfīstic and theological studies (Ismāʿīlī al-Bukhārī, d. 450/1058). The Ghaznavī tradition of Persian poetry was cultivated in Lahore by Masʿūd Saʿd Salmān (q.v.) (437-515/1046-1122) and Abu l-ʿArrādī Rūnī (d. 484/1091). This period also marks the phase of incubation, if not of actual early growth, of ʿUrdū (q.v.).

After the Ghūrī conquest of Lahore the cultural scene shifted to Iltīsāqī's Dehli (q.v.), Kohlaḵī's Mūṭān. In these courts literary history established itself with ʿAwwf (q.v.) (c. 617/1220), political thought with Fakhr-i-Mudabbir, and historiography with al-Debejali (c. 658/1260) and Ḵānīn (c. 614/1217) who, with their successors, form the chief link in Persian between the early Ghaznavī and the ʿIlkhānī historians. About this time two major ʿṢūfī orders established themselves in India, the Suhrā-
wardiyaa in Mülātān and the Čičitšiyya [q.v.] in Dīhil/Adjmer. A balance was maintained by Iletmish between the jāhānī and the jārīa, inaugurating a tradition of the tolerant co-existence of the two religious disciplines which Islamic culture in India subsequently tried quite successfully to preserve. Refugees fleeing before the Mongol onslaught brought to India fresh waves of Islamic traditions from Central Asia and northern Persia, emphasizing conservative trends in an atmosphere of external (Mongol) threat and internal (Hindū) challenge. The institution of the madrasa [q.v.] was introduced under the 'Slave' sultans, and works of al-Ghazālī [q.v.] and al-Rāzī [q.v.] were translated into Persian.

The ēlite of the court, at first purely Turkish, opened its ranks under various pressures to Afgān and later to indigenous converted elements. Under 'Alāʾ al-Dīn Khāḏḏīl (695-715/1295-1315) external religious conformity was enforced on the Muslim population, whereas the writings of Amīr Khūsraw [q.v.] reflect the borrowings into Islamic culture from Hindū ways of living, popular vocabulary and muḥāammad b. Tugḥļuq's (725-52/1325-51) policies of re-establishing political and intellectual links with the Dār al-Īslām, his patronage and employment of a foreign Muslim ēlite and his early proclivities towards rationalism and eclecticism paved the way in the growing Indo-Muslim culture for certain intellectual trends such as Ibn Tuymiyya's [q.v.] fundamentalism implemented during this period by 'Abd al-'Āzīz Arḍabīlī, pre-Taftāzānī rationalism, and an intellectual curiosity relating to certain elements of the Hindū complex of religions such as Ḏaynīmūn and yāga, emphasizing in general a movement towards exoteric and political rather than esoteric and mystical Islam. Enigmatic intellectualism, imported from Central Asia by Bāḏr Cālī, became the fashion in Persian poetry. In the reign of Frūz Tugḥļuq (752-90/1351-88) [q.v.] the state became a traditionalist theocracy, providing certain social welfare elements for the Muslims, and abolition of torture and cruel punishments for all elements of the population. His reign saw the establishment of the disciplines of fiqāh and lexicography in India, but painting and literary poetry were encouraged.

The complete Persianization of the administration by Sīkandar Lōdī (849-923/1488-1517) introduced the Hindū official into the intellectual sphere of Islam, and this in due course of time led to the specific cultural development of certain communities like the Kāyāsthas, the Khatris, the Kāshmīrī Brāhmans and the Ṭāmis of Sind, who retained their Hindū religion but identified themselves culturally with the Muslims.

The successor states of the Dīhil Sultanate [q.v.] mark a regionalization of Muslim culture in India. In Bengal a number of Hindū social and religious institutions were integrated into the Muslim way of life, and the Bengali language and literature show a simultaneous series of borrowings from Sanskrit and Persian sources. In the Dakhān (Deccan) a regional form of Urdu was developed into a rich literary language. The maritime states of Gudjārat and the Farifcā, inaugurating a tradition of the tolerant co-existence of the two religious disciplines which Islamic culture in India subsequently tried quite successfully to preserve.

The institution of the madrasa [q.v.] was introduced under the 'Slave' sultans, and works of al-Ghazālī [q.v.] and al-Rāzī [q.v.] were translated into Persian. Akbar's [q.v.] (963-1014/1556-1605) policies of integrating the Hindūs into the political and social life of Muslim India influenced the attitude of the Muslims in the direction of eclecticism. These policies also evoked an orthodox reaction represented by theologians like 'Abd al-Jasāk Dīhilwālī, who reintroduced in India an emphasis on the study of hadīth, and Nakhšbandiyya Sūfīs like Shāykh Ahmad Sirhindī [q.v.] who brought Indian Sūfism very close to orthodoxy. The programme initiated by Akbar, and earlier by Sultan Zayn al-Ābidīn of Kaghmār (822-75/1420-76) of translations of Hindū religious and literary classics marked the beginning of a more liberal understanding of Hindūism. Co-existent with these internal eclectic features was the constantly flowing cultural stream from Persia and Transoxiana bringing an administrative ēlite which developed into the Irānī and Tūrānī factions in the Mughal court, rationalist trends, artists and architects, and chieftly poets. During the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries India rather than Persia was the focus of Persian poetry, and the 'Indian Style' (sabh-ī Hindī [q.v.]) assumed its highly intellectualized and curiously stylized features in the tradition of Fīgāhānī Shīhrāzī.

Akbar's eclectic tradition remained the cultural denominator of the reigns of his successors Djhāhāngīr [q.v.] and Shāhjāhān [q.v.] with a slight focal adjustment in favour of orthodoxy. The 11th/17th century marks the culmination of the growth of syncretic sects, some of them rooted in Hindūism and borrowing liberally from Islam such as the Kābil, Pādshāhī, Vayragīs, Līngāyats, Husaynī Brāhmans, etc., others rooted in Islam with converse borrowings such as Madārs, Pāgānlāthās and others, others again developing into independent religions like Sikhism which has a strong anti-Muslim bias. The conflict of the eclectic and orthodox trends of Mughal culture is to some extent reflected in the essentially personal trial of strength between Dārā Shukhōb [q.v.] and Awrangzhīb [q.v.] resulting in the latter's victory (1069/1658) and the establishment of a theocratic régime, discriminatory against the non-Muslim elements, and in the compilation of the encyclopaedic juridical work Fātawā-i 'Alamgīrī.

In the political and economic anarchy that followed the rapid decline of the Mughal empire in the early 12th/18th century mass syncretization followed, the maritime states of Gudjārat and the Dakhān balanced Hindū cultural borrowings with fresh re-orientations from the external Dār al-Īslām.

During the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries Sūfī proselytization achieved mass appeal, and Hindū resistance to it developed in the form of various bhātī movements, borrowing from Islam its emphasis on the Unity of God and its egalitarianism, but fortifying, against its spiritual, economic and social pull, a reformed and latitudinarian Hindūism among the lower castes. The bhātī movements in their attitudes, receptive and resistant, towards Islam ranged from the syncretism of Kābil and Dādū Dayāl to the counter-conversionist trends of Cāytaṇya.

Tūrānī cultural elements from Samarājand and Hārāt were introduced into India after Bābur's [q.v.] conquest (932/1526). For a short while the Turkish language assumed at court the position of literary supremacy, only to be finally displaced by Persian during the Sūrī interregnum (946-62/1539-55) and after Humāyūn's [q.v.] return from Persia which also marks in India the establishment of the Mughal school of painting [see Tāyżwīr].
(Lucknow), decadent and economically bankrupt, developed a new creative impetus by using Urdu instead of Persian as the language of poetry. Like the Persian poetry written in India, Urdu poetry, except in makhansai, tended to ignore the Indian life and background totally in theme and image alike.

The aftermath of the Mutiny of 1857 marks the sharp turning point of Indo-Muslim culture towards modernism represented mainly by Sayyid Ahmad Khan and the 4Allgarh movement. Cultural trends inclined towards separatism and were dominated by a fear of cultural and religious submergence of Indian Islam into the religion and culture of the Hindu majority. This fear of submergence is reflected in the Urdu-Hindi controversy (c. 1870 onwards), revivalism, pan-Islamism and finally in the movement for the achievement of a separate state, Pakistan [pp.]. The official cultural orientation in Pakistan has been to play down the glories of Muslim architecture and literature in the areas outside the present frontiers of Pakistan, and to substitute instead a new concept of cultural heritage derived from regional literatures and local monuments situated within the geographical limits of Pakistan.


vii.—Architecture —

At the time of the Muslim conquest, India was a land with a rich artistic tradition: temples and monasteries abounded, Hindu shrines of all descriptions and sizes were found by almost every hillock and spring, cities were rich and well-planned, Hindu rulers had built for themselves forts and palaces, and the remains of earlier phases of Indian civilization such as the Hindu, Buddhist and Jain cave-temples, and the Buddhist stūpas and monasteries—were numerous. Architecture was characteristically of stone, its construction derived from timber prototypes: beams and lintels were supported on columns or brackets, and roofs tended to a stepped pyramidal shape, through having been built in diminishing horizontal courses. Domical shapes were known, often carried on octagonal bases, but were often solid, and in any case had little structural affinity with the true vousoir-built dome. The northern temples usually had curvilinear towers, again often solid; these, and some of the domical forms, had a characteristic crowning feature which later became part of the Indian Islamic dome decoration, a ribbed ring known as amālaka (from the fruit it resembles, the Emblic Myrobolan, Phyllanthus emblica) surmounted by a pot-shaped moulding, the kālaśa, (lit. 'water-jar'); to these a base of stone foliations in the form of lotus-petals might be added. The entire ornamental feature was on occasions surmounted by a rib of the domes, and it has been suggested that at least part of the origin of ribbed domes in India is to be found in this device. The arch is not known at all as a structure, and only rarely as a decorative form; but recesses used freely on both internal and external walls lead to a proliferation of vertical lines and to unnecessary horizontal plinths and mouldings.

Window-openings were rare: the interior of the Hindū temple was poorly lighted, its kernel being the secret shrine of an idol god whose mysteries were known only to a few initiated priests and were not for public display. The exterior, however, was as luxuriant and prolix as the interior was esoteric and recondite, for all its surfaces were covered with a profusion of exuberant sculpture of iconographic significance, in which the human form preponderated. Free-standing statues also known with the human form again dominant; but frequent also were the vehicles and attendants of the Hindū gods, especially Śiva's bull, and also the linga, the representation of the phallus as the generative principle of the world. The Indian painting tradition must also be mentioned as part of the artistic heritage; but there is as yet insufficient evidence for an unbroken tradition of Indian painting from the
Adjanfa frescoes to the period of the pre-Mughal hill schools. Of the other arts, metalwork, especially cast bronze, had reached a high degree of refinement at the time, as evidenced by the numerous coins which must have been produced by the conquering armies of Hind in the 2nd/8th century, although excavation at present being undertaken at Bhambor and elsewhere may eventually reveal the site of Daybul [q.v.], for a further account of these see SINDH, and see also MANSURA. The buildings after the 6th/12th century conquest of the north, however, show the Muslims' reaction to indigenous building very plainly; for the traditions of the idol-temples, with their plethora of floral figure representation, their gloom and secrecy, and above all the nature of the worship they implied, were not only anathema to Islam but were its direct antithesis. The earliest phase of Muslim building is in Delhi [see DIL], and is here represented by the re-use of pillaged material from Hindu and DJayn temples; destruction of the religious buildings of the enemy is known, of course, in many religions other than Islam, and indeed in India there is more than one record of a Hindu king doing just this to his neighbour's lands. Reutilization of the pillaged material is a feature of the initial phase of Muslim occupation in many regions of India, for example, at Adjmer and Djâlor [q.v.] in Rajjastân; Bharâc, Khambâyat and Pâfân [q.v.] in Gudjarât; Dîawur [q.v.]; Bidjâpur, Dawlatabâd and Warangal [q.v.] in the Deccan; Lâhnawatî, Pândus and Tribînâ [q.v.] in Bengal; Dâbâr and Mându [q.v.] in Mâlwâ; and many other sites. The first example, the Masdiid Kuwwat al-Islâm at Dîhilî [q.v.] for description and plan), is in fact built on a temple plinth, and some twenty-seven temples were pillaged to provide columns, walls, roofing materials, and paving; sculptured figures were mutilated or were set in walls that the unworked sides of the stones were all that was left of the column supports. These first a plain enclosure, but in 595/1199, eight years after its foundation, a large mâyKôSa screen was erected between the western liwan and the courtyard, and the arch appears for the first time: but these arches are corbelled out, not vousoired, and it appears that the work was done by Hindu artisans working under general Muslim direction and as yet having no mastery over the alien architectonic forms; moreover, the courtyard-side yard of the mâyKôSa is covered with carving, mostly typical Hindu floral motifs and ornaments, but also some bandeaux of resKûbh calligraphy, in such a way as to suggest that local workmanship was being employed. In the south-east corner of the mosque buildings the minaret known as the Kutb Mînâr presents a stylistic contrast, as its tapering fluted storeys develop the polygonal outline of the minKûr at Ghazna which must be its immediate prototype, and features of typical Hindu derivation are almost entirely absent.

The extension of the Kuwwat al-Islâm mosque and the first completion of the minKûr were carried out by Iltmîsh in the early 7th/13th century, and to his reign belong the Ahrâî din Kâ dâmâ mosque at Adjmer [q.v.], his own tomb of ca. 652/1253, and his son's tomb of 629/1231, the earliest monumental tomb in India (there are earlier dated tombstones: see AVAL); also minor buildings at Dîhilî and Madinân [q.v.], the Djâm-i Dhîhilî having been much repaired and rebuilt that scarcely any of Iltmîsh's fabric is visible), at Bayânâ, and at Nâgawr [q.v.]. In none of these buildings is there a true arch or dome, although all the masonry has well-dressed surfaces, often elaborately carved. The tomb of Iltmîsh's son, Nâsîr al-Dîn Mâhmûd, stands within an octagonal cell which seems to be the earliest use of the octagon in Muslim India. A true octagon appears next as the phase of transition in Iltmîsh's own square tomb, to support, presumably, a dome of which there is now no trace (and which, one must imagine, was also corbeled and not vousoired). In the latter tomb the octagon is formed by simple corbeled squinch arches across each corner. These early buildings are of so heterogeneous and, often, of so makeshift a nature that there is little of a coherent style about them. The buildings of the emperor Balban, similarly, are few and largely uninteresting, except for the significant appearance of the true vousoired arch in his tomb, now a mere unprepossessing lump of decaying masonry.

With the KhâlQî dynasty, however, a distinct if short-lived style appears, the keynote of which is provided by 'Alâ' al-Dîn's southern doorway into the Masjîd Kuwwat al-Islâm complex and known as the 'Alâ' Darwâzâ. This, like other examples of the style, is built with specially quarried stone and not improvised from Hindu materials; its chief characteristic is the shape of the arch, which is vousoired and of the pointed horseshoe shape and, in the case of external arches, has on the intrados a fringe of conventionalized stone spear-heads. The masonry is well finished and jointed, decoration in the form of bandeaux of calligraphy and a running merlon-like ornament being now more prominent than the diaper and rosette patterns in basso-relievo with which the earlier builders were wont to cover entire walls. At the 'Alâ'î Darwâzâ, but not in the other examples of KhâlQî work, the entire surfaces are so treated, and in addition show the use of white marble bandeaux of inscriptions, pilasters and architraves. Works of similar style exist at Dîhilî (the so-called Djâm-i 'Alâ'-Khanâ), and at Nizâm al-Dîn Awliyâ' and Bayânà, near Agra; but other buildings of the KhâlQî period are found as far afield as Djâlor [q.v.] in Râdjastân, at Bharoç, Khambâyat, Pâfân and Siddhur [q.v.] in Gudjarât, at Bhillâ in Mâlwâ, in Dawlatabâd in the northern Deccan, and elsewhere, many of these incorporating much pillaged temple material but showing also more prominent than the diaper and rosette patterns in basso-relievo with which the earlier builders were wont to cover entire walls. At the 'Alâ'î Darwâzâ, but not in the other examples of KhâlQî work, the entire surfaces are so treated, and in addition show the use of white marble bandeaux of inscriptions, pilasters and architraves. Works of similar style exist at Dîhilî (the so-called Djâm-i 'Alâ'-Khanâ), and at Nizâm al-Dîn Awliyâ' and Bayânà, near Agra; but other buildings of the KhâlQî period are found as far afield as Djâlor [q.v.] in Râdjastân, at Bharoç, Khambâyat, Pâfân and Siddhur [q.v.] in Gudjarât, at Bhillâ in Mâlwâ, in Dawlatabâd in the northern Deccan, and elsewhere, many of these incorporating much pillaged temple material but showing also more prominent than the diaper and rosette patterns in basso-relievo with which the earlier builders were wont to cover entire walls. At the 'Alâ'î Darwâzâ, but not in the other examples of KhâlQî work, the entire surfaces are so treated, and in addition show the use of white marble bandeaux of inscriptions, pilasters and architraves. Works of similar style exist at Dîhilî (the so-called Djâm-i 'Alâ'-Khanâ), and at Nizâm al-Dîn Awliyâ' and Bayânà, near Agra; but other buildings of the KhâlQî period are found as far afield as Djâlor [q.v.] in Râdjastân, at Bharoç, Khambâyat, Pâfân and Siddhur [q.v.] in Gudjarât, at Bhillâ in Mâlwâ, in Dawlatabâd in the northern Deccan, and elsewhere, many of these incorporating much pillaged temple material but showing also more prominent than the diaper and rosette patterns in basso-relievo with which the earlier builders were wont to cover entire walls.

Under the TughluQ dynasty the Dîhilî empire was greatly extended, and with the expansion came the spread of the Dîhilî style to all parts of that empire. Of the works of the first ruler, Ghiyât al-Dîn TughluQ, there are insufficient remains to show how early the TughluQîan traits developed: besides the ruins of his capital city, TughluQûbâd, only his own tomb has been so a major work for which he was responsible before his accession to the Dîhilî throne is the mausoleum of the saint Rukn-i 'Alâm at Mûltân [q.v.], originally intended as his own tomb. Some features of this, especially the batter of the walls and the sloping corner turrets, are reflected in the walls of TughluQûbâd and in the strong batter of TughluQ's tomb; and perhaps the profile of the dome also is closer...
to the pointed Mūltān model than to the shallow domes of the ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Darwāза and the Dījāmbāt rhyme of the preceding dynasties. The characteristic Mūltān features of raised tile-work and wooden structural courses, described below when the Pandjāb model is considered, are however absent in the extant Dīhil examples; nor is the octagonal shape retained. Tughluk's son Muḥammad b. Tughluk [q.v.] shortly after his accession conceived the grandiose idea of forming a second capital at Dāwalatābād [q.v.] and transporting there the elite population of Dīhil, and the early multilateral doors to that fort, and the former Dewgiri, at the new capital was much extended, and it seems likely that the Khaldī mosque there was modified at this time since its rear wall has tapering angle turrets, although its interior arrangements seem undisturbed. Muḥammad's occupation of Dāwalatābād was only for about five years, after which he returned to Dīhil, where most of his building projects were carried out. His building program seems to have impoverished the royal treasury, and the fine stone-work of earlier reigns almost disappears and is replaced by cheaper material, plaster over a rubble core; but, from the sudden appearance in the 8th/14th century of buildings in the Deccan which are obviously close to the earlier Dīhil styles, it is to be supposed that many of the artisans taken to Dāwalatābād drifted away from that centre and formed other Allegiances: certainly the earliest Bahmani tombs at Guldārā [q.v.] (see further below) would support this view. Muḥammad b. Tughluk's royal palaces at Dīhil, the Bīdjay Mandal and the Hāzār Sutūn, are now in too ruined a state to permit of certain conclusions as to architectural style; the majority of the remains of his period in Dīhil are in fact more commonplace works: the fort walls of ʿAdīlabād and Dīhānānpānāt, the interesting sluice or water-regulator called Sāt pūlā. The only significant innovation is to be found in the Bīdjay Mandal remains: the earliest Indian example of intersecting vaulting. Some ceramic fragments are known from the ʿAdīlabād excavations.

Under Muḥammad's nephew Fīrūz Shāh Tughluk the building art received an enthusiastic patron. Not only did he build extensively on his own account, but he arranged for the renovation or restoration of many of the monuments of his predecessors. But a strict economy had now to be practised, and plans and costings for each projected undertaking came first under the scrutiny of the Dīwān-i wizāra. Red sandstone and marble were no longer used, and in Dīhil the favourite materials were the local quartzite and sandstone. The sack of Dīhil by Timūr in 801/1398-9 left the sultanate with little resources and less prestige, and for many years the building art in the region of the capital is represented almost entirely by tombs. The tombs of the so-called "Sayyid" rulers are octagonal, continuing the tradition of the Tīlīngānī tomb with structural improvements, especially in raising the springing of the dome by a tall drum; and the shallow domes over the octagonal arcade have been replaced by small pillared kiosks (khāṭris, lit. "umbrellas")—the beginnings of a feature which later is to characterize the architecture of many later styles and was probably introduced from the region of Dījānpūr after Fīrūz's conquest of that region: the central bay of the façade of the western Masdiq at Iriš [q.v.], entirely arcuate with some good stonecarvings, parapets and plinth. Two buildings of the end of the Tughluk period show perhaps a reaction to the Firūzian austerity: the tomb of Kābīr al-Dīn Awhīya at Dīhil, a poor and half-scale copy of the tomb of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluk, and the so-called Revival of Dīhil, in red sandstone and white marble, and the Dīmilī Masdiqjī at Iriš [q.v.], entirely arcuate with some good stonecarvings, and exhibiting in its façade arches and squinches a recession of planes, a familiar device under succeeding dynasties.

The sack of Dīhil by Timūr in 801/1398-9 left the sultanate with little resources and less prestige, and for many years the building art in the region of the capital is represented almost entirely by tombs. The tombs of the so-called "Sayyid" rulers are octagonal, continuing the tradition of the Tīlīngānī tomb with structural improvements, especially in raising the springing of the dome by a tall drum; and the shallow domes over the octagonal arcade have been replaced by small pillared kiosks (khāṭris, lit. "umbrellas")—the beginnings of a feature which later is to characterize the architecture of many later styles and was probably introduced from the region of Dījānpūr after Fīrūz's conquest of that region: the central bay of the façade of the western Masdiq at Iriš [q.v.], entirely arcuate with some good stonecarvings, parapets and plinth. Two buildings of the end of the Tughluk period show perhaps a reaction to the Firūzian austerity: the tomb of Kābīr al-Dīn Awhīya at Dīhil, a poor and half-scale copy of the tomb of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluk, and the so-called Revival of Dīhil, in red sandstone and white marble, and the Dīmilī Masdiqjī at Iriš [q.v.], entirely arcuate with some good stonecarvings, and exhibiting in its façade arches and squinches a recession of planes, a familiar device under succeeding dynasties.
batter. The area of their ground-plans is less than that of the octagonal tombs, but their height is greater; and their side walls are often broken up to the eye by dividing each façade with deep string courses with sunk blind arches and above to give the impression of two or three storeys, although the interior is a single square cell; frequently a central bay of each side is extended upwards to enclose a main arch of nearly the whole height of the wall, the actual doorway being set in this arch with a lintel-and-bracket; and the west wall is usually closed to accommodate a mihrab. But Lodi tombs also exist in the octagonal style, including—apart from numerous octagonal pillared pavilions— the fine tomb of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAlām, the largest of the series, at Tidgārā, and the tomb of Sikandar, ca. 924/1518, at the Dihlī suburb of Khayrūr. The latter perhaps represents the link between the former habit of placing tombs in a fortified enclosure, of which the Tillingārī tomb is the last extant example, and the Mughal practice of surrounding the mausoleum by a garden; for this tomb stands in a large walled enclosure with decorative corner turrets and an ornamental doorway. Part of the west wall is built upwards and buttressed to form an additional external mihrāb, and is presumably a bānātīs mosque; the feature is known in other tombs of this period. Here, as in some of the square tombs, part of the external surface is embellished with glazed tiles, mostly blues and greens; and the dome, as in the earlier tomb of Shihāb al-Dīn Tād Khan, ca. 906/1501, has an inner and outer shell. Two mosques of the period are particularly significant in the development of a style which persists until well into the Mughal period; the mosque of Abū ʿAlī Khayrūd at Khayrūr, of 899/1494, has massive tapering pillars at each rear angle, and also flanking the buttress of the mihrāb, each with a band of vertical fluting alternately angled and rounded as in the lowest storey of the Kūtb Minār, the central bay of the façade projected outwards and upwards, a succession of receding architraves and soffits in each arched opening, and incidentally the finest cut-plaster decoration in Dihlī (Goetz, op. cit. below, considers it second only to that of the Alhambra palace at Granada). The other mosque approaches more nearly the type of the early Muslim monuments; this is the fine tomb of Muḥammad khān masjid of ca. 911/1505, where the tapering buttresses are confined to a position flanking the mihrāb projection on the west wall, and the rear angles are furnished with two-storeyed open octagonal towers. The pylon-like frame of the central arch, and the recession of planes in the arch outlines, are similar to that of the Alhambra; this resembles the previous examples in the eye by dividing each façade with deep string courses with sunk blind arches and above to give the impression of two or three storeys, although the interior is a single square cell; frequently a central bay of each side is extended upwards to enclose a main arch of nearly the whole height of the wall, the actual doorway being set in this arch with a lintel-and-bracket; and the west wall is usually closed to accommodate a mihrab. But Lodi tombs also exist in the octagonal style, including—apart from numerous octagonal pillared pavilions—the fine tomb of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAlām, the largest of the series, at Tidgārā, and the tomb of Sikandar, ca. 924/1518, at the Dihlī suburb of Khayrūr. The latter perhaps represents the link between the former habit of placing tombs in a fortified enclosure, of which the Tillingārī tomb is the last extant example, and the Mughal practice of surrounding the mausoleum by a garden; for this tomb stands in a large walled enclosure with decorative corner turrets and an ornamental doorway. Part of the west wall is built upwards and buttressed to form an additional external mihrāb, and is presumably a bānātīs mosque; the feature is known in other tombs of this period. Here, as in some of the square tombs, part of the external surface is embellished with glazed tiles, mostly blues and greens; and the dome, as in the earlier tomb of Shihāb al-Dīn Tād Khan, ca. 906/1501, has an inner and outer shell. Two mosques of the period are particularly significant in the development of a style which persists until well into the Mughal period; the mosque of Abū ʿAlī Khayrūd at Khayrūr, of 899/1494, has massive tapering pillars at each rear angle, and also flanking the buttress of the mihrāb, each with a band of vertical fluting alternately angled and rounded as in the lowest storey of the Kūtb Minār, the central bay of the façade projected outwards and upwards, a succession of receding architraves and soffits in each arched opening, and incidentally the finest cut-plaster decoration in Dihlī (Goetz, op. cit. below, considers it second only to that of the Alhambra palace at Granada). The other mosque approaches more nearly the type of the early Muslim monuments; this is the fine tomb of Muḥammad khān masjid of ca. 911/1505, where the tapering buttresses are confined to a position flanking the mihrāb projection on the west wall, and the rear angles are furnished with two-storeyed open octagonal towers. The pylon-like frame of the central arch, and the recession of planes in the arch outlines, are similar to that of the Alhambra; this resembles the previous examples in the
is worked out in stringcourses of tile-faced brick and bands of raised diaper pattern, bands of calligraphic inscriptions, and scrolls of arabesque ornament; similar to that of the Kuswarā of the Kuwata al-Islam mosque at Dihlā.

ii. — Bengal. — Stone In the Bengal provinces is almost confined to the black basalt of the Rajmahal hills in the Māda district; but the fine alluvial clay is freely available, the material for the characteristic Bengalī bricks and terracottas. The earliest buildings, at Tribeni [q.v.] and Čhofā Pändū [see PANDU, Čhōfa] are mostly adaptations of pillaged Hindū temple material, using pillars built of large stones without mortar, and shallow corbelled domes; the tomb of Zafar Khān Ghāzī, of 698/1298, shows an early use of the arch, and mīrābās in finely moulded terracotta. The monuments of the early buildings, after the independence of Bengal, is the large Adina mosque at Ḥadrat Pändū [see PANDU, Čhōfa], of 726–1325, in which again use was made of Hindū materials, although it appears that some of the stonework was original work executed by Hindū craftsmen in Muslim employment; it is enclosed by a multiple arcade which carried nearly 400 small domes, and there is a large central hall in the western Iwān, whose surface would have become dulled by the dust which pervades Multān in the summer. The interior decoration includes fine wood, with the six-pointed star (a common Ghaznavīd motif, but otherwise rare in India until early Mughal times) in the spandrels of the wooden mīrāb and scrolls of arabesque ornament; similar to that of the Kuswarā of the Kuwata al-Islam mosque at Dihlā.

iv. — Gujārāt. — The very rich stone-building tradition of the Hindū and Dīyaṇ craftsmen was appropriated by the Gujārāt Muslims, and made Gujārāt at once the richest and the most distinctive of the regions in architecture. The artisans appear to have been less bound here than were their fellows in other regions to the whims of individual rulers or to rigid prescriptions by punctilious 'ulamā, and indeed it often appears that the requirements of Islamic building rather emancipated them from the dogma of the schools of temple architecture, for of all the styles of Indian Islamic building that of Gujārāt is the most Indian, and its purely local characteristics are obvious, even in the earliest stages where pillaged temple material was being used under the orders of governors of the Dīhlī Khādījīs. The earliest surviving Muslim building, the tomb of Shāykh Farid at Pātain [q.v.] of ca. 700/1300, is merely a converted temple, and very little more organization appears in the Adina mosque there, of the same time, where over a thousand rich temple pillars are adapted to a mosque plan (the building has now fallen almost entirely). In Bahrōc [q.v.] a little later the Dāmmī Masjīd is a planned construction and not a mere improvisation, for the outer walls are obviously constructed of stone cut for the purpose, but the western Iwān is of three bays which appear to be three temple mandapas used unaltered except for the obliteration of figure iconography in the ornament. The arch is not used, so that the Iwān has an open pillared façade with no mīsūrā-screen—a mosque-type more frequent in Gujārāt than in other regions. The Dāmmī Masjīd at Khambāyat (Cambay), however, of 725/1325, does have an arched wall closing the Iwān. The walls of this mosque, of alternate deep and shallow courses, are uncharacteristic of Gujārāt and recall the Khādījī workmanship of Dīhlī. A feature appearing here for the first time which later became a favourite device in Gujārāt is a semicircular enframed arch, of no structural significance, carried between two pillars inside the central arch of the façade; this directly copies the torana doorways of the local Hindū and Dīyaṇ temples. This Khambāyat mosque has an entrance porch which is almost an exact copy of that of a temple at Modhērā built three centuries before, as is that of Hālī Khān Khādī’s mosque at Dōhlākā...
(733/1333); but here there is another significant innovation: the façade is ornamented with two tall turrets flanking the central arch. These are in fact solid, but are the obvious types from which the Gujjarāt minarets are derived (isolated mindrs, for example the Kūṭb Minār at Dīhlī, are not unknown elsewhere in India, but the Gujjarāt mosques present their first systematic use). Other buildings of this first phase of Gujjarāt building are to be found at Mangrol [q.v.] and Pētlad. A second phase is represented by the buildings of Ahmad Shah I in his new capital at Ahmadābād, although even here the earliest buildings, Ahmad Shah’s first mosque and the mosque of Haybat Khān, follow the pattern of the Dījam Masjid at Khambāyat; but soon after them the mosque of Sayyid Aḥām, of 814/1412, shows several elements which are developed and perfected in the later Ahmadābād buildings, including heavy projecting cornices, well-built and projecting bases for the minarets with internal stairs (the tops of the minarets above the parapet level of the roof have fallen), and an elevated portion of the roof forming a clerestory to admit more light to the central chamber. Ahmad’s chef d’œuvre is his Dījam Masjid of ten years later. The western Iʿdām has its central chamber flanked by a bay on each side raised above the level of the more distant bays of the western façade by a clerestory roof supported on an open colonnade. the central chamber itself having a second such clerestory carrying the main dome; the light thereby admitted to the central chamber has first to pass through carved-stone screens, which are another typical feature of the Gujjarāt architecture. The side ṭabābās are all of the simple pilared construction without arches. This mosque, with Ahmad Shah’s own tomb and a screened enclosure containing the tombs of the queens, form part of Ahmad Shah’s careful town planning, all lying on a central royal way to his palace, on which stands a triple-arched triumphal gateway. All these buildings are in the same harmonious style, which was continued in Ahmadābād under his immediate successors, Muḥammad and Kūṭb al-Dīn Aḥmad. Muḥammad’s reign saw the beginning of building at Sarkhej [q.v.] with the mosque of Sayyid Ḥabīb Khān and the monumental tomb of Bībī Aḥut Kuki of 876/1472, show the minarets still alternating with outer and inner perforated screens. Some five years later the tomb of Kūṭb al-ʿĀlām, at Bafwā, the western façade of the building, though essentially the same, is perfumed throughout by a second such clerestory and the oriel windows carried on rich corbels to add to the exterior richness, as do the smaller pierced screens in every opening. Other mosques in Čampaṇer are of similar design but smaller and with only a small central clerestory; in particular the Nagina Masjid, which has panels of carved tracery at the bases of the mindrs in the form of intertwining plants. Other works of the time of Māḥmūd include his palaces at Sarkhej and his own tomb there by a lake—which has, in addition to various pavilions, a set of sluices carved with the same attention to detail as the mindrs of the Gujjarāt mosques—and other buildings at Ahmadābād, of which the mosque of Muḥafīz Khān, faqīh-dīr of the city, is the finest; this is an arched building of the type of the Iʿdām with the mindrs at the ends of the Iʿdām. Towards the end of Māḥmūd’s long reign the tomb and mosque of Rānī Sabari shows the usual decorative, almost jewel-like, ornament and tracery to its best advantage by being built on a smaller scale than most of the buildings so far considered; but here the mosque minarets have ceased to be functional, becoming merely slim tapering pinnacles. Other outstanding works, of a different class, are two step-wells (Gudj. adal), described s.v. bāzālī. The common Ahmadābād mosque style, with arcuate Iʿdām and central mindrs, is continued by buildings towards the close of the Gujjarāt sultanate, for example Rānlī Rūpāwati’s mosque of ca. 921/1515. One late example, from 850/1447-48, the year before Akbar’s conquest of Ahmadābād, is an exquisite mosque built by Shāykh Saʿīd al-Ḥabṣāji [see Ḥarṣī], the tympana of the arches on the western side filled with stone traceries of filigree-like delicacy, representing palm-trees and creepers, the finest in the Muslim world, of which perhaps the blind traceries of the Nagina Masjid at Čampaṇer are the immediate ancestor.

After the Mughal conquest it would appear that many of the skilled craftsmen were taken by Akbar
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to north India; certainly there are many features of Gudjarati workmanship in Akbar's Fathpur Sikri (see above), although the mixed origins of that art are to be found in the neighboring provinces of Gudjarat, Mâlwâ, and the Deccan. The Fârâbî [q.v.] hadus, which was early provided with a powerful system of fortification, perpetuates the Gudjarati tradition. Although built after the Mughal conquest, it is characteristic of the Gudjarat; the design of these minârs, however, is different from the octagonal bases that pass to a hexadecagon, above which is a circular storey with oriel windows facing each cardinal point, with a hemispherical dome forming a fourth stage; balconies on heavy brackets separate these four stages. The Dîâmî Masjid at Asïgarh, although built after the Mughal conquest, perpetuates the Gudjarati tradition. At Cikaldâ an enormous gateway (Barâ Darwâza) has an arch of the wide Gulgârg style (see below) but is decorated with the lion-and-elephant motif of the Gond kings (cf. similar devices at Gâwîlgârg [q.v.]).

v. — The Bahmani sultanate.—The principal phases of Bahmani architecture are to be found at Gulgârg and Bidâr [qq.v.], although the kingdom was early provided with a powerful system of fortifications and many of the Bahmani strongholds contain important buildings; for these see especially Dâwlatâbâd, Gâwîlgârg, Iliçpîr, Mâhûr, Mûsâgâl, Naldrug, Nârnâlâ, Pârekâd, Râyûr, and Wâranâgul. The Dîâmî Masjid in the old citadel of Gulgârg, although of a type not reproduced later, since its izzân is completely roofed over, shows nevertheless some features that were to characterize Bahmani architecture and to spread some of the styles of the successor sultanates. The arches of the outer arcade are specially noteworthy: of obtuse angle at the apex, of wide span, and springing from very low impost. An earlier mosque in the city is a mere compilation of temple spoil, as also the large tombs at Bidişpur [q.v.] built by the Bahmani governors. The earliest group of tombs at Gulgârg, all of the second half of the 8th/14th century, are similar to contemporary examples at Dâhil with weak semi-circular domes and battering walls. A later group of tombs, the Haft Gâwîl [q.v.], shows similarities with the Bahmani style; the architect of a type seen in Mândû as early as Hûshâng's tomb, a form which becomes exaggerated and elaborated further in Fathpur Sikri (see above).

General characteristics of the Mâlwâ style are, in addition to the stilted dome, the fine masonry of walls and domes, very restrained ornament, and the frequent use of engaged domical turrets round a central dome. The minâr, so prominent in the neighboring provinces of Gudjarat and Khândhûsh, is not used.

vi. — Khândhûsh. — This small province had a building art with a character of its own, although the mixed origins of that art are to be found in the surrounding provinces of Gudjarat, Mâlwâ, and the Deccan. The Fârâbî [q.v.] hadus, which was early provided with a powerful system of fortification, perpetuates the Gudjarati tradition. Although built after the Mughal conquest, it is characteristic of the Gudjarat; the design of these minârs, however, is different from the octagonal bases that pass to a hexadecagon, above which is a circular storey with oriel windows facing each cardinal point, with a hemispherical dome forming a fourth stage; balconies on heavy brackets separate these four stages. The Dîâmî Masjid at Asïgarh, although built after the Mughal conquest, perpetuates the Gudjarati tradition. At Cikaldâ an enormous gateway (Barâ Darwâza) has an arch of the wide Gulgârg style (see below) but is decorated with the lion-and-elephant motif of the Gond kings (cf. similar devices at Gâwîlgârg [q.v.]).
Bahmani style, stilted above the haunch with straight tangential projections to the apex. Some of these were also two-storied tombs, with continuous walls, buttress-like parapets, and solid and hence can only be decorative; they are found, although they are slender mindrs, in that they appear over solid bases and rise at the sides of mosque façades where in other styles true mindrs are found, although they are slender and solid and hence can only be decorative; they frequently carry miniature domes, and facsacular clusters of minarets flanking a domical arch. The enormous mausoleum of Muhammad ‘Adil Shah, the larger of the Barid Shahi tombs at Bidar, is a square domed cell with an open arch on all four faces; thus, since there is no integral mihrāb, a small mosque is built beside the tomb. The trefoil parapet is commonly used. A common feature of the decoration is a chain-and-pendant motif in plaster, but good tile-work is still a frequent ornament. The latest buildings tend to become over-ornate, and the influence of the Hindu mason becomes more apparent.

---

viii. — Barid Shāhī, I‘mād Shāhī, Nīzām Shāhī. — The Nīzām Shāhīs (q.v.) of Ahmadnagar, although independent there from the beginning of the 9th/15th century until the Mughal arch, including the cupola, is also of Persian character. The base of the building at each corner; but the prototype of these is the small octagonal minaret found in the earliest buildings. In tombs of the closing years of the dynasty, there is a tendency to exaggerate an intermediate stage, a square storey between the arch spandrels, a medallion supported by a bracket-shaped device, moulded in plaster. The works executed before the death of ‘All I in 987/1579 are mostly in rubble covered with dense and durable plaster, and include the city walls and gates (most of these with the typical wide centre arch flanked by two narrow ones), many palaces and audience halls, and some notable mosques. One of these, in memory of the sayyid ‘Ali Shāhī Fīrūz, which unusually has a transverse wagon-vaulted roof, shows the façade arches surrounded by an outer band of cusping, remarkably similar to that of the recently-discovered Djurdjir mosque in Isfahān (q.v.). This device recurs in the other buildings, for example the Dāmūnī Maqṣūdī of 985/1576, where it decorates only the central arch of seven, which also bears the medallion-and-bracket device; the great dome of this mosque is supported by an original system of vaulting by which two intersecting squares, both oblique to the square chamber underneath, form an octagon; this system is later used to great effect in the colossal mausoleum of Muhammad ‘Adil Shāh. This mosque also shows a feature made much of by later Bijapur builders, an elegant exterior. The domes in this early phase are hemispherical; minārs are not used, although bases for them exist in the Dāmūnī Maqṣūdī; small ornamental pinnacles (gūldāstās), however, are freely used at angles of the parapets and over mihrāb buttresses, of a type found on some of the Bahmani tombs at Bidar. After 987/1579, under Ibrāhīm II and later sultans, fine sculptured stonework replaces the earlier rubble-and-plaster. The dome becomes a three-quarter sphere; the cornices and eaves are supported by intricate carved brackets, often with the added decoration of hanging stone chains and locket-like arches, and the love of vertical projections above the sky-line; but these have often become pseudo-minārs, in that they appear over solid bases and rise at the sides of mosque façades where in other styles true minārs are found, although they are slender and solid and hence can only be decorative; they frequently carry miniature domes, and facsacular clusters of minarets flanking a domical arch. The enormous mausoleum of Muhammad (d. 1062/1650), known as the Gol Gunbad, reverts to the hemispherical dome, and has a large staged octagonal turret of the height of the building at each corner; but the prototype of these is the small octagonal minarets found in the earliest buildings. In tombs of the closing years of the dynasty, there is a tendency to exaggerate an intermediate stage, a square storey between the
parapet of the tomb-chamber and the drum of the dome, so that in extreme cases the globular dome appears almost separated from the ground floor. The best of the later buildings of the capital are described s.v. Bāzār; but some Bidjāpur characteristics are encountered far afield, for example in two mosques standing outside Naldrug [q.v.] fort, and at the great entrance arch to the darāgh of Gisū Darāz at Gulkārā.

x. — Kuṭb Shāhī. — The style of the Kuṭb Shāhī buildings, first in Golkōnda and later in the city of Haydarābād [q.v.], is distinctive more on account of the monument than any originality in structure. The principal building material is stone, usually grey granite or trapstone, but rather than being carved this is ornamented with stucco and encaustic tiles. The tombs of the dynasty at Golkōnda, and the mosques and gateways there and at Haydarābād, show the comparative fixedom of the style over a century and a half from the time of Sultan Quli’s independence in 942/1538. The tombs are almost all square in shape and constructionally resemble the Bahmani tombs in Bīdar; the earlier ones are single-storeyed, and only once is the outer face divided into two apparent floors by an upper row of blind arches; some of the later tombs have two storeys, the lower one forming a projecting arcade around the building. The domes are all bulbous, usually a three-quarter sphere, and are foliated at their bases in a similar way to the Bidjāpur domes; but the later buildings develop this into a double or triple band of foliation. The Kuṭb Shāhī buildings emphasize especially the upper parts of walls between the eaves and the parapet, and the rich ornament here is sometimes projected out from the façade to form a balcony carried on brackets. The parapets are crenellated with trefoil-shaped merlons, as in the later Bahmani and Barid Shāhī styles, and are frequently interrupted by small gudālas; at the corners these may be replaced by small minārs. The Kuṭb Shāhī minār, whether decorative or functional, has its shaft encircled one or more times with an arced gallery, and bears a miniature dome with the characteristic foliations. Designs of Hindī provenance are not infrequent in the ornament, especially in the later periods; but these were accepted in the earliest period, as they occurred freely in the Kākāṭiya work taken over in the old provinces of Warangal—for example, in the Bālā Hīsār darwatā at Golkōnda.

xi. — Kaśmir. — The architecture of this region is remarkably different from that of all other countries of Islam, as it is essentially in wood: great logs of dewār (Cedrus deodara) laid horizontally and supported any superstructure; the interstices between the eaves supported on a log cornice; the pyramidal plaster covered with an impervious layer of birch-bark and there with the geese of Hindu mythology. Other stone buildings are ornamented with shallow and often occasionally also yellow. Generally the design is continuously worked in multicoloured tiles, but occasionally very small tiles, like tesserae, each of one colour, are built up to form a mosaic. The design of the tombs, especially their domes, and the few remaining mosques, is essentially Persian rather than Hindī, although this may be due to early Hindu influence. Certainly some of the Thāffha buildings of later times revert to a trabeate style in sandstone, such as the mausoleum of Tāddīn Tāmir, d. 1054/1644, which recalls the buildings of Faṭhpūr Sikri (see below) and also is the only building in which the intrados of the arch is embellished with a spearhead fringe.

The Hindī temple, with projecting wooden balconies and the eaves supported on a log cornice; the pyramidal plaster covered with an impervious layer of birch-bark and there with the geese of Hindu mythology. Other stone buildings are ornamented with shallow and often occasionally also yellow. Generally the design is continuously worked in multicoloured tiles, but occasionally very small tiles, like tesserae, each of one colour, are built up to form a mosaic. The design of the tombs, especially their domes, and the few remaining mosques, is essentially Persian rather than Hindī, although this may be due to early Mughal influence. Certainly some of the Thāffha buildings of later times revert to a trabeate style in sandstone, such as the mausoleum of Tāddīn Tāmir, d. 1054/1644, which recalls the buildings of Faṭhpūr Sikri (see below) and also is the only building in which the intrados of the arch is embellished with a spearhead fringe.

The Mughal schools.

Shortly after Bābur’s arrival in India in 932/1526 he ordered buildings to be erected; he was unimpressed with Indian edifices, and disgusted with the
lack of the formal gardens to which he was accustomed. Most of his works were, therefore, secular, consisting of terraced gardens with pavilions and summer houses, hardly anything of which has survived. Two of his mosques exist, one in Pāñipat and one in Sambhal: works large but utterly undistinguished. Little more can be said about the buildings of Humāyūn's reign (except those works of a previous period now completed, described above); but Humāyūn's importance is in the craft traditions imported with him after his exile rather than the ideas of his buildings.

In point of time, the Sūr sultan Sher Shāh [q.v.] followed Humāyūn although his buildings are a continuation of pre-Mughal styles. There is, indeed, little characteristic architecture remaining of the first part of Humāyūn's reign from which a comparison might be made, since Sher Shāh systematically destroyed Humāyūn's city of Dīhil called Dīnpanāh. In his tombs at Sahsārām [q.v.] in Bihār, Sher Shāh perfected the octagonal pattern, and may indeed have planned these buildings in the decade before he came to power. The earliest (ca. 941/1535) of these, the tomb of his father Hasan Kān, is experimental: there is no plinth, and the drum is a bare wall without fenestration or chatri. Unlike the Lōḍī examples, the Sahsārām tombs have vertical, not battered, walls. The next tomb, that of Sher Shāh himself, is amplified not only from this but also from the Dīhil (ca. 951/1546) of Hāfiz Aḥmad, which is in three stages, rising to 50 m., and set in the middle of an artificial lake connected to the shore by a causeway to which access is given by a domed guardroom; the lowest stage is a square plinth rising out of the water, the next a vast square platform with chatri at each corner, on which stands the octagonal tomb chamber in three further stages, the two lower with chatri at the corners. The roof is crowned with a massive lotus finial. The tomb of his successor Islām Shāh also stands within a lake, but smaller; the better preservation of its causeway shows this to have been constructed on a cantilever principle, each pier with projecting balconies and carrying a chatri. In Nānrāl Shēr Shāh built the tomb of his grandfather Ibrāhīm Kān, a square building not unlike the square Lōḍī tombs, but finished in better stone and with a series of bands.

After Shēr Shāh's accession in 947/1540 he started building at Dīhil, fortifying first the Purāna Kīl'ā and adding an exquisite mosque, with the corner turrets already noticed in the Mōth ki Masdīj and the Djamāl mosque, and with a refined form of the recessed arc: a lower arch set back from a taller one. The arches are struck from four centres, and the spearhead fringe is again in evidence. The stonework is very finely jointed, enriched with fillets of white marble, with fine coloured inlay patterns of a type similar to that later found in Akbār's mosque at Fatūpur Sikrī. The interior decoration is similar to that of the Mōth ki Masdīj, but with every part refined. Other important building products of Shēr Shāh were at Rōhtāsghar [q.v.] in Bihār [q.v.] and his new town of Fathīsār [q.v.] in the Pirānghād, as well as on smaller projects, including some for Dara Shāh.

The first major building to be erected during Mughal rule is Humāyūn's mausoleum, not begun until 976/1568-9, and erected, not in his lifetime after the usual practice, but by his widow. The cenotaph-chamber, which stands on a vast high plinth, is essentially square in plan, with each corner of the square chamfered off and with a recessed central bay in each side. Each of these bays contains a deep arch, as high as the walls on either side of the bay, constructed as a half-dome, and smaller arches of varied height and levels fill the remaining façades of each wall. The central chamber is surmounted by a tall drum, which carries a high double dome, with a chatri of Lōḍī type, open and on slender pillars, at each corner, and two smaller square chatri over each central arch. The dome is slightly curved at its base, but its general shape echoes that of the arches below; the arches introduce a new shape to north India, as the arcades are struck from four centres. The building is in red sandstone, with white and green marble inlay (sparking use of other colours as well), executed in star-shaped designs at the drum below the dome, well inlaid but not polished in situ: this inlay work is to be classified as opus sectile rather than as the finely polished marquetry-like pieta dura of later Mughal periods. A smaller tomb of not dissimilar design is that of Akbār's foster-father, Aṭṣa Kān, at Nizamsuddīn; but Humāyūn's tomb gains enormously in effect not only by the vast plinth (which contains the true tomb immediately below the cenotaph) but by the vaster garden in which it is set—a great square, subdivided into squares and squares again by paths, flower-beds, and parterres. It immediately the advent of a new style in India, and is of great importance as the immediate Indian prototype for other monumental mausolea. A fuller description, with plan, is given s.v. Dīhil. See also Būstan.

Akbār's building projects, many and varied, reflect something of the man. They start at Āgrā [q.v.] fort, on the trace of the previous Lōḍī fort, with the gateways: a half-octagon flanking tower on each side of the four-centred arch of the gate, the towers decorated with blind arches below and open arches on the upper storey, with chatri over towers and gateway; internally, the arch carried a spearhead fringe of a more elaborate and conventionalized form than that of previous reigns; the whole is decorated in opus sectile. Palaces inside the fort are in much the same style, and include projecting balconies supported on richly carved corbels, with much beam- and bracket workmanship; some of the brackets, in sandstone, seem to have been borrowed directly from wood-building techniques. Similar buildings were commenced in a more similar style at Lōḍī, but on a smaller scale, at Allāhābād. The new capital, at Fatūpur Sikrī [q.v.], is a sandstone city. The palaces are for the most part built in the present style, with shallow domes and heavy eaves recalling Lōḍī work, occasional arches with the spearhead fringe, carved brackets resembling those of Rājāsthān temples, and superb carving. There is some inlaid opus sectile work in white marble, especially on the mosque; the inside of the mosque, however, is of finely polished marble mosaic inlay, the first attempt towards the technique of pieta dura. Some buildings in the city, such as the Divān-i khāṣṣ, with an extraordinary bracketed central column supporting a platform in the middle of the single room, and the Pānč maḥāl, a five-storeyed pyramidal open pavilion, are remarkable structures, part of Akbār's personal whimsy, with no significance in the development of the Mughal style; but one of interest and archaeological significance is the tomb of Salīm Cīshī, after 979/1571, a square chamber with an outer verandah which is screened with marble lattices on the outside: a feature characteristic of that of north India at all, but familiar in the tombs of Gujūrāt (see above). The eaves are supported on convoluted brackets which have a prototype in
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Candari [q.v.]. Another Gudjarat feature, apparently, is the reservoir which lies beneath the sa^k of the great mosque on these features see. Burton-Paget, Fatehpur Sihri, in R. E. Mortimer Wheeler (ed.), Splendours of the East, London 1965, 143-53).

Of Akbar's reign in Dihli is the last of the octagonal tombs, that of Adham Khán, of 969/1562; it is without the wide chagdidi which characterizes the earlier octagonal tombs, and, being also without chairis, looks curiously insipid. Of about the same thatris, of the same opus sectile decoration, and corner turrets at the rear of the liwán similar to those on the Lóth Moth ki Masjéid and the Súri mosque in the Purána kilâ. At Díawnpur [q.v.] is a fine bridge, with screened pavilions over each pier, across the river Gomti, and at Gályári is the tomb of Muhammad Gáhwí, which has the typical Gudjarati screened arcades. For provincial Mughal architecture in Bengal and Gudjarat, see MUGHALS.

Dihângír's interest was more in miniature painting [see TASWIR] than in architecture, and there are few examples of the buildings of his reign; although it is known that he extended Akbar's buildings at Ágrá and Láhawr forts, beginning at the latter a "picture wall" in mosaic tiles showing hunting, polo and court scenes, and completed the building of Akbar's tomb: a four-storeyed pyramidal building, over-ornamented with chairís, with a large half-dome archway in each face, opus sectile ornament, and an open square with a cenotaph, all in marble, at the top, standing in a vast târ-bâgh garden. The entrance gateway is imposing, with a tall white marble minâr at each corner—the first appearance of this feature in the north. The two most important buildings of Dihângír's reign are the tomb at Ágrá, begun 1031/1622, of his father-in-law Mirzâ Ghíyâth Beg entitled I lâlúm, which has the typical Gudjarati screened arcades. For other buildings of Dihângír see PALAMA'.

Shâhjáhan's buildings show the Mughal style at its height, although the earliest, the completion by Núrdjáhan of Dihângír's tomb at Shâhádara, near Láhawr, continues the opus sectile tradition; it is of only a single storey, with a lofty minâr at each corner, again in an immense garden; it is more important for its decoration than for its structure, not only on the surface of the building, but in the piétra dura of the cenotaph, in white marble, calligraphy (the ninety-nine names of God) appearing in delicate piétra dura here for the first time. Shâhjáhan himself replanned the buildings at Ágrá and Láhawr forts, replacing some of the earlier sandstone structures with marble ones; these are characterized by engraved arches, tapering supporting columns and piétra dura ornament, especially on walls and at the foot of columns and their plinths; and the marble was delicately channelled and carved. There appear at Ágrá, for the first time in north India, two oblong pavilions with a Bengali-style curved cornice to the roof; and at Láhawr fort also is a pavilion in the style of a Bengali tâlûkâda hut. These works were perhaps a preliminary essay for Shâhjáhan's own grandiose fort, the Lâl kilâ (from its red sandstone enclosure walls; see BURJ, iii) in his new city at Dihlí [q.v.] called Shâhâjáhánábád. The palace buildings are designed with great symmetry; the planning along an ornamental marble canal with chutes and cascades; in structure they are similar to those at Ágrá, except that the columns tend to be thicker, and the piétra dura work and the marble carving of the highest quality. Before the fort was begun, however, the construction of the mausoleum of his queen, Mûmtâz-i Mabâhl, had been started. This building, known to everyone by its larger and more ruined Tadj (shahâj) mihrân, is in the village now called Tadjqándj outside Ágrá, on the opposite bank to the fort: a complex of buildings with a square mausoleum with a tall minâr at each corner of its plinth, and a red sandstone mosque and an identical dawâbh, used as a mihrân-khánâ, flanking it on a platform at the river end of the great oblong garden; the garden divided by paths and parterres, with central crossing water-channels, and an imposing gateway. The entire mausoleum, thirteenth, and the four minârs are worked in white marble with piétra dura in semi-precious stones, and there is a tall white marble dome, surrounded by four marble chairís; the dome is slightly bulbous. This is the perfect culmination of the tomb-type starting with Humâyûn's tomb of a century earlier, through 'Abd al-Râhím Khán-i Khánân's tomb, with decoration of the type started in the tomb of I'timád-al-Dawla and perfected at the forts of Ágrá, Láhawr and Shâhjáhánábád. In Dihlí the plans for the city were completed with the Díámi Masjéid, 1059-9/1648-50; the liwán, in red sandstone with white marbles, has a large central half-dome arch, with five smaller flanking arches on each side, all engraved; two minârs at the courtyard ends of the liwán; and three bulbous marble domes. A similar mosque, much smaller, was built in Ágrá at about the same time for his daughter Dihângír Ard [q.v.]; here the arches revert to the plain (not engraved) four-centred type. Another important building of Shâhjáhan's reign, of a different type, is the mosque of Wazír Khán in Láhawr, of about 1044/1634; here the ornament is more akin to the arts developed in Persia, consisting of true mosaic tile decoration on the external surfaces, floral, calligraphic, geometrical, especially with the cypress (Castelnaud's "pâlikhân") for the plane and technique of this art see XHAYAP); the internal surfaces are painted in tempera and cut-plaster (see X1158). Other buildings of Shâhjáhan are at Adîmür (two marble lakeside pavilions) and Kâshmîr (terraces in the Shâlimâr gardens, laid out by Dihângír).

In the reign of Awrangzib the building art began to lose its vitality, although the Mòti (pearl) Masjidí added to the fort of Shâhjáhánábád, ca. 1070/1660, retains the delicacy of earlier craftsmanship (the too-large bulbous domes are a later addition). The effectness is starting to be apparent in the great Bâdsháhí Masjéid of ca. 1083/1674 added to the west of Láhawr fort, with four tall minârs at the corners of the courtyard, four short ones at the corners of the liwán; the three domes are a little over-bulbous, and the liwán façade presents too many blank spaces. A few years later the tomb of Awrangzib's wife, Râbî'a Dâwârânî, was built at Awrangbâd; it stands in a walled garden, which is its best feature; for it is a half-scale copy of the Tadj Mâhâl, with a thin engraved central arch, bulbous dome, disproportionately heavy minârs, a cramped skyline with insufficient room for the corner chairís, attenuated guldastas, which combine to give it an air
of assiduous mediocrity. Awrangzib's mosques at Banaras and Mathurā, on the other hand, are orthodox and well-proportioned, so it must be assumed that he played no personal part in their construction. A far better tomb building is the last of the great square mausoleas, the tomb of the waliş Ša'dar Dījang [q.v.] at Dihlī (d. 1166/1753), of good proportions, even if the dome is a little too bulbous, in finely worked fawn sandstone, and in the last great dārāgāh garden.

The Nawwabs of Awadh, in their capital of Lucknow, became the artistic successors to the Mughals. Their earlier buildings are similar to the Awrangzib buildings, large and impressive, but over-decorated; their later ones, produced in a sort of bastard château style under the influence of a French adventurer with magnificent vision and no taste, mix up Corinthian capitals, fluted domes, compositions of round romanesque arches, ogee arcades, and odd ideas gathered from the Mughals, Ancient Greeks, and the European "Palladian" school. The Sikhs style of the Panjāb is at least of consistent late-Mughal extraction, but tends to over-proliferate châteis and the fluted dome, and to be too partial to the Bengali corinme. Some of the Râjpût palaces have preserved better elements of late Mughal style, especially at Amber and Dijāpurp, and have combined it with an excellent masonry technique. In the south a strange hybrid Islamo-Vidjayanagara style was evolved at Hampū [q.v.]; and later scions of the Vidjayanagara house, after the dissolution of their empire, remembered some elements in their palace of Čandragiri. The few buildings of the Mahisur sultanate of Haydar 'Ali and his son Tipū are less bizarre, particularly the tomb of the dynasty at Sṛtrangapattānām [q.v.]. Other local Muslim styles are more aberrant: for example, the 15th century tombs at Dīhnāgār, which appear to translate the fancy knobs of a Victorian bedstead into stone, not without skill.

Bibliography: There is as yet no single comprehensive work of professional standard on Islamic building in India, nor can there be until the historical development of certain aspects of structure and decoration is fully worked out. Information is still most inadequate on foundation, coursing and bonding in masonry and brickwork, and the methods of setting out; on plasterwork, incised, moulded, fresco-painted and polished; on ceramic decoration and its relation with some types of plasterwork; on fenestration; on woodwork, carved or inlaid; on decorative techniques involving polished stone: opus sectile and pīstā dūra; and on the development of such features as kiosks (châteis), merlons and parapets, sarānā-galleries, even on major structural works such as bridges, riparian buildings such as landings and ghâls, and domestic architecture. A "grammar of ornament" is also an urgent necessity. There are, it is true, many brilliant works in which most of these points are dealt with over a short period or in a limited region; but they are out-numbered by the anachronistic, inoffensive and mediocre, the most comprehensive is Percy Brown, Muslim architecture in India, in G. T. Garratt (ed.), The legacy of India, Oxford 1937, 253-55; J. H. Marshall, The monuments of the Mughal period, ibid., iv, 523-76; for a general account with particular reference to Pakistan: R. E. Mortimer Wheeler, Five thousand years of Pakistan, London 1950, specially 61-128; idem, Splendours of the East, London 1965, 68-71. A tendentious account, written in support of the untenable thesis that all Indian architecture is directly from the hands of E. B. Havell, Indian architecture; its psychology, structure and history from the first Muhammadan invasion . . ., London 1913. Older works: J. Ferguson, History of Indian and eastern architecture, London 1876; revised ed. by J. Burgess and R. P. Spiers, 2 vols., London 1910 (esp. ii, 186-335); V. A. Smith, History of fine art in India and Ceylon, London 1921, 391-420. There is much material available on local aspects of Muslim building, especially in A. Cunningham, Archaeological survey of India, xxiii vols., Simla and Calcutta 1873-87; various authors, especially J. Burgess, in Archaeological Survey of western India, Old series, ii, iii, iv, 1875; vi, 1877; viii, 1879; xi a, 1885; xi b, 1890; Archaeological survey of India, New Imperial series (combining New Series of some provincial surveys, from 1876); also Progress reports of circles of the Survey, from 1890; after 1902-3 supervised by Archaeological Survey of India Annual Reports, supplemented by monographs entitled Memoirs of the archaeological survey of India. Detailed lists of contents of all volumes relevant to Islam in R. A. C. Creswell, Bibliography of the architecture, arts and crafts of Islam, Cairo 1911, passim; individual articles after 1905 listed also in Pearson. Since Indian independence many articles in Ancient India, from 1946. Some articles of architectural importance in EIM. Critical bibliography, before 1948 only, in Annual bibliography of Indian archaeology, i-xv, of the Kern Institute, Leiden.

and Dhank, AS Western Ind., OS ii, Bombay 1875; idem, Memorandum on the remains at Gumli, Gop, and in Kachch, etc., ASWI, OS i, Bombay 1875; idem, Lists of the antiquarian remains in the Bombay Presidency ..., ASWI, OS xi, Bombay 1885; idem, Report on the antiquities at Kāthiāvārd and Kathi ... century, when it was praised by Āl-Djātiz (Sudan, ed. van Vloten, 84; ed. Harun, Rāsid'il, i, 223; cf. M. Z. Siddiqi, NIS ... architectural antiquities of Northern Gujarat .... ASI, NIS xxxii, London 1903; H. Cousens, Revised list of antiquarian remains in the Bombay Presidency ..., ASI, NIS xxxvi, London 1897. See also Bibliographies to Ahmadābād, Bharoc, Cāmpānēr, Kācch, Khambatāy, Mahmūdābād, Sārkhēm. For Mālāvā: G. Yazdani, Mālāvā: the city of joy, Oxford 1999; M. B. Gare, Guide to Chandī, Gwalior 1928; and bibliographies to Ĉandērī, Dhar, Mānādī. For Kāndīsēh see Bibliographies to Būrnāhpur, Khandēsēn, Thāṇnēr. For works of the Bahmanīs: Gulbārga in Reports of Arch. Dept. Hyderabad, 1333f./1925-6, 1344f./1934-5, and 1350f./1939-7; Bidar in G. Yazdani, Bidar: its history and monuments, Oxford 1947; and bibliographies to Bahmanīs, i; Bidar; Gulbārga. For the Barīd Shāhī style: as for Bidar. For Bīdājīpur, specially H. Cousens, Bījpūr and its architectural remains, ASI, NIS xxvii, Bombay 1916, and bibliographies to Bījpūr and Naldrūg. For Kūṭh Shāhī architecture see bibliography to Ayādābād. For Kashmir little except W. H. Nicholls, Muhammadan architecture in Kashmir, in ARASI, 1906-7, Calcutta 1909, 151-70. For Sind bibliographies to Chanderī, op. cit., 68-71; M. Idris Siddiqi, Thattā, Karachi 1958; and bibliographies to Darbhul, Mānṣūrā, Thēffāh. For the monuments of Shēr Shāh: A. Cunningham, ASI, xi, 132-9; Maulīvī Muhammad Hamīd Kūrāshī, List of ancient monuments ... in Bihār and Orissa, ASI, NIS ii, Calcutta 1931, 54-66, 139-41, 146-91, 197-202, 207-19; ARASI, 1922-3, 34-41; Wetzel, op. cit., 92-105, Abbildungen 272-334; F. V. Ahmadavali, The monuments of Shēr Shāh Sur on the Islamic architecture of India, in Proc. 3rd Ind. Hist. Cong., 1939, 636-46, (also in Bengal past and present, ivi/1940, 57-63); H. Goetz, The mausoleum of Shēr Shāh at Sasaram, in Ars Islamica, vi/1938, 97 f. See also the bibliographies to Dinīl, Nārnawī, Rōntās, Rōntāsānān, Sahsārām, Shēr Shāh, Sūrs. For the buildings of the Mughals: E. W. Smith, Mughal architecture of Fathpur-Sībīr, 4 vols., Allāhābād 1896 (ASI, NIS xviii); idem, Moghul colour decoration of Agra, Allāhābād 1901; idem, Akbar's tomb, Sīhāndarah, near Agra, Allāhābād 1909; Nur Bakhsh, Historical notes on the Lahore fort, in ARASI, 1902-3, 218 ff.; idem, Agra fort and its buildings, in ARASI, 1903-4, 164 ff.; W. H. Nicholls, Jahāngīr's tomb at Shāhādāra, in ARASI, 1911-12, 2 vols., ASI, NIS xxiv, 100-7, 121 ff.; idem, Kahnīsūr, Kashmir, in ARASI, 1906-7, 161 ff.; idem, Shālmār bāgh, Delhi: plan and brief text in AR, Arch. Surv. Panjab and U.P., 1904, 75-8; E. B. Havell, A handbook to Agra and the Taj ..., London 1912; Zafar Hasan, Mosque of Shāhī Shāh’s Abdā-n-Nabī, MASI ix, Calcutta 1921; J. Ph. Vogel, Tile mosaics of the Lahore fort, Calcutta 1920 (ASI, NIS xli); Har Bilas Sarda, Ajmer: historical and descriptive, Ajmer 1911; J. L. Kipling, Mosque of Waṣṣikhan at Lahore, in J. Ind. Art., ii/19 (1899), 127-8; idem, Essays on Persian and Saracenic art, Hephaestus, London 1927; idem, The drawing of geometric patterns in Saracenic art, MASV xv, 1925; M. A. Chaghtai, Le Tadj Mahal d’Agra (Inde), Brussels 1938; J. Burton-Page, Lahore fort, in R. E. Mortimer Wheeler (ed.), Splendours of the East, London 1965, 82-93; idem, Waṣṣikhan’s mosque, Lahore, ibid., 94-101; idem, The Red Fort, Delhi, ibid., 130-41; idem, Fatehpur Sīhī, ibid., 142-53; idem, Tāj Mahal, Agra, ibid., 154-65. See also bibliographies to Agra, Aūndh, Anragārābād, Dihlī, Lāhawr; Mughals, art. (J. Burton-Page) viii. — Music

The first detailed account of secular Indian music occurs in the Nāyakādāstra by Bharata, which has been dated variously from the 3rd century B.C. to the 4th century A.D. Although this work is primarily devoted to drama and stagecraft, music is an important topic in it. Musical theory had, by this time, already reached a high state of development and is described in considerable detail. The melodic system is based on modes (dījī), which are constructed on heptatonic series of notes (mṛūchānā) beginning on the successive degrees of two parent scales, Shādājgrāma and Mālāyagramā. These scales were composed of 3 different sized intervals, comparable to the major, whole and minor whole tone and semitone of "just intonation". These were expressed (approximately) in terms of their highest common factor, about a quartetone, called gṛuti. Thus the intervals are described as containing 4, 3 and 2 gṛutis respectively. An interval of 1 gṛuti was not considered musical.

Cultural exchanges between India and the outside world included music and musical instruments before the advent of Islam. Greco-Roman influence is clearly evident in the Gandhārā sculptures and the musical instruments depicted corroborate this. Furthermore, Roman singing boys are said to have been imported into India in about the 2nd century A.D. (Periplus of the Etruscan Sea) and 12,000 Indian musicians are said to have been sent to Bahārmūrū in Sānānd Persia (Ṭāḥalīlī, Histoire des roses des Pârthes, translated by A. COX, 139-41, 146-91, 197-202, 207-19; idem, Rūhtās, Sahsārām, Shēr Shāh, Sūrs.

During the next few centuries it appears that Indian music underwent considerable change. In Mātaĩga's Brhādāshāstra, of about the 3rd/4th century, a new technical term, rāg (═ Skt. rāga), was introduced. The essence of the concept of rāg was the recognition that certain combinations of notes were endowed with particular sentiments, rasa (═ Skt. rasa). These rāgs, which had crystalized from the ancient modes (dījī), formed a melodic basis for the composition of songs (gītā). Gradually, as the rāgs completely displaced the dījī, the two original parent scales lost their significance. In the Sāṇgīta Ratnākāra (607/1210-65/1247) it is stated that 26 rāgs were currently in use. This important Sanskrit treatise, composed by Shārīrāvada at the court of the Yādava dynasty in the Deccan before the Muslim conquest of this area, discusses sāṅgīta in its three aspects, vocal music, instrumental music and dance. Although Shārīrāvada attempted to follow the earlier theorists, he was obliged to admit that much of the ancient music was extinct.

Indian music was known and held in high regard in the Islamic world in the 3rd/9th century, when it was praised by al-Ǧāḥīz (Ṣādiṣ, ed. vau Volten, 84; ed. Hārūn, Rāṣīj, 1, 223; cf. M. Z. Siddiqi,
Studies in Arabic and Persian medical literature, Calcutta 1959, 32), and in the 4th/10th century, al-
Mas'udi, evidently referring to the emotional impact of râgs, reports that Indians “frequently hear songs and musical performances, and they have various sorts of musical instruments which produce on man all shades of impressions between laughing and crying ...” (Murâdî, i, 169 = tr. Pellat, § 177). Indian musical theory, too, was not entirely unknown, for the Caliphs of Baghdad are said to have ordered the translation of a number of Indian treatises, among which was one on Indian music entitled Bisîyâphar (Ta'rîkh al-buhâmā, ca. 595/1198) which has been interpreted as Vidyâphala “fruit of science”, but has not yet been traced (H. T. Colebrooke, Miscellaneous essays, London 1873, ii, 460).

In several respects Indian music was probably similar to Persian and Arabic music, especially as all three were modal systems based on melody rather than harmony. Each of them was concerned with the cosmic implications of music as well as its power to influence the individual. In India, the modes are ascribed to specific periods of the day, and are further associated with seasons, colours and, of course, the Hindu deities. Similar associations, at first attached to the strings of the lute (al-Kindi) and later extended to include the modes, are also found in Arabic musical treatises. Thus the conquering Muslims encountered in India a musical system which was not entirely alien, and their reaction to it appears to have been favourable. The poet Amir Khusraw, who was expert in both Indian and Persian music at the court of ‘Alâ al-Din Khâlidî (695/1296-715/1316), states, without equivocation, that “Indian music, the fire that burns heart and soul, is superior to the music of any other country. Foreigners, even after a stay of 30 or 40 years in India, cannot play a single Indian tune correctly” (M. W. Mirza, Life and works of Amir Khusraw, Calcutta 1935, 184). Amir Khusraw is credited with the introduction into Indian music of a number of Persian and Arabic elements which include new vocal forms, as well as new râgs, tâls (= Skt. tâla, time measure) and musical instruments. Of the vocal forms, two are of particular importance; bambâ, in which the singer is accompanied by a drone, and tarâna, a song composed of meaningless syllables, both of which are prominent today.

From this time until well into the Mughal period, foreign music, particularly from Iran, was frequently heard in the Indian courts along with Indian music. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that there were numerous attempts to introduce new elements into Indian music. Many of these were subtle rather than drastic innovations, but they nevertheless brought about modifications in the character of Indian music without actually changing its basic form.

Music flourished in Islamic India in spite of the puritan fashion which believed that music was unlawful in Islam. The impetus was supplied by the royal patronage of a number of excellent musicians in their own right. Sultan Muhammad b. Tughluq (726/1326-752/1351), although a strong religious convictions, yet kept 1,200 musicians in his service and had, in addition, 1,000 slave musicians (Mahdi Hussain, Reha of Ibn Batuta, Baroda 1953, 50-1). Sultan Zayn al-Abîdîn of Kashmir (895/1496-872/1462) encouraged literature, painting and music and ordered the writing of a treatise on music which, unfortunately, not extant (Abdul Halim, History of Indo-Pak music, Dacca 1962, 79). Husayn Shâh Shârî (863/1458-935/1528) (see shârî) initially of Deobura, was an incomparable performer and an innovator second only to Amir Khusraw. His most important contribution was the introduction of a new form of song, khayîl, which gave much greater scope for technical virtuosity than did the traditional and austere dhrupad. The rivalry between the advocates of these two forms of song and their respective styles of singing has continued until recent times, when the khayîl finally gained supremacy.

This was a period of great musical activity. Sultan Sikandar Lodi [q.v.] (895/1496-923/1517) took a keen interest in music in spite of his religious orthodoxy. Under his patronage, probably the first treatise on Indian music in Persian, the LaHajat-i Sikandar Shâh, was composed. This was a traditional work based on Sanskrit treatises. In Gwalior, however, Râgâ Mân Singh Tonvar (891/1486-922/1516) was responsible for the formulation of a more progressive treatise in Hindi entitled Mân Kastâhâl. This work was compiled by the leading musicians of his court and incorporated many of the innovations that had been introduced into Indian music since Amir Khusraw's time. In spite of this endeavour, traditional Indian musical theory continued to be expressed, for the most part, in Sanskrit treatises which bore less and less resemblance to court music as time went on. To some extent, the traditional Indian music has been preserved in South India, but here too the music has evolved, albeit in its own direction.

Patronage of music reached its peak under the Mughal Emperors, Akbar, Djahângir and Shâh Djiân. The lists of the leading musicians, both Hindu and Muslim, who were attached to their courts is impressive, and included such famous musicians as Tânsen, his son Bîlsî Kîhân, and Bâz Bahâdûr. Bâz Bahâdûr was the last Muslim ruler of Mâlwâ, whose tragic affair with Rûmpati, a singer and dancing girl, has become legendary. In the later part of his life, after he had lost his empire, he became one of the leading musicians in Akbar's retinue. It is interesting to note that nearly all the vocalists attached to these courts were Indian, while many of the instrumentalists were foreigners, who came from Mâshhad, Tabriz and Harât (Abu 'l-Fadî, Â'in-i Abbarî, tr. H. Blochmann, Calcutta 1873, i, 610-5). In addition to this court music, large orchestras (nawbah), consisting of wind and percussion instruments, were maintained. These usually played at regular periods in the naHkîr-khâna or nawbah-khâna, which were located in the gateways of palaces and shrines (ibid., i, 50-1). A similar tradition, nusba, had been known in Arabia several centuries earlier (H. G. Farmer, A history of Arabian music, London 1929, 153-4).

In the beginning of the 11th/17th century, music flourished in the Deccan under the patronage of Ibrahim 'Adîl Shâh II, a renowned poet. The Kitâb-i NaUras contains a collection of his poems intended to be sung in different râgs. These are, however, referred to as makhâm and give an indication of the similarity between the Indian and Arabic musical systems.

Under the Emperor Awrangzîb (1668/1658-1718/1707) music suffered a temporary setback, for, although he was fond of music and was skilled in its theory, he relinquished all pleasure and chose a life of asceticism early in his reign. The cause of Indian music was, however, revived under the later Mughals, Bahâdûr Shâh (1118/1707-1124/1712) and Muhammad
**Hind — Hind bint Al-Khuss**

Shah (1132/1719-1161/1748). The latter was a famous singer who composed many *khaydl*, which are extant, most of which are classified in 10 *rāgs* or *rāginīs*, a system which does not appear to be the beginning of modern musical theory in North India. Whereas in the mediaeval period many new *rāgs* had been introduced and the prevailing system of classification in terms of *rāgas* (masculine modes) and their *rāgīnīs* (female consorts) had been extended to include *putras* (sons) and *bhāryās* (wives of sons), a system which does not appear to have had any musical basis, in the *Naghmāt-ī Asafi* a new system based on classification in terms of scale (thāl) was advocated. This basis for the classification of *rāgs* is generally accepted in the present period.

The process of integrating musical theory and musical practice still continues. At the beginning of this century great strides were made in this direction by the efforts of V. N. Bhatkhanda, who was both a musician and a Sanskrit scholar. His theories are based on songs which he collected from a number of eminent musicians, many of whom were Muslim and could trace their ancestry to the Mughal court. Bhatkhanda’s system can be briefly outlined as follows:

- The octave is composed of twelve approximately equal semitones, but the intonation of these, with the exception of the perfect 4th and 5th of the standard tonic or drone note, *dādi*, may vary from *rāg* to *rāg* and from musician to musician. More than 200 *rāgs* are extant, most of which are classified in 10 groups on the basis of scale (thāl). These are:

  - Kalyān C D E ` F G A B C
  - Bilāval C D E F G A B C
  - Khamādī C D E F G A B C
  - Bhayrav C D E F G A B C
  - Pūrvi C D E ` F G A B C
  - Mārvā C D E ` F G A B C
  - Kāfī C D E F G A B C
  - Āsāvari C D E ` F G A B C
  - Bhayravī C D E ` F G A B C
  - Tori C D E ` F G A B C

A performance of classical or art music generally consists of two parts: *alāp*, introductory improvisation establishing the melodic features of the *rāg*; and *tāl*, the composition, which in vocal music may be *khayāl*, *dhrupad*, *tarāna* or one of several more modern forms, and in instrumental music as played on the stringed instruments, *stār* and *sarod*, is generally *gāl*. This composition is set in a particular *tāl*, a cyclic time-measure punctuated by a stress pattern which is marked on a pair of drums, *tālī*. The composition is generally short and is used as a springboard for improvised variations dependent on the creative ability and the virtuosity of the performer. While the variations maintain the interest of the audience, a deeper emotional impact is achieved through the gradually increasing tempo and the progressive complexity of the music which finally culminates in a powerful climax.

**Bibliography:** The secular music of pre-Islamic India in Sanskrit treatises, notably: Bharata, *Nāṭyaśāstra*, especially chapters XCVIII-XXXIII, text and translation Man Mohan Ghosh, Calcutta 1961; Matanga, *Brhaddeśi*, Trivandrum 1928; *Rāgas and Rāginīs*, translated and arranged for harp by W. A. Bayley, London 1916; *A short historical survey of the music of Upper India*, Bombay 1917; idem, *A comparative study of some of the leading music systems of the 15th, 16th, 17th and 18th centuries*, Bombay 1941; Abdul Halim, *History of Indo-Pak music*, Dacca 1962. There are, in addition, a number of unpublished manuscripts of the mediaeval period, some of which are mentioned in *History of Indo-Pak music*.

Miscellaneous works on Indian music:

**Hind bint Al-Khuss,** or simply *Bint Al-Khuss*, name by which is known a woman of the pre-Islamic era, whose eloquence, quickness of repartee and perspicacity became legendary. According to al-Shūbīl (Abū Umara al-Musāriq, Cairo 1326, 71), the word *khuss* denotes the son of a man and of a *dāmnīyya* (while ‘sāmā’q is applied to the offspring of a *dāmn* and a woman), and thus we perceive the origin of the legend which arose probably from the belief of the intervention of *dāmn* in the generation of human beings endowed with exceptional gifts. In spite of affirmations such as that of *LA* (s.v.) in respect of al-Khuss: ‘well-known among the inhabitants of the Iyād’, the historicity of this man and his daughter is open to serious doubt; nevertheless it is significant that some authors call the daughter Hind bint Al-Khuss b. Hābīs b. Kurya al-Iyādī (al-Iyādīyya), while they give to another woman, presented as her sister, the name of *Dumāl*a’bint Hābīs b. Muḥyīl. Furthermore, they give her also the nickname al-
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This match was resented by Hindal, in whose entourage Hamida happened to be. On Humayün's refusal to give up, Hindal felt offended and without the royal permission left for Kandahar which he seized from Kamran's men. Even this act of open revolt was condemned by Humayün, who allowed him to retain his newly gained possession. The territory of Badakhshán was conferred on him for gallantry during the battle of Kunduz in 953/1546. He was killed on 21 Dhu'l-Hijjah 952/21 November 1551 in a surprise attack by Kámrán's men while engaged in reconnoitring operations at night in the vicinity of Dju-yi Shahi in eastern Afghanistan, where he was temporarily buried. His coffin was later removed to Kábul and interred near the grave of his father, the emperor Bábúr. He was more faithful to Humáyún than to his other ambitious brothers, Kámrán and 'Askarl. He was married to Sultánám Bégam, a sister of Sayyid Muhammad Khádgá, husband of Bábúr's sister, Khánzáda Bégám. His daughter Bukáyya Bégám was Akbar's first wife but bore him no children. She died at the advanced age of 84 on 7 Dümádá I 1053/19 January 1646 at Agra (cf. Gul-Badan Bégám, 274).


**HINDI**, the national language of the Republic of India, is now generally regarded as that form of the central north Indian speech which draws its erudite vocabulary from Sanskrit and its culture from Hinduism, and for literary purposes as including not only the standard dialect (Káhri boli) but also the eastern Awádi, the central Brádi, and the bardic poetry of Rádgásthán [see also HINDI, Languages]. Formerly, and as late as the 19th century, it was also used to describe the speech of north Indian Muslims, those of Hindu as opposed to Dákhan, the speech of the Hindus being distinguished as Hindauri. The term has now been replaced entirely in its Muslim sense by Urdu [q.v.]; in the remainder of this article the term Hindu is used in its Hindí sense.

The relevance of Hindu to Islam is threefold: there is a small but important corpus of Hindu works by Muslim writers; Muslim rulers and nobles have been active patrons of Hindu poetry; and there has been a considerable Muslim influence on Hindu vocabulary, with a more limited influence on grammar (including phonology, morphology and syntax) and on style.

The Muslim poets' interest in Hindu began early, long before the emergence of anything resembling Urdu as an Indian Muslim language; thus under Ghánawí rule in Lahore in the 16th/17th century Mas'úd b. 'Abdul Saláman is credited with a Hindu dictionary, the Kalík-hár, an important early vehicle for the diffusion of common Persian words in north India.

The north Indian bhakti movement—sometimes seen incorrectly as a Hindu reaction seeking to strengthen Hinduism against the advancing pressure of conversions to Islam; in fact its origins date from long before the conquest and its early growth was in regions of slight Muslim influence—saw little Islamic theological and philosophical influence, although the number of Arabic and Persian loanwords used in the Hindu of its exponents is noteworthy. The poet Kabir [q.v.], of a Muslim weaver (dulhádi) family from Banáras (Benares), is unquestionably most strongly influenced by the Hindu bhakti tradition, even though his theology is a deistic monotheism with Vedántic affinities; but his preaching appears to be directed as much to Muslims as to Hindus, and his followers, the Kabírpanthís, have both Hindu and Muslim branches. His exact chronology is most uncertain, but he does seem to have been a contemporary of Sikandar Ládi; Kabir's criticism is bedevilled by the fact that his followers composed verses in his name, and the true Kabir and the pseudo-Kabir sometimes overlap discursively. Some of the authentic Kabir poetry is collected in the Ádí Granth, the Sikh scriptures put together in 1012/1603, which shows clearly the formative effect of Kabir on Nánák [q.v.], his younger contemporary. Nánák's writings in the Granth show him to have been somewhat closer to Hinduism than was Kabir; perhaps both show, especially in their emphasis on the worship of the Name of God and in the importance they attach to the teaching of those preachers which the teachers of the previous centuries starting with Fárid al-Din Mas'úd [q.v.], two of whose verses in a sort of "Pandjábízed" Hindi (perhaps modernized by later redactors) appear in the Granth.

An important school of writing in Awádi (Eastern Hindi) known as prem-gáthá (lit. 'love-song'), of Súfi inspiration, depends entirely on Muslim authors. The works are all narrative love stories, some of them owing much to the poetic conventions of the Sanskrit romances; but the love stories of two humans are to be taken as allegories of the soul's love for God and its ultimate union with Him. The earliest such work is the Candásyan of Mawlná Dá'æd, of about 771/1370, on a popular romantic tale which appears to have been known as far east as Bengal (cf. Rai Krishnadas, An illustrated Awádi MS of armourcanda on the Bhakti, cited by Dá'æd, Addie, Letters to a Hindu, 1955-6, 65-71). Some of the Candásyan's successors of the 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries are now known only by their names, although the stories on which they are based are still current in folklore (cited by Dá'æd in Padmávat, xxiii, stanza 17; see further Ganesh Prasad Dwiwedi, Hindi mā prem-gáthā aur Malik Muhammad Dá'æd, in Nágarí Prakári Patriká, vii/ii, 61 ff. (in Hindi); in the extant Mogulwát of Sháykh Kúš All of
Djawnpur, known as Kutban, the allegorical element seems slight in spite of I£utb cAli’s having been a murid ... in the service of prince Mucazzam (later the emperor Bahadur Shah), who with his wife—now known by no other name than vi/i (1930), 205-8; although Urdu stricto sensu

Although Allahabad 1929, i, 59). His grandson Mughal court, History of Persian language and literature at the Mughal courts set the fashion for the provincial courts of Hindu kings, and in particular Oetb, Djawypur, Gwaliyar, Nagpur, Bundi and Satara patronized Hindi poetry; in the Mughal court Awanrigub’s third son A‘zam Shāh is particularly known as an enthu-

the same traditions continued under Diahangir and Shāhjīshāh, both emperors taking an active interest in Hindi poetry, rewarding poets, and causing Hindi works to be transcribed into Persian characters; and Mirzā Muhammad b. Fālğr al-Din Muhammad ‘Ali al-Ra‘if, who briefly mentions a conventional genre of Indian poetry which depicts the various types of heroine, he has used the barawyya metre which he did much to popularize; some of his barawyyas are written in Persian or in Persian and Hindi mixed, some verses in other metres are Sanskrit/Hindi macaronics, and a treatise on astrology is in Persianized Sanskrit; he is also remembered as the translator into Persian of Bābur’s Turkish memoirs, and as the patron of the Hindi poet Gang Kavi. On Rahim see specially V. Vidyalanarka, *Abdur Rahim Khān Khāndkhānd and his Hindi poetry*, in IC, xxiv/2 (1950), 123-33.

the one Muslim name among its writers, Sayyid Ibrahim called Ras Kāhin (b. 980/1573), is an apostate. The KriñÇa-cult, however, had in some writers an aspect capable of secular interpretation in the stories of the boy-god’s dalliance with the cowherd girls of Brindāban, especially with the principal Rādhā; and while with devotees the Rādhā-KriñÇa stories were no more than symbolic of the longing of the human soul for union with the divine, in the hands of others they could provide a convenient peg on which to hang erotic verses. Eroticism in Indian poetry had a long and refined tradition and was closely linked with Indian theories of poetics, and it was this deliberately cultivated display of the poetic art which came into great favour at the Mughal courts as the indigenous counterpart to Persian court poetry. At Akbār’s court Hindi verses were written by rādā Todor Mall [q.v.], by Birbal of Djawypur, to whom many witty and humorous apophthegms are ascribed (the modern Birbal-nāmas preserve perhaps the spirit but certainly not the words of the genuine Birbal), the brothers Abu ‘l-Faqi and Faydī [q.q.v.], and above all by ‘Abd al-Rahim Kāhin [q.v.], entitled Khān-i Khānān, who wrote under the takhalus Rāhm. His Satsa is a collection of seven hundred couplets (dohās) on a variety of themes, each a neatly polished pen-picture, in which the essential philosophy and experience of this cultivated soldier is everywhere apparent; in his Na‘yākāḥ-bhed, a conventional genre of Indian poetry which he describes the various types of heroine, he has used the barawyya metre which he did much to popularize; some of his barawyyas are written in Persian or in Persian and Hindi mixed, some verses in other metres are Sanskrit/Hindi macaronics, and a treatise on astrology is in Persianized Sanskrit; he is also remembered as the translator into Persian of Bābur’s Turkish memoirs, and as the patron of the Hindi poet Gang Kavi. On Rahim see specially V. Vidyalanarka, *Abdur Rahim Khān Khāndkhānd and his Hindi poetry*, in IC, xxiv/2 (1950), 123-33.

The same traditions continued under Diahangir and Shāhjīshāh, both emperors taking an active interest in Hindi poetry, rewarding poets, and causing Hindi works to be transcribed into Persian characters; and Mirzā Muhammad b. Falğr al-Din Muhammad ‘Ali al-Rāfī (see al-Rāfī Khan [q.v.], who mentions a conventional genre of Indian poetry which depicts the various types of heroine, he has used the barawyya metre which he did much to popularize; some of his barawyyas are written in Persian or in Persian and Hindi mixed, some verses in other metres are Sanskrit/Hindi macaronics, and a treatise on astrology is in Persianized Sanskrit; he is also remembered as the translator into Persian of Bābur’s Turkish memoirs, and as the patron of the Hindi poet Gang Kavi. On Rahim see specially V. Vidyalanarka, *Abdur Rahim Khān Khāndkhānd and his Hindi poetry*, in IC, xxiv/2 (1950), 123-33.

Djahnpur, known as Kutban, the allegorical element seems slight in spite of I£utb cAli’s having been a murid of Khwājah Bahādur al-Din of Kalāhpūr, composed 900/1503. Slightly later (ca. 930/1523) is the Madmu-mālāt of Mir Sayyid Māngān, who was later a luminary of the Sūrī courts; although incomplete, the work is one of the finest Hindi romances of pre-Mughal times, with a well-constructed allegory and a striking description of the beauties of nature. By far the most prominent writer of this school is Malik Muhammad Dīlayāst [q.v.], b. 900/1494, whose Akhsāri kalām (composed 930/1523) is a short poem on the Day of Judgment, and whose Akhārāratā, of about the same period, is an acrostic on the characters of the Devanāgāri script of Sanskrit and Hindi to which mystic significance is attached; his magnum opus is the Padmāvat (composed 947/1540, a prem-gāthā partially based on the siege of Citawr in 898/1589 by A‘lā al-Din Hāṣidl, in which the poet sees the hero Ratansen as man’s soul, the elder queen Nāgmati as worldly care, the young queen Padmāvatī as wisdom, Citawr as the body, the parrot who brings the message of Padmāvatī’s beauty to Ratansen as the true teacher, Rāghaw Četan the Brāhmaṇ, who betrays Padmāvatī to A‘lā al-Din, as Satan, and the sultan A‘lā al-Din himself as illusion, this īśāwī being explicitly stated in the closing verses. The Padmāvat has naturally formed at least two later adaptations of this tale, one by the poet himself under the pseudonym of A‘lā al-Āwāl, the most notable of whom is Sayyid ʿUmmān of Djawnpur, a Nīṣāmīyya Čištī of a sīsilā very similar to that of Mubiy al-Dīn, Čīyāst’s teacher; his Čīrīwāli of ca. 1022/1613 shows a Nepalese prince marrying first the princess Kamalāwati and then renouncing her to conquer princess Čīrāwāli: the allegory is the necessity for the renunciation of ignorance in order to attain true knowledge. Similar are the Gyan-dīp of Shāhī Nabi of ca. 1028/1619, the Hans-djavāhār of Kāsim Shāh of Daryābād of 1143/1731, Nur Muhammad’s Čindrīwāli of 1157/1744, and a Yūsuf-Zalaykāh by Shāykh ʿNāṣr of Ḵhairpūr of 1200/1786. All these works have in common, besides the allegorical treatment of a love-story, a poetic form closely resembling the traditional mālāwāt but couched in purely Indian metrical forms and in which the language is Awādhi, use the Persian script (although Devanāgāri recensions are also known).

With the coming of the Mughal courts, the Indian vernaculars flourished under royal patronage. Even Bābur is known to have composed a verse in Hindi (c.t. T. Grahame Bailey, *Early Urdu conversation*, in BSOS, vii/1 (1930), 205-8; although Urdu śrīduḥ śrīduḥ sensu had not at that time come into being), and certainly had admitted a large number of Hindi words to the Urdu of his autobiography (list in M. A. Ghani, *History of Persian language and literature at the Mughal court*, Allahabad 1929, i, 59). His grandson Akbār, who was thoroughly Indianized, is known as the author of several Hindi couplets, in which he signs himself Akhābar sāhī (= Shāhī), but most of all for the patronage he extended to Hindi poets, Muslim and Hindi alike. And the liberality of his age created conditions for the writing of the finest Hindi devotional poetry by Sūr Dās and Tuṣlī Dās, who were in no way dependent on court patronage; they were poets of Hindī bhaktī, devotion to a personal god who for the love of his worshippers was incarnated in human form: Krishṇa in the case of Sūr and his followers, Rām in the case of Tuṣlī. Naturally there are no Muslim poets of this school, for the implicit theology is the antithesis of Islam;
Prose literature in the modern Indian languages is little known before the 19th century. With the founding of Fort William College in Calcutta in 1800, for the purpose of instructing the servants of the East India Company in Indian languages, an impetus was given to the development of prose, especially in Hindi and Urdu, by the commissioning of translators; although one work of Hindi prose, Rāmī Kēthi kī kahānī, had already been completed in 1800 by Rāmī Aḥlāḥ Khān [q.v.], who was in the service of Shāh Ālmā II in Delhi and later of Sāḍāt AḤl Khān in Lucknow and was an accomplished Urdu poet. The Hindi produced under these auspices was in fact the Khārī boli dialect, that is to say virtually the same dialectal standard of the northern speech as in the case of Urdu, the literary form of which was by now well established; and herein lies the innovation of the Fort William school of Hindi writing, for previously only Awadhī and Brāddī had attained literary status, although Khārī boli had for centuries been the spoken norm in the Delhi region; and in practice this new literary language was little more than the language of Urdu-speaking Hindūs, in which words of Arabic and Persian origin had been replaced by words either Sanskrit or of Sanskrit origin. Although its chief exponent, Lalīgī Lāl [q.v.], was also an Urdu writer, he went to the extreme of using Sanskrit words of learned rather than popular currency, and the new Hindi was accepted in consequence by a militant orthodox Hindū element rather than by the Hindū element as a whole. The Christian missionaries in Madras and Bengal had, in their Hindi translations of the Christian scriptures, naturally preferred to use religious terms already familiar to the Hindū mind, and thus increased the Sanskrit element. Macaulay’s appointment in 1834 as President of the Committee of Public Instruction nearly visited this Hindi with its death-blow, by his insistence on the value of Western education for Indians and his vigorous but uninform ed and prejudiced denials that classical Indian learning had anything to offer; Persian continued as the language of the courts until 1857, when Urdu replaced it; and, when the question of the medium of instruction in schools arose after the report of the Parliamentary Committee of 1854, the adoption of Hindi was vehemently opposed by Sāyyīd Aḥmad Khān [q.v.] on the grounds that it was a rustic tongue and the language of idolaters (in this view he was supported by the French Professor Garcin de Tassy). But at this time Rāḍā Shīw Prāṣād (not a rāḍā in the traditional sense; the title of rāḍā was a British conferment) became an inspector of schools in the Department of Public Instruction and produced some sixteen text-books for school use in a language not far removed from Urdu, but in Devanāgari script, which allowed the use of Hindi in the schools’ curricula; in a preface to one of these he condemns those “who always urge the exclusion of Persian words, even those which have become our household words . . . and use in their stead Sanskrit words quite out of place and familiar to the coarse expressions which can be tolerated only among a rustic population”; and he endeavoured to bring this Hindi to a wider public through his newspaper Banārās Aḥhār. But the form of the language he used was felt to offer too many concessions to Muslim usage, and the more militant orthodox Hindū politicians, especially Rāḍā Lākṣmīnārī Singh, gradually brought about the rejection of Shīw Prāṣād’s Persianized dialect in favour of a more highly Sanskritized style. Hindū-Muslim tension was thus reflected on a linguistic plane.

The subsequent growth of Urdu into a literature rather than merely a written language, first by the efforts of Bhārāntīdū Harīghendra and later by Mahāwīr Prāṣād Dwīwēdi, does not concern us here, as the linguistic and stylistic differences between Hindi and Urdu became greater and Muslims found in Hindi an expression to which they could not give their allegiance. Authors who used both Hindi and Urdu as literary vehicles are very rare — Premchand [q.v.], for example feeling and nationalism have preserved the Hindū-Muslim linguistic dichotomy in both Hindi and Urdu (in a way which has not affected Bengali), the short-lived Hindūsānī Movement [see Hindūsānī] having commanded little popularity; but the protagonists of the Sanskritized Hindi, which now has the blessing of the Government of India, have not had things all their own way: shortly after partition, village communities near Delhi and in the Indian Pandījāb preferred to listen to the news broadcasts of Pakistan Radio from Lahore, finding their Urdu more comprehensible than the Hindi broadcasts of the All-India Radio. Recently there have been signs of an increased acceptance of Hindi by some north Indian Muslims. The above account has excluded Dakkhī, which will be treated under urdū. It must be mentioned, however, that many old Dakkhī texts are now being published in Devanāgari transcription in India, often under the name of “Dakhī Hindi”, and it is probable that before long Dakkhī will be studied in India as part of Hindi literature (cf. Bābūrām Saksena, Dakkhī Hindi, Allahābād 1952).

Bibliography: in addition to references in the article: on the language: S. K. Chatterji, Indo-Aryan and Hindī, Ahmadābad 1942; for Awadhī: Baburam Saksena, Evolution of Awadhī, Allahābād 1938 (chapter on source materials for the study of Awadhī out-of-date, containing no reference to material discovered after 1922); for Brāddī: Dhiren-dra Vārnā, La langue braj, Paris 1935. On Hindi literature: there are no reliable histories of Hindi literature in European languages; Garcin de Tassy, Histoire de la langue hindoue et hindoustanie, Paris 1839, is a notable exception. Community feeling and nationalism have preserved the Hindū-Muslim linguistic dichotomy in both Hindi and Urdu (in a way which has not affected Bengali), the short-lived Hindūsānī Movement [see Hindūsānī] having commanded little popularity; but the protagonists of the Sanskritized Hindi, which now has the blessing of the Government of India, have not had things all their own way: shortly after partition, village communities near Delhi and in the Indian Pandījāb preferred to listen to the news broadcasts of Pakistan Radio from Lahore, finding their Urdu more comprehensible than the Hindi broadcasts of the All-India Radio. Recently there have been signs of an increased acceptance of Hindi by some north Indian Muslims. The above account has excluded Dakkhī, which will be treated under urdū. It must be mentioned, however, that many old Dakkhī texts are now being published in Devanāgari transcription in India, often under the name of “Dakhī Hindi”, and it is probable that before long Dakkhī will be studied in India as part of Hindi literature (cf. Bābūrām Saksena, Dakkhī Hindi, Allahābād 1952).

Hindi, the name given to the largest religious community of India, conquered by the Muslims in the 6th/12th century. Early Muslim knowledge about the religion of the Hindus was very small: and no wonder, for Hinduism is utterly different from Islam in most of its ways. It is essentially polytheistic, has no official scripture (although many sacred books), no canon, many different schools of belief and of philosophy and yet really no orthodoxy, and above all no prophecy; it tolerates the worship of idols, which are nevertheless not a necessity; it knows no organized worship, although it has temples but devotion in these is optional and individual; its
religion is inseparable from its concepts of society and of state; and its goal is not the release of the soul to a paradise and to a physical resurrection, but the release of the soul from a particular body for the purposes of rebirth until eventually the soul is freed from the necessity of transmigration. What, perhaps, impresses the oldest Muslim writers, the Arab geographers, most about Hinduism is its utter difference from Islam, and its social strictures and exclusiveness—the way, for example, certain people were excluded from eating with, or taking food from the hands of others. Its beliefs were not investigated for Islam before al-Biruni [q.v.] compiled his K. Ta‘rikh al-Hind in Ghasna in the 5th/11th century; this deals, however, mostly with the beliefs of the Brähman community, the highest grade in the Hindu social order [see BARRAHMA], a rigid system (although divided into six more orthodox schools, and a number of less orthodox ones) communicated by oral tradition from father to son or from hereditary teacher to selected and initiated pupil, based on the Vedas (the hymns to the gods composed by the Aryan people in their migrations to India in the 2nd millennium B.C.) and their later mythological accretions and their philosophical interpretations. Al-Biruni, though he mentions many popular practices, does not seem to have gone so far as collecting material on "popular" Hinduism, the beliefs of the non-Brähman population: a plethora of superstitions, taboos, local godlings including snakes, propitiation of ancestors, magical spells, sacred objects and places, and a system of ritual exclusiveness and restrictive practices far in excess of the system of the Brähmans. For the Brähmans, the priests of the community, are the descendants of the upper grade in the original Aryan hierarchy who have kept their old beliefs most pure; the lower grades intermarried more freely with the Dravidian and aboriginal inhabitants of the country they conquered, and absorbed more of the indigenous beliefs. To the Muslim conquerors all these shades of Hindu belief were anathema; their practitioners were not Ash Al-Kištah, and therefore in theory they could not be beneficiaries of the dhimma [see DHIMMA], and be given the choice of paying the gīzya [q.v.]; the alternative was to be ostracized or dealt with as dhimmi. This, however, is not easy for a minority to impose on a majority, and there is early evidence (from the Cal-nāma, a Persian work of ca. 613/1216 said to be a translation of an Arabic account of the conquest of Sind) of the Sindhis being allowed the status of dhimmī. There are references to gīzya early in the chronicles of the Dihlī sultanate, but these may relate to the payment of tribute by Hindu chieftains.

The rulers of India seem to have taken little interest in the beliefs of their subjects before the reign of Akbar. That ruler introduced many forms drawn from Hindu worship (as from that of the Dīans and Pārshś [qq.v.] and from Christianity) into his personal devotions, and later into his own syncretistic faith the Din-i Ilahi [q.v.]; this movement was probably more acceptable among the upper classes of Hindu society, especially from the lower caste Hindus or from the so-called "untouchables"; it applies also to converts to Christianity in districts where a competent ministry is only rarely available. (J. BURTON-PAGE)

HINDU KUSH, extensive range of mountains in northern Afghanistan, which forms the watershed between the river systems of the Amu Darya and the Indus [q.q.v.]. The range extends in a westerly direction from the junction of the Mustagh and
Sarikol ranges in the region of the Pamirs to where it is extinguished among the low hills of the Pamish range. The Kiih-i Baba mountains are not between Turkestan and India. The eastern section of these routes of merchants, pilgrims and conquerors between Turkestan and India. The eastern section from the Khiawak pass to near the Kilik pass, which links Hunza with Yarkand, separates Badakhshan and Wakhan on the north from Nuristan (Kafiristan), Hunza and Citral on the south. Because of the greater difficulty of the country to the south, the passes in this area, among which are the Dora, linking Citral with Badakhshan, and the Baroghil, have never been used to the same extent as those in the western section. Until the latter part of the nineteenth century they were little known to Europeans, but since the course of the last quarter of that century a great deal of exploration was done on behalf of the Government of India, especially in connexion with the Afghan Boundary Commission in 1885.

Although the range presents substantial difficulties to north-south communications, they have never been found insuperable. The main routes are all open for six months of the year. Historically the most used routes between Kabul and the north were those that via the Pandishir valley and the Khawak pass (11,650 feet), which was used by Alexander the Great and by Timur, and the route up the Bamiyan valley over the Aq Ribat Pass (12,500 feet), which was used by the early Buddhist pilgrims and by Cingiz Khân. The first motor road, completed in 1933 with the aid of German engineers, followed neither the Dora route nor the Ak Ribat pass. In 1956 this project was again taken up and involved an extensive detour. In the reign of Amân Allah Russian engineers had suggested a more direct route across the difficult Sâlang pass (11,700 feet). In 1956 this project was again taken up and by 1964 a new road had been completed involving the construction of a tunnel, one and a half miles long, beneath the Sâlang Pass. This new road shortened the journey between Kabul and the north by 125 miles, a fact of great economic and political importance.

The spoken norm of the district round about Kabul and the north by 125 miles, a fact of great economic and political importance.


**HINDU-SHÂHIS**, a native dynasty of northern India who were the first great opponents of Ghaznavid and Islamic expansion into the Panjâb. Birûnî in his *Tahâb mâ i li 'Hind* describes them as originally Turks from Tibet who ruled in the Kábul river valley; it is possible that these "Turks" were Hinduized epigoni of the Kushans and Kidarites and the Romans were pushed eastwards by the Hephthalites.[28] During the 4th/5th century these first Hindu-Shâhis were replaced by a Brâhmanic line. In the time of the first Ghaznavids Sebûtîkîn and Maḥmûd [qq.v.], the Hindu-Shâhîs constituted a powerful kingdom stretching from Lâmghân to Mîlân and the southern foothills of Kashmir and based on Udbhândapur or Wayhind (modern Und near Attock).

In the course of his campaigns down the Kábul valley, Sebûtîkîn attacked and twice defeated the Hindu-Shâhî Râdjâ Dîjayîl. Maḥmûd intensified the struggle; Dîjayîl was captured and sold as a slave in Khurâsân, and 399/1009 his successor Anandîl had been driven out of Peshâwar and Wayhind. Despite the efforts of Anandîl's son Trilochanpâl to rally the support of other threatened princes, the "Turùkîs", as the Ghaznavids' Turks appear in Indian sources, drove him into the eastern Panjâb. With his death in 412/1021-2, the dynasty ceased to exist as a major impediment to Ghaznavid penetration towards the Ganges-Djumna basin, although some Hindu-Shâhî princes took refuge in Kashmir and others founded minor independent principalities in the mountains of Citral and Gilgit.


**HINDUSTÂN** [see HIND].

**HINDUSTÂNî, also HINDUSTÂN, HINDUSTÂNî, or has been used in India, confusingly, to mean at least three different forms of language, the first two of which are common.

**i.-As a synonym for Urdu [q.v.] as spoken in North India; i.e., the Muslim speech of Hindustân as opposed to the Deccan; antonym Dakhân.**

**ii.-As a name for that speech which is the common denominator of Urdu and Hindî [q.v.], coloured neither by recondite loan-words from Persian nor by loan-words from Sanskrit: the sort of language in which a Muslim villager might converse with a Hindû villager, and vice versa; in this sense, also the customary simplification of speech made by an educated Muslim or Hindû to an uneducated person of his own community. In this form common Persian loan-words are used freely by both Hindús and Muslims. In this sense may be included also a common bazaar speech of north India which may extend west to Bombay and east to Calcutta, a sort of Hindî-Urdu without genders and sine flexione.**

The spoken norm of the district round about Mirâfth ("Meerut") is described by Grierson in the Linguistic survey of India as "vernacular Hindustânî;"
but this term is now not in use by linguists, and has
never been an Indian usage.

iii.—A conscious attempt, made for political
purposes, at a language acceptable to both Muslims
and Hindus in speech and in writing, especially the
written language of the "Hindustani movement" of
the 1930s and early 1940s; one may see in this
movement, which arose within the Indian National
Congress [q.v.], a political attempt to placate both
the Muslims within the Congress party and also the
Muslim League. This was virtually Urdu, shorn
of its more recondite Persian loanwords, written
in the Devanagari script used for Hindi, indicating
the Urdu letters े, ी, ं, ः (including ऋ, ऋ and possibly ऋ) and ज by modifications of the Devanagari characters क, ख, ग, ज, and घ. By some Hindus this form: was spelt Hindustānī (Sanskrit स्वातनता is cognate to Persian -ستان). Any movement of the hand may have operated in bringing this hybrid
as a national language for India were never high,
and seemed to recede completely during the 1930s
and / by modifications
and / by modifications
and / by modifications
and / by modifications
and / by modifications

certainly evidence that prop-
phylactic powers are attributed to the colour red.

The whitish flower of henna was called "faggia" or "faggu.
It has a sweet and strong perfume which is
reminiscent of that of mignonette. In Cairo today
mignonette bears the unexpected name of "tamar hinnā" and
is for this perfume that henna is
cultivated in the gardens of the Near East. The
flower was used to make a scented oil ("duhn al-
faggāw")
which has no corresponding noun.

"henna of the cattle"
and its uses are known from the Atlantic
to the Ganges. It was not grown in Muslim Spain.

In Africa it is cultivated in semi-desert regions
around the Sahara: Sās, Dařa, Twālit, Bīlād al-
Quraidār, Kābīs, Tripoli-Tania, Egypt, Nubia, Nigeria.
In Morocco, surprisingly, henna is grown in abundance,
much further to the north, in the suburb
of Azamūr [q.v.] at 33° 17' N.; it was probably
introduced by the Shtuka, moved there from Sus.

In Asia, henna is cultivated throughout the Near East (that of "Askalān [q.v.] was famous at the
beginning of the Middle Ages), in Iran and in western
India. It appears to be a native of the last two regions.

In medicine, the astringent properties of the leaves
were used, in a decoction, for treating burns, thrush
and swelling accompanied by inflammation. Applied
as poultices to the palms of the hands and the soles
of the feet, they closed the pores and reduced per-
spiration. But it is as a cosmetic that henna is most
widely used and has finally acquired a ritual use
as a prophylactic. Its dried leaves, finely crushed
or ground, are mixed to a paste with a
little water; this paste, applied as a poultice over-
night, dyes a reddish orange colour of varying
intensity. Old men use it to dye their beards and
both sexes to dye their hair a tawny blonde. Young
women use it, mixed with other ingredients (tan,
indigo, etc.) to dye their hair black and to strengthen
it. Women also, to make themselves attractive,
create, decorate with henna their nails, the backs of their
hands and the tops of their feet on all festive occa-
sions. Almost everywhere throughout the Muslim
world, one of the feast days preceding the consum-
mation of a marriage is set aside for the ritual dyeing
of the bride's hands and feet with henna; a parallel
but simpler ceremony may take place for the bride-
groom. It is also not uncommon to see a fine horse
with its forelock, mane, tail or feet dyed with henna;
or perhaps a fine sheep destined for sacrifice.

In all these cases the true aim of the dyeing is
probably less to embellish than to protect against
the evil eye: there is considerable evidence that pro-
phylactic powers are attributed to the colour red.

As long as the henna is not applied so as to form
designs similar to tattooing (parts of the skin being
left undyed by masking them) Islam readily permits
the evil eye: there is considerable evidence that pro-
phylactic powers are attributed to the colour red.

The Arabic name for henna has spread to most of
the Muslim languages. In Persian it is pronounced
hindū, without श (in Turkish it is hīna). The
Spanish alheña (with the stress on the e) derives from
a form with a shortened final vowel: hinnat which has become general in dialectical Arabic. It should be
mentioned that here and there, in North Africa, the
epithet hennet al-bḥhr "henna of the cattle"
indicates a mixture of dung and chaff used as
plaster for threshing-floors, walls, etc. In Hindi, henna is
called mehndī (mehndī) from the Sanskrit mendhīska.
The properties of the leaves and the flowers of
henna were known and used by the ancient Egyp-
tians and by the Hebrews.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Baytār, Traité des simples, tr. Leclerc, i, 409, no. 713; Lane, Manners
and customs of the modern Egyptians, index, s.v.
Henna; E. Westermarck, Ritual and belief in
Morocco, index, s.v. Henna; idem, Marriage cere-
monies in Morocco, London 1914, index s.v. henna;
W. Marçais, Textes arabes de Takrōrā, i, 399-400,
ii, 959-62 (plus the many references given in these
last two works); G. Jacob, Studien in arabischen
Dichtern, iii, 50: V. Loret, La fleurre pharaphique,
2nd ed., 80.

HINDÜSTÂN, or HINTĀTA, a famous Berber confedera-
tion in the central Moroccan High Atlas, of the stock of
the sedentary Masmāda [q.v.]; according to Ibn
Khaldūn ("Ithār, French trans. de Siane, Histoire des
Berbères, ii, 281), Imīṭī was the current ethnic design-
ation of these mountain-dwellers. During the 6th/
7th and 7th/8th centuries they played an impor-
tant part in securing the success of the Almohad
movement and in strengthening the Mawṣūlīn dynasty
by being the first to support the Mawṣūlīn
Ibn Tūmār [q.v.]. Their chief Faskā u-Mzāl then received the
name of a Companion of the Prophet, Abū Ḥafṣ
Umar [q.v.]. This eminent figure held a leading
position in Almohad history and his grandson, Abū
Zakariyyāʾ, later founded the Ḥafṣīd dynasty in
Tunisia, in 625/1226 [for the Hintāta of Tunisia see Ḥafṣīn]. The Hintāta fought on every battlefield
in the cause of the Almohads... and was perhaps the
most successful dynasty with chiefs of real worth and unassailable fidelity. Those who remained in the country settled
down permanently in the upper valleys of the Wādir Drā'. After the tragic events that marked the end of the
Almohads in 667/1269, the family of the Awnāl Yūnūs, whose origin seems to have been connected with Abū Ḥafṣ
Umar, gave their support unreser-
vedly to the Marmids, and for a long period played
an important political and fiscal part in South
Morocco, becoming in time an Arab Uniat
found refuge and solace, in 759/1358, before his
death. Their representatives acted as more or less
independent viziers under the Marmid princes who
were appointed as governors of Marrâkûsh and its
neighbourhood. One of these, 'Amir, had a distin-
guished career (Ibn al-Khaṭṭīb wrote his praises) and
ruled at his pleasure over vast territories. Intoxicated
by power, he married the widow of a sultan and
finally led a revolt. He was besieged in his mountains,
captured after a long siege, brought to Fâs and
flogged to death in 771/1370. In conformity with an
old Berber tradition, his family did not lose its author-
ity but continued to command the town and the tribe.
Funerary inscriptions found at Marrâkûsh,
in the royal metropolis of the Ḥiṣabâ, confirm that
at the very time when the Portuguese settled at Saâf,
the kings of Marrâkûsh were the actual descendants
of the Hintâṭâ khâyȗkh. From Portuguese sources we
can see that, when the Marmids finally lost their
authority, the chiefs of the Hintâṭâ received a share
of the power thus vacated in South Morocco and
quietly established themselves in the ruined
答卷. The same sources confirm that, even at the time
of their fullest power, the “kings of Marrâkûsh” never
had any great authority outside the town and its
suburbs. Their relations with their mountain kinmen
were far from cordial, and they won no renown in
their encounters with the Portuguese who, after the
conquest of Azzânûr (q.v.), had made Marrâkûsh
the avowed object of their ambitions. Nuno Fernandes
of Ataide attacked the town on 23 April 1515, but
unsuccessfully, as a result of the help brought to the
town’s defence by the Sa’dîd shârîfs. Ten years later
these same Sa’dîds seized Marrâkûsh for themselves
by securing the assassination of the last known
Hintâṭâ amir, Muhammad b. al-Nâṣir Bû-Shahtûf.
From that date, the Hintâṭâ vanished from Moroccan
history. Even their name has disappeared.

**Bibliography:**
R. Montagne, Les Berbères et le Mahdîch dans le Sud du Maroc, Paris 1930; P. de Cénial, Les émirs des Hintâṭâ, “rois” de Marrakech, in Esp. , xxiv (1937), which gives the complete history of this town under the Lakhmids, Histoire du Sud du Maroc, 2 vols., Casablanca 1949-50; Aḥmad al-Nâ-
ṣîrî, K. al-Istikûtâ, new edition Casablanca 1954-6,
vol. ii, iii and iv; French trans. by A. Graulle,
G. S. Colin and I. Hamet, in AM, xxxi (1925) and
xxii (1927); G. Deverdun, Inscriptions arabes de
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**HIPPÓGROPS [see Supplement, s.v. ḃuṣrāt].**
**HIPPÔDROME [see MAYDĀN].**
**HIPPOLÔGY [see BAYTAR, FARAS, FURUSYYA].**

Hintâṭâ was also written Ḥara, and without hamaz,
a mountain three Arabian miles to the north-east of
Marrakesh, often mentioned also with the mountain
opposite, Thâbir (q.v.). It was near the šahl or
quarter of the family of al-Aqhânas, on the left of the
pilgrim road to ‘Irâk.

Muḥammad is said to have been in the habit
of spending a month each year in a cave on Ḥira
engaged in takannîh, presumably some form of
religious devotion, and to have been visited here by
an angel (Ibn Ḥishâm, 152; cf. Ṭabarî, i, 1147 f.,
1155); this experience is sometimes identified with
the beginning of revelation; and hence the present
ame Ḥiṣab al-Nûr, “The Mountain of Light”. He is
also said to have gone to Ḥira on his return from
the visit to al-Tâfîf in about A.D. 620, and to have
waited there until he was assured of protection
in Mecca (Ibn Ḥishâm, 251).

**Bibliography:**
Yâkût, Muṣṭafà, ii, 228; F. Wüstenfeld, Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, i, 426,
493; ii, 447; iv, 332; Ali Bey, Travels, ii, 65;
Burchardt, Travels in Arabia, i, 520 f.

**T. H. WIKIR ([W. MONTGOMERY WATT])**

**AL-ḤIＲĀ, name of the capital of the La-
khâds (q.v.).**

The name is comparable with Syriac hirta “en-
camptment”, and the locality was no doubt so
named from having been at first a camp settle-
ment; several of the legends about the beginnings of Ḥira,
summarized in Yâkût’s Muṣtrim al-balûdîn, imply
that this was so. This sense of the word is not extant
in classical Arabic, but is found in the Epigraphic
South Arabian kēlîyûr (see A. F. L. Bereston in Le
Muséon, n.s. lxvii (1954), 312-3), while the Classical
lexica record analogous senses for the verb tabayyara
(= ābâma) and the noun bâyr.

(A. F. L. BERESTON)

The facts of geography—salubrious air, a fertile
neighbouring region, and proximity to the Euphrates
—all adequately explain the choice of the site for the
settlement, which was located to the south-east of
present-day Nadīf in ‘Irâk. But it was a political
factor which transformed al-Ḥira from a relatively
obscure locality to the most important Arab city in
the Fertile Crescent during the three centuries
preceding the rise of Islam, namely, the emergence
of the powerful Lakhmîd dynasty, who made it
their capital and advanced it to a position of domi-
nance which became still more apparent with the
rise of Hatra, Edessa, and Palmyra, in the 3rd
century A.D. Al-Ḥira became so much a Lakhmîd
city that it was referred to as “Ḥira of Nu’mân” after
one of the Lakhmîd kings. These adorned the city
and its environs with castles and palaces, e.g., al-
Khawarana and al-Sâdir, while Christian princes
of the Royal Family founded some famous monas-
teries, e.g., Dayr Hind. The city reached its heyday
during the reign of the illustrious Mundhir III (A.D.
503-554) when it became the centre of political,
diplomatic, and military activities in which Persia,
Byzantium, and the Arabian Peninsula were
involved. For the Sàsàmîs, however, it remained a
fortress for the protection of Mesopotamia against
the raids of the nomads and a caravan city of vital
importance for the transit trade between Persia and
the Arabian Peninsula.

Owing to its geographical location, al-Ḥira became
the confluence of three interacting cultural currents:
the Persian, the indigenous pagan Arab, and the
Byzantine, represented mainly by Nestorian Christi-
anity; and herein lies its more enduring significance.
It was most probably at al-Ḥira that the Arabic
script was first developed. As the seat of a Nestorian
bishop, it was a centre whence Christianity was
transmitted to the Arabian Peninsula. As the capital
of the Lakhmîds, it attracted to itself the royal
court of Arab poets from the Peninsula, e.g., ‘Abd, Tarafa,
and al-Nâbîgha, and thus gave an impetus to the
cultivation and perfection of the Arabic panegyric.
It also produced a major pre-Islamic poet, ‘Adî b.
Zayd (q.v.), who belonged to its famous Christian
community, the ‘Ibbâd, and whose poetry reflects the
various facets of Ḥira’s urban culture.

Although it was captured and ravaged by the
Besides its “chameleonism”, it is proverbial also for its caution (basm), for it will not let go of one branch until it has a firm grip of another when moving about.

It is not forbidden to eat the flesh of this animal, but it is scarcely sought after. Certain parts of its body have medicinal properties, and a chameleon seen in a dream portends various happenings.

**Bibliography:** Dībājī, Hayāūn, index; Damārī, s.v.; Kaawīnī, ‘Aqīdīs, s.v.; see also Abu Kalāmūn and the bibliography to their article *Dabb*. (Ch. Pellat)

**HIRBA** (see *KEEL*).

**HIRBA** (A.), chameleon. Tripodite with the meaning of “the head of nails joining the links of a coat of mail”, this word, because of its ending, is often treated as diplote and feminine, although it is masculine and for its feminine form has birba’ad. However, the female chameleon is most often called samm ḫalayn, while the male is referred to by a number of kunyas, of which the most frequent in Muslim Spain, abū bardāşık, often leads translators into error (see E. Lévi-Provençal, *En relisant le Collier de la colonne*, in *al-Andalus*, xv/2 (1950), 353).

This reptile, which is classified with the akhmad and is close to the dabb [q.v.], is well known to the Arabs, among whom it is proverbial for its “chameleonism” (ilāla‘um), its ability to become invisible by turning the same colour as that of any object on which it has settled. It is said that when talking in Egypt where it is young, and yellow when adult, but it becomes green in sunlight. It lives by warmth, and can be seen, from morning to night, following the path of the sun (in order, it is said, to shade its body with its head); thus the poets compare it with the adherents of various religions, who turn to pray in different directions. At midday, when the ground is too hot, it climbs to the top of a tree, and is then compared to a monk in his cell; but when the sun is at its zenith, it appears to go mad because it can no longer see it. Since it is slow-moving, God has given it an eye which can move in all directions and enables it to look out for its prey without having to move. Thanks to its tongue, which is rolled up in its throat but which can stretch a cubit or three spans when it is extended, it snaps up insects coming within its reach, without needing to make any other movement, so much so that it immediately resumes an immobility so complete that it seems to be part of whatever it is sitting on. However, it mostly hunts its food at night. Should a man disturb it, it swells up and appears threatening, but is in fact quite harmless. It has four paws and a hump similar to that of a camel, but the physical description of the animal is scarcely touched on in zoological works.
account, which does not mention the Flood, is given in the introduction to the K. Sirr al-khali^a by Balnūs. The thaumaturgist, incited by the inscription on a statue of Hermes, diggs beneath it and meets the threefold Sage in a subterranean crypt as an aged man holding an emerald tablet in his hand and having by his side the book eventually published by Balnūs; this book ends with the text on the table. Both the last-mentioned works have been analysed by J. Ruska, Tabula Smaragdana, 1926, cf. M. Plessner, in Isil, xvi (1927), 77-113; the story of this account is told in the Vorderlibanvorschreiben and gives new Hermetica in Arabic. A new translation of the story and the tablet text was published by F. Rosenthal, in Das Fortleben der Antike im Islam, 1965, 332 ff.

 Aboriginal Ma'far's account has survived in Latin translation in several texts (e.g., J. Ruska, AVMNT, xi (1928), 28-37) and influenced other texts, e.g., the Summa philosophiae by Ps.-Robert Grosseteste, ed. L. Bauz, 1912, 275 ff.; cf. L. Thorndike, History of Magic, ii, 1923, 449, and the Breslaw doctoral thesis by August Bertsch, Studien zur Summa philosophiae des Pseudo-Robert Grosseteste, Brunswick 1929 (typescript), 37. On the survival of the story in mediaeval Hebrew literature see M. Plessner, in St. Isil., ii, 53 ff.

 Traces of the story of three Hermes also occur in the legendary history of ancient Egypt as reported by numerous authors on the authority of the still puzzling Ibn Wasl Shāh (Sā'īd, Tabbahā, 39 calls him al-Wasīfī). G. Wiet, L'Égypte de Murtada, 1953, 19, points to that Hermes who lived under al-Būdāghīr b. Kuftarmīn; see now the references and parallels in Picatrix, tr. H. Ritter and M. Plessner, 1962, 322 ff. The connexion with the Alexander Romance, already recognizable in the above-mentioned Dakhūrat al-Iṣkandar, is still further elaborated in other Arabic Hermetica; the ps.-Aristotelic Sirr al-asrār (Secretum secretorum) also contains the Tabula Smaragdana. The Hermetic book al-Iṣṭamaḥīs (see below) appears as the vademecum given by Aristotle to Alexander in which some talismans to help the king on his expedition to India are enumerated; the main contents of the text have been incorporated by al-Mākinī and the Alexander portion of his history, cf. also M. Plessner, in OLZ, 1923, 922-20.

 In the stories about the Sābi'ans, Hermes appears partly as a god (e.g., Fūris, 332,24), partly as a prophet with philosophical features, cf. the analysis of the account of the Fūrisī, 318 ff., by F. Rosenthal, Ahmad b. al-Tawṣīb as-Sarajī, 1943, 41 ff. (at p. 47 add D. Chwolson, Uber die Ubersetzungen der babylon. Literatur in arab. Ubersetzungen, 1859, 93 ff., and against it A. von Gutschmid, in ZDMG, xx (1860), 42 ff. [Kleine Schriften, ii, 1890, 694 ff.], where the influence of the account on Ibn Wābšīyah's al-Fīlāhā al-Nabāṣīyya is implicitly discussed).

 The large number of extant Arabic writings bearing the name of Hermes, and the still larger number of quotations from Hermetic books not preserved induced L. Massignon to exaggerate the role of "Hermes" as the promoter of the Hellenistic tradition in Islam; he also claims for some books a Hermetic character which are simply Neoplatonic or gnostic (A. J. Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I, Appendix III, 384-400: Inventaire de la littérature hermétique arabe, cf. his Addenda in the second edition, 435-9). Unfortunately, his paper read at the Erasos-Tagung 1942 and alluded to at the beginning of the Inventaire has never appeared. So long as Hermes is not explicitly quoted, we have no right to style books as Hermetic simply because of their general character as described by Massignon, 388-9; it is made in anciently derived and not informative sources, the sayings not connotated by the word Hermes, that constitutes their belonging to the Hermetica. About the list of alchemical books (p. 391) cf. now Fück, l.c. Here are given a few comments on Massignon's list of extant books (pp. 393 ff.).

 III A 1: The books of Crates and al-Habīb contain sermons from the Turba Philosophorum, as stated by Ruska (T. Ph., 1931), but are not its sources, rather its derivatives. A comparison with the Vorderlibanvorschreiben and greekisch-almicates in oriental-literarischen Überlieferungen, to appear shortly).

 III B 2: The books containing philosophical and ethical sayings of Hermes are much more numerous; to the collections in Ibn al-Kīfī and al-Shahrastānī quoted by Massignon, add Hunayn b. Ishāk, Abūdāb al-falsāfīsa, part II, Ch. 13 (supplement to Loewenthal's translation in K. Merkler, Die Sittensprache der Philosophen, 1921, 45 ff.), Miskawābī, Dakhūdat, ed. Badawi, 1952, 214-6, Ibn Durayd, Mudjīdān, 1342, 75, al-Mubāshshīr, l.c., 7-26, Abū Sulaymān al-Manṭīkī, l.c., fol. 322-34v. A great many sayings are common to all or almost all these sources; every text has, however, sayings not shared by the others. A comparison, also with Greek anthologies, is badly needed. In al-Mubāshshīr's account Hermes shows strong monotheistic features similar to those described by al-Sarākibī (see above), but more elaborate and more specific.

 III B 4: The talismanic texts are to be supplemented by the magical stone-books [see HADJAR]. An example is MS Berlin, Wetzstein II 1208 (Ahlwardt 6216, cf. A. Siggell, Katalog der arab. alsb. Handschriften Deutschlands: Berlin, [1949], 1351). For these texts and the astrological ones (III B 5) see now the introduction and indices to Picatrix, tr. H. Ritter and M. Plessner, 1962, and the forthcoming volume of studies on the book by the author of this article. Certain passages of the cosmology found in al-İstamāfīs are quoted in al-Mas'ūdī, Abāhār al-zamān, 1938, 7 f. = Abrégé des marveilles, tr. Carra de Vaux, 13.

 V A: The sayings of Hermēs quoted by Ibn Umaylī have been translated and discussed by H. E. Stapleton, G. L. Lewis and F. Sherwood Taylor in Ambis, iii, 1949, 69-90.

 The so-called Postumus (Festugière, 340, and addition, 435 f.) has been published by G. Levi Della Vida, La dottrina e i Dodici Legati di Stomatalassa, uno scritto di ermetismo popolare (ARANL, Memorie, VIII, iii, 8), 1951. A number of Arabic hermetical texts and accounts have appeared in English translation in vol. 4 of W. Scott, Hermetica, 1956. According to al-Mas'ūdī, al-Tanbih, ed. De Goeje, 31, Hermes assumed the existence of seven southern clima corresponding with the northern. The influence of Arabic Hermetica on Renaissance thought is in part discussed by Frances A. Yates, Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic tradition, 1964. An attempt to explain Kyot's account of Flegetanis in Wolfram's Parzival with the help of Arabic Hermetica connects the interpretation of the hermetical character of the epic has been made by H. and R. Kahane, The Krater and the Grail: Hermetic sources of the Parzival, 1965.

 Bibliography: In the article and in L. Massignon's Inventaire; see also A. E. Affifi, The influence of Hermetic literature in Muslim thought, in BSOAS, xiii (1950), 840-53; J. Kraemer, Das arabische Original des "Liber de pomo", in Studi

(M. Flessner)

Hîrîz [see Tama'mî].

Hîsâb, “account to be rendered to God”. Although the Kur'ân sometimes uses ḥisâb in the sense of “reckoning”, “reporting”, or “subtracting”, it is very often used by anastomosis as the “reckoning” which God will require from a man on the Day of Judgement. The expression yaum al-ḥisâb (XL, 27; XXXVIII, 16, 26, 53; cf. XIV, 41), “the Day of the Rendering of Accounts”, is synonymous with yaum al-dîn, “the Day of Judgement”. The eschatological ḥisâb is to be given to God alone (XIII, 40; XVII, 78; LXXII, 113); He will require it from all men, but especially from the ungodly (LXXXVIII, 26; XIII, 18 and 21; XXXII, 117). And God “is prompt in demanding an account” (II, 200; III, 19 and 199, etc.). Each man will receive a “book” which is a statement of accounts, a “roll” on which his actions are inscribed. If the good deeds outnumber the bad, he will receive it “in his right hand” and the ḥisâb will be in his favour (Kûrûn, LXXXIV, 7-10; LXIX, 19-20; cf. XVII, 72); those to whom the account is “disadvantageous” will receive it in their left hand (LXXIX, 25-6), and will be punished.

These Kur’ânic statements may be compared with many earlier traditions, Iranian, Jewish and Christian. The rendering of accounts and the weighing of actions was known to Mazdaism (see J. Athdr, esp. p. 145; al-Biruni, index.

To survey all these data would involve a comprehensive discussion of the whole problem of the “retribution for deeds”, of “promise and threat” (al-wā'âd wa'l-wâ'âd [q.v.]) in the next world. We select for treatment here only some problems which concern the nature of the ḥisâb itself, or its forms, and give a brief indication of the general solution given by the different schools.

1. The “weighing” (al-ʿawâm). The very term ḥisâb evokes the ideas of counting, measuring, evaluating. The majority of the Muʿtazîls, and to an even greater extent the Faḍîsîs, gave it a metaphorical meaning. The “Pious Men of Old” and, with certain reservations, the Aṣgârs, adhered to the literal meaning (see below): the just Judge will present everyone with an account of his deeds, which will be “added up” and “weighed”. With the “book” (ḥisâb) containing the status of the account, as mentioned above, there then appears the “balance” (misân), with reference to Kûrûn, XLI, 17; LV, 6-8; LVII, 25. The “Reckoning” of the Last Day is also “the weighing” (al-ʿawâm [87]), 8): good deeds will be heavy and bad deeds light (VII, 8-9).

2. The question of “merit” (al-ʾistikhabâh). Every human act is repaid by God with either a reward or a punishment. For the Muʿtazîls, a good deed thus of necessity “merits” reward and a bad deed punishment. On the day of the Reckoning, the “merits” attached to the deeds are either added to or subtracted from the “balance” and in qualitative, considering that one single “great sin” (kabîrâ) may render void the “merit” earned by any earlier good deeds, and be punished with eternal fire. However the later Muʿtazîls of Baṣra, al-Djûbbâtî and his son Abû Ḥâshîm, believed that a quantitative evaluation is concerned, in which good and bad deeds are set against and cancel out each other. The group which prevails in number and in “weight” necessarily determines the reward, in the case of good deeds, and the punishment, in the case of bad deeds (for summary of arguments see, e.g., Falâhr al-Dîn al-Râzî, Muḥâsâsîl, Cairo n.d., 173).

Ashâʿîr tradition, on the other hand, holds that there is no “merit” attached to human deeds (al-Râzî, op. cit., 172-3; al-Djûbbâtî, Sharh al-mawâdî, Cairo 1325/1907, viii, 305 ff.), and that it is impossible (for one set of acts to cancel the other). As for the Kûrûn says (XCIX, 7-8): “Whoose has done an atom’s weight of good shall see it, and whoose has done an atom’s weight of evil shall see it”. The value of faith would never be compromised by sins, however grave and numerous, in view of the famous ḡudâth, “Those whose heart contains even one atom of faith will come out of hell” (al-Bûghârî, Imâmî, 33). Furthermore, however, the quality of the merit of the believer will be “multiplied” simply by the freely-given grace of God, while each of his bad deeds counts “as one only”. In fact all rests in the hands of God. And it is known, thanks to the promises which He has given, that God will not condemn the believer, even if he is sinful, to eternal hell. He can either condemn him in His justice to a limited period in hell, or, in His mercy, grant him complete pardon. It is therefore not certain that there are, even temporarily, any sinful believers in hell.

This is a point upon which the Hanafsîs-Mâtûrîds disagree with the Ashâʿîrs (cf. ‘Abd al-Râhmân b. ʿAllî, Nasîm al-fârâdîd, Cairo n.d., 2nd ed., 38-9). For the Mâtûrîds indeed, God may certainly pardon this or that sinner, but not all. “It is obligatory that some of those who have committed a great sin should be punished” by a period in hell (al-Lâkânî, Dja-harât al-tawâbîd, ed. Luciani, Algiers 1907, verse 117). For God has attached a punishment to great sins (kabîrâ) — a temporary punishment if the sinner is a believer—and God’s “promises” cannot be “vain”. This question of retribution for deeds, the very object of the ḥisâb, leads to the two related questions of repentance (fâsebâ [q.v.]) and of the intercession of the Prophet (shâfîdî [q.v.]).

3. Method by which the Account will be rendered. As we have seen, the Kûrûânic verses mention, in connexion with the ḥisâb, the “book”, a statement of his deeds, which will be given to every man on the Day of Judgement; and tradition makes the misân, the Kûrûânic “balance”, the instrument for the “weighing” of the deeds. The Muʿtazîls and some later Ashâʿîrs interpret both in a metaphorical sense. The “book” contains the status of the debt and “credit” which God will make clear to every man.
At the time of the resurrection, while the "weighing" of the deeds symbolizes the justice and equity of God; but God has no need of a "real" weighing to pronounce His sentence. And human actions, since they are only transitory accidents, are unable to "return again" to existence once they have been "reduced to nothing" (for a summary of this argument see e.g., Al-Ghazālī, Tibiṣid, Cairo n.d., 8, and al-Djurdžanī, op. cit., 321). Furthermore they cannot possess the attributes of lightness or weight which the act of weighing presupposes (al-Djurdžanī, ibid.). Abu ‘l-Ḥasan ibn Bāṣra and Ibn al-Mutanabī of Baghdād stated, however, that the existence of the Balance is "possible", but they make no pronouncement on its factual reality.

On the other hand, Ḥanbalīs, Ḥanafīs-Māturidīs, and the great majority of the Ḥāsharīs, relying on the hadīths and the "religion of the Ancients", agree in recognizing the existence of these eschatological entities. The Balance in particular is called "reality" (baḥṣ) in the Wajīyāt Abī Hamīfī, the Fīh Aḥārī II, and later the Fīh Aḥārī III (cf. A. J. Wensinck, *The Muslim creed*, Cambridge 1932, index), as well as in the profession of faith of al-Ḥāsharī (Ibn Ībīnī, Cairo n.d., 9) and the various Ḥanballī creeds (cf. H. Laoust, *La profession de foi d’Ibn Baṭṭa*, Damascus 1958, 95 and note 2). The Wāḥabī profession of faith adds to it the "registers of actions" (H. Laoust, *Ibn Tamīyī*, Cairo 1939, 621). The Ḥanbalīs state that it is a question of real things; but the Ḥāsharīs and Māturidīs qualify this by saying that we cannot know the exact conditions under which they exist. It is vain to try to discover whether "the weighing of deeds" is useful or not: God acts as He wills. And al-Ḡazālī adds (Tibisāʿid, 89) that it will be of use not to God but to man, who will thus understand the just Divine decision.

There are many traditional accounts which expand and elaborate this basic eschatology with a very abundant imagery. A résumé of them is found in al-Ḍāḥfūrī’s popular manual of kalām, Ḥādīṣaḵaḵ... Ṣādī Ḫawārak al-tawādī, Cairo 1352/1934, 101-6. A subsidiary part in the Reckoning is also played by "the witness of the members" (Kurʿān, XXIV, 24) and the test of the Bridge, the ʿSrāj (XXXVII, 66; XXXVII, 234).

The third form of the root ḥāṣ was to be used in Ṣūfīsm, in a sense which is no longer eschatological but spiritual, to indicate the account of his conscience which the devout person presents to God. Hence arose the by-name of al-Muḥāṣibī given to Ḥārīrī b. Asād: "he who excels in the examination of his conscience".

Bibliography: in the article. To this may be added many hadīṯs, devotional works or works of popular preaching, and various manuals of ʿilm al-kalām, in the chapters on "The Last Things" (al-waḍāʾ wa ʿl-waḍīd). (L. Gardet)

ḤISĀB — ḤISĀB AL-ʿAKD

It is not impossible that certain gestures used by the Prophet were described or interpreted by his contemporaries as indicating numbers according to a system already in use (cf. H. Ritter, in *Ist.*, x (1920), 154-6), particularly the position of his hand in the *takhhud* [*q.v.*], although the traditional accounts are far from agreeing with later practice (see I. Goldziher, *op. cit.*). The practice of dactylynom in Persia is mentioned by Plutarch (Fr. tr. Ricard, *Vies*, ii, 514, n. 25); and from the first centuries of Islam, Arab or Persian poets would for example make a subtle and veiled allusion to some person’s lack of generosity by saying that his hand made 93 (the figure indicated by the closed hand, the sign of avarice), which suggests that the system of which we possess later descriptions was known at a very early stage, perhaps through the medium of the Persian scribes. Hamd Allāh Mustawfī credits Ibn Sīnā with having invented, in 420/1029, calculation by dactylynom, and thus freed accountants from the bother of using counters; thus al-Ṣālī (d. 332/946) wrote in his *Adab al-kuttab* (Cairo 1342/1922, 229): "The scribes in the administration refrain, however, from using these [Indian] numerals because they require the use of materials [writing-tablets or paper?] and they think that a system which calls for no materials and which a man can use without any instrument apart from one of his limbs is more appropriate in ensuring secrecy and more in keeping with their dignity; this system is computation with the joints (ṣāb or ʿṣāb) and tips of the fingers (bandān), to which they restrict themselves". Nearly a century earlier this method of calculating on the fingers must have already been in use, for al-Djāhīrī (d. 255/868) advises schoolmasters (K. al-Muṣallāmīn, B. M. MS, Rieu 1129, 137) to teach the ḥisāb al-ʿākād (al-ṣābād) instead of the ḥisāb al-ḥisāb, i.e., calculation by means of the "Indian" numerals; the same author placed among the five methods of expression (bayān) what he called ʿṣāb (or ʿṣābād), according to the reading of G. E. von Grunebaum, who identifies it with digital computation [*see BAYAN*], and which for him is a calculation (ḥisāb) needing "neither spoken word nor writing"; now, the verses of the Kurʿān (VI, 95, 96, X, 5, XVII, 13/12, LV, 4/5) which he quotes in support of his affirmation of the virtues of ḥisāb (Bayān, ed. Harūn, i, 80; see also i, 96; Hayyawīn, i, 33) all refer to the cycle (كسبان) of the sun and moon, to the calculation of years and to computation; thus it might perhaps refer to counting on the fingers, following a method curiously reminiscent of that expounded by the Venerable Bede in the 7th century A.D., in *De temporum ratione* (in Migne, *Patrol.*, xc, 295; text and trans., in J.-G. Lemoine, 14-7).

What makes this hypothesis quite probable is that the same English writer, in the first chapter (De computa vel iocula digitorum) of the work named, expounds a system of dactylynom almost exactly identical with that contained in the very much later Muslim treatises of al-Mawjūlī, Ibn al-Maghribī, Ibn Shuṭai, Ṭaybughī, and Ibn Bundūd (see *Bib.*), which did not seem earlier than the 8th/14th century, and also in the Fārābī-i-Dīkhārī (between 1000 and 1017/1597-1608), which reproduces a text of ʿAll Yāzdī (d. 850/1446) in Persian, but in the Arab tradition.

Under this system, the figures are represented as follows:

1. by bending down the little finger;
2. by also bending down the third finger;
3. by adding the middle finger to them;
4, by bending down the third and middle fingers only;
5, by bending down the middle finger only;
6, by bending down the little finger very low;
7, by adding the middle finger to them;
8, by placing the tip of the forefinger on the middle of the thumb;
9, by extending the thumb and forefinger simultaneously;
10, by putting together the tips of the thumb and the forefinger;
11, by stretching out the thumb over the base of the forefinger;
12, by bending down the thumb at right angles;
13, by curling the forefinger round the thumb;
14, by placing the tip of the thumb on the central joint of the forefinger;
15, by placing the tip of the forefinger on the thumb-nail (but there are variations);
16, by placing the tip of the forefinger on the base of the thumb;
17, by opening the hand (but there are variations);
18, "the gesture which, in the right hand, serves as a sign for tens for units from 1 to 9, in the left hand indicates the same number from 1,000 to 9,000; ... and what, in the right hand, serves as a sign for tens from 10 to 90, in the left hand indicates hundreds from 100 to 900". From 1,000, the system described above differs fairly considerably from Bede's, but on the whole the two methods are practically identical; it has been possible to establish that the figure 1 is not obtained by stretching out the forefinger, as Muslim tradition would have us believe.

This system was known in the West from antiquity, but it was no longer used after the early Middle Ages; in the East, it is very probable that it was known to the scribes of whom al-Sufi speaks (see above) and that it remained in use until quite recently, being practised to perform arithmetical operations (apart from division). No ancient description of the method being available, here is one still known to old men in Tunisia (communication by M. Souissi): to multiply, e.g., 6 by 8: bend the little finger of the hand (= 6) and the first three fingers of the right hand (= 8); the total of the bent fingers (1 + 3 = 4) indicates the tens and the product of the fingers un bent (4 x 2 = 8) the units.

On the other hand, another method is also used for certain commercial transactions involving rare and very costly merchandise, especially pearls, when buyer and seller do business in the presence of witnesses and do not wish to reveal the terms of the transaction concluded. The two negotiators, sitting face to face, have their right hands hidden under a covering, and touch each other's fingers according to a precise code; although the units in the different numerical series are not distinguished, those concerned know what is meant:

1, 10, 100, 1,000: are indicated by taking hold of the forefinger (which here retains its value; see above);
2, 20, 200, 2,000: by taking the forefinger and middle finger;
3, 30, 300, 3,000: by taking the forefinger, middle and third fingers;
4, 40, 400, 4,000: by taking all four fingers;
5, 50, 500, 5,000: by taking the whole hand;
6, 60, 600, 6,000: by pressing twice on the forefinger, middle and third fingers (3 x 2);
7, 70, 700, 7,000: as for 4 and then as for 3 (4 + 3);
8, 80, 800, 8,000: by pressing twice on all four fingers (4 x 2);
9, 90, 900, 9,000: as for 5 and then as for 4 (5 + 4).

This system, recorded by Tāshkhrūzāda, Mīṣād al-sa‘āda, Haydarābād, i, 329-31 (reproduced by Ḥādīdī Khalfī, cf. von Hammer, Encyclopädische Übersicht der Wissenschaften des Orients, 375) and by Niebuhr, (Description de l'Arabie, French trans., 1779, i, 145, in particular), is still practised in the island of Bahrayn, in the Red Sea and probably elsewhere (cf. Père Anastase, in Machriq, 1900; H. de Monfreid, Secrets de la mer Rouge, Paris 1931, 100). H. Fisquet, Histoire de l'Algérie, Paris 1842, 171, records it for Algeria. A similar procedure, in use in Bengal, utilises the joints and not the whole finger, but it has not been recorded in the Middle Eastern countries.

The origin of the systems briefly described above is obscure; in any case, those which are, or were, in use in the Arab countries do not seem to be in any way indigenous (see I. Goldzg, op. cit.) or at least do not go back to Arab antiquity; on the other hand, tesserae found in Egypt indicate the numbers according to the method of bending the fingers, and it is not unreasonable to see in this the possible origin of the system described by the Arabic and Persian sources. In any connexion, the terms employed raise a difficulty, for although ḥābīl-al-yad or h. al-kaḍda bi l-yad are clear, this is not the case with words taken from the root ḥd which, apparently, denote the knuckles and joints, but also signify "contract". In the last analysis it is possible that an earlier method than those of which records have been preserved may have consisted of counting on the finger joints and that the terminology was later applied to other systems.

Bibliography: The chapter of the Farhang-i Djamānī of Djamal al-Dīn Ḥusayn Indjū has been translated by S. de Sacy, De la maniere de compter au moyen des jointures des doigts usitée dans l'Orient, in J.A., iii (1823); by A. Rödiger, Über die im Orient gebräuchliche Fingersprache fur den Ausdruck der Zahlen, in ZDMG, 1845, 112-29; and by S. Guyard, Chapitre de la préface de Farhangi Dijamangirî (MS. Paris, Bibl. Nat. 4441) has been published by Père Anastase, 'Ukbād, in Machriq, iii (1900), 169 ff. (see also 119 ff.), and translated in A. Marre and Boncompagni, i, 309: Manière de compter des anciens avec les doigts de la main (comment. of Ahmad al-Ṭabarabūsī published and trans. by H. Ritter, in Isl., x (1920), 154-6, 243 ff.). The texts of Ibn al-Maghribī, Ibn Shuʾula and Tāybughā al-Ashrafi al-Baklamishl of Ibn Yūnānī have been published by J. Ruska, Arabische Texte über das Fingerzahlen, in Isl., x (1920), 87-119. The chapter entitled Fi marjīfa 'abd al-asyībī of the Makhādí of Ibn Bundūd has been translated by G. S. Colin, in REI, 1932/1, 59-60.

— Stütze: I. Goldzg, Über Gebärden- und Zeichensprache bei den Arabern, in Zeits. für Völkerpsychologie, xvi (1866), 369-86 (analysis by G.-H. Bousquet, in Arabica, viii/3 (1961), 269-72) deals generally with sign-language; idem, in ZDMG, lxix (1907), 756-7; the principal work on the question examined in the present article is that of J.-G. Lemoine, Les anciens procédés de calcul sur les doigts en Orient et en Occident, in REI, 1932/1, x-88; see also M. B. al-Athari, in M.A., v (1923), 70-9; A. Fischer, Über Finger-Zahlen-
FIGURINEN BEI DEN ARABERN, IN ISLAMICA, VI (1934), 48-57, AS WELL AS THE ART. ISHARA.

(CH. PELLAT)

HISĀB AL-DJUMMAL, METHOD OF RECORDING DATES BY CHRONOGRAM. IT CONSISTS OF GROUPING TOGETHER, IN A WORD (SIGNIFICANT AND APPROPRIATE) OR IN A SHORT PHRASE, A GROUP OF LETTERS Whose NUMERICAL VALUES, ADDED TOGETHER, PROVIDE THE DATE OF A PAST OR FUTURE EVENT. SUCH A CHRONOGRAM IS KNOWN AS A RAMS, AND IN TURKISH A TARA'IIKH [Q.V.]

A MORE complex variety is called mushāyyl; here the principal chronogram is completed by a supplementary chronogram (ghāvīl) and it is the sum of the two which provides the date.

For the correct interpretation of these chronograms it is of course necessary to take into account the difference in numerical value which, for certain letters, exists between the aḥāzad [q.v.] of the East and that of the Maghrib (including Muslim Spain). It has been noticed that this involves six of the characters which, in the Calmian order, come after the ʿānūn: sin, shīm, sād, dād, sāmd and ghaḥm. In Persian and in Turkish, the letters which are peculiar to those languages (P, Ç, Ẓ, G) have the same numerical value as the Arabic homographs.

The ṭāʾ marbūta may be counted as a ḥāʾ or as a ṭāʾ according to whether it occurs in pause (waḥf) or in liaison (darq). The doubled (mushaddāta) letters may be counted as one or as two. Similarly, the initial and terminal alifas may be added in or ignored, as necessary.

These chronograms are commonly employed in inscriptions (generally in verse) commemorating a past or future event. Such a chronogram is called a taʾṣīkh, and it is the sum of the numerical values of the letters forming a word (in this case a proper name) or phrase which constitutes the chronogram is nearly always announced by the preposition ʿin, “in”, or by or one or other of the words ʿanma, or sanasta “in the year...”

In Morocco it was in the 17th/18th century, during the period of the Saʿdīd dynasty [q.v.], that particularly frequent use began to be made of chronograms, not only in inscriptions on monuments but also in obituaries.

The principal author in the latter category was the secretary and court poet, Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Makdātī (d. 1041/1631), the author of a lāmiyya which was a continuation of a similar work by Muhammad b. ʿAll al-Fishtālī (d. 1021/1612).

In the following century, Muhammad al-Mudarraʿ (d. 1147/1734) composed an urdi斯塔 of the same type on the notabilities of Fez. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb ʿAḍārlā (d. 1159/1746) was the author of another, on the saints of Meknès.

Wide use has been made of all these rhyed obituaries with chronograms by the historians and biographers of Morocco, notably Muhammad al-Kādirī (d. 1187/1773) in his Nāṣīr al-maṭbaḥānī, and Muham- mad b. ʿAlī al-Kattāfīl (d. 1339/1920) in his Saʿīdīd al-anfūs.

The process of adding the numerical value of all the letters forming a word (in this case a proper name) is the basis of a divinatory procedure, known as Ḥisāb al-nim, by which it can be predicted which of two rulers at war will be the victor and which the vanquished. This process has been described at length by Ibn Khaḍīn in his Prolegomena (see ed. Quatremère, 210-4; Fr. tr. De Siane, i, 241-5; Eng. tr. Rosenthal, i, 234-8); see further ʿSIMIkA and ʿSIMIkA1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The subject has been treated very briefly by Carra de Vaux at the end of his article ʿANMA in EI1; E. Lévi-Provençal, Les historiens des Chorfa, 79-80 (see also, in the index to his work, the names of the writers mentioned above); Ufrān, ʿUṣḥat al-ḥādīt, tr. Houdas, 28, 55, 66, 82, 168, 190, 191, 195, 234, 265, 341, 451; Sālard, al-ʾIšābīlī; Cairo 1521/1941, i, 179-80; iv, 28; G. S. Colin, Une nouvelle inscription arabe de Tanger, in Hesp., iv (1924), 94.

(G. S. COLIN)

HISĀB AL-GHUBAR "calculation [by means] of dust", METHOD OF CALCULATION BORROWED FROM PERSIA WHICH OWES ITS NAME TO THE USE OF A SMALL BOARD (tāḥīl) ON WHICH THE CALCULATOR SPREAD DUST, HE THEN USED A SMALL STICK TO DRAW THE FIGURES KNOWN AS GHUBAR NUMERALS AND ELIMINATED A PARTIAL

| 4th/10th century |
| ca. 340/950 |
| Ibn al-Bannaʿ, Makdātī (8th/14th century) |
| Commentary on the Talkhīs (1082/1671) |
| Kashf al-djīlibāb |
| Bashlawī 1020/1611 |
| J. A. Perez, following Los libros del saber de astronómia |
| R. Ball, European numerals ca. 1400 A.D. |
result by covering it with a little dust, which he then gathered up for use again when he had finished his operation. On the various operations thus performed, see ibn al-'Aśār.

This procedure supplemented those already known to the Arabs: dactylnomy (hisāb al-ʿahd [g.v.]), counting by means of pebbles (ḥasā, whence ṣūf; cf. calculus), and mental calculation (hisāb maftūḥ or kawāfī), etc., but little is known of its origin and in particular the question arises whether the use of dust is not the accidental result of a mispronunciation of a Persian or other term, the table originally having been plastered with clay, a material on which figures could much more easily be engraved and erased by means of a stylus flattened at one end.

In any case this procedure was possible only from the time when figures became known. The devanagari figures were introduced in Baghdād in about 555/770, but it is known that although Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Khwārizmī (d. ca. 231/846) helped to spread al-Ḥisāb al-ḥindi, the mathematicians, astronomers, etc., for long preferred to continue using the old system of referring to numbers by the letters of the alphabet (see ABDJAD, HISĀB AL-DIJUMMAL); on the other hand the ghubār figures which derive from al-Ḥisāb al-ḥindi seem to have spread fairly soon to the Maghrib and to Spain, where they were adopted by the mathematicians, and the history of their development finally became blended with that of the numerals known as "Arabic", which are used in Europe. The table opposite shows the development of the ghubār numerals up to the point where they passed into use in the Christian West.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Banna', Mābdī fi l-Ḥisāb, MS Tunis 10301; Kalašdī, Kašf al-adār (al-asrār) 'an ʿurūf al-ghanūr, MSS Tunis 3297, 3934, 4775; idem, Kašf al-dżīlāb 'an ilm al-Ḥisāb, MS Tunis 2043; Sharīshī, K. al-Taḥbīṣ baʿd al-sūb wa l-taḥbīṣ (treatise on mental calculation), MS Tunis 2046; Bāghlāwī, Risāla fi l-Ḥisāb al-maftūḥ, MS Tunis 2043; Rouse Ball, History of mathematics, Cambridge 1889; J. A. Sanchez Perez, La aritmética en Roma, in India y en Arabia, Madrid-Granada 1949, 120 ff.; M. Cohen, La grande invention de l'écriture, Paris 1958, 385. (M. SOUTISSI)

ḤIŞĀR, siege. The following articles deal with siegecraft and siege warfare. On fortification see BURDĪ, ḤIŞĀR and SŪR.

I. — General Remarks

Siege warfare was one of the essential forms of warfare when it was a matter of conquest, and not merely of plundering raids, in countries in which, from ancient times, most of the large towns had been protected by walls and where, during the Middle Ages, the open countryside was to an increasing extent held by fortresses (see ʿurūf and KALʿA). Although the forces available were rarely sufficient to impose a complete investment, they blocked the normal ways of access to the stronghold under siege and thus brought about its surrender by famine or threat of famine, unless relief brought from outside or a sortie by the besieged dispersed the assailants; nevertheless, their stocks of supplies made it possible for the besieged to hold out for quite a long time, if their morale was strengthened by the hope of rescue and by devotion to their prince, and it sometimes happened that the besiegers, being ill-prepared for lengthy operations (see ḤARB) or sceptical of the advantages to be gained by others than the prince, lost heart and gave up the struggle. The nomads, who had no siege engines at their disposal and who attached little value to cultivation, sometimes secured the surrender of important towns by devastations that brought lasting ruin to the inhabitants; but the regular troops, who realized the advantage that lay in safeguarding the revenues from the land and who shared the general opinion as to the enormity of the crime of actual destruction, countries where physical conditions rendered any rapid recovery impossible, generally abstained from destroying plantations of trees and irrigation works; apart from military operations properly speaking, their chief aim was to secure some complicity inside the stronghold or, by means of a ruse, the capture of a local lord whose liberation would be made conditional upon the surrender of the stronghold.

The actual operations were carried out with the help of siege machines—apart of course from the personal weapons—which, while continuing ancient traditions, had nevertheless achieved some measure of technical progress and, during the latter half of the Middle Ages, were employed far more extensively than hitherto. At first, whenever possible, they tried to fill in part of the moat, so that it could be crossed. In the case of towns, attempts might be made, either by a surprise attack or as the result of treachery, to scale the walls with the help of ladders, when the first to enter would run to open a gate for those following, a manoeuvre that had no serious chance of success except at night. More usually, when the nature of the ground allowed it, they tried to push forward to the foot of the fortifications wooden towers with several storeys—burdū, dubbdbà—from the top of which the assailants could fire their opponents on the walls and ultimately lead down on them. Above all, they made efforts to breach the ramparts of towns, or to pierce openings in castle walls or make them collapse, by the use of either mines or engines. Mines (nābd), in the use of which the Khūraštāns appear to have had an enduring aptitude, were excavated from points situated out-side the ramparts and if possible hidden from the sight of the defenders; supported by wooden props, they were extended forwards until they came under-the-nose of the chosen target; the wood was then set alight, as a result of which the ground subsided (if it was not solid rock), and with it the building standing above; the besieged defended themselves by digging counter-mines, in time to intercept the route taken by the enemy sappers. Siege engines were, roughly speaking, of two categories: some caused a certain point in the wall to be battered by direct blows, these being the battering-rams (kašh, ʿinnawr) known throughout the Middle Ages; others hurled a missile, these in turn being divided into three groups, according to the method of propulsion—mangonels (mandānīḥ [g.v.]), in which the swinging of a beam forced back by a team of men or (as in the Western "trebuchet") worked by a counterpoise, struck the missile with great force and thus propelled it against the point under bombardment, light ballistas (ʿarrīḍa [g.v.]), in which the same effect, with a less heavy projectile, was obtained by the twisting of a cord; and lastly, from the end of the 6th/12th century, the huge "wheel cross-bow" (baṣṣa al-siyār), operated like the ordinary cross-bow to shoot a powerful arrow, but, requiring several men to operate it. For most of the time, these engines were built or at least assembled...
almost on the spot, on account of difficulties of trans-
portation, and wheeled forward on wagons to ... Spur en der
altchoresmischen Kultur, Berlin 1953, 73 ff.). When
the Arabs attacked Ctesiphon in 16/637, the Persians
conformations of ground were obviously necessary,
exact place required; for their successful use, certain
formations had to be protected by huge shields
with arrows on the soldiers operating the siege engines,
in mountainous country.

Above all, they tried to set fire to the machines by
arrows on the soldiers operating the siege engines,
in mountainous country.

They defended themselves by showering
arrows on the soldiers operating the siege engines,
in mountainous country.

and these then had to be protected by huge shields
with arrows on the soldiers operating the siege engines,
in mountainous country.

For the construction or adjustment of these machines it
might happen that engineers were used who (strictly
speaking not being combatants) were non-Muslim,
particularly in the early centuries.

R. E. Gavagni and H. Arnb, in particu-
lar the work of K. Husni and the notes by Cl. Cahen to the Trait d'Armurerie. All the chronicles
contain descriptions of sieges, which have not been
the subject of any systematic analysis; of particu-
lar interest are those referring to the wars be-
tween Saladin and the Franks and, in the following
century, to the Mongol conquest and the Mamluk
counter offensive. Artillery in the age of fire-arms
has been omitted from this article; for this subject,
see BARDÔ. (CL. CAHEN)

ii.—MUSLIM WEST

The methods of warfare used by besiegers and
besieged were basically the same in the West as in
the East; the differences were mainly those of
vocabulary. For basic details see E. Lévi-Provençal,
L'Espagne musulmane au XVe siècle, 1932, 150; H. R.
Ibris, La Berbérie orientale sous les Zirides, ii, 533; R.
Brunschvig, La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafsidés, ii,
87.

Among siege engines, the mangonels of the Marinid
period had become very powerful. During the famous
sieges of Tlemcen for example, they were capable of
bombarding the town with cannon-balls made of
marble, some of which have been found there, the
largest with a circumference of two metres and
length 0.80 to 0.82 m. (al-Kirids, tr. Beaumier, 233, Rabat ed., ii, 196). During
the Marinid period there appeared also a new engine:
the shird);

which seems to have been a huge
mangonel. The small ballistas
which allegedly a Persian, Salman al-Farsî, who showed
the Muslims how to build a defensive trench (khân-
dah) on the western side of Medina against the
attacking Kuraysh in 5/627. Moreover, the Persians
had built a similar trench against outside barbarians
in several strategic zones, such as at Bardar on the
western shore of the Caspian and at Câltûs and Kaz-
win against the depredations of the Daylamis (cf.
Masûdî, Murâdî, ii, 196-7, on Anushirvân's wall-
building activity, and also ibid., ix, 585, and this
tradition was kept up in Islamic times (cf. Tabari,
iii, 1257, on the walls built at Tamisâh in Gurgân by
a local Iranian commander in 224/839).

The techniques of investing fortresses and the use
of siege machinery were certainly known in pre-
Islamic Persia, for there were skilled engineers in
the armies of the Sásânnîds (cf. Christensen, L'Iran
sous les Sassanides4, 212-13), and it was, of course,
ally Persia, Almâr al-Fârisî, who showed
the Muslims how to build a defensive trench (khân-
dah) on the western side of Medina against the
attacking Kuraysh in 5/627. Moreover, the Persians
had built a similar trench against outside barbarians
in several strategic zones, such as at Bardar on the
western shore of the Caspian and at Câltûs and Kaz-
win against the depredations of the Daylamis (cf.
Masûdî, Murâdî, ii, 196-7, on Anushirvân's wall-
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tradition was kept up in Islamic times (cf. Tabari,
iii, 1257, on the walls built at Tamisâh in Gurgân by
a local Iranian commander in 224/839).

The techniques of investing fortresses and the use
of siege machinery were certainly known in pre-
Islamic Persia, for there were skilled engineers in
the armies of the Sásânnîds (cf. Christensen, L'Iran
sous les Sassanides4, 212-13), and it was, of course,
al-Mansûrî, section on the
Almohads, ed. Huc, 1963, 165-8; Hesperis, xxviii (1941), 41, 62), on the two sieges of Tlemcen by the
Marinids (ibn Khâldûn, al-Tbar, vii, 94, 221, 257, tr. de Slane, iii, 375, iv, 143, 221) and on that of
Almeria in 709/1309 (al-Tbar, vii, 249, tr. iv, 204).

This may have been due to the.

Some sieges lasted for several years: the Marinid
Sultan Yusûf b. Ya'kûb blockaded Tlemcen for
about twenty years; and the siege ended only
when the besieging ruler was assassinated, this
causing his army to disintegrate. In fact the sur-
rounding wall of a town would enclose not only
buildings but also extensive open spaces which could
be cultivated or serve as pasture land. There exist
some details of the prices which the besieged in-
habitants of Valencia (al-Andalus, xiii (1948) 140)
and of Tlemcen (al-Tbar, vii, 96, tr. de Slane, iii,
377) had to pay for food.

The very long duration of some sieges led to the
besieging army transforming its military camp (mahâla)
into an actual town with its own fortified walls, its Great Mosque, its baths, its market.

The best known of these were al-Manṣûrîa [q.v.] (or rather al-Manṣûriyya) in front of Tlemcen, and Santa
Fé, built in 1491 by the Catholic Monarchs during
the siege of Granada, but many others are men-
tioned by the historians.

(G. S. COLIN)
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tradition was kept up in Islamic times (cf. Tabari,
iii, 1257, on the walls built at Tamisâh in Gurgân by
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The Arbâb al-desert were almost total strangers to
the use of siege techniques—within the Arabian
peninsula, only al-Tâ'if had any defensive walls—
and had the psychological dislike common to nomadic
peoples of solid walls and buildings. Yet as they
advanced eastwards into the Islamic world, it was
necessary for them to acquire these skills, for Persia
abounded in castles and fortified places, above all in
such regions as Ìdâbâb-daryân, Ìsâr, the Caspian
region and Khûrâsân (cf. Spuler, Iran, 499-502).

Further east still, and not to be reached by the Arabs
for some decades, were the fortified villages and
estates of Khâstarâm, recently revealed by Soviet
archaeology (see S. P. Tolstov, Auf den Spuren der
altdoresischen Kultur, Berlin 1953, 73 ff.). When
the Arabs attacked Ctesiphon in 16/637, the Persians
employed heavy catapults or mangonels (madidnib, sing. mandianik) and lighter ones (*arrddas) against the city walls and strong points of the Iranian east. In 942/1050, the governor of Khurram, Kutayba b. Nafis al-DIn, employed a powerful mangonel called al-Fadhhil" the wide-legged", whose stones fell in the local ruler's palace and killed a man; and at Samarkand two years later, Kutayba's Arabs destroyed the city walls with catapults (Tabari, ii, 1230, 1244-5; Ibn al-Athlr, iv, 437, 453). As is implied by the Sasanidis' use of catapults against the attacking Arabs at Ctesiphon, these machines—or at least the lighter and more mobile ones—could be used in normal, open fighting, as well as in sieges. Thus it is recorded that in 1217/934, the Tabari and AzdI troops of Nasr b. Sayyar were opposed by two *arrddas of the rebel al-Harib b. SuraydI (Tabari, ii, 1692; Ibn al-Athlr, v, 178).

In the 'Abbdsid period, techniques became more complex, and many new ways were developed in the fighting with the Byzantines on the Anatolian frontiers, where heavily-fortified strongholds abound-
ed (see 'AWASIM). It was probably here that the use of flaming naphtha, hurled either in pots from slings or by mechanical means into the enemy's positions, was learnt, and corps of specialist soldiers for hurling naphtha, naffdtun, are often mentioned. They were employed, for instance, by al-Mutasim's general al-Afshln in the campaigns against the Khurrami rebels Babak and the Daylamis (Miskawayh, in UL-TABARRUK). The Saldjuks, as a Turkish steppe people, had an eye for terror value than anything else must have been the suppression of Kawurd's rebellion in 602/1206, the Khwarazmian army again invested Harat. The attackers dammed up the Hari Rud so that the city walls became surrounded by water, and carried on the onslaught from boats. During the Umayyad period, the sources frequently mention the Arab's use of siege techniques against the Islamic world, and for some time they retained a respect for solid buildings and fortifications. Bundari, 37, mentions Alp Arslan's admiration for the walls of Amid in Diyar Bakr, which were celebrated for their strength (cf. NAsir-I Khurasaw, Safar-nama, ed. Khayyam-Najafi, 1965, 9). The touching of walls with his hands and then pounded his hands over his breast in order to acquire for himself something of the walls' strength (li l-tabarruk). The Saldjuks overran Persia and drove the townspeople there into submission by cutting them off from their agricultural supply regions rather than by direct assault, but TotgrI in 442/1050 kept up the siege of Isfahchan for nearly a year till the Kakuyd Abl Mansur Parma surrendered (Ibn al-Athlr, ix, 384-5). The army of the Great Saldjuks soon acquired a special division for siege warfare, with engineers, sappers and naphtha-thowers; as in the 'Abbdsid period, contact with the Byzantines doubtless hastened this process. During Alp Arslan's Georgian campaign of 456/1064, the Sultan used his corps of naffdtun against the wooden barricades of Ani, and then pushed westwards from there into Anatolia. In the course of sieges there, he constructed platforms from sacks filled with straw and earth for his archers, crossbowmen and naphtha-thowers, and he also built a wooden tower with an awning of felt soaked in vinegar to protect the attackers on the tower from having boiling liquids and fire hurled at them; from this tower, the Saldjuks troops battered down the walls (Sadr al-DIn al-Husayn, Abl Mdnsuwa al-SaldhI. 39-40).

In the early part of Malik Shab's reign, after the suppression of Kavurd's rebellion in 465/1073, the Sultan gave special charge of the mangonels and siege machinery of the army to one of his foremost command- ers, the slave eunuch 'IMmd al-DIn Shtwgin (Bundari, 49).

The sources are particularly full of information on siege techniques during the period of the Kh*arazm-Shahs, Ghurids and Mongols (6th-7th/12th-13th centuries), rather than the science. The Ghurids were responsible for much development in mediaeval Islam. It was recognized that bombarding a town with catapults not only pounded down the walls—which in the Iranian world were usually only of sun-dried brick anyway—but also had a psychological effect, making life inside the town insecure from the continual hail of missiles. It was by such a process of spreading despair and terror that the Kh*arazmians brought the Ghurid defenders of Harat almost to surrender in 600/1203 (Dubayn-Boyle, i, 320-1). Coming as they did from a low-lying region intersected by canals and river channels, the Kh*arazmians had an eye for the skillful utilization of rivers and waters in sieges. After the Ghurid Sultan Mu'Dz al-DIn Muhammad's death in 604/1206, the Kh*arazmian army again invested Harat. The attackers dammed up the Hari Rod so that the city walls became surrounded by water, and carried on the onslaught from boats. When the Shab 'Ali al-DIn Mu'mammad arrived in person, he ordered the dam to be broken down and the pent-up waters released; the rushing floods caused a long section of the walls to collapse, and after some fighting the city was taken by the Kh*arazmians. Shortly afterwards, the governor of Harat, Husayn Kharmrl, rebelled against the Kh*arazm-
Shah, so this time the latter had the Harl Rud diverted into a moat round the city, whose banks were artificially raised so that the foundations of the walls; then the water was let out from the moat with a rush, causing part of the walls to collapse, and the attackers were able to climb across the débris to the city gates (Diyaddini, Tabakdt-i Ndsiri, tr. Raverty, i, 239-60; Djuwanyi-Boyle, i, 335). An interesting example of the Trojan horse technique occurred on the death of the Ghurid Ghuythn al-Din Mah Muhammad in 604/1208, when members of the dynasty intrigued for possession of the capital Firuzkoh; eighty men were smuggled into the city inside treasure-chests, but the plot was betrayed and the men seized and killed (Diyaddini, op. cit., i, 408-9).

It is well known, both from Islamic sources and from the accounts of European travellers within the Mongol dominions, that the Mongols developed the techniques of siege warfare to a high degree. Cingiz later Khan's corps of mandaniks or mangonel-operators, headed by the Noyiin Abak, is said to have numbered several thousands (ibid., ii, 1047), and the personnel here included many Chinese and some Europeans. Hülegi's army included Chinese mandanikis, naphtha-throwers and men to operate multiple-shooting bows (carkh-andanzan). It was the Mongols who brought the multiple-shooting bow (carkh-kamán) into the Islamic world for the first time; some of these were used by Cingiz for his attack on Nishpûr in 618/1221. Concerning foreign specialists in Mongol service, Marco Polo mentions a Nestorian Christian and a German artillery master employed by Kubilay; and for the invasion of Khurasan, Cingiz had a renegade Persian soldier from the district of Ustuwî in northern Khurasan, who was in charge of the catapults and the deployment of infantry (Nasawi-Houdas, 53-4, tr. 90-1). The Mongols' siege machinery was usually transported on carts, and John of Plano Carpini says that a standard item in the Mongol soldier's equipment was ropes for dragging this machinery along, fenes ad machinas trahendas (cf. K. Huuri, Zur Geschichte des mittelalterlichen Geschützwesens aus orientischen Quellen, Berlin-Leipzig 1944, 123-4, 180-92).

In their siege tactics, the Mongols showed considerable resourcefulness. They usually began by herding together as cannon-fodder a group of the local population (bashar), who were then used as a protective shield cannon to drown the Mongol soldiers could fight or as carriers of ammunition for the catapults (cf. Djuwanyi-Boyle, i, 92-3, siege of Khodâjadand, and ibid., i, 107, attack on Dabûzây and Sarmarsand). The catapults and heavy artillery would then be brought as close to the invested walls or fortifications as possible; at Djand in 616/1219 the defensive moat had first of all to be filled in, after which the catapults, battering-rams and scaling-ladders could be used (ibid., i, 85). At Murtân, the Mongol general Türibi Töksn apparent mounted his mangonels on rafts in the Indus river (ibid., i, 142), and at Nishpûr, the Mongols are said to have set up a set of mangonels in a single day; they used timber felled in the nearby, well-wooded oasis of Bûghênkân to build protective bulwarks and to construct catapults, testudines (dabbdbdt) and battering-rams (Nasawi-Houdas, 54, tr. 92-2). Where there were no stones available as ammunition for the catapults, e.g., at the siege of Gurgândi in Khûrâzn in 617-18/1220-1, blocks of mulberry wood were soaked in water and then used; at the same time as this bombardment, the moat was filled with débris and a peasant bashar was pushed forward in a crescent formation to demolish the defensive earthworks.

The use of gunpowder and artillery in the Islamic world naturally had a profound effect on siege techniques; for a consideration of these new methods in Persia, see Bârûd. v.—The Safawids.

**Bibliography:** Material has largely to be gleaned from the historical sources extending over the whole period, but there are specific sections on siege warfare to eightry, Iran, 493-4, 499-504, and idem, Mongolen, 433-16. Quatremère's notes on the use of nafl, on peasant bashars and on catapults and engines of war in his Hist. des Mongoles de la Perse, i, 1, 132-7, 204-5, 284-92, are still valuable. Finally, Huiru's work (see above), esp. 123 ff., 180-92, should be consulted for the technical details of the various types of catapult and mechanical bow.

iv.—The Mamlûk Sultanate

The history of siege warfare in the Mamlûk Sultanate has to be dealt with against the following background.

Most of the great wars of the Sultanate were fought in the early decades of its existence. These wars were conducted mainly against the Crusaders, where siege warfare was the decisive, indeed almost the only, factor, and against the Mongols, where field battles were the decisive factor (see Hareri, though sieges played a by no means negligible role. Thereafter the Mamlûks fought only minor wars; the two notable exceptions were the war against Timûrlâng, where siege warfare had some importance, and the final war against the Ottomans, where it had none. In the minor wars sieges were very numerous, but these conflicts were too trivial to promote the development of siege methods and siege instruments.

During most of the Mamlûk period, the main machine employed for throwing heavy missiles in sieges was the mandanik (q.v.), but its heyday was in the 7th/13th century, particularly in its closing decades. With the final expulsion of the Crusaders, or shortly after that date, the great history of that machine comes to an end.

For seventy to eighty years after the end of the Crusades the heavy siege artillery of the Mamlûks consisted solely of mandaniks. During the sixties of the 8th/14th century, however, the revolutionary weapon of gunpowder was introduced into the Mamlûk Sultanate, which was one of the first Muslim countries to employ it. The Mamlûks used artillery, up to the end of their rule, solely as a siege weapon; yet in spite of its revolutionary character, it served for a very long time only as an auxiliary to the mandanik. Only towards the end of Mamlûk rule did it succeed in superseding it, and even then not completely. Some time during the second half of the 9th/15th century firearms became the main siege weapon, but never reached the point, as in parts of contemporary Europe and the Ottoman Empire, of breaking the immense superiority which defence had enjoyed over attack in siege warfare in the later Middle Ages. (For additional information see D. Ayalon, Gunpowder and firearms in the Mamlûk Kingdom—a challenge to a mediæval society, London 1956, and art. Bârûd.)

What is characteristic of siege warfare under the Mamlûks is that a machine hurling missiles, whether it was the mandanik or artillery, was in fact the only really important siege machine which they used.
Other siege instruments, like the penthouse (dabbdba), the moveable tower (burdj_), and naphtha (naff) had their heyday in the pre-Mamluk period. In the Mamluk period they did not count for very much (see below). During the early decades of their rule the Mamluks employed in their sieges very frequently, and with considerable success, the system of mining (nakb) side by side with their extensive use of the mandianik.

Despite the lack of direct evidence, there are many indications that in the Mamluk period mining was extensively used by the Mamluks (and also, though perhaps on a much smaller scale, by other Muslim and Eastern states).

One of the outstanding features of the employment of the mandianik in Syria and Egypt in the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries, particularly in the struggle against the Crusaders, is the great increase in their numbers in the sieges of the Mamluks in comparison with the sieges of the Ayyūbids. The Ayyūbid Sultans, including Salāh al-Dīn, used a maximum of ten mandianiks in a single siege, and very frequently much fewer: one, two or three such engines are a common phenomenon (al-Fath al-Kussi, 331; Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 120, 320, 331; xi, 6, 34, 42; Abū Shāma, ii, 129, 135, 184, 192, 235; RHC, Hist. Or., iv, 254; Sulāk, i, 84; Deschamps, Les châteaux des Croisés, 52, 64. For a notable exception see Ibn al-Athīr, x, 371). For additional information on the employment of mandianiks under the Ayyūbids see al-Fath al-Kussi, 154; Sibṭ, 435, 447; Sulāk, i, 95, 96, 97, 243). Towards the end of Ayyūbid rule a certain increase may be noticed (Sulāk, i, 331; Nujāmī (ed. Cairo), vi, 329). The only rulers within the boundaries of the Islamic territories who came near the Mamluks in the extensive use of mandianiks were the Ilkhanid Mongols of Persia, who quite frequently used twenty to twenty-five of these engines in a single siege (Ibn Ḥathir, xii, 234, 266; al-Nahhāj al-salṭīd (in PO), xii, 437; Ibn al-Furat, vii, 41; Sulāk, i, 426, 475. See also Huūrī, 192-192, where some exaggerated numbers are included, and note 4 on p. 191). The numbers of the mandianiks which the Mamluks employed against the Crusader castles were similar, though in all probability some of these engines were developed more rapidly than those of the Mongols (see below) (Sulāk, i, 505-505; Zetterberg, Beiträge, 16; Ibn Ḥathir, xii, 373, 376; al-Nahhāj al-salṭīd, xiv, 553; Ibn al-Furat, viii, 80, 136; Sulāk, i, 608, 778, and note 2; Dījarārī, 16); the best description of the distribution of the mandianiks in a siege is that concerning Kašāf al-Rūm. But all the former records were broken in al-Ashraf Khālid's siege of Acre (690/1291). Abu `l-Fidā', who witnessed the siege of Acre, states that it was besieged by a greater number of big and small mandianiks than any other town ever was (Abu `l-Fidā', iv, 24). According to some of the Mamluk sources they numbered 92; according to others, 72 (al-Dījarārī, Sauvaget's tr., 5; Ibn al-Furat, viii, 111, 112; Sulāk, i, 704; Nujāmī (ed. Cairo), vii, 5-6, and note on p. 6); Mankāl, iii, fol. 62 b; Ibn ʿIyās, i, 123). The numbers of Mamluk mandianiks in that siege quoted by Barhebraeus (300) or by the anonymous writer of Excidium Accinis (666) (cf. Huūrī, 173, note 3; see also J. Prawer, A history of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem (in Hebrew), Jerusalem 1963, ii, 529) should be regarded as a gross exaggeration, to be explained perhaps by the desire of the Christian authors to inflate the power of the besieging Muslims. In 672/1275, Abu Ḥamīd ʿAmīr, who expected a Frankish attack by sea, fortified the port of Alexandria with too many mandianiks (Khiyat, i, 175; Sulāk, i, 608). It should be noted in this connexion that the sources mention much more often the number of the besiegers than of the besieged. For numbers of mandianiks in sieges see also Huūrī, 164-5, 172-3 (some of the numbers quoted there are certainly exaggerated). For references on the use of mandianiks in the Crusading period cf. ibid., 156, note 1.

After the expulsion of the Crusaders from Syria and Palestine the Mamluk sources quote only very rarely the number of the mandianiks used in sieges, although they were used frequently. There are, however, some clear indications that their numbers declined considerably (see, e.g., Ibn Kaṭīr, xiv, 213, 281, 282; also ibid, 203-9). Whereas our information on the number of mandianiks participating in a siege in the Mamluk Sultanate is fairly rich, that on the number of cannons employed in sieges is very meagre: this is one of the greatest drawbacks in the study of the history of firearms under the Mamluks (Ayalon, Gunpowder and firearms . . ., 30).

The characteristic feature of the sieges of the 7th/13th century is the great increase in the number of missile-throwing machines, as well as the considerable variety of their types in comparison with the past. The new type, the trebuchet, developed into several kinds of machines based on the same principle. The Muslims often hurled naphtha by means of trebuchets which seem to have been of the lighter kinds of this kind of machinery.

The Mamluk sources speak of four kinds of mandianiks: "Frankish" (frandīyya), Maghribine or "Western" (maghribīyya), "black bullish" (karābughāniyya) and "devilish" (dāshīyāniyya). These types are mentioned far more frequently under the Mamluks than under the Ayyūbids, and perhaps more frequently than under any other Muslim mediaeval ruler. Before the 7th/13th century these names are hardly mentioned in the sources, and quite shortly after the end of that century they disappear completely or almost completely from them, or at least from the chronicles. This fact reflects the abrupt halt, indeed decline, in the development of the mandianik, the great challenge of the Crusaders' presence in Muslim territory was removed. The sources do not explain the differences between these four types, but certain important conclusions can be drawn from the information they furnish (see further MANJAŅAK).

Mining (nakb), a system of siege warfare which had been known for many centuries but which had been used quite rarely before the 6th/12th century, reached the peak of its success in the late 6th/12th and in the 7th/13th centuries, used particularly by the Muslims. It was carried out in the following way. An underground tunnel (nakb, pl. nukbāb, and much more rarely sirb, pl. asrāb, or surbāb) would be started a certain distance from the fortification or wall, and would be dug towards it. Immediately under the fortification, it would be widened, deepened and strengthened with wooden props, then it would be filled with brushwood, straw and other combustible materials, and the whole construction would be set alight. The wooden props, together with all the combustibles, would be burnt, and the undermined fortification would collapse. Mines were, of course, effective mainly against fortifications built on a more or less soft soil; they were much less effective on those which were built on rock foundations. A town surrounded by deep water for an interesting attempt to overcome the hardness of the soil, see Abū Shāma,
The great advantages of this system were that the sappers were completely safe from the missiles and naphtha of the defenders, to which the burdûq and the dabbûba were so dangerously exposed, and that the besieged garrison, unaware of the operation, was frequently taken by surprise. The best defence against such attack was for the besieged to dig a counter-tunnel, and, when the enemy's line of approach was discovered, to dig into it, kill the miners or smoke them out, and to destroy their work. Mining was used in Syria during the Crusades much less frequently than in Europe, and by the Muslims much more often and more systematically than by the Crusaders: Richard the Lion Heart employed, in his siege of Dârûm in 1192, highly skilled Muslim miners from Aleppo, whom he had captured in the siege of Acre (Grousset, ii, 86, and references in note 3). It is noteworthy that Saladin, in his siege of Şâbûnîn in 58/1188, had with him many Aleppo foot soldiers who were famous for their bravery (Ibn al-Âthîr, xii, 5-6). It may well be no accident that Saladin had in his service an élite of miners and foot soldiers, trained in siege warfare, both from the same town. The Mamlûks employed mining on a far larger scale than the Ayyûbids, and especially in their sieges of the last Crusaders' castles (Mirzâ al-samân, 225, 462, 474; al-Dâzarî (Sauvaget's tr.), 16; al-Nâkhî al-sâdîd, xii, 470, 490; Sirât al-Malîk al-Münṣûr, 152; Ibn al-Dawâdârî (ed. Roemer), ix, 131, 261; Bar Hebraeus (Budge's tr.), 492-3; al-Yûnînî, ii, 378-8; Ibn al-Furât, viii, 80, 112; Sulûk, i, 69, 84, 489, 491, 498, 747, 767; al-Âyînî, RHC, Hist. Or., ii/1, 242; Nûdîm (ed. Cairo), vi, 36, 40; vii, 138; viii, 6; ibid. (ed. Popper), vi, 407, 462, 467; vii, 52, 570. See also Quatremère, Mongols, 252-5, note 81; Rey, Études sur les monuments..., Paris, 1887, 31, 37, and passim; Oman, i, 134; ii, 50-2; Grousset, ii, 550; iii, 703-4, 743, 755, 762; Deschamps, ii, 66; Fedden, 38-9; Prawer, ii, 49, 452, 456-7, 460, 488, 539, 541). The sappers were called nakkabûn (more rarely nakhâba). The act of mining was called nakhâba or nakhaba. Those engaged in extracting stones from the fortifications were called nafidîrûn. Carpenters (nafîdîrûn) were also employed in the mining operations, setting the charges and the material alight was called alallaba (rarely abrawa). (In addition to the above references see also al-Fâth al-Kusi, 166; Sirât al-Malîk al-Münṣûr, 89; Ibn al-Furât, viii, 80; Sulûk, i, 1003; Nûdîm (Cairo), vii, 6; ibid. (ed. Popper), v, 407; Quatremère, Mongols, 284 note 95; Anûari (ed. Scalon), 92). After the Crusaders the employment of nukab declines considerably, though it by no means disappears (see the references pertaining to the post-Crusade period quoted above). Of particular interest and importance are the descriptions of the nukab dug by the Mamlûks in their sieges of Arsûf (663/1265) (Sulûk, i, 328-9), and al-Markab (684/1285) (Abu 'l-Fida', iv, 27; Sirât al-Malîk al-Münṣûr, 78-9; Ibn al-Furât, viii, 17-8. See also Nûdîm (Cairo), vi, 40).

One of the reasons for the Mamlûks' success in their mining operations was that, in their sieges of the Crusaders' coastal fortresses, they were free to use their siege methods more thoroughly and with less restraint than under ordinary conditions, because they did not intend to keep or repair these fortresses after their capture, but to raze them to the ground.

The two main siege weapons by means of which the Mamlûks succeeded in capturing the castles of the Crusaders, and thus bringing to an end their rule in Syria and Palestine, were the nusîbûn and the nûdîm.

Mamlûk siege warfare and naval power. One of the greatest weaknesses of the Mamlûks in their sieges of the Crusaders' coastal towns and fortresses was that they could never invest them completely, for the sea was always open to the besieged. In the whole Mamlûk offensive against the Crusaders there was not a single case of a simultaneous siege from land and sea, not even in the reign of Baybars I, when the Mamlûk navy was at its peak. All the Mamlûk sieges of the coastal towns were carried out almost as if a Mamlûk navy did not exist at all. Never in a Muslim offensive against the Crusaders was the weakness of the Mamlûk navy so apparent as in the great and final offensive.

In the siege of Acre Frankish warships, specially protected against fire, attacked the besiegers from the sea (Abu 'l-Fida', iv, 25; RHC, Hist. Or., i, 104); and Mamlûk warships did not hinder the Franks from bringing reinforcements, evacuating refugees from besieged or captured fortresses, or landing them in ports which were still in Crusader possession (see e.g., Ibn Kaṭîr, xii, 327; al-Nâkhî al-sâdîd, xii, 539-40; Ibn al-Furât, vii, 80, 112; Sulûk, i, 747, 764, 765; Nûdîm (Cairo), vii, 8, 11; see also Prawer, ii, 454-541, passim, and the evidence and instances below). For a rather isolated and feeble intervention of the Mamlûk navy, see Stevenson, The Crusaders in the East, 355). The Mamlûk navy would certainly have been unable to impede the landing of a Frankish expeditionary force at any point of the Syro-Palestinian coast, including the besieged fortresses, had such a force been sent. It was even less capable of doing so than in the time of Saladin, when, after the battle of Hittîn [q.v.], the Muslims were within sight of a total expulsion of the Crusaders, but lost their chance because of European naval supremacy.

The capture of Crusader towers or fortresses built in the sea gave the Mamlûks particular difficulty. Such structures were in front of Sidon (the famous Château de Mer), Marâkiyya, Lâdîkîyya and Ayâs (in the Gulf of Alexandretta); there was also the fortified island of Arwâd, northwest of Tripoli. Ayâs and Arwâd were left to be dealt with after the total expulsion of the Crusaders. Sidon's "sea-castle," which was handed over to the Muslims almost without fighting, when the capture of Acre made the position of the Crusaders hopeless (Deschamps, i, 64, 73-6; ii 17, 18, 227-30, 253-4; Grousset, iii, 762, and note 2; Prawer, ii, 498, 544). As for Marâkiyya, the fortress or tower (bîjn, burdî) which commanded the entrance of its port constituted its main fortification. It rose in the sea at a distance of two bowshots from the shore and was strongly fortified. Sultan Kâlîwûn decided that "the siege of this fortress is impossible, because it is in the sea, and because the Muslims have no ships to cut off its provisions and to stop those who want to enter or leave it" (Ibn 'Abd al-Zâhir, Sirât al-Malîk al-Münṣûr, Cairo 1961, 88). This statement reflects the ineffectiveness of the Mamlûk navy, not only in the case of Marâkiyya, but also in all the other cases of the Frankish naval operations. No less revealing is an episode which occurred during the capture of Tripoli: a group of Franks took refuge on the small islet of St. Thomas situated opposite the town, "which could be reached only by ships", but "because of the eternal good fortune of the Muslims (al-sâ'dîd al-˚ala‘iya il-‘ muslimîn)" an exceptionally low ebb enabled the attackers to reach the islet on foot and horse, and round up the fugitive Franks (Ibn al-Furât, viii, 115-27; for a
corroborative, though somewhat different version, see Abu ‘l-Fida’, iv, 23, and cf. Grousset, iii, 744). This reflects the chronicler’s feeling that but for divine intervention the Muslims would have been incapable, even in the flush of victory, of maintaining such a small defenceless target, so near the shore.

Unable to conquer the sea-fortress of Marakiyya by his own means, Sultan Kalâwûn brought pressure to bear on Bohemond of Tripoli, who forced its defenders to hand it over to the Mamlûks. It was destroyed with great difficulty by a joint effort of the Mamlûks and the Franks (683/1285) (Suluk, i, 117; Joinville, 47, 52; Ibn al-Athîr, ix, 366; see also Deschamps, ii, 66, on the siege of Marakiyya in 1184). In the siege and capture of Caesarea and Arsûf by Baybars I in 663/1265, dabbâbâs were employed (Sulûk, i, 526-7; Prawer, ii, 450, 452).

In all the big sieges of the Crusader castles which followed the siege of Caesarea and which sealed the fate of the Crusaders, there is hardly any mention of either the dabbâba or the burdî amongst the siege machines of the attackers. (Ibn Fadl Allah sources occasionally at later dates (Sulûk, ii, 428, 429; Ta’rîkh Bayûrî, 38). This machine is thus described by Ibn Saqrâ, whose chronicler covers the period 786-991/1384-97: sahâfât tadîrî ‘alî ard mithla ‘l-‘aijâl wa-‘l-alâykhâ qiyâlâd (al-Durar al-mudiyya, ed. W. M. Brinner, text, 81, Eng. tr., 113). For a description of alat al-safî, which seems to have been identical with sahâfât, see Dozy, Supplément, s.v.; for the mention by Abû Shama of abrdâl al-safî, see Huuri, 158 note 3.)

The rise of naphtha (naf’t [q.v.]) as a major weapon in siege warfare during part of the Crusading period was caused primarily by the appearance of the burdî and the dabbâba on the scene of action; it was the Muslim answer—and a most effective one—to the great menace caused by these new Frankish weapons (see, e.g., Ibn Shaddâd, RHC, Hist. Or., iii, 221-2; al-Fâth al-Kussî, 227; Sulûk, i, 57, 103-4; Sibt, 408; Dwaal al-‘alam, ii, 117; Joinville, 47, 52; J.A., 1850), 219, 244; Oman, ii, 46, 49-8; also most of the references given above for the burdî and the dabbâba, many of those given below in this section and in general naf’t. On the different versions concerning the origin (Damascus or Baghâddâ) of the Muslim naphtha employed in the siege of Acre in 1189-91, see Ibn al-Athîr, xii, 29; Abû Shama, ii, 153; Ibn Shaddâd, 166.

One of the main reasons for the decline of naphtha, together with the burdî and the dabbâba, was that it was such an effective counter-measure to them; another was that since the castles of the Crusaders were built of stone, with hardly any wood in them (Small, Crusading warfare, 228), the effective use of naphtha as an offensive weapon, during this period when the initiative passed definitely and finally from the Franks to the Muslims, was precluded. At
that period it is mentioned rarely (for its mention as an offensive weapon by the Mamluks in their struggle against the Crusaders, see Ibn al-Furat, vii, 46; viii, 80; Suluk, i, 747) and (in contrast to the near past) no particular importance is attached to it. On its decline and almost complete disappearance after the Crusaders, see Gunpowe and fireworks, 12-3, and NAPT.

The arbaelest. The heavier types of arbaelest or crossbow were employed in siege warfare (both by the attackers and the defenders), in sea warfare and in naval attacks on coastal fortifications. It could hurl both non-inflammstary and inflammstary missiles (lighter types were used in field battles, particularly by the infantry). The commonest name in Arabic in the Mamluk period for the crossbow type of weapon was kaws al-ridjl wa'l-rikab (often shortened to kaws al-ridjl), which seems to have been given to crossbows of various sizes, including those employed in sieges. The arbaelest does not seem to have been a very important weapon in Mamluk battles either against the Crusaders or against the Mongols. For a full discussion, see KAWS.
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The art of siege warfare was changing, however, even as the Ottomans acquired these older techniques. Gunpowder and cannon had begun to exert an influence more and more decisive on the conduct of sieges. None the less, the Ottomans long continued to use, side by side with newer modes of procedure, techniques derived from the practice of an earlier age (cf., e.g., i) mantlets at Oronto in 1480 (Foucard, 163), at Malta in 1565 (Girni, 113, 1149), at Niceos in 1570 (Lorini, 71: "palchi di tavoie, coperti con pelle di bufali a guisa di testuggine, per difendersi da' fuochi") and also at Hamadan in 1724 (L. Lockhart, The fall of the Safat Dynasty. , Cambridge 1958, 269); (ii) wooden towers at Malta in 1565 (Bosio, iii, 673, 684: "un'altra Machina di coperti con pelle di bufali a guisa di testuggine, per allanare le muraglie con palle di pietra e brillare con fulmine.""); (iii) "tra-buchi" at Rhodes (Sanuto, xxxiii, 573 and xxxiv, 67) during the siege of 1522). The Ottomans also retained the old method for bringing down the walls of a fortress, i.e., to dig approach trenches, to excavate the foundation of the walls, wooden beams being employed to support the stone-work, and then to set fire to the beams, so that the walls would collapse, once the timber was burnt through (cf., at Rhodes in 1522, Bosio, i, 574 and Tercier (1759), 754; also Monteveculii, 345).

The offensive weapons prominent in earlier times—i.e., the ram and the bore, the ballista, the trebuchet—began to decline in importance, as the gun was elaborated into an effective means of siege warfare. Guns, it would seem, came into use amongst the Ottomans in the reign of Mehemmed I and perhaps even at an earlier date (cf. BARUD, 1061). Artillers recruited from the German and Italian lands, from Serbia and Bosnia (cf. BARD, 1062) soon made available to the Ottomans an efficient train of siege guns. Experts of European origin would indeed constitute a major and enduring element in the Ottoman technical services (cf. BARD, 1062) connected with siege warfare—the artillers (Topq cultured), the transport corps (Topq ArabshrlJ, the
bombardiers (Kumbadagfilar) and the sappers (Laghlmdillar).

At first the Ottomans often carried into the field not the ponderous guns indispensable for siege work, but supplies of metal for the casting of cannon, which need dictated in the course of a given campaign (cf. Barletio, ii, 306r, 307r; Promontorio-de-Campis, 61, 85; da Lazz, 103; Sanuto, xxxi, 86; also Bârodû, 1061). Guns cast before a fortress might be broken into pieces at the termination of a siege, the metal being carried off for re-use on a future occasion (cf. N. lorga, Notes et extraits pour servir a l'histoire du Ceri, 1841, iii, 368). These modes of procedure, in due course, fell into desuetude. A late example, however, can be seen in the Cretan War of 1645-69, when the Ottomans, transporting clay for the moulds from Kâgdîkhânê to İnadîyye, found it more convenient to cast some at least of their cannon in the field than to bring them whole from the mainland (cf. Sîlîddar, i, 307, 467, 481; Râhîd, i, 198, 205-6; Hammer-Purgstall, Histoire, xi, 310).

Ottoman siege guns, in the time of Mehemed II and for long thereafter, tended to be of vast weight and size (on the large cannon of Mehemed II cast in 1468/1469 and now preserved in the Tower of London see Bârodû, 1061, 1065). Abundant evidence can be gathered about these guns from the sources which describe the great Ottoman sieges—, e.g., of Constantinople in 874/1470 (Barbaro, 21, 27, 35, 39, 44); of Skutari (Isgkôdara) in 883/1478-9 (Barletio, 310rv, 313r, 374rv); of Rhodes in 885/1480 (Germanicarum rerum scriptores vari, ed. Preber, ii, Frankfort 1602, 158, 159; C. Foucard, Fonti di storia Napoletana nell'Archivio di Stato in Modena. Otranto nel 1480 e nel 1481, in Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane, vili (Naples 1881), 135 ff.; Vertot, ii, 308, 602; of Otranto in 885/1480 (Laggetto, 231 and of Diu in 945/1538 (Ribiero, 255 ff.). One of the large bagülügûha guns that the Ottomans carried to Malta in 973/1565 weighed "ciento y dos mil y cincuenta libras de hierro" (Verdadera relacion, 31r, 39v, 41v; cf. also Bosio, iii, 534: "in distanza di 180. canne da Architetto, secondo la nota, che ne lasciò Girolamo Cاسر, Ingegneri della Religione"). M. Roberts, Gustavus Adolphus, London 1958, ii, 228, note 3, suggests that 720 metres would be a liberal estimate for the effective range of large cannon in the 16th and the 17th centuries. Also infrequent are references to the range of the arquebus. Ulloa, describing the Djerba campaign of 1560, observes of the Ottoman "schioppettieri" that "qui loro schioppettieri erano si lunghi, che tirando arrivavano a cinquecento passi" (Ulloa, 8v). Ottoman arquebusiers fighting at Malta in 1565 and using "las escopetas del mayor de las palomas de cañon, y las ¡ menos de siete" maintained an accurate fire at a distance of "seycientos passos" (Verdadera relacion, 34r, 68r; also Bosio, iii, 597, referring to "archibusoni da posta")

The gunpowder that the Ottomans used was often excellent. It gave off, at Malta in 1565, a white smoke—an effect of its fineness—clearly distinguishable from the black smoke of the Christian powder. (Verdadera relacion, 102v; Bosio, 85r; S. di Marzio, iv, 614). Montecucculi also praised it for an excellence which revealed itself in "le bruit, la force et la longueur des coups" (Montecuculi, 283-4). Ewliya Çelebi describes the "förmnâl bârlûtîlar" as moist and inclined to befoul the touch-hole of the cannon, whereas the powder from Egypt and Bagdad was well made—indeed he compares it on a number of occasions with the gunpowder obtained from the English (Ewliya Çelebi, iv, 413; vi, 314; x, 175, 454, 727. Much powder—some of it among the best at their command—took the Ottomans from Europe and in particular from the English and the Dutch: cf. Bârodû, 1063). A passage in the Tuhfat al-kibrî notes, however, that the gunpowder from Egypt that it was not over-clean, had no great propulsive force and did harm, moreover, to the touch-hole of the cannon (Tuhfat al-kibrî, 721; also Naîmî, iii, 52; other adverse comments of much later date, in Peter Businello Staatssekretärs der Republik Venedig historische Nachrichten . . . der osmanischen Monarchie, in C. W. Lüdeke, Beschreibung des Türkischen Reiches, Zweyter Theil, Leipzig 1778, 131, and in Schels, 306-7).

The cannon-balls fired from the Ottoman guns might be of stone, iron, lead and even bronze (cf., at
Rhodes (1522), Sanuto, xxxiv, 64, 78; at Gran (1543), Hammer-Purgstall, Historiae, v, 372; and at Malta (1565), Verdana relation, 42). Often, where possible, the cannon-balls would be collected after firing for further use against a fortress (cf., at Malta (1565), Cirni, 104 and Bosio, iii, 636). With problems of windage in mind the Ottomans often wrapped their shot in sheepskins, thus ensuring a better effect from the explosion of the charge (Montecucchi, 280-1). At Malta in 1565 the Ottoman gunners, in preparing the charge for their cannon, used sacks of powder proportionate to the range and to the result which it was desired to achieve (cf. Bosio, iii, 614). The great size of their siege cannon and the thickness of the gun-barrels led the Ottoman top hydraulic at times to fire the guns without giving them sufficient time to cool (cf. Verdana relation, 40v, 68v; and, on the cooling of guns, Ducas (Bonn 1834), 273 and Foucard, 165).

The Ottoman gunners—a large proportion of whom came from Europe—made use of their cannon in accordance with methods practised in the armies of Christendom: e.g., concentrated fire from batteries directed at one particular section of a fortress wall (Antican, 147-8: Crete, 1646; cf. also Pečewi, ii, 193—on the Christian gunners at Gran, 1595); cross-fire from various batteries of guns (Bosio, iii, 538-9: Malta, 1565); and, in addition, the use of medium cannon to cut deep into the walls of a fortress and then of the heavier guns to bring down the stone-work through the violent impact of large cannon-balls (Collado, 24v-25v; Stella, in Schwandtner, i, 610-1; also İlknöd, 1062. On the methods practised in Europe cf., e.g., Mendoza, 517-v and Marsigli-Veress, 29-30). Sometimes the Ottomans fired groups of guns in a regular sequence (Bosio, iii, 309: Tripoli in North Africa, 1551). A number of batteries might combine to cover the defences of a fortress with a "curtain barrage" destined to be raised at, but not before the precise moment when the Ottoman forces stormed the walls (Bosio, iii, 648: Malta, 1565). A device employed at Malta in 1565 was the placing, close to the fortress walls, of "alcune picche—havendo nella cima certo fuoco artificiato", the Ottoman gunners being thus enabled to maintain an accurate cannon-fire at night-time (Colto, 98v; Cirni, 113-v; Bosio, iii, 628, 676. The sources for the same siege note, too, the superb skill and precision of the Ottoman arquebusiers, even when firing in moonlight: Viperanus, 10v; Bosio, iii, 539-40, 561, 611).

Much care and effort was given to the siting of the siege guns: there are references, e.g., to emplacements with "doors" opening and closing, as the cannon fired at the fortress (Barletio, 1566, "certi bastioni di voce sacca di lana, e bamba, dietro a quali stando i Gianizzari, senza pericolo assaltavano le mura") (Impresa di Zighet, in Sansovino, 454-v). How great was the forethought given at need to the exact location of the guns and of the arquebusiers can be inferred from the fact that Mehmed II—with the siege of 1450 in mind—caused drawings to be made beforehand of the fortifications at Rhodes (Bosio, ii, 315). The Ottomans had at their command instruments of siege warfare other than guns and mortars. Amongst them was the hümbara (humbbara), i.e., bombs and grenades of various kinds—e.g., "hümbara hawanları" (Silibdär, i, 244 and ii, 47); a large hümbara weighing 70 okkas (Silibdär, i, 595); "kazan (basghân) hümbara" (Ewliya Celebi, viii, 398, 414); "sepet hümbaraları" (Silibdär, ii, 395, also Nurşetnâmeh, ed. I. Farmaksizoglu, i, 3, Istanbul 1962-4, i, 81); "feci hümbaraları" (Nurşetnâmeh, i, 81); "ömlett hümbaraları" (Ewliya Celebi, v, 191); and "güzhenen ma'mul hümbaralar" (Na'mâh, iv, 140. Cf. also on the hümbara bârûd, 1063). As for hand grenades (e.g., of glass (stycy (gische) el kumbaraları) or of bronze (lundoj el kumbarası)—cf. Ewliya Celebi, ii, 119 and viii, 414, 432; Rahşid, i, 208, also Cacavelas, 158, 139 and İlknöd, 1063) much use was made of them, not only in the siege of Candia in Crete (Rahşid, i, 208: the Ottoman manufactured per diem in the course of the siege 1000 bronze handgrenades—cf. also Silibdär, i, 484 and Scheitner, 77. Marsigli, ii, 33 observes, however, that the Ottoman "granata da mano, pure mal fatta, è di effetto assai tenue").

The sources mention quite often other techniques and devices that the Ottomans used in their siege warfare—e.g., (i) the firing, from their cannon, of small shot, lengths of chain (Ewliya Celebi, x, 676; Silibdär, ii, 337: "pačma ve demir sendirler" and i, 705: "sendir dolu topay") and also pieces of iron (A. N. Kurat, Prut Seferi, ii, Ankara 1953, 752: "demir parçaları")—cf. in addition the Lettera scritta ... da Venetia: "un Pezzo di Bronzo carico di Lanterne, e Balle da Moschetto". Bosio, iii, 641-2. The Ottomans, at Malta in 1565, constructed a "barile cerchiato di ferro" and furnished with an explosive charge and a fuse, the inside being full of "scaglie di ferro, di pezzi di catene, e di sassi"); (ii) the use of "şinderli hümbara" (explosive and combustible devices affixed to long poles or pikes: Selânlî, 40—cf. also Bosio, iii, 564) and of hümbara filled with iron fragments (Na'mâh, i, 304); and (iii) the employment of "palle di fuoco" compounded of resin, pitch, sulphur, wax, oil and the like (Barletio, 1565).
313), of "boulletz de cuivre ou bronze plains d'artifice de feu" (de Bourbon, 131-v) and of gunpowder in "peaux de chevre" furnished with a mache or fuse (Marsigli, ii, 34). The Ottomans made use, moreover, of "naft, hatrâm, haynar šu" and of "kol, birel, naft ve hafırsan palastra ve yorgannı parıcalar" (Evlîya Celebi, v, 191, 201; cf. also Naîmî, iv, 140: "naft te buçakmız ba'dı birhâb parıcalar").

There is frequent reference to the Ottoman use of "sacchi di polvere" with a fuse and intended to be thrown at close quarters—cf., e.g., "Verdadera relation," i, 252; Brusoni, ii, 372; Bosio, ii, 207, 322-323; Marsigli, ii, 572 and iii, 559 ("certi sacchetti loro di fuoco artificiato, quali era una pignattina di terra fragilissima piena di fuoco, la quale nel percuotere in terra, o ne capi de' nostri rompendosi, accendeva, s'infiammava una mistura, che tenacissimo attaccandosi, fin al ferro istesso voracemente, et efficacemente ardeva, e consumava").

Other devices and stratagems are noted in some of the sources. It was in the course of the long Hungarian war of 1593-1606 that the Ottomans came to know the "aghâdî fi'îb", i.e., the petard (Peçewî, ii, 212-3; Naîmî, i, 190; Evlîya Celebi, vii, 312-3; Brusoni, Candida, i, 42; Hammer-Purgstall, i, 190; Ewliya Celebi, vii, 312-3; Cirni, s6v, 65r-v; Bosio, iii, 559, 644, 679; Verdadera relacion, 98r; Bosio, iii, 572; Épînémûres Daces, ii, 266).
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The actual investment of a fortress involved the digging of approach trenches (slıan yolları) vertical to the walls, but sinuous rather than rectilinear, in order to give protection from the fire of the besieged foe; lateral trenches (mëterii) parallel to the walls branched off from the slıan yolları, and redoubts ("domus dame") covered with timber and earth had to be constructed on the outer rim of the fosse, over against the glacis of the fortress (de La Feuillade, 45-6, 56; de La Solaye, 325; Marsigli, ii, 138-9). At times ingenious devices seem to have been used for throwing earth excavated from the trenches forward into the fortress ditch (Bosio, iii, 614; Malta in 1565). Bridges or ramps of wooden beams plastered with wet earth as a defense against artificial fire aided the assault forces to cross the ditches and storm the walls (cf., at Rhodes in 1480, Bosio, iii, 327; and, at Malta in 1565, Cirni, 56v, 68r, also Bosio, iii, 547-8, 568, 609-10, 611).

The subterranean mines (lakhlmlar) hollowed out beneath the walls of a fortress might consist of several galleries each with its terminal chamber, often containing a large amount of gunpowder (cf. Evlîya Celebi, viii, 424: a mine with three galleries and three chambers; Naîmî, iv, 143: 150 sândâr of powder in a single mine; Montecuculî, 345: "des mines simples, doubles et triples l'une sur l'autre ... très profondes ... de 120 et de 150 barils de poudre et davantage"). See also, however, Scheiter, 72, who, in writing of the Ottoman mines at Candia in 1569-70, observes that "massen sie nicht den vierten Theil so viel als die Unserige gesprengt so auch nur die Ecken und Kanten und die meisten ohne sonderlichen Schaden abgelaufen". Numerous data on Ottoman mines are to be found in the sources for the war in Crete (1645-6)—cf. Narod, 1065; further references in Evlîya Celebi, v, 135 ("p Bushman bara in laghlmlar"); Râshîd, i, 143 ("kubdâlar ve pshumulalar ve laghlmlar"); also Bosio, iii, 618-9; J. D. Barovius, Commentarii de rebus Ungariciis, in M. G. Kovachich, Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum minores hacchnus inediti, Buda 1798, ii, 370; István Szamoskazy, Történeti Maradványai, ed. Sandor Szilágyi, Masodik Kötet (1598-9), in Magyar Történelmi Emleképek, I, 14; Budapest 1876, 176-7; Feldzüge des Prinzen Eugen, i, 623-4; Marsigli, ii, 37 ff.; and J. B. Schel, Militär-Verfassung des türkischen Reiches, in Oesterreichische Militärische Zeitschrift (Zweyte Auflage der Jahrgange 1811 und 1812, Bd. 2, Vienna, 1829, 325-6).

Ottoman siege warfare—practised with remarkable success at Constantiopole (1453), at Rhodes (1522) and, although without ultimate triumph, at Malta (1565), all fortresses of vast defensive strength—reached perhaps its culmination in the siege of Candia (1667-9). The techniques exemplified in this siege warfare derived in general from the procedures and methods current in Western Europe, experts of Christian origin holding from the first a vital rôle in

The success of the Ottomans at Candia and elsewhere also rested, however, on factors enabling them to excel in the practical and manual aspects of siege-craft such as the digging of trenches and emplacements or the preparation of mines,—i.e., on their command over large resources of human labour (e.g., ʿazab troops and levies amongst the local populations) and on the existence, within the empire, of skilled mining communities available for use in war (cf., in general, R. Anhegger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bergbaus im osmanischen Reich* (Istanbuler Schriften, nos. 2, 14 and 14a), Istanbul 1943-5; also Bârôn, 1063). Of like importance, moreover, was their access to vast quantities of the munitions (gunpowder, metals, timber, etc.) indispensable for siege warfare on the grand scale (cf. *Fieldsige des Prinzen Eugen*, i, 623).

And yet these factors tended to diminish in value, e.g., owing to the efforts of men like Vauban, a marked advance in the science of fortification. Austria, having acquired Belgrade in 1718, fortified the town anew. Among the French officers present—indeed said of their operations before Belgrade in 1739—that “ils ne se laissent pas gouverner des Ottomans acquire the latest techniques evolved in Europe—but it was also difficult for them to abandon methods which had for long been crowned with great and undeniable success. Of their grave misfortunes in war against Austria and Russia between 1683 and 1792 it can, with justice, be said—as it was indeed said of their operations before Belgrade in 1759—that “ils ne se laissent pas gouverner desChrétien, et ne se fient pas assez a eux, pour suivre leurs conseils” (de Warnery, 51-2). The old tradition of siege warfare was in fact becoming obsolete. It was imperative that the Ottomans acquire the latest techniques evolved in Europe—but it was also difficult for them to abandon methods which had for long been crowned with great and undeniable success. Of their grave misfortunes in war against Austria and Russia between 1683 and 1792 it can, with justice, be said—as it was indeed said of their operations before Belgrade in 1739—that “ils ne se laissent pas gouverner des

Bibliography: further to that given in the article: the Ottoman chronicles; J. Grzegorzekowski, *Z Siddâltâbat Rumelijîskih epokhi wyprawy Wiedenskiej. Akta Tureckie* (Archivio Nuovissimo, Dizial 1, vi/1), Lwow 1915; Kananos, Bonn 1838; Dukas, Bonn 1834; J. Cacavelas, *The Siege of Venice by the Turks in 1683*, ed. and trans. F. H. Marshall, Cambridge 1925; C. Dapontès, *Épinèdres Daces ou Chronique de la Guerre de Quatre Ans (1736-1739)*, ed. E. Legrand, Paris 1808-10, i, 260 f., ii, 266; *Giornale dell’assedio di Constantinopoli di Niccolò Barbaro*, ed. E. Cornet, Vienna 1856; Iacopo della Castellana, *Perdita di Negroponte, in Archivio Storico Italiano*, ser. 1, ix (Florence 1853), 433-40; F. Babinger, *Die Aufzeichnungen des Genuesen Iacopo de Promontorio-de Campis über den Osmanenstaat um 1475*, SBBayer. Abh., Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1956, Heft 8, Munich 1957; Donade de Letze, *Historia Turcheana (1300-1574)*, ed. I. Ursche, Bucharest 1909; M. Barletto, *Dell’assedio di Scutari*, in F. Sansovino, *Historia universale dell’origine et imperio de Turchi*, Venice 1573, 299-317; G. M. Laggetto, *Historia della Guerra di Otranto del 1480*, ed. L. Muscari, Maglie 1942; Jacques de Bourbon, *La grande et merveilleux et très cruelle oppugnation de la noble cité de Rhodes, Paris 1526; Iacobus Fontanus, *De Bello Rhodio libri tres*, in P. Lonicerus, *Chronicon Turcicum . . . tomos primus-(secundus)*, Frankfort 1584, ii, 381 ff.; M. Tercier, *Mémoire sur la prise . . . de Rhodes, en 1522* (Mémoires de Littérature . . . de l’Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, xxvi, Paris 1759); M. Sanuto, *I Diarii, xxii (Venice 1891), ii, 260 f., 279 ff.: the Venetian state could not be able to capture the fortress (de Warnery, *Remarques sur le Militaire des Turcs*). Of the most significant was the growth, in Europe, of better techniques for the manufacture of cannon. The disasters which befall the Ottoman armies during the Hungarian war of 1683-99—at the siege of Buda in 1686 no less than on the field of battle at Zenta in 1697—must be ascribed in no small degree to the effectiveness of the Christian field-guns (cf. *Mémoires du Maréchal de Villars*, ed. de Vogüé, i, Paris 1884, 380, where the Maréchal writes of the Ottomans that “leur artillerie de campagne est très belle et très bien servie, et c’est peut-être ce qui a le plus contribué aux avantages qu’ils ont remportés pendant cette guerre sur les Turcs”). At a later date Maurice de Saxe, bearing in mind perhaps the recent advances in fortification and also the appearance—as in the last phases of the Austrian Succession War (1740-8)—of cannon powerful enough to overcome the new defences (cf. G. von Scharnhorst, *Handbuch für Offiziere, Erster Teil: Artillerie*, Hanover 1804, i, r8), was constrained to observe of fortresses in general that “tous les anciens ne valent rien, les modernes ne valent guère mieux” (Maurice Corine de Saxe, *Mes réveries*, ed. Pérua, Amsterdam and Leipzig 1757, ii, 11). The old tradition of siege warfare was in fact becoming obsolete. It was imperative that the Ottomans acquire the latest techniques evolved in Europe—but it was also difficult for them to abandon methods which had for long been crowned with great and undeniable success. Of their grave misfortunes in war against Austria and Russia between 1683 and 1792 it can, with justice, be said—as it was indeed said of their operations before Belgrade in 1739—that “ils ne se laissent pas gouverner des Chrétien, et ne se fient pas assez à eux, pour suivre leurs conseils” (de Warnery, 51-2).
Walled towns and fortifications had existed in India long before the beginning of the Christian era; they increased in number from the 6th century A.D., when the Turkish and the Mughul method of warfare, which lay more in the active work of attack. It was only as a last resort that the Turks, Mughuls, and Rajputs sought refuge in their strongholds. Even then they did not seek to tire out the patience or the resources of the besiegers but often rushed out to give battle on a slight provocation from the assailants. Generally with no openings near the ground to be battered in, the forts had an almost endless capacity for passive resistance. Even a small garrison could hold out so long as its provisions lasted or it was not demoralized.

Fakhr-i Mudabbir, the earliest Turkish authority, who wrote on warfare under Ilutmish, attached the utmost importance to the use of stratagem and treachery and to winning over the besieged by promises. Şehr Khan in his early career obtained possession of Rohtas (945/1538) by treachery. Bands of soldiers were deployed by the besiegers to ravage the countryside, and the garrison was isolated from the outer world by cutting off supplies. Starvation was the one form of siege craft which the garrison was unable to withstand. Scaling-ladders, ladders and nooses remained in use till the end of the
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Jurnal de l’expédition de Monsieur de La Feuillade pour le secours de Candie. Par un Volontaire, Lyon 1669; . . . the fort by throwing in stones, logs, sand-bags etc. Rope-ladders and nooses remained in use till the end of the
Three hundred assailants scaled the ramparts of the Campānār fort on a moon-lit night by driving spikes into a smooth surface of the wall of the fort at a place discovered by Ḥumāyūn himself, who had seen a party of grain dealers emerging from the thicket which surrounded the fort (943/1536). Only very active espionage or a sheer stroke of luck saved the garrison from the disastrous consequences of such surprises. Attempts were made to secure entrance by battering a way in with very heavy timber about 6 inches thick, plated and studded with sharp iron spikes of different shapes 3 to 13 inches long, arranged in horizontal tiers and further strengthened by large battens behind. 

Along with the above devices pāshīb and gargaḍī were constructed by the besiegers to breach the fortresses with mandjanīb or 'arrdās, and later with mortars. The pāshīb was a raised platform constructed by filling the space between the top of the fort wall and the base of the besieger's camp below, with bags of sand or earth. Gargaḍīes were movable towers, such as 'Allāl-Dīn used in the siege of Ranthambhār. They were similar to the sarkob or mukābīl kob which Rūmī Khān constructed on large boats on the Ganges (945/1538) for battering in the walls of Ĉunar, as it could not be captured from the parts lying on the land-side. These towers were very strong structures with solid beams covered by raw hides, tiles, or earth to protect them from the liquid combustibles thrown by the garrison. They could be destroyed only by hurling heavy stones or by a sortie. Sābūt, which is also mentioned by Amir Khusrāw, "is a word", according to Niẓām al-Dīn Ahmad Bakhtshī, "used to express two walls, the foundations of which are laid at a distance of about one musket-shot (from the fort), and under the protection of planks, which are fastened together by raw hides, and are made strong, and forming something like a lane are carried to the wall of the fort". Ten horsemen could ride abreast inside the sābūt which was carried forward from Akbar's battery for the conquest of Citor (975/ 1567-8). A man mounted on an elephant and with a spear in his hand could pass inside it. Mandjanīb and 'arrdās were also used by the besiege and besieged. The workers drew its chain or rope back with the ballista, was a magnified form of cross-bow, and was used for discharging heavy bolts and long shafts at objects out of the range of ordinary arrows and spears, and could break through the base of the wall or the bastion. The loda (heap) ensured a more perfect use of the bows and arrows; mantelets, shields and a temporary wall of planks or earth protected the workers who were employed to work the siege-engines from the fire or stone hurled by the besiegers. Fālākhāns or gophāns (slingers) were also used for discharging stones and lighter missiles. Other implements required by the besiegers were palisades, fire-shovels, pick-axes and spades. Besides stones, boiling pitch, naphtha and darts were generally used as missiles.

The use of artillery in the 10th/16th and the 11th/17th centuries did not greatly lighten the task of besiegers. At the siege of Ĉandīl (934/1528) the stone discharge of the mortar could produce no tangible result. During the assault on Ray Sēn (950/1543) all the brass that could be procured from the bazaar and the tents of the besiegers (pots, dishes and drinking vessels) had to be used for mortars, which bombarded the fort from all directions. Though Akbar had, at the siege of Ranthambhār, had sābūt prepared, fifteen culverins, each of which could discharge boulders weighing five maunds and seven maunds and haft ḥāṭīb (made of seven metals) balls, were carried by 500 labourers to the top of the hill and placed opposite the fort for bombarding the citadel. The defending garrison, along with musket and cannon fire, rolled down large masses of stone from hill fortresses, which bounded along with great velocity and crushed to pieces all those on whom they fell, and the assailants were swept down.

Mining was certainly the most effective of all the devices for capturing a stronghold not situated on solid rocks or high ground. Muḥammad b. Ǧāsim sought to demolish the walls of Rāwar Fort in Sindh (92/1712) through mining. Amir Māsūf had mines sprung at five places in the walls of the fort of Ḥānsī before it could be stormed (428/1037). The best device which the besieged could employ against mining was to counter-mine and fill up the cavity. Ǧāmbar Diwānā, who was besieged in the fort of Badāūn at the end of Ḥumāyūn's reign (962/1555), was able to detect the mine that was being dug from outside the fort by putting his ears to the ground, exactly at the spot where the finishing touches were being given to it by the besiegers, and so thwarted their efforts. Before the invention of gun-powder the cavity was filled with straw, wood and other combustible material. When the beams which supported the cavity were burnt, the wall collapsed into the hole, and a breach was produced. Subsequently the mine was filled with gun-powder and fuses were laid. Often more than one mine was laid to ensure speedy reduction of the fort, but the process was nevertheless fraught with grave risks. At the siege of Ĉitor (December 1567), Akbar had two mines laid under the bastions which were close to each other. Fire was set to both simultaneously but the match of one, being shorter, exploded earlier, hurling that bastion into the air. The Mughuls were thus crushed forward of the area that needed to be breached. At that moment, the fire reached the other mine and the second bastion was also blown up, killing a large number of the imperial forces. The countermining done by the officers of Abu 'l-Ḥasan, the ruler of Golkonda, proved highly disastrous to the Mughuls, who had carried three mines from the siege trenches under the bastion. The garrison quietly abstracted all the powder with the fuses from one
mine and leaving some powder in the other two, filled them with water. The explosion from the two mines caused terrible havoc to the imperial forces, while the firing of the third mine was a fiasco.


**Hişar**, in Turkish 'castle, fortress, citadel, stronghold', a common component of place-names in Turkey. The best-known are the two castles which control the narrowest point of the Bosphorus [see Boghaz-ile]; on the Asiatic side Anadolu Hisari [q.v.], also called in earlier times Güzel Hisar ('beautiful castle'), on the European side Rumeli Hisari [q.v.], also called Boghaz-Kesen ('the barrier of the Bosphorus'). The former, situated between Karabati and Kunela, was built by the Ottoman sultan Bayezid I in 1797-1395 in preparation for the siege of Constantinople which he was planning; the latter, situated between Bebek and Emirgan, was built by Mehmed II in 1865 to 1452 at the beginning of his reign and for the same purpose, to block the passage through the Bosphorus of grain ships from the Crimea.

Hişar is further found as a component of numerous place-names in Anatolia, notably: Karakılıvars, a ruined site south of Eskişehir; Ayvonkarahisar ('Opium black castle'), in east Anatolia (in the vilayet of Giresun); Şebinkarahisar ('Alum black castle') in north-east Anatolia (in the vilayet of Giresun); Develikarahisar [vil. Kayseri]; Güzelhisar Ayyun (nowadays called only Aynun, chef-lieu of the vilayet), the ancient Travels; Akhisar ('White castle', [vil. Manisa]; Köchhisar ('Rams' castle'), near Tuz gölü, [vil. Ankara] Eskı Hisar, a ruined castle near Gebze, which occupies the site of the ancient Lybysia; Koyulhisar on the Kelkit, [vil. Sivas]; Sivrihisar ('Pointed castle', [vil. Eskişehir]; Uzhisar ('Frontier castle') and ortahisar ('Middle castle'), places in the cave-district of Usgup-Göreme (vil. Kayseri). Ibn Battuta mentions (ii, 269 = tr. Gibb, ii, 42a) a Kulhisar (î.e., probably Göllüşar, 'Lake castle') in the Mütessarifate of Hisar, which is now ordered to be destroyed, its name having been changed from Kulp to the name Hisar. The name Hisar was first used in the thirteenth century, and is now found in many other place-names in the district.

The region was first opened up for scientific investigation by a Russian expedition in 1875. The last of its governors, İbrahim Beg, of the Tătălisk family, died in 1926. Then in 1926 he retreated through Tadjikistan to the USSR from 1929). The ancient saffron industry has died out. In the 19th century corn and flax were the principal crops. In the 20th century there was a substantial production of silk and silk poplin, and of cotton. The southern border of the beglik of Hisar extended to the Alai mountains; thus the southern watershed of the Zarafshân valley acquired the name of Hisar mountains (with elevations of up to 5700 m).
HIŞAR — HIŞAR FIROZĀ

Moscow 1958; W. Leimbach, Sowjetunion, Stuttgart 1950, 40, 72 (mountains); Brockhaus-Efron, Encycl. (New Series), most of which have (contour map, with illustrations). (B. SPULER)

HIŞAR, 'ABD AL-ḤÂKIM ŞÎNÂŞÎ (mod. Turk. Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar), 1888-1963, Turkish writer, born in Rumelihisar, a summer village on the European shores of the Bosphorus. His family were of the upper-class Ottoman Civil Service. His father Maḥmûd Dîjalî al-Dîn was an enlightened modernist of his day having had two years' education in Paris and being the editor of various literary magazines, particularly of Khašiye-Ewërâk, to which leading writers of the Tanẓīmât School and their followers contributed. An ardent supporter of modernism, he named his eldest son 'Abd al-Ḥâkîm Şînâsî, a combination of the names of the pioneer Tanẓîmât writers (Ibrahim) Şînâsî and 'Abd al-Ḥâkîm Hâmid [q.v.]. (His second son Selim Nûzhet Gergek, 1893-1943, was the author of well-documented books on the history of the Turkish theatre and printing).

Abdülhak's mother was a descendant of Ottoman paşas. Her grand-father was the last commander of the Fortress of Belgrade. His childhood was spent in turn in their yâls at Rumelihisar, or on Büyükada, the island resort of the Marmara, and on the slopes above Çâmlica, where he witnessed all the fading splendour of the Ottoman upper-classes at the turn of the century, which he was later to evoke so vividly in most of his works. In 1894 he went to Beirut to join his father, temporarily exiled there by the Turks there and became acquainted with French employee in various foreign and Turkish private firms.

From the 1930's onwards he accepted various Government posts in Ankara, mainly in an advisory capacity, on foreign affairs. He retired in 1948 and settled in an apartment in Beyoğlu (his yâl in Rumelihisar had been burnt down in the 1920's). He died in 1963.

Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar is, in many ways, a very unusual writer. Although he started his career as a poet at the end of the First World War and wrote many critical articles and essays, he was appreciated mainly from 1920 his contemporaries had already made their names as novelists or poets. But in 1941, at the age of 53, he swept to fame overnight, upon the publication of his first novel Fâhim Bey ve bîz (1941), German tr. by Fr. von Rummel Unser gute Fâhim Bey (Copenhagen 1954), French tr. by B. de Siyêtves (Paris 1961). It won third prize for the best novel competition in the French section of the 'Bektâşî meşîsplârî' ('The moonlight on the Bosphorus' 1942), an evocative description and detailed narrative of the traditional Turkish pleasures: rowing-boats on the Bosphorus, originating in the 17th century, which consisted of Oriental music and serenades and which were held on three or four occasions each summer; (3) Çamlıca'daki enîsiye (Our brother-in-law at Çamlıca' 1944), a series of sketches loosely connected in the form of a novel about life on the Çamlıca hillside overlooking Istanbul and the Bosphorus, with picturesque descriptions of landscape and the character study of a strange man with Oriental tastes and habits, his superstitions and love affairs in a Tanẓīmât villa, which comes to life with all its decor, furniture and people; (4) Ali Nisâmi Beyin alâfrangâ- işi ve seyîkîşî (1952), the story of a young westernizing snob, a born-vivant who in the early 1900's, after spending a reckless life in the cosmopolitan society of Büyükada, ruins himself and becomes unbalanced, ending up as a Bektaşı 'Baba' in a tumble-down 'convent' on Çamlıca Hill; (5) بوشَیْجَتْیُة يَارًا (1954), a description of these typical summer residences on the Bosphorus and the care-free and relaxed life of the Ottomans upper-classes in them, with personal reminiscences of some of the most famous sea-side villas of the period; (6) Ask imiş her ne var âlemde (1955): the title is taken from the famous couplet of Fuğûlî: 'Ask imiş her ne var âlemde? [I realized at last that] everything in the world is nothing but Love, and Learning is but gossip', an anthology of popular quotations (single verses or couplets) mainly from dîvâns poets on topics of love, beauty, wine, separation, etc.; (7) Geçmiş zaman köşkleri (1956), the description of some typical old Ottoman villas where the author had lived as a child in Büyükada and Çâmlica and his reminiscences about the life, customs, people and setting of these villas; (8) Geçmiş zaman şehrâlari (1958), a collection of anecdotes, mostly humorous, on the Ottoman period, covering mostly the 19th century; (9) İstanbul ve Pierre Lohi (1958), a guide with bibliography to the well-known French Turcopilhes writer's works on Turkey, his life among the Turks and the memories associated with him; (10) Yahya Kemal'te veda (‘Farewell to Yahya Kemal', 1959) and (11) Ahmed Haşim (1963), the author's personal reminiscences and appreciation of these two leading poets, who were his contemporaries and with whom he was closely associated.

Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar's complete works are now (1966) being published by the Istanbul publishers Varlık.

Bibliography: S. S. Uysal, Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar, İstanbul 1961; Behcet Necatgil, Edebiyat-ısmiye ve sûret-sizâgül, İstanbul 1966; Yakub Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Gençlik ve edebiyat haftalarları, in Hayat, August 1965 (valuable new data on Hisar's youth, which shed light on his later work).

(FAHR İz)

HIŞAR FİROZĀ, (now simply known as Hissor; Anglo Indian: Hisâr), a citadel town in the Indian Pandžâb, situated in 29° 10' N. and 75° 44' E. on the railway from Lahore to Delhi via Bhatânāda.
It is the headquarters of the district, of the same name, which lies in a dry sandy plain, known from ancient times as Hariana. It was originally known as the Ilisar-i Firuzabad, with a large tank that formed the citadel. In 1212/1797 by a European military adventurer, Sir Edward Ferbrary, London 1921, index; Storey, i/2, 677 (q.v.).
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It is the headquarters of the district, of the same name, which lies in a dry sandy plain, known from ancient times as Hariana. It was originally known as the Ilisar-i Firuzabad, with a large tank that formed the citadel. In 1212/1797 by a European military adventurer, Sir Edward Ferbrary, London 1921, index; Storey, i/2, 677 (q.v.).
The duality in the meaning of ḥiṣba is the reason why information on it is found in such a diversity of sources. Apart from the allusions to muḥāṣbās which can be found in chronicles, biographical dictionaries, etc., information on one meaning of ḥiṣba is found in all that has been written on public morality and against ẓida' (such as the Maddah of Ibn Ḥāḍidī), and in all that has been written on trade or commercial law. We shall limit ourselves here to mentioning those works of which ḥiṣba, in one or the other of its meanings, is the primary and formal subject. They can be divided broadly into two categories, which do, however, overlap to a certain extent. Some works deal in a general way with the content of the virtue of ḥiṣba, the obligations arising from it for the muḥāṣbās, and the religious and juridical aspects of the office. The others set out mainly to enlighten the muḥāṣbās on the practical and technical details of the supervision which he must exercise; and, since this supervision applied principally to the various crafts and trades, these works are practical guides to the administrative control of the professions. We shall attempt to give a detailed list of the latter works, whereas for the former a very general mention will suffice.

The works which include a general examination of the ḥiṣba are in fact very numerous, but it is remarkable that they first appear only in the 11th century, i.e., two centuries after the appearance of the office. The two principal works are al-Ākhām al-sulṭānīyya of al-Mawardī, ch. xx, chiefly juridical (which, however, refers, though sometimes to refuse it, to an earlier treatise by the Shāfiʿī muḥāṣbās of Baghdad at the beginning of the 11th century, Abū Saʿīd al-Īṣṭaʿgharī, and the Ḥaḍāʾi al-dīn of al-Ghazālī, i, 269 f., which is chiefly moral. Among the other writers there should be mentioned the early and Spanish Ibn Ḥazm (al-Fāṣīl fī l-miʿāl, iv, 171 f.; and then, later: under the Mamluks, the Hājjī al-Tanbih al-hukkām fī l-ahkām, 910); it is probably not accidental that a treatise of this sort was produced among the Zaydis, who attached such importance to the precise interpretation of the Law, but its contents suffer from the backwardness of the economic and social situation of Tabaristan within the framework of which it was conceived.

There exists no real treatise of ḥiṣba in the exact meaning of the word until the end of the 9th/11th century in the West (particularly in Spain) and the end of the 12th century in the East (Syria and Egypt); none has been recorded earlier than these or in any other countries. Those which are known are the following:


(B) In the East: Several eastern treatises, slightly more substantial than those of the West, have as their prototype the Niḥayāt al-ʿutba fī ṭalāb al-ḥiṣba, of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Naṣr al-Shayzari (d. 589/1193) (ed. with Fr. tr. under the name of Nabrāwī by Bernhauser, Les institutions de police chez les Arabes ... , in JA, 1860-61; good modern ed. by al-ʿAcrīnī, Cairo 1946); these are, first, the longer treatise of the same title by Ibn Bassām (7th/13th century, composed in Syria or Egypt), analysed by Cheikhī in al-Maḍāriq, x (1907), and, still more detailed, the Maʿāṣīm al-kurba fī ʿl-ākhām al-ḥiṣba by the Egyptian Ibn al-Ukhbūwna (beginning of the 8th/14th century, ed. with abridged Eng. tr. by R. Levy, GMS, N.S. xii (1936)); then a series of other works, the majority of which are apparently only works-overviews and agreements which have been referred to as having been just mentioned, sometimes attributed to false authors (al-Mawardī), but the manuscripts of which, being still unpublished and not studied, cannot at present be classified: see the articles by M. Guadelfroy-Demondbynes in JA, ccxxii (1938) and K. ʿAwād, in RAAD, xviii (1943) and, for the K. al-ḥiṣba of Ibn ʿAbd al-Hādī (d. 909/1503), the note by Ḥābib Zaytūt in al-Khizna al-Sharkīyya, ii (1937), 172. For the
In addition to these treatises, there exist some diplomas of appointment of muhtasib, which (explicit reference to this is found in Ibn Bashkuwal, and many examples, among others, in the Bayān of Ibn 'Idhāri). But from the time it is possible to describe the details of the office, there appears no great difference between the two halves of the Muslim world.

The classical muhtasib then was characterised by the integration of his task as controller of the market with the broader duty, basically religious, of maintaining the seemingly orderly of social life.

The division between his duties and those of the kādī and the chief of the ġurta (q.v.) was not strictly defined, and the distinction lay, in certain matters, less in their intrinsic nature than in the method by which they were approached: the kādī judged matters concerning which there had been a complaint and held an inquiry to discover the truth, and the ġurta intervened in cases of public authority which did not hold an inquiry, but intervened of his own accord, without waiting for a complaint. The questions with which he had to concern himself were in general decided at a fairly early date by a usage which has scarcely varied up to the present day; none of them was purely formal but it goes without saying that, apart from the affairs of the sūk, the way in which he carried out some of his obligations depended very much on the social background and on his own personal character. Apart from the sūk, they can be divided into three groups: the muhtasib had to supervise the performance of religious obligations (public attendance at the Prayers, the proper use and upkeep of the mosques), the propriety of the behaviour between the sexes in the streets (and at the baths), and finally the application of discriminatory measures against the dhimmis. And cases are cited of a courageous muḥtasib's even criticizing kādīs who had judged wrongly or denouncing doctors guilty of teaching which did not conform with the ijma'.

As far as the public is concerned however the basic and permanent duty of the muhtasib was the control of the sūk. This duty above all came to be formally defined with the early economic conditions. The most important documentation for the study of the sūk is the sūk, a sāhib al-sūk could not have appeared without inspiration from outside.

However this may be, about the time of the caliphate of al-Mā'mūn, the sāhib al-sūk was replaced by the muhtasib, a name which until then had been used only in connotation with the office of ḱīsa. This change in nomenclature evidently took place within the framework of the Islamization of institutions carried out by the 'Abbāsid, particularly during the period of the Mu'tazila; but it is difficult to tell to what extent there really took place a transformation in the spirit and the content of the office of ḱīsa. The change having occurred in the East after the split in the Muslim world between East and West, the title of sāhib al-sūk remained predominant in the Magrib and in Spain, while the idea of ḱīsa was adopted primarily by the West and later (see BSOAS, xiv, 38) and the ḱūb al-ʿagāʾib of Aḥmad b. Ḥarīm, xii, 339, and extracts passim; probably many others could be found.

Such are the sources on which a study of the ḱīsa can be based. In its broad sense this is therefore the obligation incumbent in principle on every Muslim to promote good and to combat evil. He may do this in the normal course of events by information and remonstrance, more particularly by legal intervention, and, in special circumstances, in the case of absence of public authority, by constraint if he is able to do so—even, according to Ibn Ḥazm, in the case of a public authority which is not valid, by revolt against it. In reality the obligation is only theoretical, subordinate to the duty of the Muslim to do as well as possible in the situation, and he is forbidden to set himself up in place of the public authority when this exists. The idea of ḱīsa, therefore, although it can play a certain rôle in social behaviour, has in practice only an insignificant influence and it is difficult to understand in what conditions its theory nevertheless developed.

The origin, apparently very old, of the office of ḱīsa is no clearer. Originally neither the word ḱīsa nor muhtasib was used, but instead the term sāhib (or ʿāmil) al-sūk for the latter. Thus there are two questions: that of the origin of the sāhib al-sūk and that of his transformation into the muhtasib. It is generally admitted that the former was the successor of the agoramonos of the Hellenistic cities: his duties were broadly similar and the Arabic expression can be seen as a translation of the Greek term. However, there exists no record of the agoramonos in the inscriptions which have been recorded years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index), and it is possible that both the office and the name were introduced in the Muslim period without there being any connexion: the name may have survived in popular use (as is suggested by its appearance in the Greek inscriptions for three hundred years before the Arab conquest (Pauly-Wissowa; West and Johnson, Byzantine Egypt, 1955, index).
indulge in any operation which was connected with the prohibited practice of usury (riba). His competence extended even to professions which we should not nowadays normally consider as being connected with the sakā: he thus controlled apothecaries and physicians, and in the schools warned or punished any masters who were excessively severe. The mukhtasib did not go beyond the limits of the town however, and consequently the mudāfic, or traders with other districts, did not come under his control.

There is one point concerning this economic-moral activity which should be stressed in relation to Islam under its form as practised in the mukhtasib. He checked prices but he did not normally have power to fix them. He reprimanded and even punished the merchant whose prices were higher than the accepted rate and, particularly in periods of scarcity, he dealt severely with hoarding; but the Law considers that prices are determined by God, i.e. are beyond the scope of human authorities. In a period of famine, however, the power of the mukhtasib, as of the muft, was more especially felt. For there to be collaboration between the muft, the kadi, the hisba, or the professional organization; yet in fact he was sometimes known to be a (and in Islam the only) municipal official: however he was no more than was the ḫādi by nature of his office, since he was not appointed by any urban or professional organization; yet in fact he was concerned specifically and exclusively with urban matters.

The mukhtasib was appointed by the State, sometimes directly, more often through the governors or the ḫādis, to whom it delegated officially the function of hisba, not, in principle, in order that they should perform it themselves, but so that they might ensure the security or which impeded the passage of pedestrians or vehicles. He was responsible for the cleansing of the streets and, if necessary, for the repair of the city walls, for ensuring the supply and regular distribution of water, etc. . . . All these are duties which have sometimes caused the mukhtasib to be considered as a (and in Islam the only) municipal official: however he was no more than was the ḫādi by nature of his office, since he was not appointed by any urban or professional organization; yet in fact he was concerned specifically and exclusively with urban matters.

The mukhtasib was appointed by the State, sometimes directly, more often through the governors or the ḫādis, to whom it delegated officially the function of hisba, not, in principle, in order that they should perform it themselves, but so that they might ensure the security or which impeded the passage of pedestrians or vehicles. He was responsible for the cleansing of the streets and, if necessary, for the repair of the city walls, for ensuring the supply and regular distribution of water, etc. . . . All these are duties which have sometimes caused the mukhtasib to be considered as a (and in Islam the only) municipal official: however he was no more than was the ḫādi by nature of his office, since he was not appointed by any urban or professional organization; yet in fact he was concerned specifically and exclusively with urban matters.

The mukhtasib was in general considered as a specialist subordinate of the ḫādi, and the recruitment of the holders of hisba was made from among persons of lesser importance, the being less esteemed than that of ḫādi (for it sometimes served as a preliminary step).

In the majority of Muslim states the mukhtasib of the capital was invested with a certain responsibility for the supervision of those of the provincial towns. At the beginning of the 7th/13th century, the caliph al-Nāṣir, within the framework of his general policy of a theoretical and religious unification of Islam under his own guidance, tried at least in the Near East, a general control over the hisba, which however did not really materialize (see Orients, vi (1953), 21).

The penalties which the mukhtasib could inflict without resort to other juridical authorities were normally, after a reprimand, beating and a parade in disgrace through the streets; incorrect weights and measures and faulty products might be confiscated; in exceptional cases, repeated offenders might be forbidden to continue to exercise their profession or even be banished.

At the end of the Middle Ages, with the economic decline and the social crises then existing, the office of mukhtasib often declined in esteem. Under the Mamluks, it was, like other offices, obtained by payment, the purchaser recouping himself from the merchants by means of illegal taxes. There were frequent quarrels between the candidates, for example being the well-known one between al-Mañzal and al-‘Āyni; and it sometimes happened that, for mercenary reasons or out of concern for efficiency, the post was given, against all tradition, to a member of the military class.

The mukhtasib continued to exist throughout the greater part of the Muslim world until the reforms of the modern period; he still existed for example at the beginning of the 20th century in Morocco and at Bukhārā. From the Saldjukid period, in Irano-Turkish territory and occasionally elsewhere, the office was more usually called iktisāb, the name of hisba being reserved for the virtue which the holder must exhibit (see next section). The Latin East which arose from the Crusades adopted it in a limited and lay form called the "mathesis". The sources and the modern works about them have been mentioned in the article. There is as yet no general and thorough study of the subject as a whole. The main work, chiefly juridical, is that of E. Tyan in the final chapter of his Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire en Islam, ii, 1943, together with the reviews of it by M. Gaudreoy-Demombynes, in Journal des Savants, 1947, J. Sauvaget, in JA, cccxxvi (1948), 309-11, and J. Schacht, in Orientalia, xvii (1948), 518. See also the prefaces by E. Lévi-Provençal and Maḥmūd Ḵaṭṭākh "Al-Makkī to their editions and the recent restatement by J. Schacht in his Introduction to Islamic Law", 1966, index, and bibliography pp. 231-2. There is a useful chapter by A. Darrag in L'Egypte sous le règne de Barsbay, 1965, 70-82. N. Ziyada, al-Ḥisba wa-l-mukhtasib fi 'l-Islām, 1954, is of value chiefly as a collection of texts. Imāmuddin, al-Ḥisba in Spain, in IC, 1963, gives biographies of Andalusian mukhtasibs. See also the article mukhtasib in EI1 (R. Levy). The works devoted to the Muslim town of course mention the mukhtasib; they cannot all be cited here but from our point of view there should be mentioned especially G. Maqrīz, Con-
The term *ihtisāb* does not occur in the registers and documents of the Ottoman Empire, but among the officials we find *ihtisāb*, an official term used both in the capital and in the provinces, its basic meaning being the levying of dues and taxes, both on traders and artisans and also on certain imports. However, the word *ihtisāb* finally came to denote the whole aggregate of functions that had devolved upon the *muḥtāsīb* or *ihtisāb āqāsī* (more rarely *ihtisāb emīnī*); it has often been translated as “market police”, which indeed is one of the functions of the *ihtisāb*; as late as 1924–25, there were still 75 *ihtisāb* functions on the books of the Istanbul Court of Justice, including that of “inspector of markets”, but his exact responsibility went beyond that of merely superintending and inspecting markets and members of the trade-guilds. The regulations concerning the duties of the *muḥtāsīb* were codified in the *ihtisāb kanānnāmeleri*, in which that official could find everything relating to his duties of supervision, inspection, punishment and, particularly in regard to the provinces, of the levying of taxes. These regulations included on the one hand a list of the prices (*narkh-i rūzi*—see *nārkeh*) which had to be observed for the sale of commodities, manufactured or other articles, the permitted profit margins, and the penalties to be exacted from delinquent traders and artisans; they also gave the total amount or the percentage of the taxes, duties, and other contributions collected in the name of the *ihtisāb* and levied on the members of the trade-guilds. A reminiscence of the original function of the *muḥtāsīb* is to be found in certain articles in these regulations, in which that official could in certain cases in these regulations, in which that official could...
iii.—PERSIA

The muhtasib and his office, the hisba (or ihtisâb), together with many other offices of the religious institution, continued to be found in the various empires and kingdoms formed in Persia after the break-up of the Abbâsîd caliphate. It did not finally disappear until the 19th century. Public morals and the due performance by Muslims of their religious duties were under the general care of the muhtasib. He was also charged with the oversight of Islam might be called public amenities. He was not to allow slaves to be ill-treated or animals overburdened. It was also his duty to see that dhimmis complied with the regulations imposed upon them to distinguish them from Muslims. His main task, however, was to oversee the markets and prevent dishonest dealing by merchants and artisans and to exercise supervision over the guilds and corporations. He was empowered to inflict summary punishment on offenders (see further R. Levy, The social structure of Islam, Cambridge 1957, 334 ff.).

Nîzâm al-Mulk states that a muhtasib should be appointed in every city to oversee weights and prices, to watch over commercial transactions, to see that passage along the streets be in trouble and the people of the bazaar would buy and sell as they liked, middle-men (faddla-khur) would become dominant, corruption open, and the ghari'â without prestige" (Siyyâsat-nâmeh, ed. Scherer, Persian text, 41). Hüsâyîn Wâ'îsKhâshir, (d. 910/1505), who wrote under the Timurids, regards the existence of the muhtasib as a guarantee that public life would be conducted in accordance with the precepts of Islam. He writes, "Every sultan who strives to put into practice the precepts of the ghari'a and to execute the decrees of religion is the deputy of God and His shadow upon earth. But since the sultan, by virtue of the multiplicity of state affairs, cannot look into the details of this matter [the execution of the decrees of religion] he must appoint muhtasibs in his kingdom. The muhtasib must be strong in the faith and powerful in his zeal for Islam, and distinguished by virtue (yifsa), abstinence, trustworthiness, uprightness, and lack of greed. Whatever he does he should do for the strengthening of religion, and he should be free from ulterior motives, hypocrisy, self-seeking, and lust, so that what he says may impress itself upon the hearts of men" (Ashâb-i Muḥsini, ed. Mirzâ Brâhîm Tâdîr Shahrâ'i, lith., Bombay 1908, 159).


(R. MANTRAN)
officials administering customary law ("umrdz-i curf") were ordered to refrain from interfering in the fixing of prices and to see that the muhtasib was paid the customary dues of his office (see A. K. S. Lambton, Islamic society in Persia, (inaugural lecture), London (S.O.A.S.), 1954).

The chief muhtasib of the kingdom was known as the muhtasib al-mamlik. This office under Tahmasp was held by an Astarabadi, Mir Sayyid Ali, who was also the khali of the royal court, and later by a Tabatabai sayyid, Mir Dja'far, who was succeeded on his death in the reign of Shah 'Abbâs by Mirza 'Abd al-Husayn, formerly the khalâlân of Tâbriz (Iskandar Beg, 'Alam-âd-dî-'Abbâs, lith., Tehran 1896-7, 111-2). According to the Tâghkhatar al-mulûkh an undertaking from the elders of each guild concerning the prices of the goods they sold was submitted month by month to the muhtasib al-mamlâk for his approval. He then sent this to the nâşir-i buyûdî (the superintendent of the royal workshops) for his confirmation so that documents for the purchase of goods might be drawn up. Contravention of this price-list was visited by heavy penalties (ed. V. Minorsky, GMS, Persian text, ff. 79b-80a).

Chardin, who travelled in Persia in late Safavid times, states that prices were fixed in Isfahân every Saturday by the muhtasib and that any vendor exceeding the prices fixed was liable to heavy penalties. But he also alleges that there was corruption over the settling of prices and that vendors gave the muhtasib presents to induce him to fix prices at a high level (Voyages, ed. Langlès, Paris 1812, x, 2 ff.).

The muhtasib al-mamlâk appointed deputies to act on his behalf to ensure that the guilds sold their goods in each place at the prices fixed (Tâghkhatar al-mulûkh, I. 80b). He was paid 50 tânâns per annum and in addition levies on various provincial towns, totalling some 253 tânâns 5,000 dinârs, were made in his favour (ibid., II. 90a-b).

After the Safavid period the office of muhtasib appears to have declined and to have become increasingly secularized. Those of his functions which were concerned with the administration of shar'i law were in effect removed from his competence and administered by the maradîs al-taklîd. These functions included the collection of khums and zakât, the administration of inheritances and wills, and the supervision of guardians for minors and others, matters which were known collectively as umur-i fysbi. The maradîs issued idjâza for the supervision on their behalf of the umûr-i hizbi. The qualifications required by the recipient of such an idjâza were that he should be a believer (mu'min), 'just' (dâlid), and instructed in the decrees (âhkâm) of the shar'î. He was permitted to retain from the sums he collected by way of khums and zakât enough for his subsistence; the remainder was to be handed over to the maradî who had issued his idjâza for its distribution among those who had a right to it.

So far as the muhtasib's functions in relation to the guilds in the large cities and to the cleanliness of the city were concerned, they were to some extent taken over by the dârâgha and the kalânârs. His duties were increasingly restricted to the regulation of prices and the inspection of weights and measures, but in this he was subject to the orders of the dârâgha (cf. E. Scott Waring, A tour to Sheeras, London 1807, 68-9). Tancocke, like Chardin, alleges that the muhtasib was not inaccessible to bribery and often consented to sell his protection to dealers (A narrative of a journey into Persia, London 1820, 239-40). During the course of the 19th century the muhtasib disappeared in most cities. Binning, writing about 1857, states that the office had recently been abolished in Shâh rz (A journal of two years travel in Persia, Ceylon, etc. London 1857, I, 337-8). In Isfâhân the office had ceased to be in effective operation by 1294/1877-8 (Mirzâ Husayn Khân b. Muhammad Ibrâhîm, Dirghâfrîyâ-yi Isfahân, ed. M. Sutûdeh, Tehran 1963, 80). The traditional dues levied for the payment of the muhtasib nevertheless continued to appear in the tax-rolls for many years after the office had, in effect, disappeared. By the law of 20 Ashar 1309/1929 an item of 150 hîrâns levied on the guild of butchers in Tehran for the year 1312/1933 the muhtasib was abolished (The second yearbook of the municipal society of Tehran: statistics of the city of Tehran for the years 1925 to 1929).

There is mention of an ihtisâb-âbâsî in Tehran in the year 1853. His functions were inter alia to issue lists of prices for foodstuffs and other goods (cf. Râznâmâ-i Wâbidî-yi Ihtisâbîyâ, No. 127, 29 Ramadân 1267/1853). The office which he belonged to was known as the ihtisâb and its main duty was the cleaning of the streets. Shortly after a police administration on modern lines was set up by Nâşir al-Dîn Shâh in 1298/1880 the ihtisâb was placed under its jurisdiction (I'timâd al-Saltana, Râznâmâ, under dateline 5 Şafar 1299/1881, ms. in the library of the Shrine of the Imam Rîdâ at Mâghhad). In 1312/1894-5 the ihtisâb department in Tehran consisted of a director, two deputy-directors, and a number of subordinate officials, farâghehs, stable-men, and water-carriers, etc. (I'timâd al-Saltana, 'Tarîh wa Dirghâfrîyâ-yi Sa'âdâbîkh, lith., Tehran 1321, appendix). An item in the newspaper Tarbiyât, No. 58, 26 Şafar 1315/30 January 1898, addressed to Munazzam al-Saltana, the wâriz-i nâmîyiyya wa ihtisâbîyâ, praises him for his efforts to clean the streets, to facilitate passage through them, to modify prices, to prevent evil conduct and theft, and to prevent the ill-treatment of [pack] animals. Thus, by the end of the 19th century the muhtasib as an official of the religious institution in charge of the public conscience had ceased to exist, and such of his functions as survived were taken over by the police administration.

The umûr-i hizbi continued to be administered during the 19th and early 20th centuries under the supervision of the guilds of bankers, etc., but after the institution of modern courts during the reign of Rîdâ Shah Pahlavi the umûr-i hizbi were restricted to the collection of khums and zakât; such matters as the administration of inheritances and wills, the care of minors, appointment of guardians, etc., were transferred to the courts (see the law entitled Rînâm-i umûr-i hizbi, dated Tir 1319/1940).

**Bibliography:** In the article.

(A. K. S. LAMBTON)

iv.—The Indian subcontinent

The institution of hisba in the strict classical sense did not exist in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent during the period from the 5th/11th century to the 13th/19th century. The main obstacle was the complexion of the population, the majority of whom were non-Muslims. Except for Baluch (664/1266-688/1287), Firuz Shâh Tughluq (752/1351-790/1388), Sikandar Lodi (894/1489-92/1517) and Awrangzib 'Alamgir [q.v.], and they too only in certain respects, none of the Muslim rulers of India ever attempted to enforce the shar'î law, either for fear of disaffectioning the local Hindu population or by way of political expediency, of which the many
heretical measures adopted by Akbar [q.v.] are a glaring example. From the very beginning of their rule in India, the Muslims, situated as they were in India, could not be allowed to grow lax in religion or morals except at the expense of the solidarity, integrity, and, at times, the very existence of their newly established state. Hence, wherever a Muslim colony was established or a town garrisoned, a hisba and a bd$i [q.v.] were invariably appointed (cf. Minhâijd-i Sultan-i Firuzshâdi, fol. 198, 702/1305; Târîkh-i Yâmanî, 288; Tâdî al-ma'âdîrîn, fol. 83a). Balban, who considered an efficient hisba department to be a primary necessity of good government, did not neglect, as his predecessors had done, even small and insignificant places. We read in the Safar-nâmâ-i Kâdî Taâ'î Mutâsâri (Bîdînî 1909, ili ff.), of Iltutmish (608/1213-621/1236) having appointed a hisba at Ambâla [q.v.], which was then no more than a hamlet of a few hundred houses of mixed population. During the Sultanate period the functions of the muhtasib and the bdâdi, and the relations between them, were much the same as in the central lands (see above, i). At times the Sultan intervened personally to deal with customs or innovations considered heretical or un-Islamic or in matters which lay beyond the ordinary jurisdiction of the muhtasib. Firuz Shâh Tughluk, for instance, forbade many popular practices which he regarded as irreligious (cf. Futâhâl-i Firûzshâhi, ed. Sh. Abdur Rashid, Aligarh 1954, 6-11). However, the stronger and the more religiously-minded a Sultan was, the greater was his anxiety to promote the moral and religious welfare of his people. Amir Khusrwâ [q.v.] speaks highly of ‘Ali ibn Khâlid’s hisba, as being especially concerned with the flow of supplies and the control of food prices. This Sultan rigorously suppressed drinking, gambling and other social and moral vices, believing that unless public morals were tightened up the deterrent punishments meted out to various offenders against the Sâhriâ’ would be meaningless. Muhammad Tughluk (725/1325-752/1351) in his own days inflicted these punishments with unwonted severity. He was so keen to enforce ihtisâb that at times he personally acted as the bdâdi and the muhtasib and exercised the elementary rules of their faith. Under him, the muhtasib was an officer of great dignity and, according to al-Kâlkashandi (Subb al-a’Îdâ, v, 94; partial Eng. trans. by O. Spies, Stuttgart 1936, 72) and Ibn Fa’ül Allâh al-Umarî (Masâlij al-abâsr, partial Eng. tr. by Sh. Abdur Rashid, Aligarh 1944, 32), enjoyed a monthly salary of 8,000 lânsas. The Sultan paid special attention to the regular saying of prayers. According to Ibn Ba’ttûta (iii, 292; tr. von Mîk, 149), a lady of the royal household found guilty of adultery was stoned to death. Similarly, drunkards received the full measure of hadd punishment in addition to three months’ solitary confinement. Both Baraun (Târîkh-i Firûzshâhi, 441) and Ibn Ba’ttûta (loc. cit.) testify to the high level of hisba maintained by the Tughluk Sultan Ghîyâb al-Dîn (720/1320-725/1325). His son Muhammad brought more vitality in the observance of religious rites even at his court. Sikandar Lo’dl was equally keen on enforcing hisba throughout his kingdom. He boldly did away with a popular and time-honoured custom of carrying ‘lances’ (nîyas) to the tomb of the legendary hero Ghâzî Mas’ud Sâlâr [q.v.] and revived Firuz Tughluk’s ordinance prohibiting women from visiting tombs and graveyards. It must at the same time be stressed that ihtisâb was enforced only in the case of Muslims, the non-Muslims being subject to their own religious or personal laws or the common law of the land. Another important function of the muhtasib was to uphold orthodoxy and to suppress heresy. Teachers and professors in religious institutions as well as popular preachers had to be very cautious in their lectures and utterances for fear of the muhsâsib. The Kârmâjis, who created great disturbances in Delhi during the reign of Radjiyâ (634/1236-657/1240), were successfully combated by Firuz, as we hear from al-Nâsir Muhammad Firdawsî (715/1316-718/1320), the Mufti al-ma’dthir, who composed a treatise on the perils and punishments of the muhsâsib during the rule of the Lâdis or the Sayyid dynasties, but that does not mean that he had by then completely ceased to exist. While Shâh Shâh Sîr (945/1538-952/1545) was largely occupied with the consolidation of his kingdom and with administrative reforms, his successor Islam Shâh (952/1545-966/1552) paid due attention to religious matters. For instance he took very strong measures against the Muhdawis, i.e., followers of Sayyid Muhammad al-Dinwî (q.v.), whom he regarded as a heretic, and had two of his disciples, ‘Abd Allâh Niyyâzî Sirhîndî and Shaykh ‘Ali, severely punished—the former being almost beaten to death while the latter was put to death. (Cf. A. S. Bazmee Ansari, Sayyid Muhammad Dinwî and his movement, in Islamic Studies (Karachî), i/v, March 1964).

As against this, some modern historians are of the opinion that while theoretically speaking it is correct to say that state policy during the Sultanate period was directed towards enforcing the hisba, in practice little attention was paid to the dictates of the Sâhriâ. For instance Barani is quoted as saying that the punishments awarded to the Muslims went against the Kur’ânic laws. Similarly, the injunctions governing the use of kâbîl (permissible) and karrâm (prohibited) things were seldom observed. Amir Khusrwâ also is reported as saying that the charging of interest was a common practice in his day, and that when a written contract between the parties existed even the bdâdi had to recognize the fact (cf. Muhammad Habibullah, The foundation of Muslim rule in India, Allâhabad 1965, 349). But these are solitary instances, which may be the exception rather than the rule. During the anarchy following the death of Shâh Shâh, the institution of hisba appears to have collapsed, and the Mughâls, for both personal and political reasons, did not consider it expedient to revive the institution, which consequently suffered a heavy set-back. Bâbur was a great lover of wine; Humâyûn was addicted to opium; Dâhâgîr too was no exception, wine being his greatest weakness. His son and successor Shâhjâhân, although of sober habits, did not have the courage either to break away completely from the traditions of his family or to enforce hisba strictly. During one of his visits to the Pandâb, when it was brought to his notice that certain Hindus in Gudjrat had married Muslim women, he ordered the annulment of these marriages and the restoration of the women to their families. (Cf. A. S. Bazmee Ansari, op. cit., 572 ff.). It was only Awrangzib who showed the highest respect for religion and strictly enforced hisba. He included a specific provision in his penal laws (cf. M. B. Ahmad, The administration of justice in Mediaeval India, Allâhabad 1941, Appendix C, 6-7) for the punishment of persons found guilty of drinking or using narcotic drugs such as hemp and opium. He ordered the execution of Sarmad (d. 1070/1665),
a convert to Islam and an eclectic sufi, on the ground that he had refused to cover his nudity—a serious offence against public morals. In fact there is little ground to differ from the statement "that the Mahaligh emperors (never) strictly adhered to the Islamic principles ... in the case of certain crimes their punishments were practically the same as prescribed by the Quran. In other matters they greatly departed from the Quranic laws and the reasons for this departure were that firstly, there were many cases which did not come exactly within the ambit of the Quranic law, and secondly, in many cases social and political needs and the attendant circumstances demanded a different treatment" (cf. P. Saran, The provincial government of the Mughals, 38-2). Moreover, there is every reason to believe that the mughals of the Sultaneate period came to be replaced by the kolut [q.v.], a secular officer whose duties resembled very closely those of the mughals, the only difference being that while the former dealt with all sorts of crimes and offences, the latter was primarily concerned with offences against Islamic law. The Mughals found it administratively convenient to entrust the duties of the mughals to the kolut, with harmful effects first on the religious and moral welfare of the Muslims in India, then on their civil and social culture, and ultimately on their rule.


HISBA—HISHĀM 493

On his accession, he appointed to the post of governor of ‘Irāk Mālid al-Kāsī, a versatile and skilful man, who lacked the fierce energy of al-Hajjādī, but possessed the same devotion to the caliphs of Damascus. During the fifteen years he was in office, he devoted himself primarily to the agricultural and economic development of the country, continuing the work of providing a pure water supply which had been begun by al-Hajjādī, though this did not insure him against incurring the enmity of some and even against the provocation of the caliph’s court, which finally led, in 120/738, to his dismissal. His rival and successor, Yūsuf b. ‘Umar al-Thakfī, had to suppress in 122/740 the Shi‘ī revolt of Zayb b. ‘All, who was killed in arms at Kūfī after a brief affair, a small enough episode in itself, but one which was to enrich Shi‘ī martyrlogy and re-kindle the propaganda of the Khāshmī opposition. Apart from this revolt and some other small Shi‘ī and Kāhidī acts of sedition, the internal peace of the empire under Ḥishām was not seriously threatened, although the underground work of the da‘wa continued unabated. It was rather in the frontier regions of the empire that the most outstanding events of this caliphate took place.

To the east the Arab offensive had, under Kutayba b. Muslim, made its final advance. After that, it was a matter no longer of further progress but of retaining what had been gained, and particularly of containing the pressure of the Turkish counter-offensive which was carried on with vigour at this time. The many successive governors whom Ḥishām appointed to Khurāsān (among them Aṣḥās al-Sulāmī, Dīnayb b. ‘Abd al-Rāmhān al-Murri, Asad al-Kāsī, brother of Kālid, and the courageous Naṣr b. Sayyār) all had to face the menace of the Jūrgēsī and the constant threat of the intrepid leader Boghār Tārkān (the ‘Kāsūrī of the Arabs) and of the Khāshūn Su-lu. After suffering many setbacks and even risking disaster (yaum al-ṣīb in 112/730, yaum al-اثحāl in 119/737) the Arabs finally broke the Turkish offensive at Khārīstān, near Shābūrān, to the west of Balkh (119/737) and, under Naṣr b. Sayyār, advanced in the following year as far as the Jaxartes. By a wise taxation policy, Kālid was able to achieve in his province a certain degree of pacification, the ephemeral nature of which however was to be revealed a few years later by the outbreak of the ‘Abbāsid revolt.

The empire experienced another grave threat during this period, from the north, with the irruption of the Khazars Turks in Armenia and in Aḥdar-bayūqān (defeat of Dījarākh b. al-Hākam at Ardābīl in 112/730). The invaders were driven back however by the intervention of massive reinforcements led by skilled captains such as Sā‘īd al-Haraṣī, and later Maslama b. ‘Abd al-Malik and Mawrān b. Mūhammad. There followed a whole series of campaigns which led the Arabs beyond the Caucasus as far as the mouths of the Volga (foundation of Derbend by Maslama in 115/731), without however achieving any stable conquest to the north of the Caucasus. Further west, the hostilities with the Byzantines continued throughout Ḥishām’s reign, but without any large-scale operations: the great offensive of the Arabs had spent itself with the siege of Constantinople by Maslama in 98/716-7, and operations were limited to sa‘ād al-fī, in which the Muslims were not always the conquerors (defeat of Akroinos, 122/740, and death of the famous g̣hāzī al-Baḥā‘ī [q.v.], destined to become later the hero of romance of this frontier-war).
Events on a large scale, however, were taking place in Africa and in Spain, undermining in these distant provinces the direct domination of the central power. The hastened economic exploitation under the governor 'Ubayd Allah b. al-Hasbāb (116-23/734-41) provoked, in 123/740-1, a great revolt of the Berbers, who inflicted a first crushing defeat on an Arab army near Tangier (the ghazawat al-aṣārif, so called from the great number of Arab warriors who lost their lives there). Upon the news of this disaster, the caliph Hishām himself assembled and sent from Syria a second army under the command of Kūltūm ibn al-Ḥiyād, who was handed to death by the Berbers on the banks of the Sebu. While Kūltūm’s nephew, Baldj, succeeded with the remnants of this army in reaching Ceuta and then in crossing into Spain, the whole of the Magrib was plunged into anarchy and revolt, in which Berber ethnic loyalty was allied with Kharidji heresy: and it was the task of a new governor sent by Hishām, the Kalbi Ḥanṣala. Safwān [q.v.], to recover in a despairing effort (battle of al-Asnām near Kayrawān, 124/742) what could still be saved of Arab hegemony and of Umayyad power inIfrikia. From this time, the direct authority of the caliphs of Damascus (and later of Baghdād) does not seem to have extended beyond the boundaries of present-day Algeria: The crisis in the Magrib involved the new province of Spain, whose governors had up to then been answerable to the governors of Africa: whereas before 122/740 the Arabs of Spain had carried out their razzias beyond the Pyrenees (battle of Poitiers and the death of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥāfīlī, 114/732), after 122/740 they wasted their strength in internal quarrels, aggravated by the arrival of the Syrians under Baldj; these were finally ended, fifteen years later, by the foundation of the Umayyad emirate under a nephew of Hishām who had fled to the west from the ruin of the Umayyad dynasty. It is not easy, among all the facts briefly sketched here, to distinguish the part played personally by the ruler, who was living sometimes several hundred miles away and who limited himself in general (if we follow the literal interpretation of the texts) to apppointing and dismissing the governors, who are presented as the solitary figures in the events. It is possible, however, to discern several main lines which can be traced to the supreme authority of the empire and are characteristic of its policy. This policy appears as one of recovery and of conservation of the immense patrimony of the conquests, which reached its greatest extent thanks to the demographic, economic and spiritual forces of the Arab element but which, while still retaining its vitality and vigour as a coherent Muslim society, was destined to disintegrate as an Arab empire. Hishām seems to have been aware of this danger, and to have acted, together with a chosen group of capable and devoted assistants, so as to confront it and to delay it as much as possible. This seems to be proved particularly in the policy which he followed (unlike his brothers who had reigned before him) of maintaining an equilibrium between the rival tribal groups of the Ṣaḥāras and the Yamanis, both of whom he skilfully used to staff the administration, in order to forward the interests of the State. Some scholars, such as H. A. R. Gibb, even go so far as to attribute to this caliph the initiative in a general reform and reorganization of the tax system in answer to the complaints of the maṣūdī, although the sources provide details only of local measures which were taken, probably with the caliph’s consent, by governors in their own provinces (for example the work of ʿAbāṣ al-Sulami and of Naṣr b. Sāyiyr in Khurasan and in Transoxania, and the harsh tax policy of Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in the Ifrikiya). In fact there has survived no explicit documentation which would lead us to attribute to Hishām, as to ʿUmar II, measures which in principle applied throughout the empire; it cannot however be denied that he was aware of the problem and applied himself to its solution, particularly as the sources agree in describing him as a strict adminis- trator, sober and frugal almost to the point of meanness, and paying great attention to the regular ordering of the revenues and the expenditure. The only ostentatious facet of his character, which he shared with the other members of his family, was his enthusiasm for building: there dates from his reign a whole series of castles, palaces and even “towns” in the Syrian desert, some of which have been known for a long time and others only recently revealed by excavation; of some of them he was actually the founder. First, the two Kaṣr al-Hayr to the east and to the west of Palmyra (it has been suggested that the former, Kaṣr al-Hayr al-Shārīḥ— and not the Christian Sergiopolis—is the real Rusafat Hishām; in the latter, Kaṣr al-Hayr al-Gharbī, there has been found, among the splendid remains of its decoration, perhaps the portrait of the caliph himself); and in addition Kaṣr al-Mīb, Bhirbat al-Mafjar [q.v.], Kaṣr al-Tūbā, etc. There is hardly any Umayyad ruin discovered or excavated in Syria and Jordan in recent years which is not connected, by epigraphical evidence or by fairly probable conjecture, with Hishām’s reign and with Hishām himself. The final years of his reign were clouded by troubles concerning the succession: after trying in vain to get one of his own sons recognized as his heir (at first his elder son Muʿāwiya and, after his premature death, his younger son Maslama), he resigned himself to considering as his successor his nephew al-Walid b. Yazid, who had already been nominated by Yazid II and whose character, tastes and education were the complete opposite of his own. But he wrangled with him and embittered him in every way, thus undermining the solidity of his own political and administrative achievements, which his offended successor was to lose in the following. The accession of al-Walid II, when Hishām died from a heart attack in his residence at Rusafā after a reign of twenty years, in fact saw the beginning of the fitna, which was fatal for the dynasty. But the long reign of the fourth son of ʿAbd al-Malik may nevertheless be considered as a period which on the whole was glorious for the Arabs and fruitful in the development of Islamic faith and culture. In this connexion there should be mentioned the strict orthodoxy of Hishām (who was the friend of the great traditionists al-Zuhri and Abū Zinād and the persecutor of the Kadari heretics, though at the same time tolerant towards the Christians), and in addition his interest in the historical and administrative traditions of the Sāsānids, and the elaboration among his entourage (Abūr ash al-Kalbi and his pupil ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd b. Yahyā) of the Arabic chancery style, which was to have such a great development during the first years of the ʿAbbāsīd caliphate. Bibliography: Tabart, ii, 1466-1728 (the caliphate), 1428-40 (the caliph); Dinawari, 337-47; Yaʿqūbī, ii, 378-92; Masʿūdī, Murūdī, v, 45-79; FHA, 81-111. J. Wellhausen, Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz, 203-20, = Eng. tr., 325-52;
HISHAM II, AL-MU'AYYAD IBN AL-MAHDI, Umayyad Caliph of Cordova, son of al-Hasam II [q.v.] and a Basque mother. He succeeded in Safar 366/October 976, at the age of 10 years. The Slav officers of the palace tried to secure the election of the boy's paternal uncle al-Mughira, with Hisham as heir-presumptive. The plan miscarried. Al-Mughira was killed on the orders of the Emir Muhammad b. Abd 'Al-Malik al-Mansur [q.v.]. He was subsequently invested with the authority of Hisham for his own ends and held him in tutelage which proved permanent. From 370/982 al-Mansur ruled openly on his own account, and it is in this period that his numerous and successful expeditions against the Christians of the north took place. In 386/996 Hisham, by then a man of thirty but principally urged on by his mother, attempted unsuccessfully to assert his authority, and his leisure with the collection of relics (Ibn al-Abbar, ed., Paris-Leiden 1950, i, 139-46; Cl. Sanchez-Bornoz, La España musulmana, Buenos Aires 1960, i, 115-21). (D. M. Dunlop)
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HISHAM I, Abu 'L-WALID, called AL-RIDA, the second Umayyad ruler of Muslim Spain, died openly on his own account, and it is in this period that his numerous and successful expeditions against the Christians of the north took place. In 386/996 Hisham, by then a man of thirty but principally urged on by his mother, attempted unsuccessfully to assert his authority, and his leisure with the collection of relics (Ibn al-Abbar, ed., Paris-Leiden 1950, i, 139-46; Cl. Sanchez-Bornoz, La España musulmana, Buenos Aires 1960, i, 115-21). (D. M. Dunlop)
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400 (July 1010), and Muḥammad al-Mahdī appeared before him to answer for his conduct, before being removed to Spain. His reign was nominally ruled, with Wādīh as his bāḥiyy and the real power. The siege dragged on, since Sulaymān would have none of Hīshām as Caliph, till 403, when after the attempt- ed flight and death of Wādīh and further unavailing siege, Cordova surrendered on 26 Shawal/ May 1013. The entry of the Berber army and the removal for execution. Hīshām then nominally ruled, till 403, when after the attempt- ed flight and death of Wādīh and further unavailing siege, Cordova surrendered on 26 Shawal/ May 1013 (Ibn al-Khaṭīb). This was the ‘second death’. (There was also a ‘third death’ much later, in 453/1059, when the ‘Abbāsid al-Mutʿaddi [q.v.] ceased to make for peace for Hīshām, whose existence he and his father by a conventional fiction had maintained for many years.)


**HĪSHĀM III, AL-MUTṬADĪ B’LLĀH B. MUḤAMMAD b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III, the last of the Umayyad Caliphs of Cordova. Born in 364/974-75, he is said to have been the elder brother of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān IV, al-Murtaḍā [q.v.], whom he accompanied in the rout at Granada in which the latter was killed (408/1018). Hīshām escaped to ʿAbd al-Hūl (Alpuente) in the province of Valencia, where he was received by the ʿAmīrīd masāʾil Ḥādī b. Kaṣīm al-Fīhrī. Proclaimed Caliph by the Cordovans in Rabīʾ II 418/June 1027, he remained at ʿAbd al-Hūl for more than 2 years, making his official entry into Cordova only in Dhu l-Hijja 420/December 1029. Owing principally to his weakness of character and Ḥādī’s shortsightedness, he soon became unacceptable to the Cordovans. The affections resulted in the murder of the unpopular waṣīr, and Hīshām was at the same time deposed (Dhu l-Hijja 422/November 1031). But this time no new Caliph was elected. A council of notables headed by Abu l-Ḥazm b. Diḥawwār took control. The last Umayyad Caliph was allowed to retire, and ended his days at Lārida (Lerida) in Şafar 428/December 1036. A new era of Spanish Muslim history had begun—of the Party Kings (mulāk al-taʾwīf, reyes de Taifas). The governor of Lerida with whom the last Umayyad found refuge was Sulaymān b. Ḥūd (see Hūdīs).


**HĪSHĀM B. ‘AMR AL-FUWĀTĪ (or al-Fawātī), a Mu’taṣīf of Basra, where he was the pupil of Abu l-Ḥudhayf [q.v.]. After having probably been a wandering propagator of ʿĪsā (Ibn al-Nadīm, Fihrīs, ed. Fück, in Prof. Muḥ. Šafiʾīs presentation volume, Lahore 1955, 68-9), he went to Baḥdād during the caliphate of al-Maʿmūn and died there at a date not known exactly, but probably before 218/833.

His personal doctrine, which had a certain influence on al-ʿAshʿarī [q.v.], differs appreciably, according to Ibn al-Nadīm, from the teaching of the other Muṭṣāzīs, but the data given by the heresiographers are not always in agreement. Thus, according to al-Baḥḍādī (Fārḥ, 150), he forbade murder of any kind, whereas according to al-Shahrastānī (Milāl, on the margin of Ibn Ḥāẓm, Fīṣal, i, 94) he allowed the assassination of opponents of ʿĪsā and in that respect showed a fanaticism unusual among the Muṭṣāzīs. Al-Shahrastānī (op. cit., i, 91) emphasizes the extremism of his theory of free-will, for al-Fuwātī denies the intervention of God in the affairs of man, even when a verse of the Kurʾān states that God caused men to do such and such a deed. “Things” not being eternal, God cannot know them before having given them existence (al-ʿAshʿarī, Maḥālādī, ed. Ritter, 157, 488, 489; al-Shahrastānī, op. cit., i, 94), for a “thing” is the realization of the essence within existence, that which has been created by God. He rejects the doctrine that God can be seen ‘with the heart’ (al-ʿAshʿarī, op. cit., 157) and holds that it is not the accidents that prove that God is creator, but material things (al-Shahrastānī, op. cit., i, 92; al-Khayyāt, Intisār, ed. and trans. A. Nader, Beirut 1957, text 49, trans. 54), that is to say the substances which are realized when God gives them existence. Al-Fuwātī regards as infidels those who believe that heaven and hell already exist, since these are for the moment unnecessary (al-Baḥḍādī, op. cit., 150; al-Ṭijī, Muwaḥāfī, 375; al-Shahrastānī, op. cit., i, 93). In politics, he tends to the Sunni view; he holds that the imām ought to be elected, but he would allow this only in a time of calm and order, which al-Shahrastānī (op. cit., i, 93) considers a sign of hostility towards the caliphate of ʿĀlf (cf. al-Baḥḍādī, op. cit., 150; Ibn Ṣalīḥ, al-dīn, 271; Pellat, in St. Ist., xv, 39).

The basic points of the doctrine of al-Fuwātī are now known only from the heresiographers, but Ibn al-Nadīm attributes to him the following works: K. al-Maḥbūbī; K. al-Raḍd ʿalā l-ʾAsamm fi nafy al-ʿarāḥīt; K. ʿĀḥad al-Kūrān; K. al-Taʾwīhī; K. Diḥawwār al-Kāshāt; K. ʿĀḥad al-Baḥr; K. ʿĀḥad al-Ḥamn (sic); K. ʿĀḥad l-ʾBahrīyī; K. ʿĀḥad Abī l-Ḥudhayfī fi nafīʾ- Isḥāq.)

**Bibliography:** in the article; see also A. N. Nader, Le système philosophique des Muḥtaṣīs, Beirut 1956, index and bibliography there given. (Ch. Pellat)

**HĪSHĀM B. AL-HAKAM Abū Muḥammad, the most prominent representative of Imāmī kalām [q.v.] in the time of the Imāms ʿAlī ʿaṣfār al-Ṣādik and ʿAbd al-Maʿnī, ʿAbd al-Muṭṭāt. A client of the tribe of Kinda, he was born and raised in Wāṣit, but later lived in Kūfah among the Banū Šaybān. He is said to have been a ʿIjāmi before his conversion to Shiʿīsm by the Imām ʿAlī ʿaṣfār al-Ṣādik. Other accounts, however, point to his early association with representatives of dualist religions, notably with Abū Ṣhākīr al-Dayyānī. It is certain that after his conversion to Shiʿīsm he held disputations with Abū Ṣhākīr and
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other dualists, and some of his conceptions of physics are evidently influenced by their doctrines. He became closely associated with Imám Dīya'ar and then with Músá al-Kāzīm, whom he, unlike many other Shi'i leaders, recognized immediately after Dīya'ar's death (148/765). In Kufa he owned a shop together with the Ibadī scholar ʿAbd Allāh b. Yāṣīd, with whom he maintained a close partnership all his life despite their doctrinal differences. In his later life Hīshām belonged to the circle of theologians who held disputations in the presence of ʿAlāyā b. Khálib al-Barmakī and apparently presided over some of the discussions. He lived and carried on his trade in al-Karkh. He was accused by some Shi'i's of having been partly responsible for the arrest of Músá al-Kāzīm. The Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd is said to have taken an interest in his views and then, finding them dangerous, reacted by ordering the arrest of the imām. Hīshām was forced to go into hiding and died shortly afterwards in the year 199/714-5, or 199/814-5, or 200/815-6. Other accounts, which state that his death occurred either shortly after the downfall of the Barmakīs (186/803), or in the year 199/814-5, or during the caliphate of ʿAlī al-Maʾmūn, do not appear reliable. In any case, there are no reports indicating any activity of his during the imāmate of ʿAlī al-Riḍā (183-203/797-818).

The theory of the imāmate which Hīshām elaborated has remained at the basis of the Imāmī doctrine. In contrast to the other great theologians of his time, Hīshām did not accept the permanent need for a divinely guided imām who could act as the authoritative teacher of mankind in all religious matters. The imām thus was the legatee (wasfī) of the Prophet. He was infallible (maṣūm) in all his acts and words, but unlike the prophets did not receive divine messages (waṣy). In contrast to the later generally accepted Imāmī doctrine, Hīshām held that the prophet's divine messages could be criticized by divine messages, did not have to be infallible, and that Muhammad and the other prophets had, indeed, at time committed acts of disobedience. Mūhammad had installed ʿAlī as his legatee and lieutenant (khālīfa) by explicit appointment (nass). The whole community with only a few exceptions, such as al-Mikdād, ʿAlī b. Yazīd, Abu Bakr as S{idārā, and his followers in case of necessity were permitted or obliged to practice dissimulation (tabkiyya [g.v.]) concerning their religious beliefs. The imām was not expected to revolt against the existing illegal government, and rebellion without his authorization was unlawful. Hīshām defined God as a finite, three-dimensional body (qādim) and as radiant light. God had been in general. With the progressive adoption of Muṭazili theology, particularly from the 4th/10th century, Hīshām's school became extinct. Although many of his opinions were highly objectionable from the point of view of later Imāmī doctrine, the Imāmī attitude toward him has generally remained favorable.

Of Hīshām's many writings listed in the Fikrīs of al-Nādim (cited in the Encyclopaedia of Islam, II) ʿAlī b. Hāshimī, the last known writer of his time, His K. ʿIşıktaft al-nāṣī fi 'l-imāma was probably used by al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhšī as the basis of his own K. Fīrāq al-gaša. Hīshām's discussions with other theologians and heretics are frequently quoted in both Sunni and Shi'i works.

Bibliography: al-Maḥṣūl, B. ʿAbd al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhšī, Cairo 1356, 59 f.; idem, ʿUṣūl al-ḥašā, Cairo 1343-4/1925-30, ii, 142,
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The detailed forms, and the evolution, of military architecture in the Muslim West have been dealt with in the article muraqqa. In this article we shall see how the Muslim West solved the major problems of fortification, and how the various types of fortified works—town enceintes, isolated castles, fortresses of high ground—were laid out and organized; we shall see also how it overcame the difficulties of flanking, of gates, and, from the 8th/14th century, of modifications for guns.

Town enceintes. Since the period of the Late Empire, unfortified towns had become rare in the western world. Because of unrest caused by invasions, urban centres had been fortified with ramparts, thereby in many cases reducing their original extent. However, many cities in the Berber country which were primarily agricultural markets remained walled.

The disturbed history of the Muslim dynasties, especially in the Berber country, led to the fortification of towns or the maintenance of their walls in good repair. From the very beginning dynamic foundations always provided for a rampart. The need for a fortified wall round every town of any size led to the maintenance of the Late Empire practice, perforce universal in the early Middle Ages.

The plan of the enceinte. In Spain and Africa Muslim walls sometimes adopted the general trace of a former enceinte, making use of the bases and other parts of it, as at Karsuma and at Cáceres. The prosperity of certain state or provincial capitals often led, in the Middle Ages, to the enlargement of town walls to take in important suburbs.

On level ground, town enceintes were often modelled on the trace of a pre-existent settlement. In new foundations they are more regular in shape, with long alignments of ramparts. On uneven sites modification to suit the terrain was effected very simply: the principle was to use towers sparingly while the curtain wall ran along rocky outcrops, following them as closely as possible; salients and marked re-entrants are rare. Most enceintes are in the form of an irregular, but convex, polygon.

In many cases, however, it was necessary that the nearest surviving parts of high ground should have commanded the ramparts, should also be held. The town wall of Granada, in the 5th/11th century, extended as far as two small fortresses guarding the slopes and the summit of the Alhambra hill. At Shatiba (Jativa) ramparts ran up to two small fortresses on the crests of high ground dominating the town from above. It was equally important to ensure protection against access to watercourses: walls terminating in a bastion ran down to the river at Badajo (Baḥlayaws). At Seville such a terminal tower has become, as the Golden Tower, a powerful bastion.

The kasaba, the residence of the ruler or his government, usually occupies the higher part of the town, from which it is separated by a rampart; but if its site is distinct from that of the town settlement, then walls join it to two or more ramparts. At Malaga, where the Alcazaba was in the centre of the city, it had its own enceinte, and the town was connected by long ramparts to the outer citadel of Gibralfaro; similarly at Jaen (Diyyayn). When the kasaba achieved the dimensions of a governmental town, it would have its own separate system of fortification, whether or not in contact with the residential and commercial quarters. The Alhambra was distinctly separated from Granada, as was Fās al-Djadid from Fās al-Bāli. On the other hand, the Almohad kasaba at Marrākush, and the palaces of Mawlay Ismāʾil at Meknès, while partly constituting a fortified whole, are in contact with the town itself. In every case, two fortified systems are either close to each other or are juxtaposed.

Certain kasabas were built to house garrisons to keep under surveillance a town where there was some apprehension of disturbances. Such was the case with the "Conventional" of Marīda, built by ʿAbd al-Rahmān II. In the 10th/16th century the Saʿīdids kept such a watch over Fez by the north and south burgis.

Plans of the enceinte. — The double wall enclosing a narrow corridor is to be found at Madīnāt al-Zāhrah. Long passages between high ramparts are...
frequent in the palaces of Mawlay Isma'il at Meknès. The outer wall, well known in Byzantine fortification, seems not to have been employed in Muslim fortresses in the early Middle Ages. It became almost the rule in the walls of Spanish fortresses from the 5th/11th century. It existed also at al-Mahdiyya. In the Maghrib it remained rare. However, it is found at Tlemcen and Taza, and a continuous outer wall surrounded the ramparts of Fās al-Djālid. These outer walls, of variable height, were generally furnished with towers. The ditch was common from the beginning of the 5th/11th century in Spanish Muslim fortifications. Elsewhere it remained very exceptional. These were generally dry ditches, designed to stop cavalry and to make sapping operations more difficult. In dry and often broken country the ditch could not be, as in flat and wet countries, the best of defences.

Isolated castles. — The functions of isolated castles were very variable. A certain number were frontier castles marking out the battlefronts: so in Muslim Spain, from the end of the 3rd/9th century, where the frontier long remained on the line of the Duero and was until the end of the kingdom of Granada guarded by a continuous line of fortresses on the west and north, which were subject to Castilian attacks. Under the reyes de taifas the rivalries among the local amirs also led to the construction of lines of fortresses. In the Berber country there was hardly any definite frontier between the Muslim states; it was considered sufficient to fortify only those places possession of which was likely to be disputed; however, the ʿAbd al-Wādīids did set up the Soummam line against the Ḥafṣids. These frontier castles could not, in wars in which rapid destructive and pillaging expeditions were the commonest operations, prevent completely the passage of enemy troops. But although they allowed the razzias to pass, they required, for any lasting conquest, long and costly siege operations. They were often, especially in the Granada period, built on scarped peaks; they could not block the entry routes, but they were ideal for keeping the country under surveillance and were difficult to take by storm.

In Spain, in the rich plains exposed to enemy raids, it was to be found castles of refuge, usually dominating a village. The Naṣrids increased their number in the richest parts of the country, which were menaced by Castilian incursions.

On the north African coasts, in particular those of Tunisia and to a less extent the Atlantic coast, ribāḥīs [q.v.] were built, i.e., fortified enclosures where pious Muslims, while leading a very strict religious life, could prepare for the holy war. The Ifrikiyyan ribāḥīs are doubtless explained by Sicilian expeditions of conquest; there was then no Christian danger threatening the Tunisian coasts. On the other hand, the ribāḥīs of the Atlantic coast of Morocco and certain Andalusian ribāḥīs seem indeed to have originated from fear of Norman invasions. But it seems that there was never any warfare with an outside enemy to turn these castles into such castles; they were not true maritime fortifications, but gathering places for soldiers of the faith, afterwards becoming rather centres of ascetic, even mystic, life. Certain Moroccan ribāḥīs, such as the first ḥasaba of the Ūḏāya at Rabāṭ and the enceinte of Tīt, seem to have guarded the northern and southern limits of the heretic confederation of the Barghawta. Under the Almohads, Rabāṭ acquired the dimensions of a city through the activities of the third caliph Abū Yusuf Yaḥyā al-Manṣūr, and was the gathering place for warriors whose destination was Spain.

Sometimes castles were grouped together or formed a line to keep watch over countries where rebellion was threatening, or to block the routes of parties of open rebels. Thus, the Almoravids guarded the Rif by the strongholds of Bāni Tawd and the castle of Amergo. When the Almohad revolt had reached the great mass of the Moroccan Atlas, they built castles for obstructing the enemy on the foothills or at the mouth of a mountain defile. Mawlay Isma'il, faced with Berber dissensions in the Middle Atlas region and the Rif, also built lines of ḥasabas.

This same sovereign engaged in the military occupation of his own states, and built, even in the subjugated plains, castles where his garrison troops, the ʿabād, were quartered. Their main rôle was to raise taxes, both in money and in kind. The enceintes of these castles contain, besides the governor's house and a mosque, great silos. There were numerous castles built to ensure the security of the major trade routes, to accommodate travellers at the end of a day's journey, and sometimes also to provide for the relay stages of a system of official couriers [see Barid], where a fortified town could not fulfill the functions of the post stations. In the Berber country there were so marked out by castles built a day's stage apart. Sometimes secondary fortresses and watch-towers guarded mountain defiles.

Naturally, bridges over large rivers were under the protection of a fortress, often an important one. Thus the Conventual of Marïda guarded the Guadiana crossing as well as the town. Almost all the bridges of the Tagus were guarded by a castle or at least by a tower.

The plan of the castle. — The Roman and Byzantine tradition is often continued in the plans of these castles, and also sometimes those of the Umayyad castles of Syria, themselves strongly indebted to the castella of Rome and Byzantium. On flat ground the plan of the fortresses is always very regular, square or oblong, with angle bastions and also sometimes those of the Barghawta. The very geometric forms of ancient fortification were faithfully followed in Moroccan official buildings, and also in Berber architecture.

But many castles were built on hill-tops or on rocky outcrops. In such cases modification to suit the terrain was necessary. The perimeter of the castle is very variable, in size as well as shape. Sometimes above escarpments the curtain-wall needed no towers. In very mountainous country the necessity of finding firm foundations resulted in an irregular spacing of the towers. Abrupt changes of direction are frequent, the trace often appearing as a zigzag. The double enceinte scarcely appears at all except in Naṣrid fortification under Christian influence, and the outer wall remains very rare.

It is exceptional for a Muslim castle to include a reduit or a donjon. However, the ribāḥīs of Ifrikiya often have one, and the Almohad ribāḥī of Odaya at Rabat and the enceinte of Tit also has one. At the Kaša of the Banū Ḥammād the great bastion of the mandar formed a sort of reduit. In Naṣrid fortification the use of the donjon, sometimes surrounded by a reduit, was introduced in the 7th/13th century in imitation of Christian castles. But in the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries the Naṣrid castles returned more and more to the classical forms of Hispano-Moorish fortification.

Fortified ports and arsenals. — These were
both known to western Islam. The port of Tandja Baliya, to the east of Tangier, might date from the Muslim period. It included an interior dock, now filled with sand, and defended by a bastioned enceinte. The entry to and exit from the port were by two large gates flanked by towers; but of this complex there are now only remains at ground level. On the other hand, the maritime arsenal of Salé, now filled in, preserves its two gates with their towers. This arsenal occupied one of the corners of the town enceinte. From the 4th/10th century a similar solution of the problem had been adopted at al-Mahdiyya. The enceinte embodied an interior port, the entrance to which was defended by two towers between which a chain could be stretched. A large arch of carved stone gave access to the port of Ilunayn, built in the 8th/14th century; likewise at the port or arsenal of Bougie (Bidjaya) and at the arsenal of Malaga. The great arch under which shipping passed would seem to belong to the Spanish tradition.

Building material. — Ashlar often persisted in the Aghlabid fortification of Ifrikiya. It was often used for the entire curtain wall, and always for the more important works. The rubble walls themselves were bonded with dressed stone. The Umayyad fortifications of Spain, in its most beautiful works, used bonding of regularly alternating headers and stretchers. But in African fortification, up to the 8th/12th century, rubble was by far the most frequently used material. It was often bonded with dressed stone, and also on many occasions trimmed and bedded in regular courses, sometimes even with alternation of thick and thin beds. In Almoravid fortresses the joints which surround the large rubble stones are dotted with small black pebbles.

In Spain rubble was often used in the building of secondary fortresses, sometimes with lacing courses and snecks of brick; this last use is particularly frequent in the Toledo school. Sometimes false joints extend the angle bonding courses into the rubble facing. In the Našrid period imitation of Christian fortresses increased the use of rubble.

Large fortifications of brick are rare in the Muslim west. However, the ramparts of Raywān were from the beginning built of brick. Those of Baṣra [q.v.], in the north of Mesopotamia, which had been adopted at al-Mahdiyya, were not used throughout buildings except in comparatively late Mudéjar work. But in gates of ashlar or rubble, whether combined with concrete or not, brick was generally used for certain arches and for vaults, sometimes even for façades of doorways where the basic framework was constructed entirely of concrete.

From the 4th/10th century, the building material most frequently used in Spanish fortresses was a concrete made from a clayey or pebbly soil, more or less rich in lime, tamped in shutterings about 80 cm. thick. This method came to the Maghrib in the 6th/12th century and persisted until the 20th. The use of concrete brought about a simplification of forms, and thus came the preeminence of the rectangular tower. Brick was associated with it for arches and their jambs, for vaults, and for the façades of doorways.

Problems of flanking. — It is very rare for the projections and re-entrants of the curtain wall to be in themselves sufficient to provide good flanking. Hence it was necessary to rely on towers and bastions flanking the enceinte wall. Bastions on enceintes on flat ground are never spaced more than 30 m. apart, in order to leave between two towers no area uncovered by missiles. But towers could be closer together than this. In Spain in the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries towers of small dimensions and very close together were often used.

The circular or almost circular tower is met with only rarely: this shows Christian influence. The semicircular tower was employed in Aghlabid fortification, where it marks an eastern influence: it is found in certain Umayyad castles in Syria, and it is common in 'Abbasid building. Most frequently, in Spain as in north Africa, the oblong tower, of greater length than projection, is used. Towers set en masse are rare. Bastions of irregular quadrilateral form are sometimes found at the corners of enceintes. The polygonal bastion appears in Spain in the 6th/12th century, but was little used in the Maghrib. Altogether Muslim architecture in the west shows little variety in the form of the bastions. In most of the Hispano-Moorish enceintes, series of similar towers are spaced along the line of curtain walls.

In the 7th/13th century Muslim Spain invented a new tower, the albarrana or exterior tower, which is detached from and in front of the curtain wall, to which it is connected by a projecting element of wall. The tower and its base are connected with the chemin-de-ronde of the rampart. In such a case the outer wall of the defences would pass round the foot of the albarrana. Sometimes also the albarrana is thrown far forward, at the end of a section of the curtain wall with a double parapet. This innovation, later adopted often in Mudéjar fortification, does not seem to have reached the Maghrib.

On the whole these towers contain only a minimum of fittings. Sometimes they have a plain base and a crenellated platform, sometimes an interior room at the level of the chemin-de-ronde and an upper platform consisting of a floor carried on joists, to which a ladder gives access. However, from the 6th/12th century together with the other forms of the Hispano-Moorish fortress, and in the 7th/13th century to Tunisia. Some of these gates have an open passage instead of a central vaulted hall. These gates open sometimes between two towers, sometimes on the flank of a massive bastion. In the 6th/12th century gateways with a double or treble bend entrance appear under the Almohad caliphs. The interior way consists of a series of vaulted halls almost always broken by an open passage. The leaves of the entry and exit arches are generally supported by two pilasters which support the archways.

All these entrances with angle passages open between two towers. In the Almohad period towers and façade are constructed in stone and covered with a richly carved decoration. In the Marinid and Našrid entrances brick replaces stone, and the decoration of the façades is much more restrained.

The thick mass of construction which forms these
doorsways projects behind the inner face of the rampart; only the two towers which flank the entrance archway stand out in front of the curtain wall, not greatly larger in dimensions than the rest of the towers. The great Almohad entrances, whose value is as much decorative as functional, are among the most perfect creations of Hispano-Moorish architecture; they are probably among the most beautiful and certainly the most rich of the whole of Islam.

The doorway with a long corridor, of oriental type, is found in the 10th-11th century only at the principal entry of the Fāṭimid town of al-Mahdiyya, the Sakīfa al-Kabīlī. This form does not appear to have had any imitation in the Muslim West.

The portcullis is rare in Muslim Spain, and has never been reported from the Maghrib. The simple bent entrance remained in use at all periods, from Spain to Ifriqiyya.

Modification for cannon. — The Nasrids did no more than furnish low platforms as cannon emplacements at the feet of certain towers and certain doorways of the Alhambra. In Morocco the Saʿdīsultans, in the 10th-11th century, made use of two systems. In the enceinte of the ṣabāja of Marrākush, which was likely to be attacked only by tribes who did not possess cannon, it was sufficient for them to enlarge the dimensions of the oblong towers flanking the curtain wall in order to house a small mortar in the defensive chamber of each. Elsewhere, at the Bastyūn of Taza and at the north and south burdījes of Fez, they imitated (thanks no doubt to information from renegades) European fortresses with vaulted casemates, with thick and often battered walls, sometimes even of a star-shaped plan. These imitations of European fortresses were in use in all the coastal regions of north Africa, in Morocco as well as in the two Ottoman provinces, where European reprisals were to be feared. They were intended to do no more than stand up to a bombardment from the sea and to reply to it. These works were set fairly high up; low-level fortification, in the Vauban manner, was never employed. The defences were simple enough, merely a wall and a ditch with a ramp of earth forming a counterscarp.

Beside these more or less modern fortresses, the old style of fortification of the Middle Ages, under its most simple forms, was continued throughout the Berber country.

Thus the Muslim West remained faithful to the tradition of the Later Empire and to Byzantium. The only additions to this tradition by the creation of new forms were Spanish. The alburraña tower, and the entrance with a series of bends and with an open passage, appeared in Muslim Spain. Influences from the Christian world were unable to stimulate Nasrid fortification. The more or less skilful imitations of European fortifications which were erected on the Berber coasts in the modern period did not prevent north African fortification from remaining generally archaic and sketchy.

Bibliography: There is no general work dealing with the military architecture of the Muslim West. Numerous, by country and by period, will be found in: H. Terrasse, L'art hispano-mauresque des origines au XIlle siècle, Paris 1932; G. Marçais, L'architecture musulmane d'Occident, Paris 1954; M. Gómez Moreno, Arte drabe español hasta los Almohades, Arte mudóbrave, Madrid 1951 (Ars Hispaniae, iii); L. Torres Balbás, Arte almohade, Arte nazari, Arte mudéjar, Madrid 1949 (Ars Hispaniae, iv); idem, Arte hispano-

musulmán hasta la caída del Califato de Córdoba, Madrid 1957. (H. Terrasse)

ii.—IRAN

Fortified sites of the mediaeval period are extremely numerous in Iran. According to the author of the Farsnāma (G. Le Strange, Description of the province of Fars in Persia, 74) there were more than 70 notable castles in the Province of Fars alone, of which 20 are described in the text. Yet despite this wealth of remains, the military architecture of Muslim Iran has been little studied, no doubt because the poor preservation of most of the structures of this period makes them uninformative. Taking advantage of the mountainous terrain, many of these fortresses depended more for their protection on a strong natural position than on man-made fortifications. For example, according to Yākūt, iii, 490, the fortress of Tāk in Tabaristān, the stronghold of the Isāḥab Khurshid (1207/738-1249/966) was surrounded by unscaleable mountains, and entered only by a long tunnel. The entrance was closed by a stone so large that 50 men were required to move it. Inside the fortress was a stream of water. Tāk was regarded as impregnable, but eventually capitulated to the Arabs on account of an outbreak of plague. Awliyaʿ Allāh Āmūlī, Tarīkh-i Rāyān, 45, states that in later years Tāk was known as Ṭayyish Kargīl Dīz, and that it stood to the south of Sārī, beyond the gorge of Kūlā.

For such hill-top castles a reliable water-supply was an important need. Thus a few possessed springs, or wells of water—as in the case of the Ismāʿīlī castle of Girdkūh, near Damghān, which assumed major importance only after the appearance of water in a previously dry well, as the result of an earthquake. However, the majority had to depend on water stored in cisterns, the remains of which are often visible at the present day. At Bahmandis, some 50 miles south of Shāhreza in Isfahan Province, the castle crowned a precipitous rocky bluff in the centre of a great plain. The only entrance was by crawling through a crevice between two rocks, and water was stored in two large cisterns outside, and below, the castle. At this site an Arabic inscription, apparently the earliest known in Iran, records the construction of the fortifications by Khāzīn b. Muḥammad in 265/878-9.

In the mountains, fortifications had generally to be adapted to the lie of the ground, but those in the plains more often had a geometrical ground-plan. In the Gurgān plain a characteristic layout consists of a square perimeter with a smaller square keep in one corner (cf. E. F. Schmidt, Flights over ancient cities of Iran, Pl. 61, 67 and 68). To judge by the example at the site of the mediaeval town of Tamghišat Kharābābāghar in Gurgān Province, such fortifications may date from the eighth or ninth centuries A.D. Also in Gurgān Province are linear systems of fortification designed to guard against incursions from the steppe. One of these is the famous Sadd-i Iskan-dar ("Alexander's Barrier"), whilst a lesser wall, situated near Kharābābāghar, consisted of a baked-brick curtain wall running along the crest of an earthen rampart, and strengthened by semi-circular or semi-elliptical towers. Both these lines of defence appear to have been built by the Sāsānid king Khosrow I (A.D. 531-579) before the advent of Islam.

Amongst the best-studied Islamic fortresses of Iran are the castles of the Ismāʿīlī sect in the Alburz range, for example Alāmūt [q.v.], Lamasar and Maymūnīz to the north of Kāzwīn; and Girdkūh, near Damghān. These strongholds are sited on precipi-
HİŚN

tous crags, and have ingenious arrangements for water-supply. At Maymundiz, recently located near Shams Kilaya, off the Alamut Valley, a spring was found on the summit of the castle spur, and three more on the side of the feature; whilst a stream had been diverted to bring water to the foot of the castle, details all reported by Djuwayni (tr. J. A. Boyle, ii, 627). At Lamassar, there is a catchment area with cisterns on the summit of the rock. In addition, Willey describes a tunnel 600 yards long leading to a tower which overhangs the river Naina Rud. From this tower water could be drawn up out of the river with buckets. Ivanow, however, gives a slightly different description of this feature.

All the major cities of Iran were in the middle ages protected by walls, few of which survive to the present day. Pope describes the walls of Yazd, still partly extant. They are of mud-brick, guarded by circular bastions, and provided with machicolations (Persian sang-ndas), and an entrance-tower which performs the function of a barbican. The elaborate mud-brick fortifications of the citadel also survive at Bam.

As an element in place-names Hıśn is somewhat rare in Iran. The Arab geographers refer to a settlement called Hıśn Mahdī on the Kārūn below Ahwāz, but the site has not been identified in modern times. Hıśn al-Tāk in Āfghān Sīstān (not to be confused with the previously-mentioned castle of Tāk in Tabaristān) was a powerful fortress situated about 22 miles south of Zarandj (modern Nād 'Allī). Le Strange (Eastern Caliphate, 343) was in error in stating that this site lay north of Zarandj. It is correctly identified by G. P. Tate, Seistan, a memoir of the history, topography, ruins and people of the country, Calcutta 1910-12, 225, with the group of ruins known at the present day as Sar-o-tar (or Tar-o-sar), which stand on the high plain overlooking the valley of the Helmand. The site was investigated by J. Hackin in 1936, and consists of a massive mud-brick keep surrounded by two outer perimeters. A particular feature of these fortifications is the use of the bent entrance. It was at Tāk that the Saffārid Khalaf b. Ahmad (352/963-393/1002) withstood a siege by his rebellious son Tāhir, and subsequently prepared to receive the onslaught of Mahmūd of Ghāna, to whom, however, he finally surrendered on terms.


(A. D. H. Bivar)

### III.—CENTRAL ASIA

Light is thrown on the long development of mud-brick fortification in Central Asia by the researches of S. P. Tolstov in the territories of ancient Khurāzam. The earliest fortified sites are the so-called 'wall-dwelling settlements' of about the 6th century B.C., in which the living-quarters are formed by a series of vaulted corridors extending along the inner face of the wall. The ground-plan of the fortifications is usually rectangular, as at the site of Kalaly-Gyr, and the walls are provided with numerous spear-shaped arrow-slits, and occasional square towers or salients for enfilade fire. The main purpose of these enclosures appears to have been for the safeguarding of flocks and herds, since the internal court-yards were not built up with houses.

Fortresses of considerably greater sophistication were, however, developed in the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C., when Chorasmia (Khurāzam) came to constitute an independent state. There was some variation in the ground-plans at this period. Thus at Koi-Krylgan-Kala there was a circular perimeter with semi-circular towers, enclosing a circular keep. This whole lay-out is reminiscent of fortifications of the Parthian period in Iran, for example the cities of Dārbāghār and Gūr (Fīruzshābd) in Fars. At Džanbas Kal'a the more traditional rectangular ground-plan is used, without flanking towers but once more well-provided with arrow-slits, and with specially-constructed oblique arrow-slits to protect the corners of the wall. The most remarkable feature of this site is however an outwork which screens the gate, and forms a species of bent entrance. Creswell argued from its occurrence at Džanbas Kal'a that this refinement of fortification was first developed in Central Asia, reaching the Muslim and Mediterranean worlds only in the eighth century A.D.

In the second and third centuries A.D. under the local dynasty of the Afrighids a new type of fortification became general in Khurāzam. The main feature in this case, within one or two rectangular perimeters with rounded towers, was a massive square central keep with battered walls, standing on a solid base of mud-brick, and entered from the perimeter gate-house by a bridge at the first storey. These fortifications are interpreted by Tolstov as the residence of a local nobility, the dekhāns. Similar principles of fortification persisted into the Muslim period in Central Asia. Ground-plans remained basically rectangular, but there was a tendency to adapt the lay-out to the contours of the ground. Where extensions were required, it became customary to enlarge the perimeter here or there on an ad hoc basis, rather than to adhere throughout to a predetermined geometrical plan. Powerful flanking towers remained an important feature of the defences, and gates were furnished with semicircular outworks having a single entrance so arranged as to oblige the attackers to present their unshielded sides to the missiles of the defenders. It was in the 12th and 13th centuries that the art of fortification reached its fullest development with the massive structures of the Khurāzamshāhs.


(A. D. H. Bivar)

### IV.—INDONESIA AND MALAYSIA

In the sense in which historians of Muslim architecture understand the word hıśn, it is absent from Indonesia and Malaysia. Though these countries, and their several components, were converted to Islam at various times from the end of the 7th/13th century onwards, the technique of fortification and defence had already been formed by local requirements of site, materials and tactics rather than by conventional architectural principles.

Thus, though the Javanese, for instance, built superb and very large stone temples from as early as the 10th century, by the time Islam reached them 500-600 years later, their society was already based on maritime and coastal trade rather than war on
land. Their forts, and others in Sumatra, Malay and Borneo, were usually sited to control river-mouths and junctions, or in defence against pirates. They were often occupied only temporarily—for a few days or weeks at a time—and usually consisted of earth or turf walls and ramparts strengthened with timber and surrounded by ditches, wooden stockades or calthrops. Sometimes stone, locally-made brick and rubble were used, but timber was the commonest material, apart from earth, as it was everywhere available in quantity, while stone was relatively rare.

These structures are called either kota (from Sanskrit) or kubu in both Indonesian and Malay. Both words mean ‘fort’, the former type being larger and more permanent than the latter and more likely to be made of stone.

Some forts mounted cannon from before 1500 A.D. but exchange of shot was often a ritual performance containing little rancour: real fighting was by sword, spear and kōris at close quarters and in conditions where fortification was irrelevant. In these circumstances, and in terrain often thickly covered with jungle, the Middle Eastern style of military architecture deriving from long-range archery, sieges and mounted sorties was accordingly never called into existence.

The defences of royal cities were grander and more substantial, according to early travellers’ accounts, and included towers and great gates but, so far as is known, there was nothing specifically Islamic about them.


(H. C. Bottoms)

HIŞN AL-ÁKRÁD ("Fortress of the Kurds"), a castle in Syria known in Europe by the name of "Crac des Chevaliers". The castle crowns a rounded and almost isolated summit, about 300 m. to the north-west of Hisn. Situated like an eagle’s nest at a height of 750 m. on a spur flanked by two ravines on the north-east and north-west, it overlooks from a height of more than 300 m. the plain of the Bukáyáa and the eastern coastal plain of Tripoli.

The first Franks period, 503-37/1110-42. During the first Crusade, Raymond of Saint-Gilles, who had just captured Alp Arslan marched from Aleppo and besieged the castle of Munaytira and Akkár, which is snow-capped for most of the year. Shortly afterwards, at the end of 503/June 1099, the Franks were no make no attempts against Hisn al-Ákrád, which was compelled to pay them tribute. Shortly afterwards, at the end of 503/June mo, the Franks were no make no attempts against Hisn al-Ákrád, which was compelled to pay them tribute.

The second Franks period, 537-670/1142-1271. The atabeg Zangi [q.v.] had just captured the castle; the damage was quickly repaired by Raymond and the villagers of the neighbourhood remained under Frankish protection. In Radjjab 552/August-September 1157 a violent earthquake shook the castle; the damage was quickly repaired by Raymond of Le Puy, Grand Master of the Hospitallers, who had received a handsome donation from Wadišlas II,
king of Bohemia. It was the old Kurd castle, enlarged by the castellan, on which Nur al-Din [q.v.] set eyes in 557/1163 before being obliged to flee towards the lake of Hims in the siesta hour. In 565/1170 the place suffered severely from a second earthquake, as a result of which important repair works were undertaken, which were sufficiently advanced in 564/1170 to resist Şâlîh al-Dîn [q.v.]. Further earthquakes in 597/1201 and 598/1202 made extensive repairs necessary, and the general appearance of the castle dates from this period. The first thirty years of the 7th/i3th century were the heyday of Hisn al-Akrâd. In 613/1207 the Knights repulsed an attack by al-Malîk al-Âdîl Abû Bakr; in 624/1218, during the fifth Crusade, the army of al-Malîk al-Alqârî came from Aleppo to camp beneath it. In the same year King Andrew II of Hungary made an assignment of revenue for the upkeep of the fortress where he had been a guest. Frederick II excluded the Hospitallers and the Crac from the peace treaty concluded in Râbi‘ I 626/February 1229 with the Ayyûbid sultan al-Malîk al-Kâmil [q.v.]; the latter tried in vain to seize the place in Dûmâdâ II 626/ May 1229. At this time the masters of Hisn al-Akrâd exacted a tribute of 4,000 dinars from the principality of Hamât, 800 dinars from the canton of Abû Kudays, and 1,200 dinars and 100 mudûr of wheat and barley from the Ismâ‘îlî territory (bi‘dâd al-da‘wâ). They had to forgo this income in 665/1266 after the signing of a ten years’ peace treaty with Baybars [q.v.]; (Maqrizi, ed. Quatremère, Hist. Maml., 1, 2, 32, 42).

The Crac, which in normal times had a garrison of some sixty Knights of St. John, was used as an assembly point for the expeditions which were often made against Hamât. In 630/1233 more than 2000 combatants gathered at the castle: 100 Knights of Cyprus, 80 of Jerusalem, 30 of Antioch, and 100 Hospitallers, as well as 400 sergeants and 1500 infantrymen.

It was after the failure of the seventh Crusade at al-Manṣûra [q.v.] in 647/1249 and the departure of Saint Louis that the first difficulties began, since there were no further reinforcements coming from Europe. Moreover, the Muslims were gaining in strength; at the end of 649/beginning of 1252 a Turkoman army from Shâyaz [q.v.] invaded the region, although its attack on Hisn al-Akrâd failed. In 658/1260, after the Muslim victory over the Mongols at ‘Ayn Djalut [q.v.], a new champion of Islam emerged, Baybars I [q.v.]. From this time onward disaster followed disaster for the Christians. In Dûmâdâ II 668/January 1270 the sultan sent out a reconnaissance party of 40 cavalry; in Safar 669/September-October 1270, learning of the death of Saint Louis and being no longer threatened from the west, he led a powerful expedition into Syria. Baybars appeared before Hisn al-Akrâd; on 19 Râdjâb 669/March 1271 he occupied the forward defences and battered the outer enceinte; on the 21st, after the arrival of reinforcements from Hamât, he captured the first barbican (bâshâra); ten days later, on 1 Shahinân/15 March, the second barbican, at the elbow of the access-ramp, also fell, and finally, on 15 Shahinân/29 March, an entry was forced into the central courtyard and the besieged defenders withdrew into the donjon. Baybars attacked with ballistas; on 25 Shahinân/8 April the keep surrendered, and the Knights were allowed to withdraw, under safe-conduct, to Tripoli. The spurious letter from the Grand Master of the Order calling on the Knights to surrender, a letter which was said to have been forged.
by Baybars, seems to be a legend given currency by al-Nuwayri. Baybars himself directed the repair work, and left the castle on 15 Ramaḍān/27 April 680/1281 under the supervision of Ramūr Din Gūrymān, his governor. In 680/1281, after the capture of Tripoli by Kalāwān [q.v.], Hisn al-Akrād, mentioned by al-ʿUmarā as still being an important fortress, lost its importance, but a garrison was kept there to guard against any attack from Europe or Cyprus on Tarṭūs or Tripoli.

Being remote from the major communication routes, the region was sheltered from attack, and was untouched by the invasion of Ṭimūr Lang [q.v.] in 803/1401 just as it was by the Ottoman conquest more than a century later.

In 859, at the time of Rey's first journey, the castle was still almost intact, but van Berchem records that in 865 it was already occupied by a village. In November 1935 Hisn al-Akrād was ceded to France by the ʿAlawi state, the village was evacuated, and restoration work was begun in earnest. In 1947 the restored castle was returned by France to Syria. Today it is one of the wonders of mediaeval military art, and its present appearance recalls what it was like seven centuries ago.

Description. The general outline of the castle, which occupies a surface area of two and a half hectares (just over six acres), is in the shape of a trapezium of which the smaller base is to the north and the oblique sides to the eastern and western fronts. The outer enceinte broadens from north to south. The main entrance is on the east front in an oblong salient in the outer enceinte; this enceinte, the layout of which is dictated by the terrain, includes round or square towers at intervals according to the exigencies of defence. The east front has three oblong salients protected by brattices rebuilt by the Muslims in the 7th/13th century. The north front includes a postern and is protected by two square towers, the salient parts of which were rounded off at the time of Baybars. Five Frankish towers, dating from the end of the 6th/12th century, are connected by curtain walls which, retaining their crenellated chemin-de-ronde and their brattices, bring a fine architectural beauty to the western front. The south front, where there are no natural defences, was protected only by a vast front extending southwards by three ditches, of which the trace remains. The powerful rampart of the Frankish period, behind which there extends a hall sixty metres in length, was reinforced in the Muslim period by a rebuilding of the great angle towers and by the construction in the middle of the wall of a huge square structure, the work of Baybars.

An arched ramp, in two sections, leads from the main entrance and is defended at its elbow as well as at its two ends; it gives access either to the entrance leading to the interior court or to the terreplein between the two enceintes. This system of a double concentric enceinte seems to have been borrowed from the Byzantine tradition. The inner enceinte corresponds to the ramparts of the original Frankish fortress which, between 1120 and 1142, had replaced the small Muslim castle of the 5th/11th century; it enclosed a small hill and was originally furnished with square towers, some of which were later rebuilt as round towers. This enceinte, which commands all the exterior defences, may be described as follows: the east front has a square tower defending the entrance and a salient which corresponds with the chevet of the chapel. This salient and the neighbouring curtains are in a rusticated bond of moderate size, which indicates the oldest parts of the construction. At the north-west corner a large square tower forms a rectangular salient, the face of which carries three machicolations on large arches. Machicolation had been known in the east since Greco-Roman times, as the brattices of Kasr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbi [q.v.] show, although this system of defence spread in Europe only after the end of the 6th/12th century. The small north side of the salient has a side entrance which is bent, on the classical Byzantine model, to the right, to allow better protection for defenders carrying shields. The west front has only one single tower. On the south front, which because of the nature of the terrain is the most exposed, there is an impressive group of three tall towers scarfed into the batter and joined by two curtains; this formidable redoubt was used as a donjon. The south-west tower, the hall of which was decorated with fine sculpture, is known as the "Master's Lodging". The central tower was the best defended, its wall, over 6 metres thick, being pierced by two long embrasures. Finally, to the south-east, beside the corner tower, there stands between the two enceintes a pentagonal structure, rebuilt by Baybars, which was a control-point for intercommunication between the two enceintes, and which overlooks the great moat and commands the access ramp to the interior court. The inner enceinte underwent modifications at the beginning of the 7th/13th century after the earthworks which had shaken the fortress. A massive battered embankment was built up against the wall, which in addition to its rôle as a buttress provided resistance against further seismic shock. The round towers are set in this powerful revetment, whilst at the foot of the original enceinte, which can be recognized by the nature of its rusticated stonework, runs a narrow corridor pierced by loopholes. On the south front a great masonry reservoir (birka) fed by a small aqueduct and serving for men and animals, affords additional protection between the two enceintes.

All the works of the interior defences and the guard-rooms, which are equipped with latrines and drains, date from the Frankish period. They are situated in the wall, and open out onto a vast central courtyard which is reached by a ramp in the north front. The central courtyard is occupied by vaulted store-rooms, the roofs of which form a vast terrace. Opposite the entrance, to the west, there is a large council-room with an elegant portico of pointed arches which are "a gem of Rayonnant Gothic art". To the north is a Romanesque chapel, barrel-vaulted and with a semi-circular apse, dating from the end of the 6th/12th century. It was converted into a mosque by Baybars, and has three miḥrābs, one of which is in the apse, and a massive stone minbar.

All daily necessities were available in the interior of the enceinte. Rain-water was led into cisterns through earthenware channels, and supplemented the well in the central courtyard. In the southern part of the outer enceinte large stapled granaries were built, 60 m. long by 9 m. wide, which also served to shelter cattle during sieges. The north-west tower had a windmill. Barns and storehouses for reserve rations, silos for grain, cellars for oil and wine, millstones, wine-presses, and an oven provided for the victualling of the garrison under any circumstances.

Lower down the hill a terraced village called Hisn houses a farming community which cultivates the surrounding land and depends on cereal-crops, pasture-lands, fruit-trees and vegetables. Hisn, which was enclosed by a wall with two gates in the
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Middle Ages, is divided into two quarters, the Harat al-Turkman to the south, and the Karat al-Baybars. The minaret dates from the 8th/i4th century, probably from the time of the governor Sara'ya. In the latter is the principal mosque, a former church which was adapted for Islam by the tombs of two grooms who was killed at his side.


(N. ELISSÉEFF)

**HIȘN AL-GHURAB**, name ("Crow Castle") of a mountain bearing on its summit the ruins of an ancient castle, situated on the southern coast of Arabia in the territory of the Wâhîdî [v.s.] sultanate at the eastern end of the South Arabian Federation, near the small town of Bir 'All (14° N., 48° 19' E.). The mountain, which is of volcanic origin like several small islands in its vicinity and has its name because of its conspicuous blackish brown colour, is connected with the mainland, as it was already in the 1st century A.D., by a low strip of sandy ground. In A.D. 1938, in the laternomer of the principal mosque, a south-west a small bay, in the north-east corner of which lies the trade port Bir 'All, a walled place of modest dimensions. This bay offers the best harbour because of its conspicuous blackish brown colour, is now generally accepted that the site of Cane is at *Hüsên al-ğurâb*, and not at Bal-Ḫayf to the west nor at Madjdiya, 10 km. to the east of Bir 'All.


(J. SCHLEICHER-[L. O. SCHUMAN])

**HIŞN KAYFA**, town in Turkey (Hasankanef in modern Turkish) situated in *Dijàzra* (Upper Mesopotamia) on the right bank of the Tigris (37° 40' North and 41° 30' East) about halfway between Diyâr-Bakr and *Dijàzrat Ibn 'Umar* (Cizre), which in the Middle Ages was reputed to have an unhealthy climate.

The word Kayfâ appears to be of Syriac origin (*Kfu̯ = rock*), in which case the town would take its name from its castle, built on the rock which overhangs the Tigris. The historians of the Roman period refer to it under the name of Kipas or Cepha and Chiphas. According to Taylor (see *JRS*), in early Arab traditions it was called Sab'at Aghâl which refers to the sevens converging ravines. Yâkût mentions it under the name of *Hüsên Kayfâ*, which he takes to be an Armenian word; according to Taylor, the place was known in ancient Armenian as Kentzy. The modern name, Hasankeyf, is obviously merely a deformation of the name Kayfâ. The various Turkish etymologies: *Hasan keyfi* = Hasan's pleasure, *hisni keyf* = good humour and *hiśn-i keyf* = castle where cares are forgotten, are fantasies of popular interpretation.

The region has been inhabited from very early times. Many grottoes and caves cut out of both banks of the river and in the neighbouring ravines date from the Chaldean period. Taylor found there many Parthian, Greek, Roman, Byzantine and Arab coins. But no precise information on these early settlements is available.

During the Roman period, the castle of *Hüsên Kayfâ* marked the frontier between the Roman and Persian territories. Because of its remarkable situation on the edge of the regions of Tur 'Abdin, which guards communications with the region of the diyâr Râbi'a, and being at a point on the route between the valleys of the Batman Su and the Nahr al-Sarbat, this castle was for centuries of great strategic importance.
Hisn al-Akrad — View from the South-West
Hiş al-Akrād — View looking north-west

(photograph by N. Elisséeff)
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In the 5th century A.D. the town was the seat of a Nestorian bishopric and possessed many churches; indeed there were always many Christians there. At the beginning of the Artukid dynasty they possessed considerable influence, which was reinforced by the resistance of the Arabs and the Kurds to the Turco-Mongol invasion. It was not until the 6th/12th century that the district of Diyār Bakr became involved in the movement of Muslim reaction aroused by Nūr al-Dīn. Nevertheless the Christian element did not entirely lose its importance, and in the 7th/13th century Hisn Kayfā was joined to the district of Tūr 'Abdin to form a patriarchate independent of that of Mardin.

No details exist of the Arab conquest of the Byzantine fortress of Hisn Kayfā. With the decline of the 'Abbāsid dynasty the town came under the domination of the Hamdānids, as did the whole of the Diyār Bakr, in which Sayf al-Dawla was particularly interested, making long and frequent visits to Mayyāfārīkīn. The Hamdānids supplanted the Hamdānids and were themselves driven out by the Seljūqs; the Diyār Bakr became an integral part of the empire of Malikshāh. It was at this time that there appeared a new dynasty of Turkomans origin, that of the Artuqids [g.v.] under whom Hisn Kayfā flourished. Sūkmān b. Artūq, in the service of the Seljūqs, made his masters give him this town in 495/1102 and Hisn Kayfā, which thus became the seat of a princely dynasty, was for more than a century the political centre of a state which, though nominally a vassal of the Seljūk sultans, was in fact almost totally independent. Dāwūd b. Sūkmān succeeded his father and was himself replaced on his death by his son, Kara Arslan, to whom is attributed the restoration, in 510/1116, of the famous bridge over the Tigris which will be mentioned later. Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad, the son and successor of Kara Arslan, was more or less the vassal of the Zangī Nūr al-Dīn. On his death the Artuqid princes became increasingly the dependants of Sālh al-Dīn.

In 629/1232 they were completely dispossessed of Hisn Kayfā by the Ayyūbidids. In 658/1260, the town, captured by the Mongols, was pillaged and partly destroyed, though the branch of the Ayyūbidids in Hisn Kayfā survived for more than two centuries under their Ayyūbid and their Seljūq successors; it even survived the upheaval of Timūr's invasion, maintaining in the declining town a centre of Arabic culture. The Ayyūbid dynasty succumbed to the Ak Ğoyunlu [g.v.], who imposed their rule on Hisn Kayfā but rebuilt it from its ruined state, particularly under the sons of Uzun Hasan. At the beginning of the 10th/16th century the Persians invaded the region and defeated the Ak Ğoyunu, Hisn Kayfā then coming under the sovereignty of the Şafawī Shāh Ismā'īl. The final capture of the region in 922/1516 by the Ottomans caused no change in the condition of Hisn Kayfā, which gradually dwindled to a small and unimportant town (pop., 1960:1058). Today it forms part of the mediaet of Mardin but is very little visited because of the poor communications.

During its period of prosperity, Hisn Kayfā was a flourishing commercial centre, its situation on the Tigris making it an important entrepôt on the river route linking Diyār Bakr and Diyarhashtags Ibn Umar. The town was surrounded by several suburbs with prosperous markets.

The present ruins of the town bear witness to its importance in the Middle Ages. Among the monuments still existing should be mentioned: (1) The castle built on an enormous rock overlooking the Tigris on its north side and surrounded on its three other sides by ravines. Access to it is by the north-east side of the ravine alone, a ramp provided with fortified gates. This castle contained, according to Ibn Shaddād, palaces (of which some remains may still be seen), a mosque (on which there exists an inscription of 796/1394), some other buildings, a hippodrome and some ground which was cultivated. To the north of the castle was a first suburb with chíks, madrasas, baths, cemeteries and mausoleums of the Seljūqs and Artuqid princes. The town had no walls but possessed a fortress on a rock. (2) The Dījamī al-Rīzk to the north-west of the town on the banks of the Tigris. Built in 811/1409 by the Ayyūbid Sulaymān, this mosque has an imposing minaret 30 metres high with a cylindrical shaft and square base, ornamented with a cornice of stalactites and crowned by a lantern. (3) The Dījamī Sulaymān, a little further inside the town, with a varied arrangement of cupolas and a richly decorated dome. The minaret of the same type as the preceding one, is divided into four storeys by bands of moulding. Several inscriptions are still to be read: 752/1351, 809/1407. (4) The Koč Dījamī, a vast ensemble dating from the end of the 8th/14th and the beginning of the 9th/15th centuries and consisting of a number of buildings grouped around a rectangular court; only the southern wing exists today. (5) A small mosque probably founded by the Shāhī Sulaymān, of the 9th/15th century. (6) A mausoleum of the 9th/15th century. (7) The convent of the imām 'Abd Allāh on the summit of a mound on the left bank of the Tigris, bearing an inscription which refers to a restoration and is dated 883/1478 in the name of 'Afl, son of Uzun Hasan. A porcelain plaque with the formula of benediction of the twelve imāms proves that it was a Shi'i sanctuary, perhaps of the Shi'i Kara Koyunlu, the rivals of the Ak Ğoyunlu, who themselves were Sunnīs. (8) The tomb of Zaynāl Bēg, son of Uzun Hasan, on the left bank of the Tigris, a mausoleum with a cylindrical exterior and octagonal interior. (9) Finally, the bridge over the Tigris, which Yākūt described as one of the most beautiful works he had ever seen. Its decoration, similar to that on the walls of the castle and the adjacent türbe, shows that it was a Şī'ī sanctuary, perhaps of the Shi'i Kara Koyunlu. According to the account of the traveller Barbaro, who saw it still complete in 1510 and who is the last so to describe it, this bridge had five arches. Today there remain standing only three masses of masonry: the beginning of the abutment pier with an arch and parts of the first pier, the second pier and the third pier.

There may also be mentioned the many rock dwellings, more numerous here than anywhere else in Mesopotamia.

Plan of Ḥiṣn Kayfa (based on the plan by A. Gabriel)
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By the definitions given by the Ikhwan al-Safa, operation. This distinction is perhaps best illustrated by the definitions given by the Ikhwan al-Safa: “Al-khäs is the change produced in the temperament of the senses by their contact with the sensibilia; al-thsâ is the consciousness of the sensory faculties of these changes in the quality of the temperaments of the senses” (Rasâ’il Ikhwan al-Safa, Bombay 1305, ii, 261).

The Islamic philosophers, in general, follow the Aristotelian theory of sense-perception as far as what they term the “external” (šâhira) senses are concerned. The sensibilia are apprehended by means of the change caused by them in the appropriate sense organ. This change, however, is not merely a passive one, but rather an actualization in the organ of a quality, corresponding to the quality perceived, which already exists potentially in that organ. Ibn Sinâ describes the process as an istikmâl = “a perfecting” (Avicenna’s De Anima, ed. F. Rahman, London 1959, 66).

Al-Kindi, in his Rûsâla fi l-šâfiû, describes the process as follows: “The image that is in matter is that which is actually sensible... When the soul apprehends it, it is in the soul. The soul apprehends it only because it is potentially in the soul. When the soul comes into contact with it, it is then actually in the soul; it is not present there like something superimposed on it, like an image in a body, for the soul is incorporeal and indivisible: it is in the soul, and the soul is one thing... In the same way the sensory faculty is nothing other than the soul: it is not in the soul like a member in a body—it is the soul, which is that which senses... In the soul, then, that which is sensed is that which senses (fa-iḍân al-mahsiûs fi l-nafs huwa l-hâs)” (Rasâ’il al-Kindi al-falsafîyya, ed. Abû Rida, Cairo 1950, 254-5).

No sense organ perceives by direct contact with the sensibilia, and indeed it cannot do so: it operates through an intermediary, which for most of the senses is either air or water. The Islamic philosophers, however, unlike Aristotle, make an exception of touch in this respect, regarding the flesh as the organ, rather than as the intermediary, of this sense. Even Ibn Rushd, in his Talkhîs Kitâb al-frus wa-l-mawrus (the “store-house” for the perceptions of the senses that are in most of the Islamic theories the “store-house” for the perceptions of the imagination). In al-Fârâbî appears to assign a somewhat different role to this faculty: “fi ‘l-hâd al-muṭâjâr bi‘l-bâdîn wa-l-šâfiû wa-l-dhâlî” (op. cit., i, 8), but omit it in the actual Rûsâla (i, 258-70), where al-friswa al-muṭâbâyâsila asumes its function, in addition to its own.

In al-Fârâbî wâhîm appears to operate on a similar level to that of hîss; in Ibn Sinâ al-friswa al-wâhîmiyya (the highest faculty of judgment in animals) seems to be ranked above al-friswa al-muṭâbâyâsila (corresponding to the human huwa al-muâfhika = “cognitative faculty”), and also, incidentally, to perform a function of the Aristotelian sensus communis that is disregarded in the other Islamic theories, that of perceiving the fact that perception is taking place. Ibn Rushd rejects as unnecessary the concept of wâhîm in animals, and maintains that al-friswa al-muṭâbâyâsila, as an active faculty, is capable of performing the function assigned to wâhîm (Talkhîs al-tahâfûs, ed. M. Boyyges, Beirut 1930, 546-7).

The clearest and most systematic of the Islamic theories are those of the Ikhwan al-Safa (loc. cit.) and Ibn Sinâ (loc. cit.). See also MAHSûSAT.

Bibliography: in the article.

(J. N. MATTOCK)
HIT, town in 'Irâq situated in about 33° 35' N. and 42° 48' E. on the right bank of the Euphrates, on a hill which may be the mediaeval Arab travellers estimate the distance between Hit and Baghâd at 33 parasangs (ca. 130 miles) or 5½-6 days' journey, cf. M. Streek, Babylonien nach den arabischen Geographen, I, 8. Some Arab geographers (al-Îstâghri and Ibn ʻHawkâl) include Hit in the Dazirâ; it was generally considered, however, to be a frontier town of ʻIrâq. In al-Mu'âddasâ’s time (4th/roth century) it was of some importance; at the time of the 13th/14th century Ya'qûb, it was made a small place; at the beginning of the 19th century 'Olyâvî estimated the number of its inhabitants at about 1000, Cernik about 70 years later at 2000; Chesney counted 1500 houses; 'Ali ʻDâwâdî put the population at 3000. The Ottoman Sâlâmâme of 1323 lists 500 houses, about 10 shops, 1 dâmî, 2 masâkîn, 1 madrasa and 1 hâ Dön (243-4). The population of the nâbiya in 1957 was 6892. The situation of Hit is picturesque; the walls and two gates have survived; otherwise there is no prominent building. Ibn ʻHawkâl (227; French trans. 222) and Ya'qûb mention the tomb of the distinguished jurist 'Abd Allâh b. al-Muḥârâk who died in Hit in 161/779; cf. also al-Mas'udi, Murûtî, vi, 294, 503, and the reference in Ya'qûb, vi, 508.

Hit is a very ancient settlement, being mentioned under the name Id as early as the beginning of the 9th century B.C. in an Assyrian inscription. Herodotus and apparently also Isidorus Characensis knew the town as 'Idî; in Zosimus it is called Sîtha. Hit is the Syriac form of the name, which was adopted by the Arabs; the name is apparently derived from its most characteristic product, asphalt (Assyr. iddâ, itû). Hit was occupied by the Arabs in 16/629; it was the scene of a battle against the Carmathians in 315/927, which were worked even in ancient times. The mediaeval Arab geographers also note the wealth of bitumen which was collected in Hit and there is some recent production; bitumen was carried down the river in boats and the busy shipbuilding trade of Hit was also directly due to the asphalt. Bitumen is still collected in Hit and there is some boat-building, but neither activity is nowadays of great importance.

South of Hit are several quaries which were worked even in ancient times. The most important among the others are the place-palms and the extensive cultivation of cereals around Hit. It was further noted for its excellent wine; cf. the poems of Abû Nuwâs (ed. Kremmer, no. 12, p. 46), and the Mâ bukâtû of al-ʻAshâ (ed. R. Geyer, in Sâh. Wien, cxlix, p. 145, i. 14). Near Hit a ruined area, called Uâyâ al-Mâkûtûba (= "the transformed city"), is pointed out; there is a nearby chapel of which it is said, that Mee points out (Zeitschr. für Assyriol., xviii, 220), strikingly recalls the Frau Hitt legend in Innsbruck.

Bibliography: B.G.A., passim (see the quotation of Hûdât al-ʻAlâm, index; 'Had Allâh Mustawfi in the index; ʻYâkût, iv, 997; Abu ʻl-Fidât, Târikh, i, 298 f., 328; Kaftân, Kosmographie, ed. Wustenfeld, ii, 186; Ballâdhuri, Futûh, 279, 299; Le Strange, 64-5; M. Canard, 'A-lhamdûnî, i, Paris-Algiers 1961, 146-7; 'Ali ʻDâwâdî, Memâtî-i 'Oltümâmînînîn târîhî we-diğrîfîdîلغ bûgdiî, iii, Istanbul 1316 s., 841; Sâmâlûnînînîn târîhî we-diğrîfîdîلغ bûgdiî, ii, Istanbul 1316 s., 841; Sâmâlûnînînîn târîhî we-diğrîfîdîلغ bûgdiî, ii, Istanbul 1316 s., 841; Sâmâlûnînînîn târîhî we-diğrîfîdîلغ bûgdiî, ii, Istanbul 1316 s., 841; Sâmâlûnînînîn târîhî we-diğrîfîdîلغ bûgdiî, ii, Istanbul 1316 s., 841; Sâmâlûnînînîn târîhî we-diğrîfîdîلغ bûgdiî, ii, Istanbul 1316 s., 841; Sâmâlûnînînîn târîhî we-diğrîfîdîلغ bûgdiî, ii, Istanbul 1316 s., 841; Sâmâlûnînînîn târîhî we-diğrîfîdîلغ bûgdiî, ii, Istanbul 1316 s., 841; Sâmâlûnînînîn târîhî we-diğrîfîdîلغ bûgdiî, ii, Istanbul 1316 s., 841; Sâmâlûnînînîn târîhî we-diğrîfîdîلغ bûgdiî, ii, Istanbul 1316 s., 841, which have been translated by illustration); Cernîk, in Pet. Mist., Erganz.-Heft xiv (1875), 23 f.; J. Peters, Nippur or explorations and adventures on the Euphrates, i, New York 1897, 395-6; Gertrude Bell, The eastern bank of the Euphrates from Tell-ʻAnas to Hit, in Geog. Journal, 1901; Violett, Description du Palais d'al-Moutassim = Mirm., l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, xii (1909), part ii, 575 f. (and pl. i); A. Musil, The Middle Euphrates, New York 1927, 352-3.

(M. Streek)

HI'TTIN or HATTÎN, in the Talmud Kefer Haṭṭîyye, a village to the west of and above Tiberias on a fertile plain, the southern border of which is formed by a steep limestone ridge. At both the western and eastern ends of the ridge there is a higher summit called Khirbat Haṭṭîn. A tradition known in the 6th/12th century the origin of which is uncertain, places the tomb of the prophet Shu'aîb (Jethro) here; the little chapel, which has been rebuilt in modern times and is still annually visited by the Druzes, lies on an elevation in a rocky valley at the western summit. On the uneven tableland south-east of the rocky ridge was fought the battle which destroyed the power of the Crusaders, when Șâlāh-d-dîn won a great victory over the Christians on 5 July 1187. After some of the Frankish troops, tormented by heat and thirst, had been cut down, and others put to flight, the remainder retired to the eastern summit, where many were thrown over the steep southern side. In memory of this the victor built a small chapel on the summit, called Khirbat al-ʻNaṣr.

Bibliography: G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 450 f.; T. Robinson, Palästina, i, 483. For the battle see (besides the general histories of the Crusades by Grousset and Runciman, and that edited by Setton (Philadelphia), etc.): Marshall W. Baldwin, Raymund III of Tripoli, 1936, 96 f.; Jean Richard, Acad. des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, xii, 575 f.; Cernîk, in Pet. Mist., Erganz.-Heft xiv (1964) (with photographs); P. Herde, Die Kämpfe bei den Hîrmn von Hattin, in Römische Quartalschrift, lii (1966), 1-50, one map and eight photographs.

(FR. BUHL-[CL. CAHEN])

HIYAL, plural of hîla (A.), artifice, device, expedient, stratagem, a means of evading a thing, or of effecting an object. The word is used in several technical meanings.

1. Hiyal is a technical term for stratagems in war (synonyms are makdîd and dabb.) The use of stratagems in war is justified by a saying attributed to the Prophet, really an old proverb, al-harb hûd'a, "war is deceit". The term occurs in the titles of works on military art, as well as in their text. The earliest of these works known to us is the Kitâb al-Hiyal of a certain al-Harithami al-ʻShârînî who dedicated it to the caliph al-Ma'mûn; the Fibrîştî (314, lines 23-27)
gives detailed information on its arrangement but unfortunately not on its contents. A popular work of a later period is *Al-Bahar al-Fawqani* (Brockelmann, S I, 879; the author died 611/1215), which was analysed by H. Ritter, together with other works on the art of war, in *Isl.*, xviii (1920), 144 ff. It was edited, with an important introduction and a French translation, by J. Sourdel-Thomine, in *BEO*, xvii (1962), 105-268. Popular, too, was the *Kitāb al-hiyāl fi l-mashf wa-fāṭik al-maddā'īn wa-kīsā al-durūb* (from which the term *mukhātara* (from which the term *mukhātara* of the medieval law merchant is derived) or, more commonly, *ṣina* euphemistically, it is also called *muwashshā*, "transaction"). The purpose is to instruct the money-lender in how to calculate the chances of legal validity to a nicety if the *bāb* (which was bound to apply the sacred law, was not to upset the real effects of the business transaction which their customers, the merchants, had in mind, effects which depended upon the validity of every single element in an often complicated series of formal transactions. The activity of the authors of *hiyal* who catered for the practice, is intrinsically parallel with that of the early specialists who had in mind, effects which depended upon the validity of every single element in an often complicated series of formal transactions. The activity of the authors of *hiyal* who catered for the practice, is intrinsically parallel with that of the early specialists who had first elaborated the theory of Islamic law. The early specialists had warned their contemporaries against acts incompatible with the Islamic way of life; the authors of *hiyal* helped them not to conclude contracts which would be considered invalid by the fully developed system of Islamic law. The *hiyal* are a natural outcome of that cleavage between theory and practice which has accompanied Islamic law from its very beginnings, and one of our most important sources for the knowledge of the legal practice of the Muslims in the middle ages.

Written documents often formed an essential element of *hiyal*. (Cf. *Sarāqīshī*, *Mabāšā*, xxx, 150, l. 16 ff., on Ibn Abl Layla; *Ikhwan al-Safā*, *Rasā'lī*, iii, 155.) The more complicated *hiyal* normally consisted of several transactions between the parties concerned, each of which was perfectly legal in itself, and the combined effect of which produced the desired result. Each transaction was, as a matter of course, recorded and attested in a separate document. Taken in isolation, a document recording a single transaction or an acknowledgement made by one of the parties might be used by the other party to its advantage, and was a very harmful one to merchants, the more so because traders also acted as money-lenders. This custom prevailed in Medina as early as in the time of Mālik (d. 179/795). There were hundreds of these devices, many of them concerned with highly technical points, but all with a scrupulous regard for the letter of the law. The acknowledgement (*ikrār*) plays a very important part in the construction of numerous *hiyal*, because it creates an abstract debt and is therefore particularly suitable for their purpose.

The first and simplest *hiyal* were presumably thought out by the interested parties who felt the need for them, the merchants in particular, but it was quite beyond them to invent and apply the more complicated ones; they had to have recourse to specialists in religious law, and these last did not hesitate to supply the need. The inventors of *hiyal* had to calculate the chances of legal validity to a nicety if the *bāb* (which was bound to apply the sacred law, was not to upset the real effects of the business transaction which their customers, the merchants, had in mind, effects which depended upon the validity of every single element in an often complicated series of formal transactions. The activity of the authors of *hiyal* who catered for the practice, is intrinsically parallel with that of the early specialists who had first elaborated the theory of Islamic law. The early specialists had warned their contemporaries against acts incompatible with the Islamic way of life; the authors of *hiyal* helped them not to conclude contracts which would be considered invalid by the fully developed system of Islamic law. The *hiyal* are a natural outcome of that cleavage between theory and practice which has accompanied Islamic law from its very beginnings, and one of our most important sources for the knowledge of the legal practice of the Muslims in the middle ages.

Written documents often formed an essential element of *hiyal*. (Cf. *Sarāqīshī*, *Mabāšā*, xxx, 150, l. 16 ff., on Ibn Abl Layla; *Ikhwan al-Safā*, *Rasā'lī*, iii, 155.) The more complicated *hiyal* normally consisted of several transactions between the parties concerned, each of which was perfectly legal in itself, and the combined effect of which produced the desired result. Each transaction was, as a matter of course, recorded and attested in a separate document. Taken in isolation, a document recording a single transaction or an acknowledgement made by one of the parties might be used by the other party to its exclusive advantage and for a purpose contrary to the aim of the whole of the agreement. In order to prevent this happening, the official documents were deposited in the hands of a trustworthy person (*ghārā*) or intermediary, together with an unofficial covering document which set out the real relationship of the parties to each other and the real purport of their agreement. (This kind of document is technically called *muwashshā*; "understanding.") The intermediary, then, acting on the contents of the covering document, handed to each party only those papers which they were entitled to use at any given stage,
HIYAL

and prevented the unauthorized use of any document by producing, if necessary, the document of a self-imposed penalty for non-fulfilment and, in general, declarations by which a unilateral disposition is made dependent on the occurrence of a certain event, such as "if I do such and such a thing, or if such and such a thing happens, my wife is repudiated, or my slave is manumitted". Islamic law has the tendency to interpret declarations restrictively in this case, to mitigate the resulting religious and legal obligation, and the hiyal take full advantage of this. The use of ambiguous terms and expressions is often suggested, and it is justified by a saying attributed to 'Umar: 'ina ma'arrid al-halal, ismanidaha 'am al-halal, "ambiguous expressions obviate (outright) lying" (Bukhari, Sahih, adab 116). The social need for this kind of evasion appears from the fact that the poet and philologist Ibn Durayd (d. 321/933) composed the Kitab al-Malakbin, a treatise on equivocal expressions, for the benefit of people who were forced to take the oath against their will. The legal attitude is expressed in the maxim, transmitted by Shaysun—Abu Yusuf—Abu Hanifa—Hammad al-Hamda'i—Ibrahim al-Nakha'i, i.e., with the official trad of the school of Kufa: "If a man is put to the oath whilst he is treated unjustly (wa-hwa ma'ahid), his oath is ruled by what he (himself) means, but if he is put to the oath whilst he (himself) is acting unjustly (wa-hwa zidlim), his oath is ruled by the intention of the person who makes him take it". Abu Hanifa, Hammad and Ibrahim are credited with numerous hiyal of this kind, and Ibrahim is reported to have recommended the use of this kind of fiyih to his own visiters when he was in hiding from the government (a standing feature in the biographies of ancient authorities). Even farther goes a saying attributed to the Prophet: "Every lie is counted as a lie except in three cases: if a man lies to make peace between two men, if he lies to his wife by making her promises, and if he lies when he is illiterate, (Angel, 631, l. 5 f.). Ibn Kuthayya (d. 276/889), who, as an ahl al-madhab, is the leader of the systematic lawyers (see below), nevertheless vigorously defended the lawfulness of the kind of mental reservation in question, expressed in a saying of Hudhayfa b. Yaman, a famous Companion of the Prophet: "I buy (or we may translate: I sell out) part of my religion for another lest it may disappear altogether" (Muhkthalif al-hadith, 27, 42 ff.; transal. G. Lecomte, Damascus 1992, 25, 38 ff.). Ghazzali (d. 505/1111), too, who regarded certain hiyal in legal transactions as forbidden and invalid, approved and even recommended verbal hiyal and mental reservations in order to evade the effects of an undesirable oath (Streitschrift, 73-90). H. Bauer, Islamische Ethik, 1, 80). This attitude to declarations and engagements under oath in Islam derives directly from that of the pre-Islamic and the early Islamic Arabs (e.g., Nabiqa al-Dhubayyânî, ed. Ahlwardt, The Divans, 2, 5; Dinar, Nabîzâd, ed. Bevan, 754, 3; see also J. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten, Strassburg 1914, esp. 191 ff., 217 ff., 228 f.).

There are certain differences of degree in the attitudes of the several schools of Islamic religious law towards the hiyal. The Hanafis are the most favourably inclined, and it was they, in fact, who produced the first special works on hiyal; these are the treatises of Abu Yusuf (d. 252/768) and of Shaybani (d. 289/805); the treatises of Shaybani constitutes a special branch of hiyal, and it incorporates long extracts from that of Abu Yusuf. It was edited and commented upon several times, among others by Shams al-A'mma al-Sarahghî (d. 483/1090) in his K. al-Mabsûn, and by several reputed Hanafi scholars of the 5th/11th and the 6th/12th centuries, extracts from whose works exist in the detailed chapter of the Fatwâ d'Allâmiyûn on hiyal, in the great legal devotional work in which important works of the school are collected. (A shorter collection of this kind, though without mention of the sources, is found in the fifth jann of the K. al-Ashbâh wa-l-nazâ'ir of Ibn Nudaym, d. 970/1563). Shaybani's treatise was more or less plagiarized by Khasâfî (d. 261/874), the court lawyer of the 'Abâsîd caliph Mu'tadid, who became the most reputed author on hiyal in the Hanafi school of law. But his reputation was based on an extensive treatise on hiyal which was presumably written in 'îrak in the 4th/10th century and attributed to Khasâfî; this, too, was commented upon several times. Shâfî'i, and the first few generations of his school after him, regarded the hiyal as forbidden or reprehensible, although the majority recognized them as legally valid. The success of the hiyal in the Hanafi school, however, caused several Shâfî'i authors, from the 4th/10th century onwards, to compose books on hiyal, of which that of Mahmûd b. al-'Ahsan al- Kazwinî (d. 440/1048) has been preserved, and a distinction was made between hiyal which are allowed (and which form the great majority) and those which are reprehensible or forbidden. The legal validity of all hiyal was strongly and definitely upheld by the great Shâfî'i authority Ibn Haqîr (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Verspreide Geschriften, ii, 423-s). Malik strongly disapproves (in effect, declares forbidden) the particular fiyih of the double sale, mentioned above (Mushawâ'â, k. al-buyû'â, mâ dâ'î fi ba'î al-'urûbân), without considering the question of its validity; the Malikî school admits some hiyal and rejects others, but generally regards them as valid.

The Traditionists (ahl al-hadîth, in keeping with their general approach to questions of religious law, rejected all fiyih, though a whole "book" (no. 90) of his Sahih to combating them; the commentators Aynî and Kastallân point out that Bukhârî's polemics go beyond the wording of the traditions which he adduces, and confim that they are directed against Abu Hanifa and his school. In this connexion, Bukhârî gives 14 quotations from the writings of his opponents, one at least taken either from the work of his contemporary Khusyâyî or from its source, the work of Shaybânî. Al-Khatib al-Baghdâdi (d. 465/1071), another traditionist and a follower of the Shâfî'i school, did not fail to include in his unsympathetic biographical notice on Abu Hanifa alleged sayings of the Traditionist 'Abd Allâh b. al-Mubârak (d. 181/792), who declared that the author of the Kitâb al-hiyl attributed to Abu Hanifa and its users were unbelievers and apostates, etc. (Târîkh Baghdad, iii, 426-8). Some Hanbalî authors, too, are on record as opponents of hiyal. The hadî fiyih, 'Abî Ya'fâ (d. 458/1066) wrote a Kitâb lbiyl al-hiyl (in H. Laoust, Méthodologie canonique, 170, n. 1). Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328), in special work of his (Ibâmat al-dallî 'alâ 'l-hiyl al-labihi), attacked and declared invalid the hiyal in general and the so-called tahlîl in particular; this last aims at removing the impediment to remarriage between the former hus-
band and wife after a triple repudiation by arranging for the marriage of the woman to another husband (iii, 103-109, 119-377), discusses the ḥiyyal at great length with numerous references to the works concerning them; he distinguishes ḥiyyal which are lawful, by which a lawful end is to be achieved by lawful means, from those which are forbidden and which he declares invalid; the first group comprises numerous devices in the field of commercial law. (Summary and part translation in J. P. M. Mensing, De hepaalde straffen, Leiden 1936, 122-7).

The Ḥanafis, on their part, whilst they state that ḥiyyal which cause prejudice to another are forbidden, and are loth to suggest ḥiyyal which comprise acts that are in themselves reprehensible, are not really concerned with the moral evaluation of ḥiyyal in detail, and they take their being legally valid for granted. According to them, many ḥiyyal are not even reprehensible, for instance those which aim at evading the incidence of the right of pre-emption (šu'ā'ī); and the device of tahli has been widely practised, by Ḥanafis, Mālikis and Ṣahālīs, down to the present generation (cf., e.g., the short story El Mohallel, in Yvonne Laeuffer, Oeil pour Oeil, Cairo 1930; B. Board, News girl in Egypt, London 1938, 117). The legal thought of modernist Muslims is not favourable to ḥiyyal because they are part of the traditional doctrine of fiqh.

The works on ḥiyyal, together with works on written documents and other subjects of importance for the application of Islamic law in practice, form a part of a well-defined branch of the literature of the Ḥanafī school of religious law. Bibliography: I. Goldzweig, Die Zähirliten, 68 ff.; J. Schacht, editions of Ḥiṣnâlī, K. al-ḥiyyal wa'l-makhâridî, Hanover 1923; of Ḥazwînî, K. al-ḥiyyal i l-ḥisb, Hanover 1924; and of Ṣâyâbânî, K. al-makhâridî i l-ḥisb, Leipzig 1930; Die araβische fiqil-Literatur, in Ḥ, xv (1926), 211-32; further in Revue africaine, xxvi (1952), 355/77; Introduction to Islamic Law, 3 f. f., 242. (J. Schacht)

ḤIZB (pl. ḥisb) means primarily “a group, faction, a group of supporters of a man who share his ideas and are ready to defend him”, and this is why the term has been adopted in modern Arabic to mean a political party (see below); it means also “part, portion” and it is from this meaning that it has come to indicate a portion of the Kur‘ān as well as a group of liturgical formulae. In this meaning the term is probably a borrowing from Ethiopic (see Th. Nöldeke, Neue Beiträge zur sem. Sprachw., 59, n. 8) for, in Arabic, the verb ḥasaba means “to happen (speaking of a misfortune); to be painful”. In the Kur‘ān, the expression ḥizb Allāh, “the party of Allāh” is used twice (V, 61/56, LVIII, 22) but in the other examples the word is used in a bad sense, in the singular (XXIII, 55/53, XXVIII, 14/15, XXX, 31/32), in the dual (XVIII, 11/12 where it has the sense of (arīb) and also in the plural (XI, 20/17, XII, 36, XIX, 38/37, XXXVIII, 10/11, 12/13, XL, 5, XLII, 65). Sāra XXX, sāral al-ḥisb, deals with the siege of Medina by the Jewish tribes allied with those of Mecca, Nāджd and Thīmā; in verse 31/30 of Sāra XL, the “day of the factions” alludes to the Battle of the Ditch (see al-Sandhâk). While in verses 11/12-13 of Sāra XXXVIII, the ḥisb are the people of Noah, the Ḥidâs, Pharaoh, the Thāmûd, ʿlî and the asḥâb al-ʿAllāh. From the meaning of “part, portion” there derives the technical use of the term to indicate first a definite portion of the Kur‘ān (see LA, s.v.) which a believer binds himself to recite. This practice led the Muslims of certain countries (e.g., in Egypt, see Lane, Modern Egyptians, ch. XXVII; in North Africa, see W. Marçais, Testes arabes de Tanger, 159, n. 2), to divide the Kur‘ān into 60 ḥisb, which are thus half the length of the 30 gi‘ās’ attested from a very early period (see R. Blachere, Introduction au Cor an, ch. XXVII; in North Africa, see W. Marçais, Testes arabes de Tanger, 159, n. 2). In this division appears to be comparatively recent, for al-Qāṣâlī, in the part of his Ḥiyyâ in which he deals with the recitation (tilâwa) of the Kur‘ān (1st quarter, book viii, bâb 2), mentions the 30 gi‘ās’ but refers only to the seven ḥisb of the Companions. Among the Muslims of India and Pakistan the division in question is not made, and the word ḥisb does not appear in either the Dict. of Islam by Hughes or in the Dict. of technical terms. The division into ḥisb is intended to facilitate the individual or collective recitation of the Kur‘ān in certain circumstances, particularly during the nights of the month of Ramaḍān. In Algeria, ḥāssâb, placed under the authority of a bâsh-hazzâb, were attached to certain mosques; they had to recite each day a ḥizb at noon and another in the afternoon, so as to achieve a complete recitation of the Kur‘ān in a year. In Egypt, see Lane, Modern Egyptians, see Lane, Modern Egyptians, see Lane, Modern Egyptians, see Lane, Modern Egyptians, see Lane, Modern Egyptians, see Lane, Modern Egyptians, see Lane, Modern Egyptians, see Lane, Modern Egyptians, (see J. Desparmet, Coutumes, institutions, croyances, ii, 145). Generally speaking, a collective recital of a ḥizb takes place once or several times a day after certain prayers; when the payment of the ḥāssâb was not provided for by a pious foundation, this pious work was carried out by devout folk. Some Moroccan scholars considered the recital of the ḥizb as a bid‘a (see Mub. b. ʿAllâd Djinûn; Gennun) on al-Rahînî, on ʿAbd al-Bâki al-Zurkânî, on Khâlid, Bülûk 1306, ii, 47). The edition of the Kur‘ān published in Cairo in 1342/1923 under the patronage of King Fu‘âd gives in the margins the two divisions into gi‘ās’ and into ḥisb. This innovation was perhaps due to the influence of the editions of 1322, 1324, 1342, 1382, 1431, 1432, 1445. (J. Schacht)

In Egypt, in effect, each fraternity is a ḥizb (Lane, Modern Egyptians, ch. XVIII) but this term means also the “office” of each fraternity, which consists of the recital, during the Friday service (hadra [q.v.]) in the ša‘yâa or the ṭakhiyya, of long extracts from the Kur‘ān and of other prayers [see DHIKR]. It is from this that there seems to spring a narrower meaning of the word, namely its application to formulae of “superegorgatory liturgy” [see ʿuṣâ] at a fairly late date, for this use of the word ḥizb is found for the first time in ʿAbd al-Kâdîr al-Dîjlânî (d. 561/1166); it is found again in Ibn ʿArabî (d. 638/1240), Aḥmad al-Badawî (d. 675/1277), etc. The most famous of all these ḥizbs is the ḥizb al-bâḥr of al-Ṣâhîbî, also called al-Ḥîb al-ṣâkhîr to distinguish it from another, longer but less well known, by the same author; it is recited in particular by travellers who are crossing the sea, because its chief aim is to “subject” (ṭakhîr) it to them; it was composed in the very year that the author died (656/1258), and he is reported to have said that the Mongols would not have taken Baghdad if this ḥizb had been recited; it is poor devotionally, for the author died (656/1258), and he is reported to have said that the Mongols would not have taken Baghdad if this ḥizb had been recited; it is poor devotionally, but the Kur‘ān is not recited in the ḥizb of the ṭakhiyya. The ḥizb is closed. (J. Schacht)
which has become very popular (the most complete text is given by Ibn Battuta, i, 40-4; Engl. tr. H. A. R. Gibb, i, 45-7; cf. ZDMG, vii, 25). According to Ahlwardt, Verschweis der ar. Handschriften zu Berlin, iii, 407-14, these prayers were called hizb because "in them the invitations to God are divided into certain groups", but he does not state what this explanation is based.

Bibliography: in the text.

HIZB, 'political party'. The use of the word hizb in the sense of a political party is a recent one, dating from the beginning of the twentieth century or thereabouts, but this modern usage was in a way a natural and legitimate extension of the traditional and classical one (see preceding article). This traditional sense is the one found in the nineteenth-century dictionaries. Thus Kazimirski's Dictionnaire (1860) defined hizb as a 'troupe d'hommes'; Lane's Lexicon (1863 et seq.) as a 'party or company of men, assembling themselves on account of an event that has befallen them'; Bustanî's Mubâh as a fa'âqa; Dozy's Supplement (1851) records an interesting variant, where it lists among the meanings of the word, 'ordre religieux'. Later dictionaries begin to record the political connotation which the word was beginning to acquire: Badger's English-Arabic Lexicon (1886) translates 'party' as hizb and Hava's Arabic-English Dictionary (1896) translates hizb as 'party of men, confederacy, division'.

The following articles deal with political parties in Muslim countries. For associations, see also ANQUMAN and DJÂMIYYA.

I.—THE ARAB LANDS

Literary evidence, in support of the lexicographical, does tend to show that in the last two decades of the nineteenth century, hizb, though it was not yet a fully recognized part of the political vocabulary, was coming, albeit slowly, unconsciously and hesitatingly, to have a certain political connotation. An excellent illustration of this ambiguous and fluctuating usage occurs in the minutes of Ahmad Urâbî's trial at Cairo in 1852. Urâbî was asked to describe himself to be described on a document as ra*is al-Jiizb al-watani', he replied that it was well-known that Egypt was inhabited by different races (adinds) whose action was usually clandestine. But Urâbî went on to say that every people had akhâm inna ahl al-bildd hizb bi-*l-dâr al-farikayn yuflâlin yafa' 'alay-hi. The young men of the Sursuk, Kitta, Zughayb and Mukhalls families—all Syrian Christians—who had thus come to the conclusion that they had no personal interest in the matter—since they were all protected by European Powers—

Finally, an illustration drawn from the first decade of the twentieth century shows how hizb has come to be stabilized in meaning and to signify unambiguously a political party. In an article of 1906, discussing whether a nationalist party can be said to exist in Egypt, Farâb Anûtân states that a hizb signifies in politics 'the organized struggle of one group against another owing to a difference of opinions and interests between the two sides (ta'âlub d^am^â' a'sâl d^am^âi a 'âkhirâ' is*bîlatî 'ârâ' al-farikayn wa ma'dilîkmü)". He goes on to say that by ta'âlub he means that the group would become a single, solidary entity working to attain its aim, 'idjâmîna'uhâ 'isba wabinda wa la'dâjûdâhâ lauwassîl al-âlîm bulâgh al-waladahî' (Hizb al-nâsîyândîst fî Misr, in al-Djâmi's, New York, v/6 (1906), 224).

In the article just cited, Farâb Anûtân came to the conclusion that, on his definition, there was no nationalist party in Egypt for the reason that the crucial element of organization was lacking. His conclusions may be considered to apply generally to the Arabic-speaking areas for the greater part of the period in which people became accustomed to think of parties as a usual political phenomenon. There is no doubt that they came so to think as a result of contact and familiarity with European politics, in which parliaments and estates, having continuously existed since mediaeval times, provided a natural context and an indispensable setting for parties and party organization. Such representative institutions were absent in the Muslim world, and it is therefore not surprising that it is only contact with Europe which made organization into parties for political action familiar and attractive. Familiar and attractive, that is, to the small minority which was open to European influences, and which was therefore critical of native and traditional institutions. Parties were therefore at first usually organized or inspired by radicals who were intent on drastic reforms, and because such parties had, in the absence of representative institutions, little scope to manoeuvre, their radicalism became intensified; this very radicalism alienated the authorities who, often trying to suppress these parties, forced them underground. In short, all these factors, the nature of the political context in which the party-making areas were, at the outset, small groups of people, influenced by European ideas, who were or affected to be dissatisfied with existing political conditions, whose organization was loose and ephemeral, and whose action was usually clandestine. Egypt—One of the earliest of such groupings in Egypt—calling itself, however, not a hizb but a djâmiyya [q.v.], was djâmiyyat itthâkî Misr al-falâlî, which existed in Alexandria in 1879 at the beginning of the reign of Khedive Tawfiq. It would seem to have been the outcome of Afgânî's political teachings and to have been formed by his followers. A letter to Afgânî from his follower Ibrahim al-Lâkâni dated Beirut 7 Rabî' II 1300/15 February 1883 explains that the Young Egypt Society consisted of members of the Sursuk, Kitta, Zughayb and Mukhalls families—all Syrian Christians—who had induced some Muslims to join them and published an Arabic-French newspaper preaching Afgânî's views and calling on the Khedive to institute political reforms. Mustâfâ Râyâd Paša, then Chiet Minister, banned the newspaper; the Group tried to publish a second one, but the Muslim members seceded and, according to Lâkâni, even tried to harm the Syrian Christians, whereupon he wrote to Afgânî saying that they had no personal interest in the matter—since they were all protected by European Powers—

...

Another early grouping in Egypt was that known as al-hizb al-watanî, which also seems to have been organized in 1879 after Tawfîk’s accession. This group was also opposed to the Khedive and his minister Muştafa Riyāḍ, but seems to have had no connexion with the Young Egypt Society. Its members were ex-ministers, like Muhammad Sharîf Paşa, who were Mushtafâ Riyâd’s rivals and whom disliked his administrative reforms; some of them worked for the restoration of the ex-Khedive Ismâ‘îl, and some to advance the claims of ʿAbd al-Ḥalîm Paşa, the last surviving son of Muḥammad ʿAll Paşa, to the Khediviate which he had long desired. This group became connected with the officers who under Āṭâʾullâh ʿUrbâb’s leadership, and moved by military grievances, carried out a coup d’état against Tawfîk and his government on 9 September 1881. The ostensible aims of this hizb were a constitutional and parliamentary régime for Egypt and the cessation of foreign interference. These aims were taken over by ʿUrbâb and his followers when, the coup d’état having demonstrated their power, they supplanted Sharîf Paşa and the other notables in political life. In fact, this group became al-hizb al-watani, and with their defeat by the British Army in 1882 the party ceased to exist.

There is no trace of party activity in Egypt until after the accession of the Khedive ʿAbbâs Hilmi in 1892. ʿAbbâs tried in the early years of his reign to break loose from British control, and one of his methods was to inspire political agitation by young Egyptians, graduates of European universities or European-type schools in Egypt. Ahmad Luṭfî al-Sayyid has recorded that in 1896, when he had just graduated from the Law School, ʿAbbâs saw him in audience, and he was afterwards enrolled in a secret society of which the Khedive was the President and the members of which included Muştafa Râmi and Muḥammad Farîd; this group, according to Luṭfî al-Sayyid, was the nucleus of what came to be later known as the ʿUlamaʾî hizb al-umma, which had already been formed in 1874 (Seyyed Āḥmad Bâmi, ʿAlî ʿAlî, Cairo 1892, pp. 34-35). Of this group, the most prominent was Muştafa (1874-1907). As his letters to the Khedive’s Arab Secretary (published in 1962 by M. Anis) show, his political activities at the outset of his career were directed and financed by ʿAbbâs. From a letter cited by ʿAbd al-Ḥalîm al-Râfî in his biography of Muştafa Râmi, it appears that relations between him and the Khedive remained very close until 1904. Thereafter Muştafa Kâmil seems to have worked on his own, and increasingly in opposition to ʿAbbâs. In 1907 he formally launched a party which was called al-hizb al-watani, dedicated to securing the British evacuation of Egypt. At this annual conference of the party he was elected president for life, but he died soon afterwards. His successor was Muḥammad Farîd (1868-1919), who in 1912 left Egypt to avoid imprisonment for alleged subversion against the Khedive’s government. It is difficult to see that the Nationalist Party had much influence on Egyptian politics. When it was founded in 1907, the influence of Muştafa Kâmil, after his parting with the Khedive, was already on the wane. The Party, after his death, had some reputation and influence based on the newspapers which Muştafa Kâmil had started up, the day before he expired. The Khedive’s government, it seems, was more interested in political careers after the first World War, nothing at all to do with the Nationalists. It is almost symbolic of the Party’s fortunes that a statue of Muştafa Kâmil which it had made after his death remained shut up in a school until 1952, because no Egyptian government could be induced to offer a public site for its erection (Muştafa Kâmil, 301-2). The Party’s rôle in Egyptian parliamentary life under the Monarchy (1923-1952) was insignificant. The Party were occasionally allotted a handful of seats in the preliminary bargaining between politicians in Cairo which often determined the exact composition of Egyptian Parliaments. This handful of seats represented such influence and power as the Party still had and which it exercised in coalition with other parties against the Wafî. Nationalists very rarely exercised political office. Ḥâfîz Râmadân, the president of the Party, was a Minister in Muḥammad Mahmûd’s second ministry (30 December 1937-5 April 1940), in Ḥasan Ṣâbî’s ministry (27 June 1940-14 November 1941), in his own ministry, and in Mahmûd Fahmî al-Nuṣrâshî’s first ministry (25 February 1945-26 November 1945); but in holding office in these administrations, Ḥâfîz Râmadân was acting against the wishes of his Party colleagues, and may therefore be considered more as an Independent than as a Nationalist representative. In 1946, the breach between him and his colleagues was healed, and three Nationalists accepted office in two subsequent administrations as the avowed representatives of their Party: Muḥammad Zakî ʿAlî and ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz al-Ṣâfînî in Ibrâhîm ʿAbd al-Ḥâdi’s ministry (28 December 1948-25 July 1949), and ʿAbd al-Ḥalîm al-Râfî together with Muḥammad Zakî ʿAlî in Ḥusayn Sîrî’s third ministry (26 July 1949-3 November 1949). The Nationalist Party, in common with other political parties, havewritten a handful of seats in the 1940, 1944, 1946, 1952 elections, lost its influence and its financial assets confiscated by decree of the Revolutionary Command on 18 January 1953. Muştafa Kâmil’s foundation of the Nationalist Party in 1907 was followed in the same year by the foundation of other groups, calling themselves parties, which proved to be more ephemeral and to be even less organized than al-hizb al-watani. The first which falls to be mentioned is al-hizb al-ulama, which was founded in September-October 1907, and which consisted of a group of notables and landowners, who promoted the publication of the newspaper al-Djawīda. The common denominator of the group, as Ṣâbî Maḥmûd al-Akhâd put it, was that they were under the Khedive’s displeasure (maṣūbaʿ ilayhim) and that they could hope therefore to curry favour with the British Residency (Ṣâfî Zâkâlî, Cairo 1936, pp. 151-2). Whether this was so or not, the fact is that the British presence enabled them to express opposition to the Khedive’s ambitions. Some of the prominent members of this Party became associated with hizb al-ṣaṣār al-ṭustâriyyin, which was founded in 1922. The name of another party to be recorded is that of hizb al-ilsâṭ ‘ala ’l-mabâdiʿ al-ḍustâriyya, which again came to be spoken of in 1907. It is difficult to say that it was the Khedive’s men who in their own way, tried to counteract the effect of Muştafa Kâmil’s founding of the Nationalist Party; it seems,
in fact, possible to associate only one name with it, namely that of CA11 Yusuf, the editor of Khedive's main newspaper organ. J. M. Landau records the names of four other so-called Parties, which existed after 1907 and which seem to have been, in fact, one-man affairs disappearing from the scene soon after their foundation was proclaimed; these were al-thib al-wafiati al-kür, founded by Muhammad WaJđl A-yyubi, the Party of Nobles (sic) associated with Hasan Ilmî and Thâbat Farâgi and al-qiridjâwî, the Party of the Independent Egyptians (sic) founded by the Cpt Alnâbûf FânuS, and the Young Egypt Party (sic) founded by Idrîs Râqîh.

The end of the first world war inaugurated a new chapter in the history of Egyptian political parties. Widespread agitation in Egypt for some three years was finally successful in persuading the British government to abolish the Protectorate which it had assumed over Egypt in 1914. This was done by the unilateral Declaration of 28 February 1922, one of the consequences of which was the transformation of the Sultanate into a constitutional Monarchy and the setting up of a parliament composed of a house of representatives elected by indirect suffrage and a senate partly elected and partly appointed. The general scheme of the Egyptian Constitution—promulgated by a Royal Rescript in 1923—was that a cabinet drawn from the majority in Parliament would hold office so long as it retained the confidence of this majority. Such a state of affairs gave obvious scope for the creation and the functioning of parties on the European model. The first of these parties which must be considered is the WaJď, which has its origin in the struggle which led to the abolition of the Protectorate. In this struggle Sa'd Zaghlûl (1857-1926), who came to lead and indeed embody the WaJď, had taken, by the play of circumstance and his own considerable shrewdness, a leading part. The appellation WaJď originated in a demand which Zaghlûl, together with Abd al-Azîz Fahmi and 'Ali Sha'râwî, put before the British High Commissioner on 13 November 1918, to be allowed to proceed in a delegation (Ar. waJď) to Great Britain to discuss Egypt's relations with the Protecting Power and how it might be free from it. This demand was put forward at the knowledge and approval of Sultan FuJâd and his Ministers, but the three personalities who lent their names to it came inevitably to be the focus of the political agitation which followed its rejection and the repressive action taken by the British authorities. Between 1919 and 1923 many Egyptian public men were associated with Zaghlûl in the political movement which came to be known as the WaJď, but Zaghlûl managed to capture the public sentiment and to be exclusively identified with the successful struggle against Great Britain. His earliest and most prominent associates broke with him and became his fierce opponents. Of the three personalities who saw the British High Commissioner in November 1918, 'Ali Sha'râwî resigned formally from the WaJď in 1922 and played no further part in politics, and Abd al-Azîz Fahmi became a Liberal Constitutionalist and later entirely forsook politics. Others, such as Muhammad Mâmîm, Ismâ'îl Şîldî, 'Ali Mâhîr, Muhammad 'Ali 'Allîbâ, became declared opponents of the WaJď. By 1923, Zaghlûl was surrounded by younger men who were little known and newcomers to Egyptian politics, necessarily very much under his domination: his nephew Muhammad Fâth Allîh Bârâkî, MuJfâjâl al-NâbûS, who had been a magistrate in Tanjâ and who had been deposed by the Nationalist Party to represent them in the original WaJď, William Makram 'Ubâyî, who had been a civil servant, Muhammad NaJdîl al-Ghârîbî, Ahmad Mâhîr, Mahîr Fâhmi al-Nufâsî, 'Ali al-Shâmî, all of whom came to be prominent in the WaJdîst movement at one time or another between 1924 and 1952. The WaJď as a formal body was organized in 1919 at the inception of the anti-British agitation. It took the form of a central committee composed of public men, the ostensible business of which was to direct from Cairo the collection by provincial committees of signatures to a petition praying the British authorities to allow an Egyptian delegation to proceed to London. It is not known how effective such a country-wide organization was, and there is a suspicion that the WaJď committees benefited, at the outset at any rate, from the support of the Sultan and his government. After 1921, the prominent members of the original WaJď left it and Zaghlûl became the undisputed leader of those who remained, the committee being his creature and instrument. But Zaghlûl then and later refused to be considered as the leader of a mere faction, holding that he was the sole authorized delegate of the Egyptian people, and that it was his opponents who were guilty of factionalism. A characteristic claim of his, made in a speech of 2 July 1924, was 'I am not the president of a party, but the delegate of a nation (waJđl umma)' (Muhammad Ibrâhîm al-Dâjârî, ed., 'Athâr al-zâ'im Sa'd Zaghlûl, i, Cairo 1927, 211). His followers indeed acclaimed him as the za'im, the Leader (a title which devolved on his successor MuJfâjâl al-NâbûS), his house came to be called bayt al-umma, and his wife Safîyya umma al-misrijîyyîn.

Zaghlûl won the elections held in December 1923 under the new Constitution, and his followers constituted the overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives. He formed a government almost half the members of which—it is interesting to note—were non-Wafdist. This is not how the constitution was supposed to work, and it is generally explained by the fact that the King's and the administration's influence had been exerted on Zaghlûl's behalf during the elections, because the King did not wish the latter's rivals, the Liberal Constitutionalists, to win, and that once the election was won, the King's influence had been exerted on Zaghlûl's behalf during the elections and that he was the sole authorized delegate of the Egyptian people, and that it was his opponents who were guilty of factionalism. A characteristic claim of his, made in a speech of 2 July 1924, was 'I am not the leader of a party, but the delegate of a nation (waJđl umma)' (Muhammad Ibrâhîm al-Dâjârî, ed., 'Athâr al-zâ'im Sa'd Zaghlûl, i, Cairo 1927, 211). His followers indeed acclaimed him as the za'im, the Leader (a title which devolved on his successor MuJfâjâl al-NâbûS), his house came to be called bayt al-umma, and his wife Safîyya umma al-misrijîyyîn.
tation had had little time to dismantle the network of Wafdist committees in the countryside which Zaghlul in his year of power must have overhauled and strengthened. Ziwar dispensed with a parliament until the British High Commissioner, fearing unfettered palace rule, which Ziwar's ministry in effect signified, pressed for new elections. The palace being checkmated, the electorate ratified its defeat by electing a Wafdist parliament in May 1926. But since Zaghlul, the leader of the Wafd, was not acceptable to the British authorities as Prime Minister, the normal play of party politics in a constitutional and representative regime was again frustrated, and 'Adli Yakan, the Liberal Constitutional leader, took office at the head of a coalition of Wafdist and Liberal Constitutionalists. The coalition subsisted until March 1928, when the Liberal Constitutionalist 'Abd al-Khalîk Thawrât, who succeeded 'Adli in April 1927, having failed to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain, found his position untenable and yielded his place to Muṣṭafâ al-Nâhhas—on whom had fallen Zaghlul's mantle—who formed the first wholly Wafdist administration. Al-Nâhhas soon found himself at loggerheads with both the King and the British authorities; in June 1928 the King dismissed al-Nâhhas, dissolved parliament, and called on Muḥammad Maḥmûd, now president of the Liberal Constitutionalists, to form a government. This new Prime Minister obtained from the King authority to suspend elections and parliamentary government for a period of three years. But in 1929, a new government in London having made clear that it would negotiate only with a Wafdist government (whom it regarded as the only legitimate representative of Egypt), Muḥammad Maḥmûd resigned and new elections took place; they ratified the decision of the British government and returned a Wafdist government, which took office on 1 January 1930. Negotiations between al-Nâhhas and the British government having failed, and the King disliking a Wafdist government, he dismissed it in June of the same year, commissioned Ismâʿîl Siṣâlkī to form an administration, dissolved the parliament and promulgated a new constitution and a new electoral law. Elections under the new law were held on 1 January 1931, and the new parliament was returned with a Wafdist parliamentary majority. A complicated series of events in 1935-6 forced the King to seek an accommodation with the Wafdist. He re-established the constitution which he had abrogated in 1930. This was a victory for the Wafdist, and the elections which were held in May 1936 ratified it by returning a parliament with an overwhelming Wafdist majority. King Fuʿâd died in April 1936, to be succeeded by his son Fârîq, who attained his majority in July 1937. A clash between him and the Wafd was not long in coming. In December 1937 he dismissed al-Nâhhas and shortly afterwards dissolved the parliament. The new parliament had an insignificant Wafdist minority, thus ratifying the victory of the King. This parliament itself was also dissolved as a result of an extra-parliamentary clash of power. By the coup d' état of 2 February 1942, the British authorities forced a Wafdist government on the King. This government dissolved the parliament of 1938 and obtained an overwhelming majority at the subsequent elections. It ruled until October 1944, when the King found the power to dismiss it and dissolve its parliament. The ensuing elections were boycotted by the Wafd, and the parliament elected in January 1945 was wholly Wafdist. This parliament was dissolved in November 1949, and the election of January 1950 gave an overwhelming Wafdist majority; the course of events which led to this result is still very imperfectly known, but there was considerable support from the outcome of a reconciliation between the King and the Wafd. The Wafdist government lasted until January 1952, when it was dismissed by the King. Its parliament, the last under the constitutional monarchy, was dissolved shortly thereafter.

The course of events here briefly set out indicates that in the Egyptian parliamentary régime, contrary to the intentions of its founders, and indeed to its formal working elsewhere, it was the government, or rather the actual effective authority in the country at any given time—which determined the character and composition of a parliament, and not the other way round. This had a fundamental bearing on the character and functions of the political parties. These could not function as coherent parliamentary and electoral organizations dedicated to the acquisition of popular support and the exercise of political power within a legislative assembly. These so-called parties could rather more intelligibly be described as either movements or factions. The Wafd was clearly a movement; Zaghlul claimed to be above all parties and interests, to be the representative and the leader of the nation; he thus inaugurated a new style of politics of which appeal to the mass was the most significant characteristic. This new style, which depends on a leader with a hypnotic popular appeal who is the ultimate depository of unfettered power, was made possible by the disintegration of traditional society, the erosion of traditional authority, the increase of literacy, the improvement in communications, and the existence of a new urban amorphous mass of recent migrants from the countryside, leading lives of material poverty and spiritual disorientation. All these created new conditions of political action, new possibilities of channeling hitherto untapped sources of political power by organizing the passive and malleable mass into a formidable phalanx round a leader and his slogans. It is evident that the Wafd under Zaghlul and al-Nâhhas attempted this. They were only intermittently successful, and they ultimately failed. The reasons for their failure may possibly have been an imperfect grasp of the new techniques; the influence as a check and a disturbing factor, the existence of other, more traditional, forms of authority which still had some life in them and, of course, sheer accident. But the Wafd again and again tried to create various organizations for the recruitment and control of their supporters. Foremost among these, and the least known in their detailed working, are the Wafdist committees which spread over the whole country. When the Wafd was either expecting or exercising power, it attempted to create specialized organizations to cater for different sections of the population, particularly students, industrial labour, etc. The example of Fascists and Nazis no doubt stimulated the creation of a Wafdist para-military group, al-ḥisâb al-sarba', which functioned in 1950-7 and which had some analogy in both name and function with Blackshirts and Brownshirts. The Wafd were not the only ones to experiment with these new possibilities; one writer has indeed claimed that the Nationalist Party was the first to organize Blueshirts, and that the Wafd filched the idea from it (Muṣṭafâ al-Hînâwî, al-Sīr al-ḥâlîd, Cairo n.d. [after 1936], 5-6). Be this as it may, the Nationalist Party never succeeded in becoming a movement, and remained what may be called a faction. One organization which from the outset attempted to be a movement was
Misr al-fatāt, founded by Ahmad Husayn in 1933, it is claimed at the inspiration of King Fuʿād (P. Graves, The story of the Egyptian parties, in the nineteeth century and after, March 1938). Its slogan was Allāh, al-watan, al-malik, and it attempted to organize its adherents into Greenshirts (al-bīmān al-ḥādārī), which frequently clashed with the Blueshirts. Another organization which became a political movement had, at its inception, quite a different character. Al-ḥithānid al-muslimīn (q.v.), founded in 1928 by Hasan al-Bannāʾ (see al-bannāʾ), was at the outset dedicated to a renewal of the religious life, to the fight against laxity, scepticism and unbelief prevalent among Muslims as a consequence of European influence. Some ten years later, the Brotherhood was an extensive organization covering a large part of Egypt. Because Islam is din wa-dawla, and because the circumstances after 1940 became propitious, the Brotherhood under its murshid came to play an increasingly political rôle. Al-Bannāʾ’s political transactions are still quite obscure, but the Brotherhood was a formidable weapon which he and his successor Hasan al-Huḍaybī could use in pursuance of their aims in the troubled years between the end of the second world war and the final dissolution of the Brotherhood by the Egyptian Revolutionary Command in January 1954. The tight organization of the Brotherhood enabled al-Bannāʾ and his collaborators to set on foot a secret terrorist apparatus (al-dīkāk al-tāriṭ) which was used to enforce the wishes of those who controlled it until an attempt on the life of Colonel Djamāl ‘Abd al-Nāṣir in October 1954 resulted in the arrest and trial of the most prominent Brethren—al-Huḍaybī included—the execution of six of them, and presumably the final destruction of the apparatus.

In contrast to these organizations, which may be called political movements, other groupings in Egyptian politics under the constitutional monarchy may be termed factions. They consisted of people who, by virtue of their educational attainments or an inherited position, were members of the official classes and therefore had the necessary knowledge and connexions for filling political office and exercising power. Such men were loosely grouped under party labels which they acquired by accident at some point of a career. To be called a faction rather than movements, because they seldom or never sought to involve the masses in politics in the manner of the Wafd or the Muslim Brethren, and yet were not strictly parties, since the constitutional régime in Egypt worked in such a fashion that parties could not function, let alone flourish. These groupings may therefore not all be dismissed as a mere collection of placemen eager for office and ready to do the bidding of whoever gave them office; but whatever their original aims and motives were, the situation was such that if they desired to take part in politics they had to acquiesce in measures and combinations quite remote from their proclaimed principles. A good case in point is the Nationalist Party, which started with an articulate ideology, but the activity of whose leaders under the constitutional monarchy had, as has been seen, little to do with this ideology. Another party between whose activities and principles a great gap opened was the Liberal Constitutionalist Party (hizb al-ittihād al-mustabīla), formed when ‘Abd al-Nasir al-Saʿdi, formed when Ḥāmid al-Bāṣīl seceded from the Wafd in 1930, which proved quite ephemeral; al-hayya al-saʿdiyya, formed when Maḥmūd Fāhmi al-Nuṣrāḥīl and ‘Abd al-Māhīr fell out with the Wafd in 1937, which went on as a political grouping until 1952 and which provided three Prime Ministers and other ministers in anti-Wafdist governments; and al-kutla al-wafdiyya al-mustabīla, formed when Makram ʿUbayd was expelled from the Wafd in 1943, which consisted of his own personal following and provided two or three ministers in three coalition governments which succeeded the Wafd government of 1942–44.

The Ottoman Empire.—The earliest parties in the Arabic-speaking areas of the Ottoman Empire were in their origin and character somewhat similar to the earliest Egyptian parties. They were groups of young men touched by Western influences and discontented with what they considered to be the constraining and stagnant conditions of the Empire under ʿAbd al-Ḥāmid II (q.v.). In those years there was little scope for overt political action, nor were the generality of the subjects much inclined to
question the established and traditional order. Such
groups were small, clandestine and ephemeral. One
of the earliest of these groups was one formed by some
Christian students at the Syrian Protestant College
at Beirut in the early 1880s; they had fallen under
the influence of a Maronite who taught French at
the College and who was imbued with French liber-
tarian and revolutionary ideas. These young men
conceived the project of fomenting a movement to
end Ottoman supremacy in the Lebanon. They went
so far as to put up copying in public places placards in
this sense, but as no reaction was forthcoming the group dissolved itself in 1882-3.

Another group was the one which came into being
at Damascus in the early years of the twentieth
century. It was composed of young Muslims who were
disciples of Shaykh Tahir al-Djaza'iri, who was In-
structor of Education in the Damascus wilayat and
who lived in Damascus from 1880 to 1905. The group
is known as halalat Dimashq al-saghira, and it in-
cluded Shaykh Djamal al-Din al-Kasimli, Shaykh
Abd al-Razzaq al-Bitari, Shaykh Salim al-Bukhari.
These were among the original members, who were
joined by younger men including Muhhib al-Din al-
Khatib, Salih al-Din al-Kasimi, Abd al-Hamid al-
Zahrawi, Shukri al-Asali, Abd al-Rahman al-
Shahbandar, Muhammed Kurd All, Faris al-Khuri
and Salim al-Djaza'iri. The circle apparently dis-
cussed mainly religious ideas, and increasingly when
younger men joined it, political questions. Muhhib
al-Din al-Khatib was apparently the mainspring of
this later development. Some of the younger members
of the circle went to Istanbul in about 1905, and in
1906 Muhhib al-Din al-Khatib and his friend Arif al-
Shahhadi founded there a secret society, djam'iyyat
al-nahda, and asked two friends still in Damascus,
Shaykh al-Ashtari, a religious teacher, and al-Hasan
al-Halabi, to form a branch in the city. The djam'iyya consisted en-
tirely of a small group of young educated Damascenes,
and in spite of its foundation at Istanbul Damascus
was its centre. After the Young Turk Revolution, the
djam'iyya applied for permission to function openly,
and interested itself for a few years thereafter in
spreading knowledge of Arab history and Arabic
literature and in providing a local forum for discuss-
ing Arab nationalism. But the society was not
successful, and in 1909 it was dissolved.

Another group, or at any rate the name of a group
which existed at the beginning of the twentieth cen-
tury, falls also to be recorded. It was the Ligue de la
patrie arabe, founded by Na'dib Arif, a Syrian
Christian who had studied in Paris and then became
an official in the Jerusalem wilayat; this post he left in
1904 for treasonable activities in Paris. Who, apart
from the French retired official E. Jung (who has
chronicled his activities) collaborated with him, and
whether he was the agent of one or more European
powers, is obscure. The programme of his Ligue was
the creation of an Arab empire extending over Mes-
opotamia, Arabia and the Levant and the creation of
a 'spiritual' Caliphate. But the Ligue seems to have
been of little consequence and to have sunk into
obscurity when his periodical, L'Indépendance Arabe,
of which eighteen numbers came out in 1905-6,
ceased publication.

It was only after the restoration of the Ottoman
Constitution in 1908 that many Arab parties were
formed, and became quite active for a time. Because
of the vicissitudes of the Ottoman parliamentary
régime of 1908-14, these parties could not function
as normal parliamentary parties, nor could they,
owing to the state of society then obtaining, aspire to
enlist mass support. They were small, ephemeral
factions made up of members of the higher classes
and such others as had access to European ideas. It
is commonly agreed that the first of these groupings
was djam'iyyat al-ikhd* al-arabi, founded by the
Damascene Shaikl al-Mu'ayyad and other, mainly
Syrian, officials and notables in Istanbul in 1908.
A report in The Arab Bulletin (24 May 1918) records
that the group came into being as a consequence of
the 1908 Parliament, refusing to be satiated with the
Shi'ta, and as member for Benhazri and the Shaikl al-
Khallil, was accused of treason and executed. Two
groupings dating from this period, among Syrian and
Lebanese living in Egypt, may be noticed. The first
is an ephemeral group called djam'iyyat al-ikhd* al-
'ushtdni, which apparently lasted for only a few
weeks, among the members of which were Rafik al-
'Asim, Rashid Rida, Yahid Safi, Diurriti Zaydan,
Nasim Shukayir and Diurriti A'mamli. The second
grouping was al-ittihad al-bi-khi, al-ittihad al-
'ushtdni (L'Association is-
noise) formed by Maronite notables in Cairo in No-
vember 1909. It was founded by Iskandar A'mmnun,
Atnun al-Djumayyil and D'Badda Barakat. Before the
war, its programme consisted in demanding better
commercial facilities within the Empire for Mount
Lebanon, widening the suffrage for its assembly,
increasing the number of its members and widening
its powers, and annexing the Blanc, Tripoli and
Beirut to Mount Lebanon, to form what came to be
known under the French mandate as the Grand Liban.
This last point came to form the main issue for
which the ittihad worked after the outbreak of
war, when the partition of the Ottoman Empire
became a possibility. The ittihad—the president of
which from 1917 was Auguste Adib—lost its raison
d'etre with the French occupation of the Lebanon.
Apart from these our list of public political groupings
is limited, and a number of secret groupings are also recorded.

Towards the end of 1909, there was formed in Istanbul
a secret group composed of officers and university
students mainly from Syria, al-djam'iyya al-bahtani-
iyya. The group was dedicated to the encourage-
ment of Arab nationalism, and among its prominent
members were the two officers A'mnun al-
Lutfi Hafi and Salim al-Djaza'iri, nephew of Shaykh Tahir,
Abd al-Karim al-Khallil and Arif al-Shahhadi, all of
whom were executed for treason by the Ottomans
in 1915-16. Another secret grouping was one founded
by students, again mainly Syrian, in Paris in 1909. This
was djam'iyyat al-umma al-arabiyya al-fatali, which
was founded by Ahmad Kaddi, Awal Abd al-
Hadi and Rustum Haydar. The aim of the society was
Arab independence. It is of course difficult to know
the extent and effectiveness of the operations of
a secret society, but the members of al-fatali are said
to have taken the initiative in calling for an Arab
Congress (which met in Paris in June, 1913), and
seem to have carried on conspiratorial activities
against the Ottomans in the Levant until the end of
the first world war; many of them became prominent
later on in Syria, Palestinian and Iraqi politics. Another
secret society, al-jam'iyyat al-khalil, was


but seems to have been more ephemeral than most and there is no record of any activity for which it was responsible. The personal and external vicissitudes to which the Ottoman Empire was subject in the years immediately preceding the first world war created fears and tensions and afforded occasions for political action and openings for political ambition, so that in 1912 and 1913 new Arab political groupings came into being. Of these new groupings, the best-known was ḥizb al-līmarbākisiyya al-ṭidārīyya al-ṣūhmānī, which was founded in Cairo in December 1912, and which, as its name showed, was dedicated to the achievement of administrative decentralization and provincial self-government in the Ottoman Empire. The founders were again Syrians, the most prominent among them being Muhammad Rashīd Rīdā, Rafīq al-ʿAzm, Shibli Shumayyil, Iskandar ʿAmmūn and Muḥīb al-Dīn al-Ḥaṣīb. The programme of the Party was obviously akin to the ideas of Prince Saḥbān and to the Khāmiṣīyya, but it seems to have enrolled various potentates of the Ottoman Empire, and there is no record of any activity for which it was responsible.

The internal and external vicissitudes to which the Ottoman Empire was subject in the years immediate-ly preceding the first world war created fears and tensions and afforded occasions for political action and openings for political ambition, so that in 1912 and 1913 new Arab political groupings came into being. Of these new groupings, the best-known was ḥizb al-līmarbākisiyya al-ṭidārīyya al-ṣūhmānī, which was founded in Cairo in December 1912, and which, as its name showed, was dedicated to the achievement of administrative decentralization and provincial self-government in the Ottoman Empire. The founders were again Syrians, the most prominent among them being Muhammad Rashīd Rīdā, Rafīq al-ʿAzm, Shibli Shumayyil, Iskandar ʿAmmūn and Muḥīb al-Dīn al-Ḥaṣīb. The programme of the Party was obviously akin to the ideas of Prince Saḥbān and to the Khāmiṣīyya, but it seems to have enrolled various potentates of the Ottoman Empire, and there is no record of any activity for which it was responsible.

The period between the Italian conquest of Tripoli and the outbreak of the first world war saw also the creation of two secret Arab groups. The first of these was ẖimārīyya al-ṣūnūm, which was founded on 28 October 1913 by Bīnābīqīʿ ʿAzīz al-Ḥiṣnī. Its members were army officers and included Salīm al-Dājazāʿīrī, Nārī al-Sāʿīdī, Yāṣīn al-Ḥāshīmī, his brother Tāḥā, Dāmīl al-Maddātī, Ṭubṣīn ʿAṭī, Maḥīdīl Muḥāṭīs, Aḥmīd Ṭalīb, Mūṣīm al-Ṭalīb and Mūṣīm al-Ṭalīb. The programme of the Party was evidently akin to the ideas of Prince Saḥbān, who had also called his Khāmiṣīyya, and the Khāmiṣīyya was reconstituted, with some of the most prominent Sharīfians, such as ʿĀbd Allāh al-Dulāyīmī, Ahmad Kadrī and Nasīb al-Bakrī as leading members. The Khāmiṣīyya was formed following the Ottoman defeat in the Balkan wars when the foundings decided that the strength of the Arabs lay in their peninsula, and that this strength would be useless unless the rulers of the peninsula were united in an alliance. Rashīd Rīdā seems to have known of various potentates of the peninsula in this Society, but apart from a long and fearsome oath (reproduced in Amin Saʿīd, al-Ṣawīr al-ʿarabīyya, i, 47-59) no activity by the group is recorded.

When the Ottoman Empire entered the war in November 1914, political activity by Arab groups and parties, such as it had been in the six years from 1908, virtually came to an end. It was only at the end of the world war that a new grouping came into being in Cairo known as ʿumūmīyya al-islāmīyya, whose ambitions in Syria they mistrusted. Their views are to be gathered from the memorial they addressed to the British government in the summer of 1918, which elicited the reply known as the Declaration to Seven Syrians (E. Kedourie, England and the Middle East, 113-5). The group included Michel Lutfī Allāh as president, Rashīd Rīdā as vice-president, ʿĀbd al-Rahmān al-Ṣabāndār and Salīm Sārkīs as joint secretaries. When eventually Sharīf Fayṣal was installed in Damascus at the head of an Arab government, the conditions in Syria became such that the grouping had no longer a raison d'être and, in fact, its members were later found adopting a variety of positions in Syrian politics.

The short-lived Sharīfīan régime in Syria (November 1918-July 1920) was characterized by an active, not to say turbulent, political life. The faṭālī society was reconstituted, with some of the most prominent Sharīfīans, such as ʿĀbd Rīdā al-Rīkābī, Yāṣīn al-Ḥāshīmī, Ahmad Kadrī and Nasīb al-Bakrī as leaders. But the faṭālī never seems to have made its existence or membership public; instead a political party was organized to work in public for the aims
of the secret society: this was *ḥizb al-istiklāl al-ʿarabī*, the declared purpose of which was the liberation of all Arab countries from foreign domination. The pan-Arab aims of the leaders of the *ṭakfīl* and the *faṭāt*, many of whom were then young, unknown, and with no local standing in Damascus, evoked some opposition among Damascus notables, who organized *al-ḥizb al-watāni al-sūrī*, the secretary of which was Muhammad al-Sharifī and the declared aim of which was to work for a Syria "independent within its natural frontiers". Another group concerned with the political future of Syria was one organized by some Syrian Christians in Cairo in 1919 to work for a United States mandate in Syria. The group was called *al-ḥizb al-sūrī al-awlādī*, and its members included Fāris Nimr, Saʿīd Shuḵāʾī, Yaʿqūb Ṣarfūtī and Iyās ʿĪsāwī. The group delegated two of its members, Fāris Nimr and Ḥālīh Khayyāt, to put its views before Charles Crane of the King-Crane Commission which visited the Levant in the summer of 1919. When it became clear that there was no possibility of the U.S.A. accepting such a mandate, nothing more was heard of the group.

The aftermath of war saw Mesopotamia, which was under British occupation, in an unsettled condition. The tribes and cities of the Middle and Lower Euphrates, predominantly Shi`ī, were in effervescent activity, and the Hashidī were among the malcontents of the former Ottoman officials and officers, and the Sharifian régime in Syria encouraged warlike activities against the British authorities. The Sharifian officers in Syria who had been members of the pre-war ‘aḥd sent emissaries to Baghādād, and secretly constituted a group of their sympathizers under the name of *d jamʿiyatiyat al-ʿaḥd al-ʿarabī*. This was a predominantly Sunnī group. Some Shi`ī leaders of Baghādād and Karimayn formed their own secret political society to protect Shi`ī interests in the anti-British struggle. The society was known as *d jamʿiyatiyat ḥaras al-istiklāl*. Its founders included ʿAll al-Bāzzīr-gān, Shaykh Muḥammad Bāšīr al-Shābībī, Ḥādī Zwayn, Muḥammad Daʿārībīr, Abū ʿl-Tīmmān and Sayyid Muḥammad al-Saḍrī. With the installation of Fayṣāl as King of Iraq in 1921, new issues and new groupings led to the disappearance of both the ‘aḥd and the ḥaras.

Iraq.—The Kingdom of Iraq was supposed to be a constitutional, parliamentary monarchy [see *duʿūrā*]. But as in Egypt, though here the circumstances and reasons were quite different, parliament never functioned in a normal or representative fashion but was rather the instrument of whatever effective authority existed in the country at any moment. Parties therefore during the monarchical régime (1922-1958) may be described as more or less factions composed of politicians manoeuvring on the restricted and artificial political scene of the capital. The first parties to be formed under the monarchy were *ḥizb al-nahdā al-riyāḍiyya* and *al-ḥizb al-watāni*, both founded in August 1922. They were composed of public men who were dissatisfied with the second ministry of Sayyid Abū al-Raḥmān al-Naḥkābī and who were prepared to adopt an insinuate stance towards the mandatory power. The leaders of the *nahdā* group included Ḥamdī al-ʿAṣāfī and Nāṣīr al-Suwaydī, whilst *al-ḥizb al-watāni* was, and remained until the mid-thirties, when it disappeared from view, identified with Muḥammad Daʿārībīr, Abū ʿl-Tīmmān whose following it in fact constituted.

Authority existed in the country at any moment. Parties therefore during the monarchical régime (1922-1958) may be described as more or less factions composed of politicians manoeuvring on the restricted and artificial political scene of the capital. The first parties to be formed under the monarchy were *ḥizb al-nahdā al-riyāḍiyya* and *al-ḥizb al-watāni*, both founded in August 1922. They were composed of public men who were dissatisfied with the second ministry of Sayyid Abū al-Raḥmān al-Naḥkābī and who were prepared to adopt an insinuate stance towards the mandatory power. The leaders of the *nahdā* group included Ḥamdī al-ʿAṣāfī and Nāṣīr al-Suwaydī, whilst *al-ḥizb al-watāni* was, and remained until the mid-thirties, when it disappeared from view, identified with Muḥammad Daʿārībīr, Abū ʿl-Tīmmān whose following it in fact constituted.

The group was called *al-ḥizb al-sūrī al-muwaddī*, and its members included Fāris Nimr, Saʿīd Shuḵāʾī, Yaʿqūb Ṣarfūtī and Iyās ʿĪsāwī. The group delegated two of its members, Fāris Nimr and Ḥālīh Khayyāt, to put its views before Charles Crane of the King-Crane Commission which visited the Levant in the summer of 1919. When it became clear that there was no possibility of the U.S.A. accepting such a mandate, nothing more was heard of the group.

The aftermath of war saw Mesopotamia, which was under British occupation, in an unsettled condition. The tribes and cities of the Middle and Lower Euphrates, predominantly Shi`ī, were in effervescent activity, and the Hashidī were among the malcontents of the former Ottoman officials and officers, and the Sharifian régime in Syria encouraged warlike activities against the British authorities. The society was known as *d jamʿiyatiyat ḥaras al-istiklāl*. Its founders included ʿAll al-Bāzzīr-gān, Shaykh Muḥammad Bāšīr al-Shābībī, Ḥādī Zwayn, Muḥammad Daʿārībīr, Abū ʿl-Tīmmān and Sayyid Muḥammad al-Saḍrī. With the installation of Fayṣāl as King of Iraq in 1921, new issues and new groupings led to the disappearance of both the ‘aḥd and the ḥaras.

Iraq.—The Kingdom of Iraq was supposed to be a constitutional, parliamentary monarchy [see *duʿūrā*]. But as in Egypt, though here the circumstances and reasons were quite different, parliament never functioned in a normal or representative fashion but was rather the instrument of whatever effective authority existed in the country at any moment. Parties therefore during the monarchical régime (1922-1958) may be described as more or less factions composed of politicians manoeuvring on the restricted and artificial political scene of the capital. The first parties to be formed under the monarchy were *ḥizb al-nahdā al-riyāḍiyya* and *al-ḥizb al-watāni*, both founded in August 1922. They were composed of public men who were dissatisfied with the second ministry of Sayyid Abū al-Raḥmān al-Naḥkābī and who were prepared to adopt an insinuate stance towards the mandatory power. The leaders of the *nahdā* group included Ḥamdī al-ʿAṣāfī and Nāṣīr al-Suwaydī, whilst *al-ḥizb al-watāni* was, and remained until the mid-thirties, when it disappeared from view, identified with Muḥammad Daʿārībīr, Abū ʿl-Tīmmān whose following it in fact constituted.

The group was called *al-ḥizb al-sūrī al-muwaddī*, and its members included Fāris Nimr, Saʿīd Shuḵāʾī, Yaʿqūb Ṣarfūtī and Iyās ʿĪsāwī. The group delegated two of its members, Fāris Nimr and Ḥālīh Khayyāt, to put its views before Charles Crane of the King-Crane Commission which visited the Levant in the summer of 1919. When it became clear that there was no possibility of the U.S.A. accepting such a mandate, nothing more was heard of the group.
ideas were influential at the time and many of its members participated in Iraqi politics after 1945, notably in Hizb al-istafrad.

After the second world war, the Regent 'Abd al-Ilah in a speech of December 1945 gave an impulsion to the formation of political parties, and in April 1946 five parties were licensed: Hizb al-Abi'r, Hizb al-istafrad, al-Hizb al-wa'tani al-dimahraji, Hizb al-'afrd al 'Abi'r, and Hizb al-istafrad al-wa'tani. Hizb al-Abi'r was founded by eight men, none of whom was prominent in politics; it does not seem to have had any noticeable political activity, and it decided to "freeze" itself in December 1948, after which date nothing more was heard of it. Hizb al-istafrad was formed by a group which included Muhammad Mahdi Kubbah, Khalil Kanna and 'Abd al-Razzâk al-Zâhir; it was pan-Arab in its views and included many of those who had followed or sympathized with Rashid `Ali al-Gaylani's coup d'etat of 1941. The Party remained active in opposition to successive governments until it went out of existence in September 1954, when a decree was issued at the beginning of Nâri al-Sa'd's twelfth administration dissolving all existing associations and clubs in Iraq. Hizb al-wa'tani al-dimahraji was formed by some of the old members of giam'm'yyat al-istafrad al-'afrd; the founders included Kaml al-Câdirji, Muhammad Hadid, Husun Djânîl, 'Abd al-Wahhâb Mirgân and Şadîk Kammûnî; it functioned for a year as the Pan-Arab Democratic Movement of Iraq, and was dedicated to pan-Arabism and socialism and operating in opposition to successive governments who were in favour of upholding it. It was not a homogeneous group, being composed of politicians hoping for office and using the front as a lever for their ambitions, and of ideologists whose hopes of office were remote; rifts between members appeared, and in August 1954 the front ceased all activity.

Syria.—The early years of the French mandate in Syria show little party political activity. Syrian nationalism was fostered in this period, and in 1927 the French rule in Syria, but until 1935 such protest was little organized. In May of that year, the Syrian leader 'Abd al-Râhamân al-Shâbendar found, together with other Syrian nationalists, including Hasan al-Hâkim, Ltûtî al-Haffâr and Fâris al-Khûrî, Hizb al-'afrd; but this Party was short-lived, since the French authorities banned it the following August on suspecting it of involvement in the Druze rebellion which had just started. In the anti-French troubles which followed, Shâbendar took a prominent part, and when the French were successful in pacifying the country, he went into exile and remained absent from Syria until 1957. The next Syrian political grouping was al-kulla al-wa'taniyya, formed in about 1929, which was organized formally at a meeting in Hims in November 1932. The National Bloc was dedicated to the attainment of Syrian independence and Arab unity; it was led by Ibrâhîm Hanânî and Hâshim al-Atâsî, and among its prominent members were Sa'd Allâh al-Djâbirî, Djâmil Mardâm, Shukrî al-Kuwâtî, 'Abd al-Râhamân al-Kayyâtî, Ltûtî al-Haffâr, Edmond Rabbath, Fakhîr al-Bârâdî and Miikhâl Ilyân. The Bloc was the main political grouping in Syria in the nineteen-thirties. Its leaders were influential in the country and frequently occupied ministerial positions in their localities; the Bloc essentially consisted of notables united by struggle against the French, but here and there, now and again, they succeeded in mobilizing the mass and organizing it in towns like Damascus, Hâmît and Aleppo, but only by fits and starts. Their success in this enterprise was greater between 1936 and 1939 when they exercised power with French help and consent, dominating the legislature and dispensing administrative patronage; in this period, they organized a para-military youth movement, al-shabab al-wa'tani, the uniform of which was an iron-grey shirt. Along with the kulla, there were in the nineteen-thirties a variety of evanescent political groups which came and went depending on French encouragement, political rivalries or foreign (whether European or Iraqi) inspiration. Of the groups, the best known are 'usbat al-'amal al-ba'sami, Hizb al-wa'da al-'arabiyya, Hizb al-inkafrd, al-Hizb al-wa'taniyya al-mutta'kida, and al-hay'a al-'afrd biyya, which constituted Shâbendar's own political following when, on his return to Damascus in 1937, he fell out with his colleagues of the Bloc. Overt political activity in Syria ceased between the outbreak of the second world war and 1945, when parliamentary elections were held, but in 1941 a small political group dedicated to the support of Rashid `Ali al-Gaylani in Iraq was formed by two Damascus schoolteachers, Michel 'Aflak and Şâlîb al-Din al-Bttar; the group was known as gi'ma'il nasrat al-'Irâd; it was the nucleus of what later became Hizb al-ba'th al-'arabi, which in 1953 amalgamated with a group founded in the late nineteen-forties by Akram al-Hawrâni, al-Hizb al-'arabi al-'afrd al-mutâ'kida, in order to become Hizb al-sunûrî, dedicated to pan-Arabism and socialism and operating in Syria from 1954 to 1956.
ating not only in Syria but also in the Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq as well, and, with the support of sympathetic army officers, actually executing power in both Syria and Iraq. The elections of 1943 resulted in an overwhelming majority for the National Bloc, which took power and, with British support, succeeded in securing French departure from Syria. The Bloc, a coalition of politicians, suffered from fissiparous tendencies; this was the case in 1936-39, when jealousy and dissensions between different leaders and areas were already visible, and also after 1943, when the very extent of their power before a Lebanese military court for taking part in armed rebellion. 1936-7 saw the formation of two movements with paramilitary features: hizb al-nadjiyya, which grew out of the Muslim Boy Scout movement, and hizb al-kahtib al-lubnaniyya (les Phalanges libanaises) founded by Pierre Djjumayyil for the protection of Maronite interests. Finally, in 1949, Kamal Djjumblat founded hizb al-lekaddumi al-siyarikhi, which advertised a socialist ideology, but which remained, by and large, a group consisting of the founder's personal following.

Palestine.—Zionism was the main issue in terms of which the Arabic-speaking population of Palestine had to define its political divisions and rivalries. Leadership in the anti-Zionist struggle was disputed between two prominent families, the Husayns and the Nashashibis. A member of the former family, Muhammad Amin al-Husayni, became early in the nineteen-twenties the mufti of Jerusalem and president of al-majlis al-islami al-a'ld, which was set up by the Mandatory authorities to supervise and administer Muslim religious endowments and establishments in Palestine. A member of the latter family, Raghib al-Nashashibi became mayor of Jerusalem. These two personalities became the focus round which their respective followers were gathered, and in the nineteen-twenties Arab-speaking Palestine was divided between two factions, the majalisyiyyun, who constituted the Husayni following, and the mu'saridun who opposed them. In 1931, a number of politicians who believed in Pan-Arabism formed hizb al-istishabi; the group included Akram Zu'a'atar, Subh al-Kha'ara, 'Abwani 'Abd al-Hadi, Muhammad 'Issat Darawa, Mu'sin al-Madi and 'Agdi al-Nuwayhid. In December 1934, the Nashashibi faction was formally constituted into a Party, hizb al-difa' al-watani, and in April of the following year the Husayni faction also constituted itself into a Party, al-bizb al-arabi al-fisasfin, the president of which was Djjamal al-Husayni. In June of the same year Dr. Husayn al-Khali'di (hitherto in opposition to the mufti) organized his following into hizb al-islah, and, opposing the Nashashibi faction, captured the office of mayor of Jerusalem. In October 1935 a Nablis group formed itself into hizb al-kullta al-wataniyya. All these different groupings proved quite ephemeral, for in April 1936, at the beginning of the long drawn-out Palestine troubles, they agreed to form a body, al-lajna al-arabiyya al-'ulyd, in which they were all represented, in order to coordinate the struggle against the Mandatory Power. The subsequent events in Palestine between 1936 and 1948 allowed no further opportunity for the formation of party groups. But some of the parties formed earlier, notably hizb al-istishabi and hizb al-arabi, resumed their activities between 1943 and the end of the Mandate.

The Sudan.—Political parties in the Sudan were quite late in making an appearance, and when they did, their activities were governed by their connection with the heads of the two leading tarikas, the Khad-
miyya and the Ansār, and the attitude they adopted toward union with or separation from Egypt. In March 1938 the formation of a group, muṣmar al-
akhīrīyya al-dīmm, was announced, the aim of which was to promote the general welfare of the country and its graduates (by the term 'graduate' was meant someone who had finished school at the intermediate grade or above). The group wished for a greater share in government to be given to the Sudanese. A split in the ranks of the Congress led after 1942 to the formation of another group, the aṣṣihkā* led by Ismā‘īl al-Azhari, which was allied with the Khāmīyya
tarīka and dedicated to unity with Egypt. Opposing them was hīṣb al-umma, which called for the complete independence of the Sudan, and was backed by the Ansār. In August 1949 another group, al-dżāhba al-
waṭanīyya, was formed which aimed at Dominion status for the Sudan under the Egyptian crown. To this group Khāmīyya support was given for a time.

In 1951 a group dedicated to the formation of a Sudanese republic immune from Mahdist influence was formed: it was called al-hīṣb al-dżumī ḫūri al-
sābrī, it never had much influence. In 1952 the aṣṣihkā* and the dżāhba combined to form al-hīṣb al- waṭanī al-ittihādī which, led by Ismā‘īl al-Azhari, proclaimed unity with Egypt as its objective. This group came to power in January 1954 and remained in office until the coup d’état of 1958 put an end to its purporting activity. In spite of its professed aims the Party, when in power, found that it had to acquiesce in separation from Egypt.

Tunisia.—The French Protectorate of Tunisia dating from 1881 was the framework within which organized Tunisian political activity took place. This Protectorate facilitated the settlement of Frenchmen and other Europeans in the country and slowly led to increasing French control over Tunisian administration. Such a situation led a small number of educated Tunisians to form a group in 1907 known as the Parti Jeune Tunisien, whose aim was to work for a constitution and a greater scope for Tunisians in public affairs. The group included ʿAllā Bāṣḥ Šaṃba and ʿAbd al-ʿArīz al-Ṭaḥālībī. At the end of the First World War, the group came to be known as the Parti Tunisien and in the boom to Presi-
dent Wilson in April 1919 and published a bouquin: Paris in 1920, La Tunisie Martyre, which was written by Ṭaḥālībī and Ahmad Sakkā and which set out Tunisian grievances. In June of the same year the Parti Tunisien changed its name to Parti Libéral Constitutionnel (al-hīṣb al-hurr al-dustūrī), commonly known thereafter as the Destour. Towards the end of the nineteen-twenties the Party became revitalized through the efforts of a younger generation of mem-
bers, including Ḥabīb Bourguiba (al-Ḥabīb Abū Ṣuqayyab), al-Šāḥīlī Khayr Allāh and Ṭaḥālībī Māṭīrī. The younger men led by Bourguiba soon clashed with their elders, and at the Party Congress of Kaṣr Hillā in March 1934 Bourguiba captured the organization, which he continued henceforth to lead in spite of many challenges and vicissitudes. The Party came henceforth to be known as the neo-
Destour to indicate the rejection by the new leaders of the ideas of those whom they called 'archīs'. Under Bourguiba's leadership, the neo-Destour stood for Tunisian independence. Bourguiba also transformed the Party into a mass movement with a country-wide organization and a pyramidal chain of command with himself at the apex. The Party was composed of branches (dṣwāba) of two kinds: terri-
torial (dṣwāba tūrābīyya) and non-territorial (dṣwāba ghayr tūrābīyya), the latter being found in a large city like Tunis, and comprising members from the same home-town or locality. The Party also organ-
ized the unions of workers, al-ṣuḥābā al-
dustūrīyya, and controlled the Tunisian trade union movement, al-ittihād al-dīmm al-tūnīsī li-l'īlān
. The new technique of canalizing mass emotions for political ends is described in a remarkable passage by one of Bourguiba's prominent followers, in which he says that when Bourguiba made speeches orator and audience became as one flesh, the mass respond-
ing to the inflences of the speaker's 'being moved by his anguish and reflection if he compelled it to think' (ʿAllā al-Bahlā-
wān, Tūnīs al-ṭābira, Cairo 1954, 73). After the attain-
ment of Tunisian independence, the neo-Destour consolidated its position in the country, and is today the only political organization in Tunisia.

Algeria.—It is only after the First World War that purely Algerian organized political activity emerges. And it emerges not in Algeria itself, but among the Algerian proletariat in France. In 1926, the French Communist Party tried to organize Algerian workers into a grouping known as the Étoile Nord-Africaine; in 1927 this grouping came to be led by the Algerian Meṣālī al-Ḥāḍī who had served in the French army and been demobilized in France. The Étoile was a left-wing anti-colonial proletarian organization which operated in France, not in Algeria. It had many ups and downs, its leaders were repeatedly prosecuted, and the association itself was banned for alleged sub-
version. In 1936, Meṣālī al-Ḥāḍī, having fled to Swit-
zerland to escape the police, met there the Amir Ṣaḥīb Aslān and, under his influence, gave up his Communist sympathies and began to work for an Arab Islamic Algeria. In 1937 he founded the Parti du Peuple Algérien which recruited its members and organized them in cells in Algeria itself, and worked for Algerian independence. On the outbreak of the second world war, the authorities banned the Party and imprisoned its leader. In 1946, having been allowed to return to Algeria, he organized his followers into a new party, the Mouvement pour le Triomphe des Libertés Démocratiques, which called for a sovereign Algerian republic and for the unity of the Maghrib. The Mouvement was the public and legal front of an underground organization, the Mouvement pour la Mājūl, which had worked underground since its banning in 1939. An even more secret grouping which was set up by Meṣālī al-Ḥāḍī and his colleagues was the para-
 military Organisation Spéciale, the head of which was Āmmān bin Bella. In April 1954, he and eight of his colleagues set up in Cairo the Comité Révolutionnaire d'Unité et d’Action which organized insurrection against the French authorities in Algeria. The Comité launched the Front de Libération Nationale, to whom the French Government eventually con-
ceded Algerian independence. The Front has become the only political movement in the Algerian Republic.

Other political groupings appeared on the Algerian scene in the nineteen-thirties and forties. In 1934, Muḥammad Šaḷāḥ bin Diḷūl (Ben Dielūl) organized the Muslim local representatives of the départements de Constantine into a Fédération des Élus musulmans du départe-
ment de Constantine. Other fédérations were also set up and these groups, loosely organized as they were, did attempt to adopt a common line of policy towards the authorities. What they desired was a lessening of Algerian disabilities and a greater share in government. Algerian independence was not an ob-
jective of theirs; neither was it the objective of the Rassemblement franco-musulman algérien, which bin Diḷūl organized in 1938, or of the Union Populaire al-

gerienne which Farhat Abbas set up in the same year. Neither of these groups was destined to have a long life. When Morocco declared war on France in April 1940, Abbas addressed a manifesto to the Governor-General of Algeria entitled L’Algérie devant le conflit mondial. Manifeste du peuple algérien, asking for justice for the Algerian Muslims and Algerian autonomy. In 1944 Farhat Abbas organized Les Amis du Manifeste et de la Liberté, which he designed as a mass movement to take the place of the Parti du Peuple Algérien. Whether or not his methods before and after 1945 contributed to the rising of May 1945 in the Constantinios, the authorities did arrest him and dissolve his organization. On his release in 1946 he organized the Union Démocratique du Manifeste Algérien, forsaking mass agitation, his watchword being: ‘Ni assimilation, ni nouveaux maîtres, ni séparatisme’. In April 1956, he joined the National Liberation Front.

Morocco.—Organized political party activity in Morocco dates from the nineteen-thirties. Its origins lies in the protest organized by some young Moroccans in 1930 against the Berber dahir [see ZAHIR] and French policy, which they took to aim at separating the Berbers from the Moroccan polity. A group of these young men produced in 1934 a Plan de reformes marocaines, and organized themselves into a Comité d’action marocaine. The group included Muhammad Hasan al-Wazzan, who had fallen out with his fellow-members of the Comité, organized a political group under the name of Action nasionale marocaine, which was likewise banned in October 1937. These early political groupings were much influenced by the political ideas of Shâkal Atâr, who had visited Tétuan in 1930 and to whom Muhammad Hasan al-Wazzan had for some time acted as secretary; they were also encouraged in their activities by the sympathy of some French socialists notably Robert-Jean Longuet who had started the periodical Maghreb in Paris in 1932.

Between October 1937 and 1943 there was little political party activity in the French zone of Morocco. In the Spanish zone, the Spanish Civil War starting in 1936 had a direct and important influence on the character of political party activities. The Spanish Nationalist authorities, who speedily came to control the zone, wished to secure political support among the Moroccans and encouraged the formation in June 1936 of a party led by Abû al-Khalîk al-Turaysi (Torres) under the name of hisb al-islâm al-watani. In February 1937 Makkl al-Nâşri was encouraged to form a rival group, hisb al-wahda al-maghrabiyya. These two groups remained in existence until the end of the Protectorate; intermittently enjoying the favour and support of the authorities.

Towards the end of 1943, conditions inside and outside Morocco making political activity in the French zone once more possible, the Istikliî Party was formed. It was led by the same group who had formed the Comité d’action marocaine and the Parti national; its most prominent members were Ahmad Ballârî, Abû al-Rahîm bû Abîd, Muhammad al-Yazidy and ‘Umar Abîd al-Djall. But the Istikliî Party differed from earlier groupings by the fact that it succeeded in organizing from 1945 onwards a countryside-wide network of cells (djâmâʾat, sing. djâmâʾa) with a pyramidal chain of command; it could thus mobilize the masses in the struggle against the French Protectorate which had succeeded in 1956. The Istikliî Party during the period 1945-56 functioned as a movement. Alongside it there were a number of groupings which were more in the nature of factions: Muhammad Hasan al-Wazzan organized in 1946 the Parti démocratique de l’indépendance (which after independence became the Parti démocratique constitutionnel); the Sharîr Mülyî Idrîs organized in 1947 the Parti démocrate marocain des hommes libres; and in 1948 Bashîr Zîrnî organized the Parti du peuple marocain. These two latter parties supported the Protectorate and in turn enjoyed official protection.

After independence the Istikliî Party emerged as the most powerful political organization in the country, but in 1959 there was a split in its ranks, and two of its leaders, Mahdî bin Barka and ‘Abîd Allâh Ibrîhim, led a new party with leftist leanings, the Union nationale des forces populaires, which seems to enjoy some mass support.

Communist Parties.—From the end of the first world war, small, usually clandestine, groups of communists have existed in the Arab East; their formation has sometimes been assisted or influenced by emissaries of the Third International, by communists in the various Islamic settelment or by Armenian refugees with leftist sympathies. Details concerning them are found in W. Z. Laqueur, Communism and nationalism in the Middle East, London 1956, which, for Iraq, should be supplemented by John Batatu, Some preliminary observations on the beginnings of communism in the Arab East, in J. Pannen, ed., Islam and Communism, Munich 1960.

In the Maghrib, communist parties were rather offshoots of the French Communist Party which gradually separated off from it; details of their activities may be found in the works of Le Tourneau, Rézette and Robert listed below. On communism in Arab countries, see further šuveyṭyঁya.

Political parties became a regular feature of Turkish political life only after the revolution of 1908. Their precursors were coteries engaged in conspiracy within the Ottoman Empire or in agitation from exile (see ǧaziiyya). These included societies formed among non-Muslim or non-Turkish groups aiming at autonomy or independence and groups of Ottoman Muslims dedicated to a change of rulers or of the constitution—e.g., the Ethiske Hetairia (Odessa 1864, later headed by Alexander Hyspilanti) which prepared Greek independence; the Social Democrat Hunchakian (or Hincak) Party (Geneva 1887, subsequently in exile and founded anew in Salonica in 1906). This last group, known to Europeans as the Committee of Union and Progress or more loosely as the Young Turks, was responsible for the restoration of the constitution in July 1908 and the suppression of the counter-revolutionary movement in April 1909 (Osle-Bir Marz Waqfasi).

The revolution of 1908-9 was a triumph of conspiracy and of party; yet the C.U.P. remained somewhat in the background and did not fully seize power until the coup d'état of January 1913. Meanwhile a large number of parties were formed inside and outside of the parliament, mainly among opponents or dissidents of the C.U.P. who objected to its intense partisanship and to its increasing Turkish nationalist bias; the most notable of these was the Hurriyet ve İtihad Fırkası (q.v.) or Entente Libérée of 1912. Secret conspiracy also resumed, e.g., among the Khalâsîr Débilîn who forced the appointment of an anti-C.U.P. cabinet in 1912. Before the assassination of Mehmed Şevki Paşa in June 1913, however, the C.U.P. government suppressed all opposition, sending the leading liberals into banishment or exile.

Intense party activity recommenced after the armistice of October 1918. In the Istanbul the C.U.P., which had the support of the Entente Libérée (see 1914-18), reconstituted itself as the Tedjieddud Firkasi or Renewal Party; others revived various anti-C.U.P. groupings, promoted separate interest (e.g., the Kürdistân Te'welî Dişîyeti of Seyyid ʿAbd al-Ḵâdîr); advocated close collaboration with the British (the Ingilîs Muhibbâr Dişîyet Dişîyet of Saʿîd Molla); or invoked national self-determination for the Turks (the Wilson Prenstîpleri Dişîyet Dişîyet of Khalîl Edbî and others). These manoeuvres, however, remained without much consequence because in Istanbul power was in the hands of the occupying forces and in Anatolia of the nationalists. Nationalist organization in the peripheral provincial towns (Edirne, Adana, Izmir, Erzurum, etc.) formed around local C.U.P. leaders and other notables; its aim was to resist encroachments by Allied authorities or non-Turkish groups. The local party organizations met in regional congresses and in a national congress at Sivas (4-11 September 1919) under Mustafa Kemal [ Atatürk], at which they merged in the Anadolu ve Kâmil Mûdafâ-i Hukûke Dişîyet Dişîyeti, or Society for the defence of rights of Anatolia and Rumelia. This group dominated the first Grand National Assembly at Ankara, although a more conservative faction, the so-called “Second Group”, informally organized and opposed to Mustafa Kemal’s personal leadership, split off in 1922 (one of its leaders was Djalâl al-Dîn ʿArîf). In 1923, Kemal transformed the Mûdafâ-i Hukûk into the Republican People’s Party (R.P.P., or Dîsimhûriyet Khâbat Fırkası [q.v.]), which dominated the Turkish political scene until 1950.

The one-party period was briefly interrupted by the appearance of two opposition parties. The first of these, the Progressive Republican Party (Terâbbî-pervoir Dîsimhûriyet Fırkası) was formed late in 1924 among Kemal’s early close collaborators, including ʿAli Fuṣûd [Cebesoy], Kâzım Karabekir, Rûfû [Orbay], and Bekir Sâmi, rallied a total of 28 deputies, and was dissolved under the Law for the restoration of order (Taḥrîr-i sukûn kânûnu) on 3 June 1925. The other, called the Cepîdat Dîsimhûriyet Fırkası, was founded and dissolved at Kemal’s behest by his good friend ʿAli Fethî [Okyar] (12 August-
The transition to a multiparty system was announced by President Ismet Inonui in his speech of 19 May 1945, and as many as 27 parties were founded by 1950. The most prominent among these were the Democratic Party (Demokrat Partisi), founded in 1946 by Celal Bayar, Adnan Menderes, and other R.P.P. dissidents; and the Nation Party, formed in 1948 by Fevzi Çakmak [q.v.], Osman Bölbükbaş, and other dissidents from the D.P. The Democrats campaigned for a liberalization of the economy, for agricultural development, and a relaxation of the R.P.P.’s secularism; the Nation Party took a more intransigent tone of opposition toward the R.P.P. and later the D.P. and favoured religious conservatism.

The following table indicates the strength of the parties since 1946.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Republican People's Party</th>
<th>Democratic Party</th>
<th>Justice Party</th>
<th>Nation Party</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946(a)</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1961(b)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of votes</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of eligible voters participating</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to Table: (a) No election figures available. (b) National Assembly only. (c) New Turkey Party. (d) Republican Peasants' National Party. (e) Democratic Party. (f) Nation Party.

Party organization, which between 1908 and 1945 had been limited to the cities and the educated class, since then has spread to the small towns and villages. It would appear that traditional local factions (e.g., old residents versus recent migrants or clients of rival leading families) are easily absorbed into national parties. Election participation has been higher than in many Western countries, and the tendency has been toward a two-party system, both under the multiple-member plurality system that prevailed until 1950 and under the proportional system in effect since then. The suffrage, which had been limited to taxpayers under the Empire, was extended until 1960 and under the proportional system in effect since then. The suffrage, which had been limited to the cities and the educated class, has been extended until 1960 and under the proportional system in effect since then.


iii.—Persia

The history of the emergence of political parties in Persia does not conform to the general Western liberal concepts of a polarization of communities of interest into organizations formed to carry out political action, which then enter the political arena via a variety of already established or revolutionary routes. In the writings and speeches of the reformers and modernizers of the last quarter of the 19th century—particularly those who were active outside Persia—there is a general awareness of the desirability of concerted group organization and action in order to achieve political goals, but there is no definition or advocacy of political parties, and the term hizb retains its traditional religio-sectarian connotation. Although the communities of interest which agitated...
on behalf of the Constitutional Movement and participated in it can be differentiated and identified, the notations which they made and the associations which they formed had neither the form nor the substance of "party" activity. Both the notions and the rudimentary formations of political parties in Persia emerged after the initial phases of the constitutional régime within the parliamentary framework which the constitution had created; and only to a limited degree had they any generic relationship to the various groups existing prior to the constitutional régime in the early years of the constitutional régime, when proto-partisan factions were developing in the Madjlis, it is difficult to ascertain the beginning of the accepted usage of the term "hzib". Not until the period of the First World War and its immediate aftermath did hzib become the exact and commonly understood term for "political party" in Persia, and the acceptance of this usage coincides with the appearance of embryonic political parties having some semblance of a public base and an organizational apparatus, as distinct from mere parliamentary factions.

The factional lines were already emerging towards the end of the first session of the Madjlis (1906-8); and after the military conquest of Tehran by the Constitutionalist forces in 1909 and the inauguration of the second session in the same year, two distinct groups known as Dimahb-i A'zmuyan ("Popular Democrats") and Istim'am-iyiyân ("Social Moderates") were formed. Although in their pronouncements and in the newspapers supporting them the terms "dzam'iyiyat, firka," and occasionally hzib were used interchangeably by these groups to describe themselves, their formal parliamentary organizations went by the French term faction. The Democrats saw themselves as the revolutionary group, and were, in general, composed of Western-educated bourgeois elements. Their platform included general and vague references to: (1) 'separation of religion and politics,' (2) 'distribution of land among the peasantry,' (3) 'preference for indirect over direct taxation,' and (4) 'opposition to the Madjlis-i A'zâyân (House of Notables).'' Some direct and residual influence of the Caucasian Social-Revolutionaries of 1905, as well as generally recognized western ideologies, influenced all these groups. Their chief spokesmen were Sayyid Hasan Takizada and Sulaymân Mirzâ. They were the minority fraction in the second Madjlis, numbering 28. The Moderates were made up of the aristocracy and the influential "ulama:" they were led by Mirzâ Ma'hammad Şâdik Tâbâbâ'î and were supported by the Regent himself. With 36 members and 38 supporters, they were the effective majority in the second Madjlis. In the same period several smaller "parties"—including one with the evocative name of Istifâkh wa Taraqqi ("Union and Progress")—appeared on the scene but made no impact.

The Democrats were defeated in their attempt to retain the American financial adviser Morgan Shuster, and the second Madjlis was dissolved in 1911 as a result of Russian pressure. In the three-and-a-half-year period, political parties became a significant and genuine penetration of the Persian scene. After the suppression of the Kûčik Khân revolt in Ghîlân in 1921, Madjîl-i Adâlât went underground and its membership dwindled. In 1927 it held its second congress jointly and in secret with the Turkish communist party in Urmîya (Rıdâ'iyya). It had already virtually withdrawn from Persia by 1931, when communist parties (hûzb-i iktîdârî) were formally outlawed.

Between 1921 and 1923 there emerged a number of pro-Soviet parties with socialist programmes, having a small popular base but with some influential journalists as their leaders. Under the leadership of Sulaymân Mirzâ (the former leader of the Democratic Party) and Rûdâ Rûstâ (both later members of the Tâdâ Party), these groups joined in a Dîshâva-yi Ìîlî ("National Front") and took a vigorous part in the elections for the fifth Madjîlî. They were severely suppressed by the government and only a few Dîshâva-yi Ìîlî deputies were elected.

With the rise to power of Rûdâ Khân, there appeared a few nationalistic parties of the centre and the right, such as Irân-i Dâstân ("Young Iran") and Pîdî-i A'dînî ("Anti-Foreign"), led by his supporters but often acting as instruments of his personal intrigues. During the reign of Rûdâ Shâh, political parties were proscribed. On one occasion in the 30's, probably in emulation of the Turkish model, it was decided to create a party as an aid for étatist propaganda and control, but preparations were interrupted in mid-course and the plan was dropped. In 1937 53 men were convicted for communist conspiracy. Their leader, Dr. Taqî Arânî, was a German-educated
professor of physics at the University of Tehran, who died in prison. Among the group were a few veterans of the leftist regime of Khatami’s early 20s, but the majority, including Arani, were intellectuals with no political and party experience. They later played a part in the foundation of the Tude (“Masses”) Party in 1941.

The abolition of Russi Khaṭṭar, caused by the entry of British and Soviet troops into Persia in September 1941, brought about a revival in political life. The first reaction in the Maddris in and the press was to view the last twenty years as an unhappy interlude. Outside the Maddris, however, a development of true political parties was taking place. On 20 September 1941 the Hizb-i Tude-ya Irān was organized, and was launched publicly on 2 February 1942. Its platforms and propaganda characterized it from the start as a “democratic bourgeois national liberalization” party, concentrating primarily on an attack on the socialists, the anti-Fascist League to the pro-Nazi Hizb-i Milliyiyān-ya Irān. In between were to be found Hizb-i Hamzhik, Hizb-i Sosyalist, ‘Adilāt, Mardān-i Kūr, Milli, Milli, Miḥān-parastān, ‘Āsīā-i Bābāshāh, Isṭikhlāl, and Paykar. None of these parties had any influence on the government and its policies, and they were little more than extensions of political ambitions and intrigues of their leaders. Late in 1943, Sayyid Ḫiyāl al-Dīn ‘Abbās, the leader of the 1921 coup d’état which had brought Rūhānī to power, returned from exile and served as the focus of attempts to create an anti-Tude party, which was first called Wafā and was re-named Irāda-ya Milli in 1945. The Tude was the only party to take part as an organized party in the electoral campaign and the inauguration of the fourteenth Maddris in 1944, eight of their members being elected. Shortly after the opening of the fourteenth Maddris, two nationalist bourgeois parties were formed: Hizb-i Irān, with a leftist orientation in the electoral membership, and Hizb-i Mardom, with a traditionalist leadership.

The years 1944-46 were a period of rapid growth and consolidation for the Tude, owing to the growing power of the Soviet Union. By 1946 it claimed to have approximately 100,000 members. Meanwhile, more immediate Soviet support created separatist movements, which were spearheaded by Hizb-i Dinagul in Gilan, Fikhr-ya Dimashk in Khurshāb-ya, and Hizb-i Komilā (also called Fikhr-ya Dimashk) in Khurasān. On 23 June 1946 the Hizb-i Dimashk-ya Irān was founded by Ahmad Kəwām, then Prime Minister. The apparatus of the state and bureaucratic patronage were used to foster the rapid development and organizational spread of this party. First Kəwām co-operated with the parties of the left, to the extent of including those Tude members in his cabinet, and brought about the disintegration of Irāda-ya Milli and other leftist splinters. The collapse of the separatist regime in eastern Persia, and in general the thwarting of Soviet aims in Persia in December 1945, were crucial factors in the decline of the Tude, which was seriously weakened by loss of membership and by the defection of an anti-Soviet nationalist faction led by Khayal Malikī in Encyclopaedia of Islam, III

1947. Kawam and the Hizb-i Dimashk-ya Irān entered the fourteenth Maddris in near complete triumph. His only opposition came from a few remnants of Hizb-i Irān and Hizb-i Mardom, formed the Dībha-ya Millī in the fourteenth Maddris. The Hizb-i Dimashk-ya Irān was split, and disintegrated just as rapidly as it had grown. From the end of 1947 began another period of general fragmentation and insignificance of political parties in Persia. Tude efforts at regaining strength suffered another eclipse when, following an attempt on the life of the Shāh, it was formally outlawed in February 1949.

When the first disagreement with the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company served as the magnet of new nationalistic groupings and political activity, a new group of the extreme right, Fikhr-ya Dībha-ya Millī [q.v.], took the timelight from the left as being the most radical anti-imperialist force in Persia. This was essentially a religious secret organization led by Nawwāb-ya Ṣafāwī. It first appeared in 1948 and drew its support mainly from some sections of the ‘ulamā’ (the most prominent of whom were ‘Abādānī and Ṣa’dī), but the urban proletariat, and traditional elements in the ‘ulamā’. Its distinctive political feature was the employment of terrorist gangs, which were successfully used against politicians accused of pro-British ties.

On 24 October 1949, the Dībha-ya Millī, previously formed as a parliamentary faction, was re-organized as a partisan political coalition. It included the Fikhr-ya Dībha-ya Millī, and Muṣaddik was only one of the leaders. Large numbers of their supporters, with the widespread support of nationalist bourgeois elements, were elected, and the stage was set for the virtual control of governmental policy by the Dībha-ya Millī. On 25 March 1951, the Maddris passed the oil nationalization law; shortly afterwards a cabinet, composed mainly of Dībha-ya Millī members headed by Muṣaddik, was formed and began efforts for the implementation of that law.

There followed a relatively free and vigorous political activity in Persia. A number of left-of-centre parties, the most important of which were Nīrū-ya Siyāsī (“Third Force”—the Tude dissidents led by Khayal Malikī) and Hizb-i ‘Azmah-mād-khān-ya Irān (The Tolerant), led by Dr. Ḫayāl, appeared and joined the Dībha-ya Millī. A group of leftist front organizations also developed; this included the Djam-i-yūsuf-ya Tarādārān-ya Ṣulṭan (“Partisans of Peace”), who demonstrated against the Korean war and United States advisers in Persia, and collected 50,000 signatures for the Stockholm Proclamation, and the Djam-i-yūsuf-ya Millī-ya Mūvārīza bā fāṭimāt (“League of Struggle with Imperialism”), which demanded the legalization of the Tude Party. The Tude itself made a comeback as a supporter of nationalization policies. Although its chances of popular support were pre-empted by the Dībha-ya Millī, it succeeded in strengthening its secret structure and its striking ability among its civilian and military supporters. In 1953, when a number of nationalist supporters of Muṣaddik moved to oppose him, the Tude, though remaining ostensibly loyal, was acting to gain control of Muṣaddik. Arrayed against the forces of the left, apart from the Fikhr-ya Dībha-ya Millī, which split in two in 1951, were a number of ultra-nationalist and fascist-type parties, such as the Pan-Iranists and the ‘Imāmīya. The fall of Muṣaddik in 1953 drove the Dībha-ya Millī into a circumscribed and largely futile opposition. The organization of the Tude was broken and
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its membership was decimated as much by suspicion of its anti-national role as by the vigilance of the new régime. The party was proscribed; some of its leaders were seized and others were sent into exile.
Its central organization has been maintained in East Germany since the mid-50's. A number of extreme right groups: Fida’iyoun-i Shāh, Khaļīb, Ārūq, Dhu’l-Fikār, and 25 Murdād flourished briefly after 1953.

The development and activity of political parties in Persia has, by and large, been in recess since 1953. In September 1957, an attempt to create a loyal two-party system of Hizb-i Mardum led by Asad Allāh ‘Alām and Hīz-bī Miḥlīyyīn led by Mānṭûhr ‘Ikāl, failed. Since 1965 a Hīz-bī Irān-i Nāwīn (“Modern Iran”) has been discreetly promoted more as an informal motivational framework for the members of the government than as a political party.

In general, it may be concluded that the period for the true political significance of parties in Persia has not arrived. Only the Tādē Party in certain stages of its history and Kawām’s Hīz-bī Dimāhrāt-i Irān for a brief span have succeeded in creating the structure and organization of political parties of a totalitarian nature, and only the Tādā has had the element of ideological popular appeal. No broadly based, liberally oriented, loosely organized, viable party has developed. The ruling classes have continued to assume that the form of an institutional borrowing is conducive to the content desired. The interaction of the newly emerging phenomenon of political parties in Persia with the patterns of the exercise of power and the pull of tradition has profoundly affected the configurations and roles of these parties. The electoral system and practices in Persia reflecting traditional patterns of power have rendered political parties largely irrelevant; while political traditions have often made the parties indistinguishable from personal schemes and functional tools of a recognizable traditional mould. As such, they have proved inadequate levers.
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iv. — RUSSIAN AZERBAIJAN

No political parties existed in Transcaucasia until the last quarter of the 19th century. Before then, opposition had taken the form of peasant uprisings or conspiracies by the nobles against Russian rule. Modern political activity began in the reign of Alexander II (1855-81) in Georgia and Armenia, as a development from the cultural revivals, with strong nationalist overtones, which had grown up there in the middle of the century.

In comparison with Georgia and Armenia, Azerbajian was politically backward. Only in Baku, a boom town, was there political activity, conducted mostly by Russians and Armenians. Never having been a nation, Azerbaijan had a rising middle class and the intelligentsia had to solve the problem of their national identity before they could act.

Every Russian political party was represented in Baku, but none attracted a native following. Some wealthy Azerbaizanis associated themselves with the Constitutional Democrats (Kadets), while simultaneously promoting Muslim organizations.

In 1905 a small group of Bolsheviks made a conscious effort to attract Muslim workers in the Baku oil industry. Though they considered it most unorthodox to form a party on ethnic-religious lines, the Bolsheviks organized one, naming it Hemmat (“Endeavour”, = Himmat, Russ. Gummeli). This was essentially a front organization. Most of its early leaders were foreign Bolsheviks such as S. Shumian, I. Stalin, and A. Jagaridze. The Himmat never assumed much importance and disappeared after the Sovietization of Azerbaijan in 1920.

During the revolution of 1905 the Muslims of the Volga, Crimea, Azerbaijan, and Turkestan formed a loose political party named Ittīfāk-i Muslimin (Union of Muslims). Its chairman was an Azerbaijani, ‘Ali Mardān Bek Topcibaşev, who was politically close to the Russian Kadets. The Ittīfāk-i Muslimin elected Topcibaşev to the first Duma in 1906. In the second Duma, Azerbaizanis were represented by Muslims who were members of the Russian Kadet party. On the whole Ittīfāk-i Muslimin accomplished very little, though some of its members later held important positions in the government of independent Azerbaijan.

The most important Azerbaijani party was the Musavat (Equality), founded in 1911 by a group of Azerbaijani intellectuals who had been previously associated with the Russian Social-Democratic Workers’ Party. The leader of the Musavat was the journalist Muhammad Amin Rasulzade, who had taken part in the Persian revolution against Muhammad ‘Ali Shāh Kādār. Like many of his contemporaries, he had been exposed simultaneously to European nationalism, Russian Marxism, and the Pan-Islamic movement. In 1911 ‘Ali Mardān Bek Topcibaşev selected I. Stalin as the secretary of Musavat’s programme reflected all these irreconcilable theories: the unity of all Muslims irrespective of nationality or sect, the restoration of the independence of all Muslim peoples, aid to all Muslims, the development of Muslim economic life.

In spite of its ideological and organizational weakness, the Musavat emerged as the strongest force in Azerbaijan (but not in Baku, where the Bolsheviks and the Dashnaks predominated) after the collapse of Russian authority in 1917. It participated, though unenthusiastically, in the formation of the Transcaucasian Federation and, in spring 1918, proclaimed the independence of Azerbaijan. The Musavat became the strongest party in the government which was established in Baku in September 1918 after the Turks had occupied the city.

The rule of the Musavat was brief. The party was beset with insoluble problems. It failed to implement its promises of land reform, but did open a university in Baku. Neither the Musavat nor anyone else could defend Azerbaijan against Soviet Russia. In April 1920 the Red Army occupied Baku and the Musavat ceased to exist.
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Before 1905, in European Russia as in Central Asia, the formation of organized political parties was as difficult among the Muslims as among the Slav inhabitants. However, the introduction of a common language and creed (almost all the Muslims were Turks, except for a few Caucasian tribes and the Tadjiks; and, except for the Adharbaydjanis, almost all of the Muslim inhabitants were Sunnis) had already in the 19th century led to the formation of a strong community feeling on a common basis, which was to prove a solid foundation within the framework of the party structure. Furthermore the number of Muslims and Turks was greatly increased through the Russian conquests in Central Asia in the second half of the 19th century; old ties were revived between those lands and the Volga region with the possibility of mutual influences. This led to a great increase in the self-assertion of the Muslims.

The political revolution of 1905 with the formation of an imperial Duma unleashed a powerful movement among the Muslims. Under the leadership of prominent citizens, among whom the Tatars very soon played a leading role, it was decided on 8 April 1905 to convene a 'First all-Russian Muslim Congress' in Nižniy Novgorod (now Gorkiy) for 15 August 1905; this was followed by two further congresses in 1906 and 1907. They were of great importance also for the formation of parties, since at them the representatives of all the individual peoples, and also of all political opinions, met together and discussed common action. They concerned themselves mainly with the publication of newspapers and periodicals, with the establishment of elementary and secondary schools of truly Turkish-Muslim character and free from interference from the Russian authorities, with questions of cultural autonomy, and with relations with the Russian state and people.

Their emphasis was on education and on the creation of a common language and creed (almost all of the Muslims were Sunnis) which, although they were fundamentally in agreement over many issues, yet led to the formation of two parties: (1) progressive-minded clergymen, merchants, landowners and others formed the group of the "Muslim Union" which occupied itself principally with the furthering of national and religious interests and which (since they thought that among them they would most readily find understanding of their aims) inclined towards the "Constitutional Democrats" (generally abbreviated to "Kadets"), a bourgeois leftist-liberal group consisting of the educated Russian middle-classes and many professors; (2) a number of younger representatives, among them teachers, lawyers and publicists, rejected cooperation with any Russian political party, since they would thus bind themselves ideologically, and advocated—at least as an objective—complete independence and socialist ideals; this policy, which they tried to carry out chiefly against the Russian government, led them into the company of the Russian social-revolutionaries. Many of their leading personalities later, especially during the emigration, became ardent nationalists. In the first Duma (10 May-22 July 1906), with a majority of "Kadets", the Muslims were represented by 25 members, of whom six had signed the "Viborg manifesto" of the socialists. In the second Duma (5 March-16 June 1907), there were 35 Muslim members, among them 29 members of the "Union". The remaining six constituted the "Muslim Party" (Müslümanlarnın hikmesi) which, under the leadership of Ayáz İshakli, represented socialist ideas, while recognizing Islam and "Turkishness" as the basis of their national life. After the sweeping limitation of the franchise the third Duma (14 November 1907-1912) included only nine Muslim members (3 from Ufa, 2 each from Kazan and the Caucasus, one each from Orenburg and the Crimea, the representatives of Central Asia who had lost their right to vote). The fourth Duma (1912-1917) included only seven members, six of whom were members of the "Islamic group" and one Lesbian.

On the whole the Muslims very rarely got a hearing during the proceedings and furthermore met with the rejection by the Russians of their claims, especially in the third and fourth Dumas. Nevertheless there was the possibility of joint discussion, the activity of a press (though frequently suppressed by the Russian censorship) and the ventilation of topical questions of concern to Muslims. The Muslims became conscious of their numbers and their influence, and began gradually to break away from their hitherto characteristic alignment with Ottoman Turkey and to concentrate on coming to an arrangement with the Russians from whom, as the bearers of European ideas, they also learned and adopted much. Yet a part of the Muslim clergy (who opposed all Western ideas as being harmful to Islam) supported complete isolation.

In any case the Muslims in Imperial Russia gained the principle of equality of rights when the two revolutions of 1917 gave a new status to all the population. Among the Turks in the Volga region there came into prominence at the "National Congresses" of 1917 and 1918 the question of whether they should advocate merely cultural autonomy or also a territorial autonomy (within the frame of the Idel-Ural state: Idel is the Tatar name for the Volga), and also the question of relations with Communism. In addition to this there was the question of a choice between an amalgamation of Tatars, Bashkirs and possibly Cuvashes, and their separate organization. In the Crimea the "National Party" (Millî İflka, a minority, came to an agreement in 1917 with the Ukrainians, whose leading rôle was recognized also for the Crimea. In addition, efforts which had been made during 1918, partly in co-operation with German troops which had arrived there, to achieve a territorial secession of the Crimea broke down in November 1918 and ceased entirely, as did all other party-political activity, with the occupation of the Crimea by Bolshevik troops in November 1920.

In Central Asia, the two 1917 revolutions gave rise to various movements which were directed as much against the Russian settlers or the Russian administration as against the conservative Muslim clergy or the rule of the amirs in Khiva or Bukhara. Among the Kazakhs, the National Council (Alyqsh Ordu) strove in several congresses for a merely federal incorporation into the new Russia and turned against the Bolsheviks. But as early as 1919-20 the country was subdued by the Russians (= Bolsheviks). In Turkestân, the conservative and the progressive (Diedît) circles united in discussions which went on for months on the formation of a "Decentralization Party", which rejected the Russian policy of centralization and obtained from the Bolsheviks guarantees of their religious and national freedom, of the reten-
tion of private property and of a Shari'ā system of jurisdiction; until, in 1922, the Bolsheviks prevailed in fierce struggles against the Basmachi. [4.8] movement and had also brought under their control the two emirates, where the "Young Bukhārān" party co-operated with them.

For both the Volga region and Central Asia, the victory of Bolshevik rule within the former boundaries of Imperial Russia (which were finally fixed in 1895) meant the sole rule of the Communist Party. Within the framework of its changing policy, which during the 1920's was quite open with regard to national claims, there were repeated political struggles, which finally led to the eradication of the so-called "National Deviations" (named Sultangliebhāna after one of the prominent Tatar leaders, Sultan Galiey [q.v.]) and to the establishment of the Communist Party also in the Muslim districts in the federative states of that time. However, since national aspirations remained alive and had to be accommodated to the demands of the state party, the leadership of the Communist Party in these districts had frequently changed. The very responsible position of Second Secretary remained for the most part in the hands of a Russian or a Ukrainian, while the party leadership was usually given to a native inhabitant (for 1966, see the lists published in Öst-Probleme, xviii/10 (Bonn 1966), 318 f.).

During the 1920's was quite open with regard to the attempt to obtain recognition by the Berlin authorities of certain political rights for the Muslims. When the Agha Khān and Amir 'Ali, alarmed by the nationalistic demands of the Muslim League, withdrew from the party, a reconciliation took place between the Congress Party and the Muslim League: after 1915, the two organizations held their annual meetings simultaneously and in the same town. It was at that point that Muhammad 'Ali Djinān tried to make himself the representative of Indian unity and to reconcile the few divergent points of view of the Congress Party and the Muslim League. This tactical unity lasted throughout the whole period of effervescence caused by the abolition of the Caliphate but, from the end of 1927, the two organizations grew apart, never again to combine their efforts for Indian independence. Djinān therefore realized that the Muslim League must become a popular movement, and no longer remain a clique of landed proprietors and the rich if it wished to attain its avowed objectives— the defence of the Muslim element among hostile surroundings (mainly Hindu), the establishment of separate electoral colleges, and the setting up of an Islamic nation in the Indian sub-continent.

The resolution adopted by the Muslim League in 1940, during the special session held at Lahore, called specifically for the partition of India on a religious basis in order to safeguard the interests of the Muslim community; and in 1942 the Muslim League could claim to be the only organized party capable of leading an effective political course of action in favour of an Islamic State still unborn. Until 1947, the three expressions Muslim League, Islam and Pakistan were to be practically synonymous for the majority of the Muslims of North India.

After the partition of India, the Kā'īd-i 'A'sam Muhammad 'Ali Djinān, President of the Muslim League, became the first Governor-General of Pakistan and Liyākāt 'Ali Khān the Prime Minister. These two men made it possible for the new State, in its first months, to overcome the considerable obstacles posed by a deficient economy and a social situation rendered tragically critical by the influx of Muslim refugees. After the death of Muhammad 'Ali Djinān in 1948 and that of Liyākāt 'Ali Khān in 1951, the Muslim League lost its dynamism and suffered severe electoral defeats, especially in East Pakistan. Until 1956, the leaders of the party did in fact hold the reins of government. Early in 1956 the new President of the Muslim League, Sādār 'Abd al-Rabb Nīghtār, followed by the other party leaders, decided that in future ministers could no longer hold office within the party and asked the deputies of the provincial Assembly of West Pakistan who were members of the Muslim League to form themselves into a parliamentary party. Despite these salutary measures, the Muslim League was unable to regain its earlier popularity. It was, however, disbanding like the other political parties when martial law was proclaimed in October 1958.

In India, the modern notion of a political party is relatively recent and, before the partition of the Indian sub-continent in 1947, two major parties represented the two political groups which led to the creation of the new India (Bhārat) and Pakistan: the Congress Party, with nationalist, pan-Indian tendencies, and the All-India Muslim League which favoured the re-grouping of Indian Muslims in an autonomous territory.

The All-India Muslim League was set up on 30 December 1906 at Dacca on the suggestion of the Agha Khān. At the start it constituted a cautious move to reconcile the somewhat divergent points of view of the Congress Party and the Muslim League: after 1915, the two organizations held their annual meetings simultaneously and in the same town. It was at that point that Muhammad 'Ali Djinān tried to make himself the representative of Indian unity and to reconcile the few divergent points of view of the Congress Party and the Muslim League. This tactical unity lasted throughout the whole period of effervescence caused by the abolition of the Caliphate but, from the end of 1927, the two organizations grew apart, never again to combine their efforts for Indian independence. Djinān therefore realized that the Muslim League must become a popular movement, and no longer remain a clique of landed proprietors and the rich if it wished to attain its avowed objectives—the defence of the Muslim element among hostile surroundings (mainly Hindu), the establishment of separate electoral colleges, and the setting up of an Islamic nation in the Indian sub-continent.

The resolution adopted by the Muslim League in 1940, during the special session held at Lahore, called specifically for the partition of India on a religious basis in order to safeguard the interests of the Muslim community; and in 1942 the Muslim League could claim to be the only organized party capable of leading an effective political course of action in favour of an Islamic State still unborn. Until 1947, the three expressions Muslim League, Islam and Pakistan were to be practically synonymous for the majority of the Muslims of North India.

After the partition of India, the Kā'īd-i 'A'sam Muhammad 'Ali Djinān, President of the Muslim League, became the first Governor-General of Pakistan and Liyākāt 'Ali Khān the Prime Minister. These two men made it possible for the new State, in its first months, to overcome the considerable obstacles posed by a deficient economy and a social situation rendered tragically critical by the influx of Muslim refugees. After the death of Muhammad 'Ali Djinān in 1948 and that of Liyākāt 'Ali Khān in 1951, the Muslim League lost its dynamism and suffered severe electoral defeats, especially in East Pakistan. Until 1956, the leaders of the party did in fact hold the reins of government. Early in 1956 the new President of the Muslim League, Sādār 'Abd al-Rabb Nīghtār, followed by the other party leaders, decided that in future ministers could no longer hold office within the party and asked the deputies of the provincial Assembly of West Pakistan who were members of the Muslim League to form themselves into a parliamentary party. Despite these salutary measures, the Muslim League was unable to regain its earlier popularity. It was, however, disbanding like the other political parties when martial law was proclaimed in October 1958.

VI. INDIA AND PAKISTAN

The word hizb in the sense of political party occurs almost exclusively in compound expressions modelled on Arabic and Persian. The opposition party would be hizb-i mukhalif or hizb-i-Ikhšaṣ; similarly hizb al-ahār, hizb al-'umāl and hizb al-mustabilīn would denote respectively the Liberal party, the Labour party and the Conservative party. But in the general sense of political party, the current expression is sīyāsī dhāma', although we also find the term pārī, taken directly from English.
The Ahrar Party was organized in 1930 with the aim of enabling a Muslim group to participate directly in the struggle alongside the Congress Party, but its activities were for the most part limited to the province of the Punjab, where it showed itself to be fiercely anti-British and attempted to deprive the Muslim League of a section of its electoral supporters. Its success depended too greatly on the personality of its leaders, especially its main leader, Mawlana Fadl al-Hakk, a brilliant orator and consummate demagogue. From 1942, when the Muslim League had become a popular party, the influence of the Ahrar Party declined rapidly, and many of its followers rejoined the ranks of the Muslim League. In 1947, at the time of the Partition, the Ahrar Party disappeared almost completely. It was only in 1953, during the riots directed against the Ahmadiyya community, that it reappeared for a time and appealed, with some success, to popular religious emotions.

Among the groups representing Islamic nationalism, the Khaksar movement had a brilliant period between 1930 and 1942. Its undisputed leader, 'Ali al-Masri, imposed an extremely rigid discipline upon it; military training and social service were the two essential characteristics of the party. The imprisonment of 'Ali al-Masri, a large number of its members, and its entire crippled the movement which, after 1945, existed only in theory.

The party of the Khudai Khidmatgar (Servants of God) exerted any real influence only in the North-West Frontier Province, where it gave support to the Indian Congress Party. Its leader, Fadl al-Ghaffar Khan, turned it into a religious movement that was destined to organize and discipline Pathan nationalism. Its members were familiarly known as "Red Shirts." After Partition, the movement lost much of its prestige when Fadl al-Ghaffar Khan asked his followers not to take part in the struggle for Kashmir.

The Krishak Pradha Party (Peasant Party) was founded by Faqih al-Hakim as early as 1927, and was always confined to the province of Bengal. In 1937, Faqih al-Hakim became Prime Minister of a coalition government, but he was dismissed and imprisoned by the British government in 1951. He was not given the overall support that he demanded; he decided to abandon his party and to join the Muslim League, which however expelled him at the end of 1944. In May 1944 his government was compelled to resign, and it was then that the Muslim League came to power in Bengal. Faqih al-Hakim became a member of the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan in 1947, and then Advocate-General for East Pakistan in 1951. In September 1953 the opponents of the Muslim League formed the Krishak Sramik Party (Labour and Peasant Party), again headed by Faqih al-Hakim, who demanded the provincial autonomy of Bengal within the framework of Pakistan. Faqih al-Hakim, now over eighty, was once again appointed Prime Minister of Bengal in 1954, but the central government dismissed him shortly afterwards. Minister of the Interior in the central government in 1955, and then Governor of East Pakistan, Faqih al-Hakim was once again forced to resign. The Krishak Sramik Party, believing his personality to be indispensable, invited him to resume leadership of the party some time before the proclamation of martial law in October 1958.

The Awami League (People's Party) owes its existence to the repeated efforts of Husayn Shahid Suhrawardi to organize a parliamentary opposition group of the Western type. Despite the establishment of parties with almost the same title in the North-West Frontier, Punjab, and Sind provinces, and despite the congress held in Lahore in December 1952 to set up the Dinan Awami Muslim League, it was in fact only in Bengal that the movement was able to play a very significant part. Its social aims included the abolition of the great landed estates, nationalization of the jute and tea industries, and the rapid development of education and social services. Politically, it called for the autonomy of Bengal within the framework of Pakistan, and for the recognition of Bengali as a national language. When Suhrawardi became Prime Minister of the central government in September 1956, the President of the organization, Mawlana Abul Hamid Khan Bhashani, gave up his position as a protest against Suhrawardi's political manoeuvre whereby he went straight from the opposition to power. Mawlana Bhashani even formed a new party with the name National Awami Party, which, as a result of the banning of political parties in October 1958, had only a brief existence.

The Republican Party was set up in April 1956 by Dr Khan Sahib to take advantage of the conflicts among the various factions of the Muslim League in West Pakistan. Its programme, which throughout its two congresses held in September 1956 and September 1958 was far from precise, called for a democratic and liberal policy on the part of the government. These good intentions were belied by the actions of the Republican Party when in power. By its devious tactics, first in coalition with the Muslim League and then with the Awami League, it precipitated the crisis which was to lead the army to seize power in October 1958. The bloodless revolution carried through by Field-Marshal Ayyub Khan put an end to the corrupt parliamentary régime, which threatened to provoke a national catastrophe in Pakistan.

The political parties, banned in Pakistan from 1958, were able to reappear on 14 July 1962, on which date the National Assembly voted an amendment to the Constitution of 1 March 1962. This amendment stipulated that no political party should prejudice the Islamic ideology, the stability or the integrity of Pakistan, or receive any aid whatsoever from a foreign country.

The Muslim League immediately resumed its activities, but the two provincial sections of the movement disagreed over certain points: while the Western group intended to bring younger blood into its organization, thereby following the advice given by Field-Marshal Ayyub Khan, the Head of State, the Eastern group wished to adhere to the tradition of the old Muslim League. The first party congress was held in Karachi on 4 and 5 September 1962; it nominated Khalid al-Zaman as chairman of the organizing committee of the League. A second congress was held in Dacca on 27 October, attended by a certain number of former "counsellors" of the party, who elected as president Khadji Nazim al-Din, the former Governor-General and Prime Minister.

Furthermore, Suhrawardi, who had been arrested on 30 January 1962 on a charge of treason, was released from prison and, on 4 October 1962, he succeeded in forming the Democratic National Front which included among its members various former politicians of both East and West Pakistan.

Finally, Field-Marshal Ayyub Khan, Head of State of Pakistan, who since the promulgation of the Constitution of March 1962 had made clear his wish
to remain above party, decided to become a member of the rejuvenated Muslim League: he joined it on 22 May 1947.

After the Partition of 1947, the All-India Muslim League ceased to play an essential part in politics in the new India. An Indian Muslim League does however exist, which is of some slight influence in the South only, in the states of Madras and Kerala. In 1960, this Muslim League conducted a victorious electoral campaign in co-operation with the Congress Party and the Indian Socialist Party to prevent the Communists from returning to power in the state of Kerala.


(A. G. Uibemretierē)

vii.—Indonesia

In the years before independence, Indonesia did not succeed in developing any equivalent of the Indian National Congress. Political parties came into existence, splintered, coalesced and disappeared, in numbers and with a fertility reminiscent of the Indonesian islands themselves. The first party to achieve a mass following was Sarekat Islam (q.v.) (Islamic Union), founded, on the basis of an earlier and more limited association of Muslim merchants, in 1912. Its following grew rapidly on the tide of Muslim revival and anti-colonialism, but it was increasingly penetrated by more secular political elements, and its influence and popular backing thereafter declined. Its place was to some extent taken by the Islamic reform organization Nahdathul Ulama and the Islamic traditionalist organization the Nahdathul Ulama. In 1920 the more radical Marxists founded the Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI), which, until its eclipse following an abortive coup in the years 1926 and 1927, took up the running. In 1927, leading Indonesian nationalists, including Dr. Sukarno, founder the National Party of Indonesia (PNI), in the hope of creating a united nationalist movement. In this they were unsuccessful, but the name and the initials survived as important political symbols, to be resurrected in the post-independence period. Under the Japanese, as under the colonialists, the political situation varied and were characterized by impermanence, but one significant move was the welding together of Nahdathul Ulama and Nahdathul Islam into one Muslim organization, Masjumi.

Independence was declared on 17 August 1945, and all significant groupings rallied to Dr. Sukarno as President of the new Republic of Indonesia. It was at first intended that there should be a single political organization, but calls soon arose for the legalization of political parties. When this was permitted, three assumed prominence. These were the Masjumi (Consultative Council of Indonesian Muslims), founded on the platform of non-political organization; the Indonesian Nationalist Party (PNI), many of whose leaders had once been active in the old PNI; and the Socialist Party, which was soon to split into a democratic wing taking the name of the Socialist Party of Indonesia (PSI), and a left wing. The latter was largely absorbed in a re-formed PKI, but this, like its precursor, was to have a short effective life, for it was again suppressed after an unsuccessful coup (1948).

After the Dutch conceded independence, in 1949, there followed a period of experiment with constitutional democracy on the Western pattern. At first two parties—the Masjumi and the PNI—dominated the governing coalitions, and by and large the PSI was sympathetic to their aims, which were moderate. After 1953, however, new alignments began to emerge. The recovery of the PKI had become noticeable after 1952, and it tended to throw its weight behind the more radical wing of the PNI, thus detaching it from Masjumi and the PSI. The new coalitions, supported by the communists, included the PNI, the Nahdathul Ulama (which had broken away from the Masjumi in 1952; being more strongly anti-Western, it could reconcile more conservative religious attitudes domestically with more anti-imperialistic policies externally), and a number of minor nationalist and Islamic parties. After the first, and so far the last, general election in 1955, four main parties emerged—the PNI, Masjumi, Nahdathul Ulama and the PKI. An attempt was made to govern by means of coalitions embracing all the major non-communist parties, but this failed. The parties continued to show themselves incapable of constructive co-operation and, outside the PKI, incapable of sustaining even internal cohesion. In the years 1956 to 1958, the existing Parliamentary system was replaced by "Guided Democracy", in which real power ebbed away from the parties and lodged instead in the President and the Army. The PKI, however, continued to play a crucially important rôle, enabling President Sukarno to maintain his own position in relation to the armed forces.

The 1956 election, party based on the earlier warrant of presidential decree in July 1959. This temporarily put an end to an ideological debate which had racked the young republic from the beginning, and had underlain many of the political divisions, namely what was to be the rôle of Islam in a predominantly Muslim country. Ninety per cent of Indonesians were said to be Muslims, but on the other hand there was a clear distinction inside this majority between the devout and the nominal. President Sukarno had consistently argued and manoeuvred against making Indonesia an Islamic state, on the grounds that all opinions represented in the republic must be tolerated and embraced. The 1945 Constitution was based, largely on his insistence, not on Islam, but on his own panla sila ("five foundations", see DUSTOR, p. 663), of which the first was, not acceptance of Islam, but simply belief in one God. Parties wishing to retain a legal position under Guided Democracy had to be prepared to acknowledge and accept the panla sila, and this a handful of parties, including paradoxically the PKI, did. The PKI, which had earlier in its career antagonized Muslims by a dogmatically Marxist position vis-à-vis religion, was now guided by leaders who had drawn the moral of the two disasters of 1926-27 and 1948, and were con-
ounced that the only way to power was through slow and careful building up of support by legitimate means throughout the country without risking further suppression. The Maqam and the PSI were, in contrast, banned in 1960, partly as a result of the complicity of a number of their leaders in the anti-Sukarno revolt of 1958 in Sumatra. In 1961 and 1962, a number of troublesome Islamic revolts were also crushed, including a major one, led by Darul Islam, a fanatic Muslim organization, which had lasted for thirteen years in West Java. A National Front was also formed in August 1960, in which the surviving parties were obliged to participate, for example by helping to disseminate Sukarnoist ideas. As compared with the pre-1958 period, the parties had suffered badly by the introduction of Guided Democracy in respect of their freedom of political action and movement. The banning in 1965 of Partai Murba, a left-wing nationalist but anti-communist party, continued the process of political simplification and polarization.

However, Islam continued to play a vital political role in the opposition which its organized manifestations put up at all levels, from the village to the Governmental, and in all social organizations and strata, to the steady accretion of strength to the PKI and its various "front" organizations. Clashes between Muslims and communists were common, and culminated in the aftermath of the "September 30 Affair". This was an attempted pre-emptive left-wing coup in the face of threatened suppression of the PKI by the Army in 1965, and its failure precipitated nation-wide massacres in which untold thousands of communists and their supporters were killed. At the time of writing (March 1966), it is not yet clear what the attitudes of the new Army leaders in Indonesia will be either to Islam or to the political parties, but already the PKI has been banned.


**Hizkili**, the biblical prophet Ezekiel. His name does not occur in the Kūr'ān, but traditional exegesis regards him as that prophet of the people concerning whom the Kūr'ān speaks in these words (II, 243/244): "Hast thou not regarded those who went forth from their habitations in their thousands fearful of death? God said to them "Die!", then He gave them life" (tr. A. J. Arberry). According to exegetical tradition, this took place in the time of the prophet Hizkili b. Bādhī (or Būdī, corrupted into Būrī; in the Bible עז וּֽבְרִי—Ezziel, I, 3); the immediate cause of this mortality was an outbreak of plague (אֲדָמָא); and the description given of the resurrection (a temporary one, until the predeter-

**Hmād u-Mūṣā** (šīʿa), great saint of southern Morocco and patron saint of Sūs, was born about 846/1440 at Bū Merwān in the territory of the Ida u-Semlāl, at the western extremity of the Anti-Atlas. He died, after living more than a century, in 975/1563, and is buried in the region of Tazerwalt where crowds still come to venerate his tomb.

Hmād u-Mūṣā adhered to the tariqa [q.v.] founded in the 10th/15th century by Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad al-Diraḍūlī (*see al-Diraḍūlī*). This last had devoted himself to spreading the teaching of al-Shādhili (7th/13th century), himself a disciple of the famous 'Abd al-Salām b. Māshīḥ [q.v.], whose master was the great Andalūsī cūfī, Abū Madyān [q.v.].

Al-Shādhili's school recalls, in some aspects of its teaching, the Persian al-Din Muḥammad bin Abī Ṣafī al-Mawardī, who founded the Ṣad'ī school, which itself derived from the teachings of the Christian mystics, the Bohemians. It forbids monasteries and bids its members lead a wandering and contemplative life, without resorting to begging. This suited Hmād u-Mūṣā, who enjoyed travelling. In the course of his stormy youth, he liked to wander across the country in cheerful company. Touched by divine grace, he undertook the classic journey to the East and went as far as Baghdaḍ. On his return to Morocco, he visited Marrākūš, Taroudant, and finally Bū Merwān, his native village. Then he gave up these lengthy journeys to found a niyya in the Tazerwalt region, situated at the south-west edge of the Anti-Atlas.

By a kind of transmutation well known in the Maghrib, and upon which there is need to elaborate here, Hmād u-Mūṣā became a Marabout, spiritual head of a community and father of a vigorous dynasty destined to reign in the Tazerwalt, which became a kingdom independent of the Maghrib. In the 10th/16th century, Hmād u-Mūṣā supported the Sa'dī Shīrīa who were fighting the Portuguese; but very soon his successors cut themselves off from the central power and founded the kingdom of Tazerwalt with Ilīgh as its capital.

The first half of the 11th/17th century was the
apogee in the history of this kingdom. Sidi ‘All, grandson of the Marabout and the foremost member of the dynasty, felt strong enough to make a bid for the Sharitian throne against Ahmad al-Mansur’s successor. However, towards the end of his reign, the power of Hmäd u-Mũsũ’s descendants, which extended greatly beyond the boundaries of Tazerwalt, was threatened by the progress of the ‘Alawī Shūrā of Taflilīt. The second half of this century brought the temporal power of the Marabout’s descendants to an end for at least a hundred years. Indeed, the kingdom was unable to withstand the strength and energy of the ‘Alawī sultans, Mawũlī al-Raḫād and Mawũlī Ismā‘īl.

Between the end of the 18th century and the end of the 19th, the Ulād Sidi Ḥmād u-Mũsũ regained their power, but the Sultan Mawũlī al-‘Hasan (1290-1311/1873-94) took it from them again.

From then on, although the princes of Tazerwalt had lost their kingdom, yet their spiritual authority, thanks to Ḥmād u-Mũsũ, still remained intact down to the beginning of the 20th century. Large crowds continue to assemble for the three annual pilgrimages (March, April and September) around the tomb of Ḥmād u-Mũsũ, who has remained the patron saint of travellers and the great saint of the Sūs.

Bibliography: A few lines on him can be found scattered among a dozen or so pages (see index s.v. Ahmad Ou Mousa) in R. Montagne, Les Berbères et le Maghreb dans le Sud du Maroc, Paris 1930. In the first place one should consult: L. Justinard, Notes sur l’histoire du Sous au XVIe siècle, in AM, xxix (1933); Dj. Jacques-Meunin, Génealogie-Cités des Maroc, Paris 1951 (the chapter Chronique du royaume de Tazeroual, 198-217, very clearly expressed, is an excellent résumé of the history of the house of Tazerwalt from the 16th to the 20th century); L. Justinard concluded his research on the kingdom of Tazerwalt by publishing his notes as a small treatise called Un petit royaume berbère, le Tazeroual, un saint berbère Sidi Ahmed ou Moussa, Paris 1954; the author gives here the Arabic manuscript sources for the life and legends concerning the saint. (A. Faure)

HOCA [see KADIA].
HODH [see HAOU].
HODNA [see HUPNA].
HOLY PLACES [see MAKKA, AL-MADĪNA, KABARA2, AL-KUDS, NAJAF, etc. For the custodianship of the Christian Holy Places in Jerusalem see KAHŠAT AL-KIYĀMA].
HOMILETICS [see WA‘Ī].
HONOUR [see 3RD, MUṆĀKhARA].
HORDE, term originating from the Turkish ordũ, via the Russian ordũ and Polish horda, and assimilated into European languages from the 16th century onwards, is the name given to the administratıve centre of great nomad empires, particularly also to the highly adorned tent of the ruler (cf. the Golden Horde); to such nomad confederacies themselves, insofar as they formed a tenuous association linked to no particular place, substantially different in their way of life and government from the European states, and inflicting considerable damage on this population by their marauding attacks. In the Islamic world it was mainly the Turkish and Mongol conquerors of the 7th/13th century onwards who ruled their empires from a tented encampment. The rulers of such states often remained for decades in this non-sedentary life, migrating with their court and the nucleus of their people according to the rhythm of the seasons, between northern and southern (high and lowlying) areas. Their tents, not only living quarters, but mosques and churches, as well as the harems, were transported on their tents (araba). The wanderings of such a horde (for the Golden Horde, see BĀṬūR) were described in detail by the Flemish traveller William of Rubruck, 1254-56, and by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa [q.v.] in 1333 (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ii, 379-87, 398-412, trans. Sir Hamilton Gibb, ii, Cambridge 1962, 451-5, 490-8; condensed in Spuler, Horde4, 264-6). When the peoples of these nomad empires gradually became sedentary, they grew accustomed to a particular place of residence and to permanent wooden or stone houses, and their rulers built themselves palaces (Sarāy, Tafrīz, Sulānīyya, Kāra Korum, Ḩanbalīk = Pekin, Karšh in Central Asia, etc.; see these articles). Thus the original “horde” gradually disappeared from the Islamic world from the 11th/12th century onwards; nevertheless, the raids of the Crimean Tatars in Podolia and Wolhynia (well into the 14th/15th century) and the marauding attacks of the Turkmen into northern Persia as late as the 19th century kept alive the memory of this kind of state. For a long time, too, in Islamic states, military units were quartered in tented encampments or barracks, which (like the Roman Pretorian Guard or the bodyguard of the ‘Abbāsīds) were situated at some distance outside the capital and other large cities, to prevent their becoming a danger to the rulers or the population, or lending support to insurrections. Soldiers in such military encampments (to which too the name of ʿordũ was given) could usually be quickly installed (cf. the Janissaries). A lingua franca often developed amongst them. In these camps in central and western Asia in the 8th/9th century, Turkish replaced Mongol as the language of the nomad invaders and of the court. A similar function was fulfilled by the military encampments of the Muslim rulers of Northern India, particularly the Great Moguls. The language which developed here, a mixture of Hindu, Persian and Arabic elements, was recognized after 1947 as the official language of Pakistan, and still bears today the name which reveals its origin, Urdu [q.v.].

Bibliography: For the Turkish term see Mahmūd al-Raḡhābī, Dīnān, Istanbul 1917, i, 122 (ed. C. Brockelmann, Budapest 1928, 128); G. Doerfer, Türkische und Mongol. Elemente im Neupersischen, Wiesbaden 1963, i, 165 (no. 4) and ii, 1965, 32-9 (no. 452). On the horde, see (for the Mongol peoples) L. Krader, Social organisation of the Mongol-Turkic pastoral nomads, The Hague 1963. (B. Spuler)

HORMUZ [see HURMUZ].
HOROGO [see SĀ‘Ī].
HOROSCOPE [see TĀLĪF].
HORSE [see FARAS].
HORSEMANSHIP [see PURŪŠĪYYA].
HOSPITALITY [see BIMĀRSHĀT].
HOSPITALITY [see BIMĀRSHĀT].
HOTELRY [see FUNDUS, KHAN].
HÔT [see BALūCĪTAN].
HÔT CITY [see FUNDUS].
HOUSE [see NĀR].
HUBAL, an Arabian god whose worship was fostered in Mecca by the Khūzā‘ī ‘Amr b. Lubayy [q.v.] in the first half of the 3rd century A.D. Represented at first by a baetyl, like most of the Arab deities, it was later personified, with human features, by a statue made of cornelian, with the right arm truncated (cf. Judges iii, 15, xx, 16) and which the
HUBAL — HOD

Kurayshis are said to have replaced by a golden arm (al-Azraki, Akhbdr Makka, ed. Wiistenfeld, Leipzig 1858, 74). It was from a town with thermal springs (hamma) that it was apparently brought to the Hijaz. Having come there to bathe in the waters and thereby being cured of a serious illness, 'Amr b. Luhyay, it is said, had taken back this statue with him. As to its place of origin, tradition hesitates between two towns. For al-Azraki (31, 58, 73), this town is Hit in Mesopotamia, a town situated on the Euphrates, and on the edge of the desert (al-Mas'udi, Mushaf, 234; Yâkid, 997-8; cf. R. Dussaud, La pénétration des Arabes en Syrie avant l'Islam, Paris 1955, 86, n. 2), and today still renowned for its springs of bitumen (cf. E. Dhorme, Recueil, Paris 1951, 749); for others (Ibn Higham, 51; al-Mas'udi, op. cit., iv, 46; Yâkid, 652 ff.; al-Shahrastâni, 431), it is Ma'lab, in the district of al-Balka, in Transjordania.

Having asked the local inhabitants what was the justification of their idols, 'Amr b. Luhyay is said to have received the following reply: "These are the lords (arabû) whom we have chosen, having [simultaneously] the form of the celestial temples (al-hayâkîl al-ulayyîya) and that of human beings [cf. Iamblichus, De Myst., III, 30]. We ask them for victory over our enemies and they grant it to us; we ask them for rain, in time of drought, and they give it to us" (al-Shahrastânî, loc. cit.).

In the Ka'ba, Hubal must have preserved this original character of a stellar deity; but his most characteristic role was that of a cleromantic divinity. Indeed, it was before the god that the sacred lots (istîkšâm [q.v.] bi 'l-âsîdâm) were cast. The statue stood inside the Ka'ba, above the sacred well which was thought to have been dug by Abraham to receive the offerings brought to the sanctuary (al-Azraki, 31). Another somewhat surprising fact indicates a connexion with Abraham: in the mural paintings of the pre-islamic Ka'ba, Hubal, represented as an old man holding arrows, seems to have been assimilated with Abraham (al-Azraki, 111).

The earliest mention of the name Hubal occurs in a Nabatean inscription (CIS, ii, 198), in which it appears as an associate of Manawat. According to al-Azraki (74), its cult was the best organized in the Ka'ba; a hajib guarded the idol; he received the offerings and sacrifices that were brought; he shook the arrows of divination before it. When a Meccan returned from travelling, he used to go to give thanks to the god before going to his own home. In the field of popular piety at least, it eclipsed the other deities in the Meccan pantheon, to such an extent that there has been some speculation whether the unaniety regarding this cult did not help to prepare the way for Allâh (cf. J. Wellhausen, Reste, Berlin 1897, 75; Dussaud, op. cit., 143 ff.; an opinion disputed, though wrongly, by Lammens, Les Cultes à la Mekke, in BIFAO, xiv (1918), 24).

Bibliography: In addition to the authors referred to in the text, see Yâkid, iv, 549-50. The essential facts concerning this deity will be found in T. Fahd, Une pratique clérémoniale à la Ka'ba présislamique, in Semitica, viii (1958), 55-79, particularly 58 ff., 73 ff. (T. Fahd)

HUBAYSH B. MUBASHSHIR [see qâfar b. mubahshir].
HUBB [see 'irgh].
HUBUS [see warf].

AL-HUBUS (Hassil), a tribe, for the most part settled, of al-Sharkiya district in 'Umân, south-eastern Arabia. Al-Hubûs belong to the Hinâwî political faction (see hinâ, banû) of 'Umân, and members of the tribe are adherents of the Ibâdîyya [q.v.]. They, together with al-'Hîrân and al-'Hâshîyya-

Allâh and his descendants, formed the tribal block upon which the Imâmate relied in al-Sharkiya until the events of 1377/1957 [see umâk].

Al-Hubûs are settled in a group of villages, known collectively as Balâdin al-Hubûs, in upper Wâdî 'Andâm. Their tribal capital is Muşaybî, which since 1377/1957 has been administered by a wâdî, 'All b. Zâhir al-Hînâwî. Other important villages of the tribe are: Balâdin al-Hubûs, 22 km. south of the Mutaylîf, al-Wâfî, al-Radda, al-Shârik, al-Zâhib, and al-'Aynam. Muhammâd b. Sa'îd b. Muhammâd al-Awâlî Rashûyad section, residing in al-Fath, was paramount sâbîkîd of al-Hubûs in 1384/1965. Final authority in the area, however, rested with the appointed governor. Important tribal sections of al-Hubûs are al-Ghanâmîm, al-'Asàsîrî, Awlân ribâb, and al-Shamâzîrî are Bedouin sections that share the northern part of Ramât Âl Wâhîbî with Âl Wâhîbî.


HÜD, the name of the earliest of the five "Arab" prophets mentioned in the Kurân (Hûd, Shâhîb, Ibrâhîm, Shu'âyb and Muhammâd). In his history, which is related three times (on this repetition, see al-Djahîz, Bayân, ed. Hârûn, i, 105) in slightly different forms (in chronological order: XXVI, 63-72, XLVI, 20/21, merely a restatement), the Kurân represents him as an Âdî sent to this people [see ad] to exhort them to adore the One God; but, like Muhammâd later in Mecca, he found only incredulity and insolence among the people and his followers were few; God therefore punished the Âd, destroying them with a "roaring wind" (XLI, 15/16, LIV, 19, LXIX, 6). Later traditions, however, say that they suffered three years of drought, the Âd sent a deputation to Mecca to pray for rain. God made three clouds appear in the sky, one white, one red and one black. One of the deputation, called Kayl, was given the choice of one of the three by a voice from heaven. He chose the black one, with the result that a terrible storm broke over the Âd and destroyed the whole people with the exception of Hûd and his followers; they went to settle in Mecca, where the prophet stayed until his death at the age of 150 (according to another tradition, he did not make the pilgrimage to Mecca and until his death never left his people; Ibn Rusta, 26, trans. Wiet, 24).

There exist several traditions concerning the genealogy of Hûd, going back to Âd b. 'Yây b. Arâm b. Sâm b. Hâyâ. But he is sometimes associated with 'Âbar (the biblical Heber, ancestor of the Hebrews) or regarded as a son of the latter. Since the word Hûd is also, in the Kurân, a collective noun denoting the Jews (II, 105/111, 129/135, 134/140) and that the root h.w.d. has the meaning "to practice Judaism, to profess the religion of the Jews" (II, 59/62, IV, 45/46, etc.), the proper name certainly appears to be derived from this root, which would also confirm the identification of Hûd with the
ancestor of the Jews; thus Hirschfeld is perhaps correct when he calls Hud an allegorical figure (Beiträge z. Erklärung des Korān, Leipzig 1886, 17b. 4).

The South Arabian tradition transmitted by Wabbb b. Munabbih [q.v.] gives other details about Hud, making him a brown-skinned merchant with handsome features and flowing hair.

The Kabr Hud, situated at the mouth of the Barḥūt [q.v.], in the Ḥadrāmawt, is a place of pilgrimage still frequented. R. B. Serjeant (Hud, 1297, 1297) verified on the spot the facts related by al-Harawi (Ziyārat, 97/220-1), who described, at the gate of the mosque, on the west side, the rock onto which Hud climbed to make the call to prayer and which Hud climbed to make the call to prayer and which the prophet of the walls of the Great Mosque of Damascus (see J. Sourdel-Thomine, Plerinages damascins, in B. F. Or., xiv (1954-4) 75, n. 7; Ibn Battuta, i. 205, speaks only of the south wall); this is certainly the reflection of a local tradition, giving proof of the interest which the Muslims attached to the prophet of the 'Ad.


Hübān Bān [see supra 1096].

Hūdā [see QHIMĀ].

Hūdā, MAHMūD b. FADL ALLāH b. MAHMūD, better known under his mahkāj Hūdā?i, born at Koczbiar in 950/1543-4 (Hūdā?, al-Tūbr al-masḵāk, Istanbul, Selim Ağa, Hūdāyī collection no. 250, vol. i, fol. 71v., 81v., 87r.; op. cit., Bursa, Orhan, Ulű Cami collection no. 1753, fol. 258v., 290r., 404v.). Almost nothing is known of the first twenty-seven years of his life except that he was an orphan from early childhood (op. cit., Selim Ağa, Hūdāyī collection, no. 250, vol. i, fol. 76v., vol. ii, fol. 64v.), and that he spent a number of years at Sivrihisar where he was in contact with the disciples of Shaykh Baba Yūsuf (op. cit., vol. i, 27v., vol. ii, 15v., 69v.). In 978/1570-1, he entered the service of Naṣīrī, in the medresa of Selim II at Edirne (Hāṭa, Dīkhā al-masḵāk, Istanbul, Selim Ağa, Hūdāyī collection no. 1268, 760, cf. 421). He followed his master when the latter was appointed kādī, first at Damascus, then at Cairo and finally at Bursa (Muḥarram 981/May-June 1573). He was then moved to the medresa of the temple of old mosque (Dīkhā-i 'āṭīḥ, and of teacher (mūḍērīs) at the Fāhrādīyya medrese (Hāṭa, op. cit., 760, cf. 421). There then followed a period of misfortune which coincided with a religious crisis. He lost his position as nāḥī, perhaps because of an error which he made over a legal matter (İsmā'īl Bēlîg, Ǧūdeste, Bursa 1302, 335). When his patron was transferred to Edirne on 30 Ramdān 1579/9 October 1575, he remained at Bursa and on 1 Dhu 'l-Ka'da' 984/18 January 1577 he became the disciple of Shaykh Uṭfāde, the founder of the Djīl-watiyya [q.v.] order. At the end of 986/1578, he also lost his post at the medrese and fell into poverty. His period of initiation under Uṭfāde lasted for three years. On Saturday, 1 Dhu 'l-Ka'da' 987/19 December 1579, only a few months before Uṭfāde's death in 988/1580, Muḥammad ibn Abd al-Qādir Bālīkmānij, Beldeccanu-Steinberger, Schirkeb Uṭfāde, der Begründer des Geleitweiss-Ordens, Munich 1961, 131 ff.), the latter sent him on a mission to Sīvrībāṣh. Other journeys followed (Abd al-Ghāni al-Nābulūsī, Sharī-ı Tadhjīliyyat-i Hūdā?, Ankara Dîl ve Tarih-Cografya Fakültesi, i. S. Sencer collection, i,3515, fol. 2v.). He settled finally at Istanbul, on the Asiatic side, at first in the district of Camiğlī and later at Uskūdar in Djiha'de-i 2ıo. February-March 1594, he was appointed preacher (nādīr) in the mosque of Meḥmūned II through the good offices of the kādī-i ḥakīm of Rumeli, Sun' Allāh, and received 100 akçe from the foundation (Pecēw'i, ii, 36; 'Atā', op. cit., 761). On the completion of his own mosque, in 1003/1594-5, he resigned from this post. Instead, he preached on Thursdays in the Miḥrīmeh mosque and, from 1020/1611-2, on the first Monday of each month in the Sultan Ahmed mosque ("Atā', op. cit., 761). He died in 1018/1608-9. His tūrbe is adjacent to his mosque.

Hūdā?i enjoyed a very great prestige in his own day. His convent was a refuge for dignitaries who had fallen out of favour (Pecēw'i, ii, 357; Na'īmā, Tārīḵ, 1280, ii, 155, 159; Hammer-Purgstall, Histoire, viii, 168, 233, 251, 272). Although Uṭfāde must be considered as the founder of the Djīl-watiyya order, there is no doubt that it was due to Hūdā?i that the order survived. Faithful to his master, Hūdā?i gave it a firmly orthodox bias (cf. his attitude to the disciples of Bahr al-Dīn: M. Šaraf al-Dīn, Samānūa-ḫāššī-oglu šaykh y bād al-Dīn Istanbul 1340, 72).

There exist some poems by him of a mystic character and some short works relating to religious matters, seven of which are mentioned in M. Gūlğen (Kulliydt-i hadrat-i Hūdā?), Istanbul 1338), some letters and a journal in Arabic which he began at the time he attached himself to Uṭfāde (and from which have been taken the main dates of his life). The section which runs from Muḥarram 975 to 9 Shawwāl 975/March-April 1577 to 27 November 1597, has the heading Kalimdt. . Na τον το

Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned above: Brockelmann, I, 444, S II, 661; Hāḍidjī Khalfa, Fedhieke, Istanbul 1827, ii, 113-4; Hammer, Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst, Pest 1837, iii, 192-202; İsmā'īl Hakkı, Kiāb al-asliya giwātisīyya, Istanbul 1291, 88-6; Muḥibbī, Khulṣat al-ahār fi ʿayān al-karm al-kādī i ʿāsqar, Cairo 1284, iv, 327-9; "Othmānī muḥāfīlī, i

(I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr)

AL-HUDAYBIYA, or AL-HUDAYBIYYA, a medium-sized village on the edge of the Haram or sacred territory of Mecca, one marjāla from Mecca itself. Both the village and the Mosque of the Tree (presumably on the site of the pledge described below) were unknown in the time of al-Fāṣi (d. 582/1190). One authority says the name was derived from a dome-shaped or hump-like (hūdāb) tree, but this may be conjecture.

The village gave its name to an important Muslim expedition from Medina, led by Muhammad, in Dhu 'l-Ka‘da of the year 6 (March 628). Muhammad had a dream (cf. Kur‘ān, XLVIII, 27) in which he saw himself performing the rites of the lesser pilgrimage (‘umra) at Mecca, and decided to make an expedition to Mecca for this ostensible reason, though in so doing he would also demonstrate to the pagans of Mecca that Islam was an Arabian religion and would not threaten the prestige of their sanctuary. Muhammad hoped that the nomadic tribes near Medina would join him, but they saw little prospect of booty and were afraid the expedition might end in disaster. He set out with only about 1400 followers, mostly from Medina itself, and they had with them camels for the sacrifice. The Meccans, realizing that after the failure of their attempt to besiege Medina they would be considered weaklings if they let Muhammad enter Mecca even as a pilgrim, sent out 200 cavalry to bar his way. These Muhammad eluded by taking an unusual and very difficult route, and so reached al-Hudaybiya on the edge of the Haram. Here he decided to halt and negotiate.

A number of emissaries came and went between himself and the Meccans. Eventually a treaty to last ten years was agreed on, of which the following were the chief provisions: for the present, Muhammad and his followers were to withdraw, but in the next year Mecca would be evacuated for three days to let them perform the ‘umra; there was to be no raiding between the two parties; Muhammad was to send back to Mecca anyone of Kuraysh (presumably minor or woman) who came to him without his permission or protection; and others than Kuraysh were to be free to enter into alliance with either side. On the conclusion of the treaty Muhammad and his followers sacrificed their animals and returned to Medina. Many were disappointed; some thought Muhammad's policy mistaken. The expedition to Khaybar about six weeks later was in part to console them for this disappointment.

A year after the original expedition Muhammad performed the pilgrimage with a party of about 2000. The treaty continued in force for only about ten months more, because a quarrel between allies of the contracting parties led to Muhammad’s victorious entry into Mecca (Ramadān 8/March 630).

While the Muslims were at al-Hudaybiya negotiating, it came to be believed that one of their number was slain by Al-Mu‘awiyah, and the latter was in part to console them for this disappointment. Muhammad then called on them to take an oath to support him, known as the Pledge of Good Pleasure (bay‘at al-ridāwān) or the Pledge under the Tree. It is usually said to have been an oath not to flee, but it is more likely that (as stated by one authority in al-Wākidī) it was an oath to follow Muhammad in whatever he decided. If the latter, the oath marked an increase in Muhammad’s constitutional powers. Rīḍawān is used because Kur‘ān, XLVIII, 18 says God was “well pleased (radiya) with the believers when they pledged themselves under the tree”.


(W. Montgomery Watt)
Hudhayl has occupied much of the territory immediately west and east of Mecca and on up to the mountains towards Tihama; there is no tradition of its having migrated here from elsewhere. This territory, which has been called “the heart of Hijaz”, includes the valley of Ban Tammour Marr al-Zahrân (modern Wadi Fâtimma) between Mecca and the present port of Djidda and the valley’s main tributaries, Nakha al-Shâmiyya (or al-Sha’ânîyya) and Nakha al-Yâmâniyya [see al-

According to Ibn al-Kalbi, the people of Hudhayl were the first among the descendants of Isma’il to become idolaters. At a place called Ruhât they had the idol Suwâ’. Although Ibn al-Kalbi locates Ruhât in the environs of Yanbu’, it was more probably close to Mecca and may have been in Nakha al-Yâmâniyya (see Yâkût, s.v., and al-Azraqî, 1, 78, 79; al-Sukkâri, i, 105), however, identifies Ruhât as the only Ruhât mentioned by the poets of Hudhayl, as being in the land of Banû Hilâl, three nights from Mecca). The custodians of Suwâ’ were Banû Liyân [q.v.], a division of Hudhayl. Hudhayl also had ownership, or shared it with Khuzâ’a, of one of “the daughters of Allâh”, Manât [q.v.], a stone at Kudayd on the way from Mecca to Ya’thrib reputed to be the oldest of the Arab idols.

In the legendary accounts, Hudhayl plays a leading rôle in the visit of tubba’a As’ad Kâmil (Abû Karîb) to Mecca and in the expedition of Abrahâ [q.v.] against the town. During the pre-Islamic period Hudhayl engaged in numerous feuds with the neighbouring tribes. The famous ode of vengeance by Ta’ababbâta Sharrâ’ [q.v.] of Fahm was directed against Hudhayl, who had killed his uncle. Hudhayl used to sell prisoners taken in battle as slaves in Mecca. During the struggle between the Prophet and Kuraysh, most of the members of Hudhayl, with Liyân in the forefront, sided with their kinsmen of Mecca. The Muslim commander given a stick by the Prophet as guarantor for his victory over Hudhayl was ‘Abd Allâh b. Unays (not Uwais, as in El-Attar), the first among the descendants of Isma’il that entered into Islam; he became a faithful companion and servant of the Prophet as guerdon for his victory over Hudhayl. After the conquest of Mecca, the Muslims obliterated the idols of Hudhayl. ‘Amr b. al-‘Ash destroyed Suwâ’, and various persons, including ‘Ali, were credited with the destruction of Manât. Hudhayl joined Kuraysh in embracing Islam.

Although most of Hudhayl were slow in coming in, one man prided himself on being among the earliest converts. This was ‘Abd Allâh b. Masa’d [see Ibn Mas’ud], who may have been a client of the tribe, though Ibn Hazm lists him as a Hudhayl by descent; he became a faithful companion and servant of the Prophet and a prolific traditionist. The historian al-Ma’sûd [q.v.] claimed him as an ancestor.

Hudhayl stands out among the Arab tribes for its bountiful poetry, its renown in this field being due in part to the fact that its tribal al-dâm is the only one to have survived in extenso. Among the scores of poems of the stock of Hudhayl were Abû Dhû’sayb, Abû Kublî, Abû Khirrâsh, and Abû Sakhr [q.v.]. Not many of the Hudhayl poets lived wholly in the Djâhilîyya; a number began life in that period and ended as Muslims.
the aid of Uddi b. Shakh (given in other sources as Uddi b. Haddi), whom al-Hamdani calls "the 
Slave of Mecca" (probably a Turkish slave of the 
"Abbadids appointed to be governor of the Holy 
City).

Given the proximity of Hudhayl to Mecca, it is 
surprising that the chroniclers of the city provide 
very little information on the doings of the tribe. 
Hudhalls often took part in the campaigns of the 
Hshmlid sharifs, but in general the tribe had a 
bad name for harassing pilgrims. Out of fear of Hudhayl, 
travellers often chose the blistering road along the 
coast to Medina in preference to the cooler road east of 
the mountains of al-Sarat.

In the 19th century J. Burckhardt gave these 
notes on Hudhayl: "They must one thousand 
matchlocks, and are reputed the best marksmen in 
the whole country. They are a famous tribe, eminent 
for their bravery. The Wahabys killed above three 
hundred of their best men before the tribe would 
submit". The most attractive villages of Hudhayl 
were in the mountains west of al-Taar, including 
Karähudhalls were settled in the Meccan quarter of 
al-Ma'abida, and the division of Libyan was 
established in Hadda and Bahra, the main stations on 
the road from Mecca to Djudda.

Coming down the old road from al-Taar to Djudda, 
Doughty met Hudhalis: "Their skins were black and 
shining; and their looks (in this tropical Arabia) 
were not hollow, but round and teeming". Philby 
found members of the tribe along the same road, 
leading a hard life "in worsted boots ... perhaps 
not more than three or four feet in height ... tending 
bees and sheep and doing a certain amount of 
cultivation on the torrent-irrigated terraces ...; 
they also rear camels of a diminutive and extremely 
hardy highland breed, of which it is said that they 
can climb up the steep flanks of the hills as surely 
as goats".

The old grouping of the tribesmen into Hudhayl 
al-Sha'm and Hudhayl al-Yaman is still preserved. 
Perhaps the most important centre of the tribe is the 
 oasis of al-Zayma at the point where the old road 
from al-Taar leaves Wa'di al-Yamaniyya (the modern 
name for harassing pilgrims). Out of fear of Hudhayl, 
these people along the same road, 
leading a hard life "in worsted boots ... perhaps 
not more than three or four feet in height ... tending 
bees and sheep and doing a certain amount of 
cultivation on the torrent-irrigated terraces ...; 
they also rear camels of a diminutive and extremely 
hardy highland breed, of which it is said that they 
can climb up the steep flanks of the hills as surely 
as goats".

The old grouping of the tribesmen into Hudhayl 
al-Sha'm and Hudhayl al-Yaman is still preserved. 
Perhaps the most important centre of the tribe is the 
 oasis of al-Zayma at the point where the old road 
from al-Taar leaves Wa'di al-Yamaniyya (the modern 
named of southern Nakhla) to run southwards and 
then westwards to Mecca, though the oasis is likely 
to become a backwater now that a new and more 
direct paved road to Mecca is in use.

The people of Hudhayl are relatives and close 
friends of the Djahadila, whose range lies near the 
Djahadila.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Kalbi, Kitab al-Asyam, 
ed. Ahmed Zeki, Cairo 1343/1924 (Eng. tr. N. A. 
Faris, The book of idols, Princeton, N.J. 1950); Ibn 
Hisgam; Tabari; Hamdani; Yahy; al-Azraqi, 
Ahbbar Makha, ed. Rushdi Malhas, Mecca 1952; 
Ibn Hazm, Dhamarai ansab al-Ab, ed. E. Levi- 
Provenal, Cairo 1948; J. Wellhausen, Skizzen und 
Vorarbeiten, iii; idem, Reste arabischen Heidentums, 
Berlin 1927; J. Burckhardt, Travels in Arabia, 
London 1829; idem, Notes on the Bedouins and 
Wahabys, London 1831; C. Doughty, Travels in 
Arabia Deserta, new ed., London 1936; Admiralty, 
A handbook of Arabia, London 1915-16; H. Philby, 
The heart of Arabia, London 1922; idem, A pilgrim 
to Arabia, London 1945; M. v. Oppenheim, E. 
Brannlich, and W. Caskel, Die Beduinen, ii, Leipzig 
1943.

For the poets of Hudhayl, see the references in 
Brockelmann, SI, 42, the bibliographies for the 
poets mentioned above, and the introductory 
voluminous references in Farradj's 
Ancient West-Arabian, London 1961, and Farradj's 
ed. of al-Sukkari. (G. RENZ)

Hudhud, the hoopoe, belongs to the order 
Scansores and bears a remarkable tuft of feathers on 
its head. Only a part of what is related concerning 
its habits and character can be mentioned here. Its 
piety is particularly emphasized. In Umayya b. Abi 
'l-Salt (ed. Schulthes, in Beiträge zur Assyriologie, 
vi, 26, 84 f.; cf. also Ibn Kutayba, al-Shirr, 279 f.) 
there is a story that the hoopoe enthroned its dead 
mother and carried the body on its back and head 
till it found a resting-place for it; this is why its back 
is brown; but it is also related that the tuft of feathers 
was a reward for this act.—When its mate dies, the 
hoopoe does not look for a new wife.—When its 
parents grow old, it feeds them. It bears different 
 kunyas in Arabic, e.g. Abd 'Ibhad, Abu l-Saddjihdi, 
after the numerous bows of its tuft as it walks. It 
makes its nest in dung so that it has an unpleasant 
smell. Its eggs are white or purple and black etc. are used in various ways. 
The Prophet is said to have forbidden it to be killed; 
hence, according to some, its flesh is forbidden 
(though other schools regard it as permissible). The 
hoopoe plays a prominent part in the legend of Solo- 
mon and Bilqis (q.v.), which was apparently already 
developed by Muhammed's time as may be concluded 
from Sura XXVII, 20 f. In this passage we are told 
that Solomon assembled the birds and the hoopoe 
was missing. When he arrived late, he gave an account 
of the queen of Saba and was entrusted by Solomon 
with the bearing of a letter to the Sabaean.

The later writers as a rule give the whole story as 
follows. The hoopoe possesses the power of seeing 
where water is through the earth. He was the therefore 
used by Solomon on his pilgrimage to Mecca to find 
water. But on one occasion the hoopoe whom Solo- 
mon had appointed for this purpose, named Ya'fur, 
or Yaghfur, while on the journey, took a trip to the 
south and reached the garden of Bilqis where he made 
the acquaintance of another hoopoe named 'Ufayr. 
The latter told him a great deal about the queen of 
Saba. In the meanwhile Solomon was looking in vain 
for water for his army (or according to another 
versions for ritual ablation). He sent the vulture (nasr) 
to assemble the birds and as the hoopoe was missing 
the eagle ('Ufayr) was sent to fetch him. But he was 
already on his way back and was brought by the 
eagle before Solomon, who talked to him severely 
but finally, after hearing his account of Bilqis, sent 
him with a letter to the Sabaean.

Another version of the beginning of the story 
relates that Solomon on his pilgrimage was being 
carried with all his retinue on a carpet by the winds 
out into the sea and said "Now eat, O thou Prophet of God! if
the meat be lacking, there is at least plenty of sauce". Solomon and his soldiers laughed for a year at this joke.

On the relationship of the Jewish hoopoe-legend to the Muslim, see M. Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sagenkunde, Leiden 1895.

In North Africa, hoopoes are mostly used for silk, feathers, etc., and used for magical purposes (Doutte, Magie et religion dans l’Afrique du Nord, 270).


Hūdīds, in Arabic Banū Ḥūd, ‘sons of Ḥūd’, a family of Arab extraction, as rulers of Sarakūsta (Saragossa) among the more important of the Partya Kings (mulūk al-tawdīf, reyes de Taifas) in 5th/11th century Spain. Hūdīds [q.v.] was well known as the name of a prophet sent to the people of ‘Ād (sūra VII, 63 ff., etc.); his descendants, the Banū Ḥūd, is mentioned in legend (e.g. Ibn Khaldūn, Beirut ed., iv, 308, 384). The ancestry of the historical Banū Ḥūd is traced to an eponymous Hūd, said to have been the first of the family to enter al-Andalus. He was, according to some, a great-grandson of Sālim, the freedman of Ṭūḥayyata, a famous Companion of Muhammad. But Sālim is stated to have died childless (Ibn Kutayba, Mu‘āṣirī, 139), and, since the names of members of the family is regularly given as Dījaḥīz, it seems slightly more probable that, as others claimed, the Banū Ḥūd of Saragossa were descended from the celebrated Rawb b. ‘Zinbā’ al-Dījaḥīz. The first Hūdīd to come into prominence was:

1. Abū Ayyūb Sulaymān b. Muhammad b. Hūd al-Dījaḥīz, later styled al-Musta’īn b. ‘illāh (al-Musta’īn I). Sulaymān is mentioned before the revolution which produced the Partya Kings as a military officer on the Upper Frontier (al-tawdīf al-‘aṣkāf). He supported the Tūdūbīds [q.v.] of Saragossa and took part in the disastrous campaign of the caliph al-Murtadā against Granada (408/1018). While governor of Lārida (Lerida) he entertained the unfortunate ex-caliph Hīṣām III al-Mu’tadīd [q.v.] till the latter’s death in 427 or 428 (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 199, cf. ‘Abd al-Wāhid al-Marrākūshī, 41). Shortly after the murder of the Tūdūbīd Mughīrī II b. Yaḥya, Sulaymān b. Hūd occupied Saragossa (Muḥārāt 431/ September-October 1039) and became ruler of an extensive kingdom which included most of the Ebro valley and, in addition to Saragossa itself and Lerida to the east, Huesca to the north, Tudela and Caltatayud to the west, and territory to the south in the direction of Valencia. In 433/1043-44, according to Ibn Ḥayyūn (quoted Ibn ‘Idhārī, al-Dabāyīn, iii, 219), Sulaymān was head of one of the political parties in Muslim Spain, and he blames him and Ibn Dīja ‘I-Nūn [see qur’ān ‘L-‘Nūn] for inviting the Christians to attack Muslim territory on the Upper and Lower Frontiers, which they did in 437/1045-46. Sulaymān survived his successful coup for only a few years. Having divided his possessions among his five sons, he died in 438/1045 and was followed at Saragossa by:

2. Abū Dīja’ār Aḥmād I b. Sulaymān b. Hūd al-Muṭḥadīr. He set aside his brothers in turn, pursuing with the eldest, Yūsuf b. ‘Arifīn of Lerida, called al-Muṭṭafarīn, an especially bitter struggle which went on till the last years of his reign. In 453/1061 al-Muṭṭadīr obtained control of Tārūsh (Tortosa), and in 460/1069-70 he expelled the ‘Ammārīs A‘lī b. Muḥjābī hostility to the Almoravids became more and more pronounced. In 470/1079, after the death of Tūdūbīd Dījaḥīz b. ‘Alī, the pressing with the eldest, Yūsuf b. ‘Arifīn of Lerida, called al-Muṭṭafarīn, an especially bitter struggle which went on till the last years of his reign. In 453/1061 al-Muṭṭadīr obtained control of Tārūsh (Tortosa), and in 460/1069-70 he expelled the ‘Ammārīs A‘lī b. Muḥjābī hostility to the Almoravids became more and more pronounced. In 470/1079, after the death of Tūdūbīd Dījaḥīz b. ‘Alī, the
and on 3 Ramadan 512/18 December 1118 Alfonso I of Aragon, el Batallador, took Saragossa after a siege of 7 months (May–December). 'Imād al-Dawla held out in Rueda, while the Christians began to occupy the lands of the Frontier piecemeal. 'Imād al-Dawla died in Rueda in Shābān 534/1330 (the date 513, frequently accepted, in the text of Ibn Khaldūn is a slip for 523, cf. Dozy, *Scriptorium Arabum Locii de Abbadiatis*, ii, 144, n. 12). He was succeeded by his son, the last of the line.6

6. Abū Dja'far Ahmad III b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Hūd Sayf al-Dawla ('Zafadola') al-Mustansir bi'llah. In 534/1334 or earlier he exchanged Rueda with Alfonso VII for what Ibn al-Abbār calls 'half the city of Toledo', but more probably was territory in the province of Toledo and perhaps Estremadura (Codera, Prieto y Vives). In 539/1144, when the revolt against the Almoravids was general, al-Mustansir b. Hūd, as representing ancient native royalty, found himself with partisans everywhere in Muslim Spain, and, taking the field, occupied successively Cordova, Jaen, Murcia and Valencia. Ultimately, in a battle with the Christians in the east of Spain near Dianjāla (Chinchilla) in Shābān 540/February 1146, al-Mustansir was defeated and killed, and with him the dynasty came to an end. (The account of the death of al-Mustansir given by Ibn Khaldūn is the same as that in the date, A.H. 539, is not right.)

It remains only to notice Muhammad b. Yūsuf b. Hūd al-Djūdhāmī, called al-Mutawakkil, who claimed descent from al-Musta'sīr b. Abbadīs. In Rueda in Shamān 524/1130 (the date 513, frequently accepted, in the text of Ibn Khaldūn is a slip for 523), Imad al-Dawla died, while the Christians began to occupy the province of Toledo and perhaps Estremadura (Codera, Prieto y Vives). In 539/1144, when the revolt against the Almoravids was general, al-Mustansir b. Hūd, as representing ancient native royalty, found himself with partisans everywhere in Muslim Spain, and, taking the field, occupied successively Cordova, Jaen, Granada, Murcia and Valencia. Ultimately, in a battle with the Christians in the east of Spain near Dianjāla (Chinchilla) in Shābān 540/February 1146, al-Mustansir was defeated and killed, and with him the dynasty came to an end. (The account of the death of al-Mustansir given by Ibn Khaldūn is the same as that in the date, A.H. 539, is not right.)


HUDJARIYYA [see HUDJARI]

HUDJARIYYA (أ.), pl. HUDJAR, both proof and the presentation of proof. The term is Kur'ānic, and is applied to any argument—one that attempts to prove what is false ("worthless argument"), as well as one that attempts to prove what is true ("decisive argument"). Men should have no *hudjaria* against God (4, 142), if they argue (yuhaddiun) against Him. This argument is worthless in His (Ex. XLI, v, 17, cf. XLI, 25). It is to God that "the decisive argument" belongs (VI, 149), and it was God who gave Abraham the (decisive) argument against his people (VI, 83). In the sense of "proof", *hudjariyya* is very close to *dali* [q.v.]; in the sense of "argument", it is very close to *burhān* [q.v.]. But whereas *dali* is, in the first place, the "indication", the "guide" that leads to certainty, *hudjariyya* suggests the conclusive argument that leaves an opponent without a reply; and whereas *burhān* is, in the first place, as it were the clear evidence of an irrefutable proof, and, consequently, the correct reasoning that leads to it, *hudjariyya* retains the idea of a contrary argument. "Dialectical proof" would perhaps be the translation that best renders the primary meaning of *hudjariyya*.

This shade of meaning, however, is often almost (but not quite) the last shade of meaning of *hudjaria* also assumes a precise technical meaning in the science of *hudjariyya*, and moreover becomes one of the initiatory degrees of the Ismā‘īlī gnosis. When used by the *mutakallimūn* and the *falāsifa* (in treatises on logic or discussions of methodology), it remains, according to the authors' inclinations, somewhat imprecise. An exhaustive recession would be very long, but a few references may be given here.

Ibn Snā in Avicenna *dali* may refer to any argument or demonstration; in a narrower sense it denotes the *burhān al-inna* (or *al-in*), the demonstration of existence. The meaning of *hudjariyya* in Avicenna is very wide. The section of the *Shīfiya* that deals with logic takes it in a general sense as a process of argumentation, for it subdivides it into syllogism (baṣṣā‘a), induction (istibhār), analogy of like with like (ijtihād), and *falsāfah* (in treatises on logic or discussions of methodology). On the following page *hudjariyya* is defined as the point of arrival (mašhu’sa) of acceptance or judgment (falsāf). The term is characteristic of the old Latin translations should here have rendered *hudjariyya* by ratio (cf. A.-M. Goichon, *Le lexique de la langue philosophique d’Ibn Sīnā*, Paris 1936, no. 120). We find the same idea, contained in the plural form *hudjarid*, in the *Ijīrāt*, and the same three-fold division (ibid. Forget, 64 ff.); the *Mantiq al-maqbūlsa‘ya* (Cairo 1328/1910, 10) also repeats the idea of the *Shīfiya* (*Makbul*, 19): *hudjariyya* is the point of arrival of judgment or acceptance. However, in the *Ashāb al-‘ulām* al-‘aṣḥābiyya (in *Tisrā sā‘a‘*), Cairo 1326/1908, 177 *hudjarid* are distinguished from *burhān*, and resume the more precise meaning of "dialectical arguments" (fīl ‘ardhīl), designed to convince an opponent. Alpago translates as *argumentatio* (cf. A.-M. Goichon, *Ibid.*).

*‘Im al-kalām*. The object of the science of *kalām* being to reply to "doubters and deniers", the term *hudjariyya* is often used in it, concurrently with *dali*, in the presentation of arguments (e.g. al-‘Aṣkālānī, *Al-bayān *an al-farā’bayn al-mudjazzīna wa-l-kalām*, ed. R. J. McCarthy, Beirut 1958, index). But it only rarely receives the force of an exclusively technical term. The "proof" of *‘im al-kalām* is primarily *dali* (pl. adhilla), or *dālā’, in several
Mu'tazzili texts as well as in al-Šā'arī (Kitāb al-
Lumān), ed. R. J. McCarthy, Beirut 1953, 6, 12; al-
Bašlāni states in his Kitāb al tudhīja (ed. Luciani, Paris 1938, 5[18-9]), al-Džuwaniy, after
speaking of reasoning (našar), devotes a paragraph to "proofs"; he uses adillā, and distinguishes between rational (ʿabīliyya) proofs and traditional or author-
itive (sāmiyya) proofs. Many other examples
could be listed.

Al-Džuwaniy (iḥbīd) and al-Bašlāni before him, define proof, dalīl, as giving knowledge of what is hidden. Now, al-Bašlāni states in his Kitāb al-
Tuhbījī (ed. McCarthy, Beirut 1957, 14) that this
dalīl, which is also referred to as dīdā, and which is
that by which something is proved (mustudād), is the
budīdja. In fact, the demonstration of that which is
not exclusively and necessarily known, the actual
definition of dalīl, is that which, in the context of
kalām, can convince an opponent, and be the decisive
budīdja against him. In speaking of "rational proofs"
the Tuhbījī sometimes uses adillā (13), and some-
times budīdja (102, 119). When, however, it is a
matter of distinguishing clearly between rational (and
"necessary") proofs and textual proofs, al-Bašlāni
prefers to use adillā (Tuhbījī, 9, 12, 14).

In the methodology of his Bayān ‘an ṣūrīl al-imān
(MS 577 of al-Maktāba al-ʿUthmāniyya in Aleppo,
communication of Shāykh Kawīṣari and G. C.
Anawatī), Abū Džāfar al-Sumānnā (a disciple of al-
Bašlāni), follows the "line of the Ancients", also uses adillā to denote the arguments
for, and the proofs of, kalām. He defines "rational proof",
however, as budīdja al-ṣulāl, which operates according to five processes: elimination, verification, attribution, generalization, and generalization simultaneously (cf. Anawatī and Garden, Introduction à la theologie musulmane, Paris 1948, 365-7); the last four processes are described as
dependent on a biyāḍ in the primary sense of the
word, an analogy of like with like. This, in kalām, is
one of the clearest instances that we have of awareness of the "logic of two terms". One might say that
budīdja was here most definitely seen as dialectical
argument.

Al-Ghazālī. The vocabulary of al-Ghazālī is
distinctly Arabic rather than in the point of meeting between those of falsaṣa and kalām. He readily employs dalīl, adillā, in a sense very close to that used by Ibn Sinā.
At the beginning of the Munḥakī it is specifically stated that dalīl (here = reasoning) presupposes
recourse to first principles. However, al-Ghazālī’s
personal attitude is known—he was, besides, in-
fluenced by Džuwāniy— as is his mistrust of recourse exclusively to dalīl, thus understood: it is takhaffu
al-adillā, where proofs that balance each other
disappear before an interior illumination of a
different order. More often still, it is true, al-
Ghazālī leaves to dalīl its primary meaning of a
suggestive indication leading to manifest certainty.
He who was to be called budīdja al-Imām certainly
uses dalīl more than budīdja to denote rational proof.

He does, however, use budīdja with the common meaning of "convincing argument", which demands, or should demand, the acceptance. Basically, using a
term in a more technical sense, when he presents his
own theses on formal logic, he repeats almost word
for word the definitions and distinctions of the
Maktab al of the Shīʿī: budīdja, which is used to mean
any argumentative process, "is of three sorts: syllogism, induction, analogy of like with like or parable (tamthil)" (Maṭbāʿ al-ʿilm, Cairo 1346/1927, 86). Cf. also Farid Jabre, La notion de certitude selon

Ghazālī, Paris 1938, index s.vv. dalīl and budīdja.

In the methodology of falsaṣa and kalām, the term
budīdja receives fairly widely differing meanings,
sometimes being almost identical with dalīl, and
sometimes being distinguished from it; sometimes
suggesting any process of argumentation, the syl-
logism (and induction) of three terms as well as
reasoning of two terms, sometimes signifying rather the
dialectical argument that confines and convinces an
opponent. It is apparently in this last case that
it retains its most specific meaning. Budīdja, as
translated by H. L. Cadoc (La profession de foi d’Ibn
Batūta, Damascus 1948, 90, n. 31), "... a proof that
one produces against an opponent; it is the victorious
proof, whether it is a matter of prophetic teaching,
the merits of the Companions (id., 116) or the
dialectical effort of the human reason.

Bibliography: in the article. (L. GARDET)

In Shiʿī Terminology

The notion that something or someone was visible "proof" of God’s presence or will must
have antecedents among monotheists before Islam. Among Shiʿīs, the term budīdja, "proof", has been
used in at least three ways. It refers most generally to
that person through whom the inaccessible God
becomes accessible, who serves at any given time
as evidence, among mankind, of His true will; thus
the Prophet was budīdja of God. Very early, the
term received a more specialized meaning: among some
of the Ghāzālī, it referred to a particular function
within the process of revelation, sometimes identified
with the role of Salmān as witness to ‘All’s status as
imām. The term was also sometimes used to refer to
any figure in a religious hierarchy through whom
an inaccessible higher figure became accessible to
those below.

In Iṣmāʿīlī dogmatics, the first use of the
term was systematized. It designates the category
formed by prophets and imāms together, in that
either a prophet or an imām must always be present
as guide to God’s will. Thus the section in Kūlini’s
al-Kāfī dealing with prophethood and imāmate is
titled budīdja. The argument is that if there were no
representative of God among mankind, God would
remain unknowable and human beings could not
serve him; and they must always have a represen-
tative, for records of a former representative, even
the Kurʿān itself, will give rise to disputes and
uncertainty unless there is an authorized interpreter.
The present budīdja is the hidden twelfth imām.

Among the Iṣmāʿīlīs, the term usually referred to
a particular figure in the religious hierarchy, thought
of as fulfilling a function in revelation. In Fātimid
times, it was used for the chief dāʿīs, directing the
ordinary dāʿīs. In numerical passages, the budīdjas are
twelve, presiding over twelve districts; or, occasionally,
twenty-four—presumably twelve as dāʿīs in their districts and twelve at the court of the
imām. A chief budīdja is mentioned, identical with
the chief dāʿī. The Ṭayyībī Iṣmāʿīlīs (Bohrs) have
retained Fātimid usage in their dogmatics, but not
in their organization. Among the Nizārīs, the term
had a complex development. It was probably used
for Ḥasan-i Šābāh [g.v.] as visible head of the
movement when the imām was hidden. Later, when
the restored imām was treated as the locus of divine
self-revelation, there was one budīdja (identified
with Salmān, the ideal believer), who alone, by
divine inspiration, could fully perceive the reality of
the imām. The exact rôle of this budīdja passed
through several phases as Nizārī teaching evolved;
eventually, the *hudidja* was normally the imam's heir-apparent. In the present *hudidja* lists of the Niṣāfīs, each imam is assigned a *hudidja* as spokesman or visible token; the *hudidja* need not be a man or even a person.

**Bibliography:** For the *Ismaʿili* position, see Muhammad al-Kullānī, *Kīdāb al-hudidja*, in al-Kāfī. For earlier Ismaʿili usage, there is no one chief source; but Naṣr al-Dīn Tūsī, *Rauwat al-tasālim* or *Tawawurrat*, ed. W. Ivanov (in The Ismaili Sources, II, 195), Leiden, 1939, is especially useful for the later period (the translation is not dependable). H. Corbin, *Histoire de la philosophie islamique*, i, Paris 1964, discusses all usages (see index); on the Nizāris, he is to be supplemented by M. G. S. Hodgson, *The Order of Assassins*, The Hague 1955, which traces the variations in the concept in various historical circumstances.

See further *Khalwa*.

**Hudjriyya** (Hegiriyya), name of a tribe, and of an administrative division (*hdadīt*) in the Yaman, one of the four districts in the province (*liwāʾ*) of Taʿizz. It is to the east of the *hdadīt* of al-Makhā and to the south-west of Taʿizz, on the frontier of the South-Arabian Federation. The area is entirely mountainous, well-cultivated (coffee, cereals) and rich in livestock; according to Heyworth-Dunlop it is famous for producing a kind of ass called *saawirka*yya. The number of inhabitants in this district was given by the same author in 1952 as 192,392,250 about one-third of the total population in the *liwāʾ* of Taʿizz. Its most important town is Turbat al-Dhubbān, belonging traditionally to the important clan of the *Shardjahb* (*Shirgāb*); Von Malzau rated the number of its inhabitants at about 800, and that of the Jews among them at about one-fifth; the place has the remains of old *Himyar* buildings. Another powerful clan is that of Hammād, whose town is called Dār Shawwar.

The Hudjriyya claim to be true descendants of ancient *Himyar*, and are said to have at one time formed one tribe with the *Ṣubaybā*, who live to the south of their territory. *Ṣabīb* is like all the other inhabitants in what is now the *liwāʾ* of Taʿizz, and having a common language, but they have become subject to the *liwāʾ* of Shāfī; they have been called by invaders *Hudjriyya,* and to the south of their territory. Their number is given by Ibn Asakir, as well as by Ibn al-Makrizi, as 32,000. Von Malzau rated the number of its inhabitants at about 800, and that of the Jews among them at about one-fifth; the place has the remains of old *Himyar* buildings. Another powerful clan is that of Hammād, whose town is called Dār Shawwar.

The Hudjriyya claim to be true descendants of ancient *Himyar*, and are said to have at one time formed one tribe with the *Ṣubaybā*, who live to the south of their territory. *Ṣabīb* is like all the other inhabitants in what is now the *liwāʾ* of Taʿizz, and having a common language, but they have become subject to the *liwāʾ* of Shāfī; they have been called by invaders *Hudjriyya,* and to the south of their territory. Their number is given by Ibn Asakir, as well as by Ibn al-Makrizi, as 32,000. Von Malzau rated the number of its inhabitants at about 800, and that of the Jews among them at about one-fifth; the place has the remains of old *Himyar* buildings. Another powerful clan is that of Hammād, whose town is called Dār Shawwar.

The Hudjriyya claim to be true descendants of ancient *Himyar*, and are said to have at one time formed one tribe with the *Ṣubaybā*, who live to the south of their territory. *Ṣabīb* is like all the other inhabitants in what is now the *liwāʾ* of Taʿizz, and having a common language, but they have become subject to the *liwāʾ* of Shāfī; they have been called by invaders *Hudjriyya,* and to the south of their territory. Their number is given by Ibn Asakir, as well as by Ibn al-Makrizi, as 32,000. Von Malzau rated the number of its inhabitants at about 800, and that of the Jews among them at about one-fifth; the place has the remains of old *Himyar* buildings. Another powerful clan is that of Hammād, whose town is called Dār Shawwar.

The Hudjriyya claim to be true descendants of ancient *Himyar*, and are said to have at one time formed one tribe with the *Ṣubaybā*, who live to the south of their territory. *Ṣabīb* is like all the other inhabitants in what is now the *liwāʾ* of Taʿizz, and having a common language, but they have become subject to the *liwāʾ* of Shāfī; they have been called by invaders *Hudjriyya,* and to the south of their territory. Their number is given by Ibn Asakir, as well as by Ibn al-Makrizi, as 32,000. Von Malzau rated the number of its inhabitants at about 800, and that of the Jews among them at about one-fifth; the place has the remains of old *Himyar* buildings. Another powerful clan is that of Hammād, whose town is called Dār Shawwar.

The Hudjriyya claim to be true descendants of ancient *Himyar*, and are said to have at one time formed one tribe with the *Ṣubaybā*, who live to the south of their territory. *Ṣabīb* is like all the other inhabitants in what is now the *liwāʾ* of Taʿizz, and having a common language, but they have become subject to the *liwāʾ* of Shāfī; they have been called by invaders *Hudjriyya,* and to the south of their territory. Their number is given by Ibn Asakir, as well as by Ibn al-Makrizi, as 32,000. Von Malzau rated the number of its inhabitants at about 800, and that of the Jews among them at about one-fifth; the place has the remains of old *Himyar* buildings. Another powerful clan is that of Hammād, whose town is called Dār Shawwar.
The most interesting section of the *Kashf* is the 14th: "Doctrines professed by the various Şûfi sects": he lists twelve of them and explains the doctrine of each. One only, that of the Malikis, appears to be mentioned in older works on Şûfism; brief references to other sects found in later works (e.g., the *Tadhkirat al-awliya*) are probably borrowed from it. It is not clear whether these sects actually existed or whether they were invented by Hudjwiri in his desire to systematize the doctrine of Şûfism; but there is every reason to suppose that he often mingled his own personal views with his exposition of the doctrines which he attributed to the founder of each school. It is possible that the main source of the information in the *Kashf* was oral, but Hudjwiri does mention a treatise on Şûfism, the *Kitâb al-Luma* (in Arabic of Abu Naṣr al-Sarrâdī (d. 377/987-8), one of the earliest of this type (a passage from it is included in the *Kashf*, tr. 341); a comparison of the two works reveals that the plan of the *Kashf* coincides with that of the *Luma*; the *Kashf* includes references to three other mystic writers (tr. 26 and 114).

In the introduction to his translation of the *Kashf* (2nd ed., revised), Nicholson has this to say: "Though Hujwiri was neither a profound mystic nor a precise thinker, his work on the whole forms an admirable introduction to the study of Şûfism: it... has the merit... of bringing us into immediate touch with the author himself, his views, experiences, and adventures, while incidentally it throws light on the manners of dervishes in various parts of the Moslem world. His exposition of Şûfi doctrine and practice is distinguished not only by wide learning and first-hand knowledge but also by the strongly personal character impressed on everything he writes".

In addition, Žukovskiy, in his important introduction, gives a list of the works which Hudjwiri consulted (21-5) and a list of the Muslim writers who used the *Kashf* (36 ff.); he examines carefully the peculiarities of the author's language (40-51) and gives a judgement of the book as a whole (31 ff).


*Hudna*, abstract noun from the root *h.d.n*, with the sense of "calm", "peace". Other terms which have the same meaning are *muwa'da*, *muṣālaqa*, *musâlama*, and *mutâraka*, the general meaning of which in Islamic law is the abstention of the parties concerned from hostilities against each other. The process of entering into a peace agreement with the enemy is called *muḥādārana* or *muwa'dāa*, but the instrument of peace is hudna (peace agreement).

In Islamic legal theory, normal relations between the *dâr al-ḥarb* [q.v.] and its ene mies (at least) were not peaceful, and there existed a state of latent or open hostilities which jurists nowadays call a state of war. Short intervals of peace were, however, permitted by divine legislation (Kur'ān VIII, 63; IX, 1 and others) and the Muslims could establish peaceful relationships with non-Muslims, individually and collectively, if such a peace was not inconsistent with the interests of the Muslims.
the individual level, the ḥarbi (person from the dār al-ḥarb) could enter the dār al-Islam unmolested, provided he obtained an amān (q.v.) see also MUDRADA) beforehand from any believer, whether in an official or an unofficial capacity. But as a territorial group, the unbelievers could obtain such a temporary status only by an official act, either directly or indirectly granted by the Imām, which conferred upon the inhabitants of the territory whose ruler entered into a peace agreement with the Muslims the benefits of the amān obtained by a single individual. It is clear that the mudradda or muwadda is, as Kasānī observes, a form of amān. But the amān is a temporary peace given to an individual ḥarbi, although his country is still in a state of war with Islam, while the mudradda or muwadda is a temporary peace extended to a certain town or a country (including its people) by an official act. Hudnā in Islamic law is thus equivalent to "international treaty" in modern terminology. Its object is to suspend the legal effects of hostilities and to provide the prerequisite conditions of peace between Muslims and non-Muslims, without the latter's territory becoming part of the dār al-Islam.

The Kurʾān provided for the Muslims not only the possibility of entering into a peace agreement with the enemy, but also the obligation to observe the terms of the agreement to the end of its specified period (Kūrʾān IX, 4; XVI, 93), once the agreement was accepted by the Muslims. This is the principle pacta sunt servanda, stressed both in divine legislation and juridical writings. Thus hudnā in Islamic law was established by practice (i.e., agreement and consent of the parties concerned) and validated by authoritative sources. The treaty-making power rested in the hands of the Imām, but this power might be delegated to commanders in the field who were empowered to negotiate with the enemy if the latter was willing to come to terms with Islam. However, the Imām reserved the right to repudiate the treaty if it proved to be inconsistent with the interests of the Muslims. The Imām's approval or ratification was, therefore, necessary to make the treaty binding upon the Muslim community. Even after the treaty was ratified, the Imām had the power to terminate the treaty (nabhd) provided a prior notice was sent to the enemy to that effect. The Hudaybiya treaty, concluded by the Prophet Muhammad with the unbelievers of Mecca in 6/628, provided a precedent for subsequent treaties which the Prophet's successors made with non-Muslims. Although this treaty was violated within three years from the time it was concluded, most jurists concur that the maximum period of peace with the enemy should not exceed ten years, since it was originally agreed that the Hudaybiya treaty should last ten years.

The Prophet and his successors concluded treaties with the People of the Book [see AḤL AL-KĪTĀB], but these treaties were not temporary in nature, since both the people and the territory were incorporated in the dār al-Islām and the aḥl al-kītāb became subjects of the Imām. Since these were not required to become Muslims, they were regarded as protected members of the state and called ǧissīmīs (q.v.). The treaties with aḥl al-kītāb were, accordingly, not strictly international treaties, but covenants (ahd) or a form of constitutional charters which fall under Islamic constitutional law, not under the Islamic law of nations (for a model text of such a charter, see Shāfiʿī, al-Umm, IV, 118-9).

An examination of the treaties concluded by the Prophet and his successors leads us to establish certain general characteristics which may be summed up as follows: (1) the treaties were, on the whole, brief and general, and no attempt was made to supply details as to their applications; (2) the preamble consisted of the basma ("in the name of Allāh"), the names of the parties and their representatives, and their titles; (3) treaties were temporary agreements, the duration of which was specified, except those with aḥl al-kītāb, although it was understood that a treaty might be renewed; (4) the provisions were stated in written form and were confirmed by witnesses; (5) that the text of the treaty must be written and signed by the parties and often the names of the witnesses were added at the end of the text. The writing as well as the signing and the dating of the treaty are not, strictly speaking, legal prerequisites; but Hanafī jurists insisted that treaties, in order to be binding, must be written and duly signed.


(M. Khadduri)

HUDNA, current orthography Hودنا, a low-lying region in the centre of the upper plains of Algeria, at the foot of the mountains of Wernougha, Hodna and Belezma, and lying open to the south-east towards the Saharan region of Zāb (Biskrā). It covers an area of 8,600 sq. km and is made up of the hills of the Djerr in the north and east, immense alluvial plains in part flooded by water from the wadis that come down from the chain of mountains in the south, a sandy region, the Rmel. The country, which is very hot in summer and very dry (annual rainfall 200 to 300 mm), is a sub-desert steppe devoid of alfa-grass. It is quite well supplied with water, thanks to a number of springs which emerge from the limestone mountains, the abundant but very irregular flooding by the wadis (Oued el-Leham, el-Ksob, Selmari, Magra, Barika, Bitham), and the high water-table (partly artesian) in the sub-soil. The Hodna has thus always been a country of both agriculture and stock-breeding, inhabited alike by a sedentary population and by nomadic herdsmen. In ancient times it formed part of the Roman limes, and a series of towns marks the route leading to the east and north from the Sebkha, while forts guard the south. In the early Middle Ages, along with Zāb it formed a military, political and economic march for Ifriqiya, facing the pastoral steppes of the central Maghrib and the Sahara. Fortified agricultural centres, often marking the site of ancient cities, are scattered throughout the nomads' pasturages—Tobna (Tubunae), Ngaous (Nevivibus), Maggara (Macri); Msila was founded in the 4th/10th century close to the ruins of Zabi; in the following century it was momentarily eclipsed by Kūfa, a temporary capital set up in the mountains.
HUFASH, high mountain in South Arabia, belonging to the al-Mašānī' range of the Sarāt group, on the Wadi Surdud near Harāz [q.v.]. It is often mentioned by Hamdānī, along with the adjacent large mountain of Milbān (called after the Himyari Milbān b. 'Awf b. Mālik) the real name of which was Rayshān. In Hamdānī's time the latter was said to possess no fewer than ninety-nine springs and had a large mosque (called Masjidī Shāhīr) on its summit, Shāhīr. It was popularly believed (also according to Hamdānī) that not far away there lay a treasure which many Arabs sought but could never reach, as a snake barred the way in the shape of a high mountain, as soon as they tried to approach it. In Niebuhr's time, Hufash formed a separate district to which Djabal Milbān also belonged. Among places of some importance in Hufash he mentions Seefekin, a small town surrounded by a wall, the residence of the Dawla (Dūla) and the two villages of Bayt al-Nuğhelli and Bayt al-Shumma.

**Bibliography:** Hamdání, 652,4-8, 791,13-18, 133,3-5, 125,6, 126,5-16, 190,4-13; C. Niebuhr, Beschreibung von Arabien, 249; Pet. Mitt., xxxii (1886), pl. i. (J. Schleiper) al-HUFUF, or al-HUFUF according to an older form, and in English most frequently Hofuf, a town in eastern Saudi Arabia, capital of the oasis of al-Hasa [q.v.]. The name derives from haffa, to kiss, or hāf, which was first used by a group of gardens near the old capital of al-Hasa. The population is estimated at about 80,000 inhabitants, some 40% of whom are Shi'īs.

Until the 1930s/1950s, al-Hufuf was surrounded by a large wall with a number of defensive towers. Six gates gave access to the town. The wall enclosed the town's three main quarters: al-Kūt, al-Rifā'ī, and al-Naşīfī. al-Kūt, which was the first administrative offices, the garrison, and the homes of officers and functionaries, was itself fortified by another wall and surrounded by a moat. The gradual modernization of the town has necessitated the demolition of most of the walls, and to avoid overcrowding two extramural suburbs, al-Si̇l̇ibiyya and al-Ru̇kayyika, have grown at the southern edges of al-Hufuf and have substantial populations.

Al-Hufuf succeeded al-Hasa, which itself had succeeded Hadjar, as the administrative centre of the oasis as well as of the region which since 1371/1952 has been called the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia. During the Turkish occupation, 1289/1871 to 1322/1913, al-Hufuf was the residence of the Mutaṣṣarīf Faṣḥa, who governed the sandgāb of al-Hasa (misnamed Naḍīl) under the jurisdiction of Basra. After the conquest of al-Hufuf by ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Ibn Su'ūd in 1322/1913, the town continued to be the provincial administrative centre until 1371/1952 when the capital was moved to al-Dammām [q.v.].

Besides its administrative functions, al-Hufuf, as the capital of Saudi Arabia's richest and largest oasis, has long been an important trade and manufacturing centre. Its production of textiles, coffee-pots, weapons, and jewellery was long well known in the Persian Gulf, and its weekly Thursday market still attracts large crowds from the entire province. Al-Hufuf is now connected by asphalted road and by railroad with both the provincial capital at al-Dammām and the national capital at al-Riyāḍ.


---

**Huelva** [see Walba].

**Huesca** [see Warna].

**HUKM** (ا. pl. akhām), verbal noun of ḥakama, which originally means "to withhold, restrain, prevent!", is used in a number of technical meanings in the field of religious law (see AHKAM), philosophical (see below I), and grammatical (see below II). On the different meanings of the term ḥukm, see Dict. of technical terms, i, 372 ff.; L. Gauthier, La racine arabe س and ses dérivés, in Homenaje a Don Fr. Codex, Saragossa 1904, 435-54.

I. Ḥukm means in philosophy, the judgement or act by which the mind affirms or denies one thing with regard to another, and thus unites or separates them. According to al-Dżurđānī, it is "the act of establishing a relation between one thing and another by affirmation or denial" (Tu'rifāt). Ibn Rushd explains the combining of certain concepts which are juxtaposed terms of the bipartite statement are set forth as a judgement and a proposition only if the copulative—verb or personal pronoun—is under- (sharīf, conditional. But this can occur in two different ways. In the first case, the condition involves only one consequence, either positive or negative: the judgement is then expressed in a conjunctive conditional proposition (mutadiqālā); e.g. "if the sun rises it is daylight". In the second case, the consequent implies an alternative of which one member necessarily excludes the others, e.g. "this man is either old or young"); the statement of such a judgement is called a "disjunctive conditional proposition" (munfassāla) (Manṭik al-maghibriyyīn, 60-1, see also 62). This passage is among the few which make it clear that the judgement the central point of explanation; it is not even mentioned in a closely related text (Ighrárī, 22-3; Fr. trans., 124-6). This theory of conditional judgement and those of the proposition and syllogism which arise from it, are not of Aristotelian inspiration. Together with other indications, they pose the problem of other sources, notably Stoic, of Arab philosophy.

"The definite proposition has four forms" according as "the judgement applies to all by way of affirmation", then it is "a universally affirmative statement", or "applies to all by way of negation", "a universally negative one", or "applies to some by way of affirmation" or "to some by way of negation", particular propositions either affirmative or negative. Moreover "an indefinite judgement is the same as a particular judgement". According to another series of distinctions, the judgement expressed in any proposition is either necessary, possible, or impossible, the necessary being to some degree included in the possible (Dāneṣghnāme, 35-45, trans. 36-41; Manṭik, 63 and Nadād̮, 19-20). Nadād̮, 18, explains the subject and the predicate in connexion with their place in the judgement.

Ḥukm means also sensory intuition, where assent of the mind is necessitated by sensation, e.g. "our judgement that fire burns"; the judgement of experience which follows repeated sensory intuitions, e.g. "our judgement that a blow administered with a piece of wood is painful"; the practical judgement, e.g. "our judgement that the sun exists"; the judgement which follows a strong intellectual intuition (the principle of the discovery of a scientific explanation); the judgement that follows on the fundamentals of what our education has taught us without that having compelling force on our intelligence as such, e.g. "our judgement that it is wicked to steal the property of another". But in order to distinguish judgements relating to first principles, by an absolute necessity of the human mind, Ibn Sinā uses had̮, which expresses the ineluctable character of the act, e.g. "our judgement that the whole is greater than the part" (Ighrárī, 56-9, trans. 176-80).

In the statement of the attributive proposition, and therefore in the formulation of the judgement, there is an important difference between Persian, where the grammatical copula is explicit, as in European languages, and Arabic where it can be omitted. It nevertheless exists in the mind, and the two juxtaposed terms of the bipartite statement are set forth as a judgement and a proposition only if the copulative—verb or personal pronoun—is understood by implication (Ighrárī, 27, trans. 126-7).


II. In grammar, Ḥukm can be understood only if the term, in the world's thought of the Arab grammarians, is assigned its proper place in the whole grammatical system that they elaborated. In this system,
the Arabic language is considered as a logical and harmonious entity, subjected to the rules of wisdom, intelligence and justice. The organization of this entity has been achieved especially:

(a) by the establishment of hierarchies (see especially K. al-Insâf, 35, lines 14-6), of subordinations: the governing power of the verbs is the strongest; among the hurâf, the particles governing nouns, ʿawâmil al-asnâm, are stronger than the particles governing verbs (op. cit., 233, 3), etc.; among the words, there are primary forms: a typical example is the word yadâr; called maṣâdir because it is the "original" of the other forms of the verb (see question 28 of the K. al-Insâf); we may also cite the singular considered as prior to and stronger than its corresponding internal plural or plurals. These last considerations influence the explanation of syntactical relationships.

(b) by the search for the asl, the base: the basic meaning of words, of grammatical constructions: "we [the Basrans] are attached to the asl, and he who is attached to the asl is ex各大 from establishing the proof (al-dâlî)" (op. cit., 199, 1); pointing out this asl as it was a conclusive argument (cf. in the Luma al-adilla, of the same author, 106, line 11). Examples: for asl, Inṣâf, 198, 19; for the vocative form allâhumma, ibid., 151, 19. In the case of words, one determines its basic position, its marâba or ru̇ba, that is to say its “rank”. This rank is a consequence of the preceding factors, or may be simply an affirmation, sanctioned by the consensus (ʿâdîm) of the grammarians of Baṣra, but it is a particularly important element of the system; for it is exactly at its marâba in which it is placed that the word exercises or has to exercise its hukm.—Besides this, there is an extensive use of bi-yâsîd.

For hukm, it means: (i) the proper function which the word performs at its marâba in which it is placed, its activity; (ii) the proper function to be performed by the word at its marâba in which it is placed. It may be translated by "part played or to be played", but this translation gives no indication of the whole system in which hukm is involved. The distinction indicated may sometimes not be obvious in the use of hukm in the texts; there are times when it can be taken in the one sense or the other. The following examples allow this distinction to be clearly recognised.

For (i): (a) Inṣâf, 121, 19-24 (cf. 39, 20-1): laawà (= law + lâ) is compound (ru̇khkharî); the word loses the hukm (specific activity) of its components and acquires a new hukm (a new activity); therefore this is compared with the adwîya, remedies, which are compounded of various ingredients: their compounding annuls the hukm (efficiency) of each one in its separate state, and confers upon them a new hukm (power to act). According to the present example, it should be understood not mean "intrinsic task in performance", but rather "faculty, power of acting in respect of some specific task", which would introduce an ontological aspect.

(b) Inṣâf, 176, 10-12: in an oath one can say annu lâhâ. The asl is asyamn lâhâ; yâ sâhîna has been suppressed, but, as this suppression was not necessary, its hukm (activity) remains.

(c) Inṣâf, 199, 11-12: to be astonished one must first know; this is why it can be said, in determining the meaning of al-ta'âsdiyîn: mà zayra hukmâ wa-hâlîsya sahabûh, “its intrinsic task has not [yet] appeared and its cause is [still] hidden”.

(d) Inṣâf, 123, 15-6: on the subject of ilâ, the particle denoting exception: ilâ cannot have the meaning of wasâl, for ilâ with the meaning of “except” excludes the word following from the hukm (field of activity) of the preceding one; but ma joins together; and in joining together it necessary zayr (yâsdiyî) the introduction of the word following into the hukm (task being performed) of the preceding one.

For (ii): (a) Inṣâf, 175, 12-3: in the construction la-sayyâd afjalâ, the grammarians of Kûfa perceive a lâm coming after an oath (was-lâhà) which is not expressed. The Basrans regard it as the lâm al-aslâdî. Their argument against the Kûfians is: if the lâm in question were the lâm of the oath (guanâb al-basâm), it is not permitted to be used to cancel the governing influence of the verb yâmmâ, when it is introduced into the phrase; one says zaynàt sayyâd kâ'imî,“and with the lâm: zaynàt la-sayyâdî kâ'imî”; now the hukm (task to be fulfilled) of the lâm al-basâm (lâm of the oath) is kull mawdi, in any circumstances, is to exert no governing influence, either before or after it.

(b) Inṣâf, 175, 15: a’ilâhî mà fâ’âlîs. This form of oath can be used only with the divine name Allâh: wa-kâhisâs hadda ’l-ism bi-hadda l-hukm hadda bi-hadda, “and the particular use of this name for this hukm (task to be fulfilled = vocative with the particle a) is the same as the particular use of lâm with hûna.”

(c) Inṣâf, 184, 23 and 185, 1: one says, mararû bi-hîlî abramwâya, and mararû bi-hîmî hilayhîm, wa-hâqûhûsa hukm âdafa hilîla ilîlî la-mushar wa-l-mudmar, “so this is the hukm (task to be fulfilled) of the grammatical annexion (in âdafa of hilîla) to a noun (mushar) and a pronoun (mudmar)”. Other examples can easily be found in grammatical literature; thus: al-Zâridjâdîjî, al-Djum, 129, line 3, 312, foot; al-Zamâkshârî, Mufasal, § 517, title of § 697; Ibn Yâ'qîb, 187, line 13, 628, 1, 3, 1144, 11. 20-7; Ibn Djiinî, Sîrînîn, i, 35, 1, 2; Ibn al-Hâdîbî, in Zahrî al-Kûsî’s of Rûdî al-Dîn al-Ashtarâbî, 4, 297, 1. 4.

In determining the meaning of hukm, we have restricted ourselves to a single author, Ibn al-Anbârî, in a work of unique importance for the method of the Arab grammarians, his CdÂd al-Inṣâf. All the examples given refer to arguments of the Basrans; but at Inṣâf, 92, 18-22, it is the Kûfians who are speaking: "... because we say: that is performed by the hukm (task being performed)". But as the Kûfians do not accept the doctrine of the marâba or this system of Basrâ mentioned above (see G. Weil, Einleitung, 30-1), it is natural that they should understand hukm in a more ordinary sense, as when we translate it by “part to play”. The word in its marâba possesses a right, fâkû, to give due weight to its hukm, according to whether it accomplishes its task partially or wholly. This is the
The word is thus endowed with a sort of juridical personality. In the system of the biyās. Indeed the biyās (see its definition in the Luma' al-adillā of Ibn al-Anbāri, Damascus 1377/1957, 93) involves a communication of hukm, from the asl to the farā', in recognition of the resemblance of the farā' and the asl, by virtue of the principle (enunciated, ibid., 99, lines 16-7) that the resemblance necessitates a similarity of hukm.

On this logical and formal gap between resemblance and hukm, see also the chapter of al-Suyūṭī, al-‘Aqīdah wa-l-nassir fi l-tulūb, Hadhārābdāb 1359, l. 217-21.

On some different meanings of hukm, see Ibn Dīnān, Khāṣṣāt, iii, 57-6, 59-67, 157-64, and the chapter of al-Suyūṭī, op. cit., 221.

If such is the meaning of hukm in grammar, why then the choice of such a word for such a meaning? In fact, hukm is the infinitive of hakama yakhumu hukmān "to pronounce a sentence", with bi- "on", with li- "in favour of", with ala- "against". In law, hukm means "judge's decision, his judgement in a disputed question and also in a less litigious matter like the nomination of a guardian". Hukm in grammar, into which the concepts of law penetrate, must itself also imply the expression of an authoritative decision, a judgement. In the background of hukm there is hakama. The divine origin of language, which is wāḥy wa-lhukmān "closed revelation" (see H. Fleisch, in Orients, 1963) and, more particularly for the Muslim Arab grammarian, the belief in the Arabic language as the organ of expression of the divine Absolute in the Kurān, kālim Allāh in this connexion, see, in Mufassāl, § 522, Ibn Yaḥyā, 1123, lines 14 ff., the audacity, al-‘alwā ‘ala-lhukm [Muf., al-ibād ‘ala kālim Allāh [I-Y., which was alleged against al-Hādhālī (ibid., 285). In this kālim Allāh, this utterance of Allāh, the word can accom-

The plural of hukm is hukmān, in the event of a plurality of hukm, e.g., Inṣāf, 64, line 13-26, line 4; or Ibn Hīṣām al-Anṣārī, in the Shādhil of his Shuḥdār al-qādīh (Cairo 1371/1951, 416, line 7); but this seldom occurs in the current texts. It is not rare in the chapter-book on Hukm (‘Ilm, Biblioth. Islam., iii, 140, 142, 144, 146, 147; Ibn Dīnān, Khāṣṣāt, ii, Cairo 1374/1955, 108; al-Zadī-Jādī, al-Dīnawal, 277, akhām al-hamās fi l-khāfif (cf. al-Dānī, Muḥarrīb (Biblioth. Islam., iii, 63). The meaning can be expanded and so translated by "behaviour, situation, conditions", while in the previous example it would be "situation of the hama in writing". Bibliography: G. Weil, Abu 'l-Barakāt Ibn al-Anbāri, Die Grammatikalen Streitfragen der Baster und Kufier, Leiden 1913, Kitāb al-Inṣāf fi masa'il al-khāfif bayna l-naḥqayyin al-basriyayn wa-l-kāfīyayn, Einleitung, pp. 1-93, particularly 15; idem, Zum Verständnis der Methode der moslemischen Grammatiker, in Festschrift Sachau, Berlin 1915, 380-92; H. Fleisch, Traité de philologie arabe, Beirut 1961, 1-18. In addition, the authors cited in the text. (H. Fleisch)

On the political and administrative use of hukm, see akhām, diplomatic, KFāmān.

Hukk, pl. of hāk [q.v.]. legal rights or claims, and corresponding obligations, in the religious law of Islam. One distinguishes the ḥukk Allāh, the rights or claims of Allāh, e.g., the ḥadd [q.v.], punishments, and the ḥukkā ādāmīyān, private, and essentially civil, rights or claims. Used of things, ḥukk signifies the accessories necessarily belonging to them, such as the privy and the kitchen of a house, and servitudes in general; this term is of common occurrence in the legal formalities (ṣirūt [q.v.]). In contemporary terminology, ḥukk means merely "law" in the modern meaning of the term, and Kullīyyat al-Ḥukkā is "Faculty of Law".—In the terminology of the Sufis, ḥukk al-nafs denotes the essential requirements for the existence of the soul, as opposed to any additional elements which are called ḥayāq. Bibliography: Mikhail ‘Id al-Bustānī, Maraqīj al-julūb, Beirut 1914, 39-41; J. Schacht, Introduction to Islamic Law, index. s.v. ḥukk ādāmī and ḥukk Allāh. Tahānawī, Dictionary of the technical terms, s.v. ḥukk al-nafs.

Hukkām, in modern Arabic "government". Like many political neologisms in Islamic languages, the word seems to have been first used in its modern sense in 19th century Turkey, and to have passed from Turkish into Arabic and other languages. Hukkām comes from the Arabic root ḥ-k-m, with the meaning "to judge, adjudicate" (cf. the related meaning, dominant in Hebrew and other Semitic languages, of wisdom. See ḤKMĀ). In classical usage the verbal noun hukkām means the act or office of adjudication, of dispensing justice, whether by a sovereign, a judge, or an arbitrator, as for example in some enumerations of the hereditary functions of Kuraysh in Mecca (the Jerusalem concordance lists occurrences in T.A., ix, 68, l. 1; L.A., xiv, 95, l. 17, xv, 31, l. 24, 177, l. 11 and 16, 304, l. 25; xvi, 41, l. 13; Aḥfānī, x, 63, l. 4-5, 165, l. 7; xili, 134, l. 1; references communicated by Dr. M. J. Kister. The last example is particularly clear. fākur ḥukkām bi-lḥukkāmāt al-‘ilāma. Other examples in Ibn Ḫutaybā, plish only the task allotted to it by the decision of the Wādī, its sovereign Founder. Hukm "judgment" is to be understood in the passive sense, which the infinitive can have—judgment on the word in relation to its activity, the task it has to perform.
Government in the Islamic states before the 19th century is examined in the articles on Khilafah, Sultan, Wazir, etc. The articles that follow here are concerned with the introduction and development of the modern apparatus of government in the 19th and 20th centuries. See further Dim'iyva, Quumhüriya, Dostur, Hizb, etc.

I—Ottoman Empire

The introduction of the modern European type of governmental apparatus in the Ottoman Empire began in the reign of Sultan Mahmud II [q.v.], 1808-39. He came to the throne at a particularly critical period of Ottoman history, when the authority of the central government was almost non-existent. The ayyan and derebeys [q.v.] were supreme in the peripheral provinces of the Empire, while the Janissaries continued to terrorize the capital. Mahmud's first task, therefore, was to restore the authority of the centre, and in this he was largely successful during the first half of his reign. The Janissaries had become the main stumbling block to military reform—and all other reform was incidental to this, were suppressed in 1826, when they rebelled against the measure to establish a new style army. Their destruction marked the end of the purely military phase in Turkish modernization, and Mahmud was now able to proceed with the reform of institutions.

The Serasker replaced the Agba of the Janissaries [see Râbi, Seraskeri]. He performed the functions of a commander in chief and Minister of War; by the end of the 19th century the Serasker was occasionally a civilian appointment (see Shaykh-ı-İslâm Djemal al-Din, Khârîrât-i siyâsîyye, Cairo 1917, 10-12). It was only after the revolution of 1908 that the Seraskerate was transformed into the War Ministry. The religious institution was also bureaucratized and brought firmly under the Sultan's control. This was marked by the creation of an official office for the Shaykh-ı-İslâm known as the Bâb-i Maqâlîhâ [q.v.] or Fetâwâhâne. Mahmud ended the financial independence of the religious institution by setting up an inspectorate of the waqfs, which later became a ministry. The Shaykh-ı-İslâm was now no more than a civil servant with advisory and consultative functions. After the introduction of the cabinet system, he became a member of the cabinet, though he enjoyed the privilege of being appointed directly by the Sultan and not by the Grand Vizier.

In 1835 Mahmud turned his attention to the Sublime Porte [see Râbi, 'Fânil], for the past two centuries the very heart of Ottoman government. The old office of the Kâhya first became the Ministry of Civil Affairs (Mülkiyye) and later the Ministry of the Interior (Dâkîhiyye Nezâreti), while the office of Reis al-Küttâb became the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Kâhrîdîyye Nezâreti). Two years later (1837) the Defterdarlîhâ was transformed into the Ministry of Finance. These ministers assumed many of the prerogatives traditionally belonging to the Grand Vizier, and the abolition of that title was, therefore, no more than the reflection of his declining position.

On 30 March 1838 the Grand Vizier ('Sadîr-i a'zeam) was given the modern title of Prime Minister (Başwcheh) and in the Council of Ministers he became primus inter pares. But the new title was dropped in the following year; despite brief reappearances in the period 1876-82, it came into permanent use only after the fall of the Empire, when at times it took the form of Başbakan.

Mahmud's reforms and innovations in government
were not intended as an exercise in western governmental practice. Their prime aim was to centralize and consolidate in the person of the Sultan the power released by the break-up of the traditional order. As the central government grew stronger and more confident it increased its area of activity. The Ministry of Public Works was set up in 1839. With the steady secularization of government following the Imperial Rescripts of 1839 and 1856 [see Taanzimat] and the promulgation of the constitution of 1876 the government extended its control over areas which had been part of the religious domain.

A Ministry of Education was set up in 1857 and a Ministry of Justice in 1879. Police duties had already been taken away from the Serasker in 1845, and in 1870 the Ministry of Police was established [see Dastiyya]. The Seraskerate was renamed Ministry of War in 1879, but this was soon dropped in the interest of tradition and was only re-adopted by Abd al-Hamid on 22 July 1908 as a concession to the constitutionalists. The nucleus of a European type of governmental structure was formed by the creation of these departments. There were later additions, such as the Ministry of Trade and Agriculture [see Filiına, iv, 908], the Ministry of Posts and Telegraphs [see Posta], the Ministry of Marine [see Barııiya, iii, 948b], and in 1918 the Ministry of Food.

But the introduction of ministers and ministries with European titles did not at once lead to the practice of Western government with ministerial responsibility. Just as these modern institutions had emerged as a result of growing centralization and the increased power of the Sultan, so ministerial responsibility was to be the outcome of the Sultan's declining position and the emergence of a new bureaucratic elite, itself the child of centralization and determined to have a share in the government.

Consultation (maghsoret [see Mashwarah]) has always been regarded as a fundamental principle of Islamic government. Its rôle in the Ottoman State, however, always depended on the relative strength of the Sultan and his ministers. Thus, under Mahmud, the Privy Council (Meflis-i Kâdis) represented little more than the Sultan's will; he appointed and dismissed the ministers. But the increasing centralization of the government and the growing complexity of the administration led to the formation of specialist bodies such as the Council of Justice, the Council of Reform and the Council of Military Affairs. All this increased the importance and independence of ministers and their committees, and in time, such ministers as Fuad Pasha [q.v.] and Ali Pasha [q.v.] were even able to challenge the authority of the Sultan.

It was the Constitution of 1876 which first gave legal recognition to a Council of Ministers presided over by the Grand Vizier and dealing with "all important matters of State, both internal and external" (article 28). Now for the first time there was a cabinet but no cabinet responsibility. The Sultan continued to appoint the Grand Vizier and the Shaykh al-Islam and to nominate the other ministers by Imperial irade (article 27). All ministers were individually responsible to him (article 30). The principle of cabinet government had been firmly established; the support to make it a practical reality was still missing. Parliament was inexperienced and divided and the Sultan retained full control. He promulgated the Constitution in 1876. In 1877 he revealed his complete authority by proroguing parliament and putting the Constitution in abeyance for the next thirty years.

After the revolution of July 1908 the Imperial Charter (Khâtis-i Hâmidî) of 1 August was an important landmark in the evolution of the cabinet system of Turkey. Article 10 of this Charter conceded to the Grand Vizier the right to appoint all ministers other than the Ministers of War and Marine, who, like the Grand Vizier and the Shaykh al-Islam, were to be appointed by the Sultan. The Young Turks, not satisfied with this concession, forced the Sultan to surrender his prerogatives of appointing ministers other than the Grand Vizier and the Shaykh al-Islam. The constitutional amendments of 1909 made the Grand Vizier responsible for forming the cabinet (article 27; amendments to the 1876 Constitution are given in A.S. Gözübüyük and Suna Kili, Türk Anayasa metinleri, Ankara 1957, 70-3; see also nusrûs). For the first time the principle of collective responsibility of the ministers for the overall policy of the government was stated (article 30). The Sultan became a figure-head and power passed into the hands of the ministers and parliament.

Perhaps the most important effect of the introduction of a modern governmental structure was the creation of a new civil service and the growth of a bureaucratic class. It was easy to establish a European type ministry; the real problem was manning it with officials having a modern outlook. And wherever a traditional institution was replaced by a modern one there arose the need for men with a modern education. Mahmud had opened the Translation Bureau [Terdijîme Odasi [q.v.]], where Turks learned the languages of Europe and replaced the traditional Greek dragomans. In the same way, trained revenue collectors had to be found to replace the old taxfarmer (mutezini) and provincial administrators to rule in place of the ayyân and derebeys. A civil service school (Mekteb-i Mülkiyye) was set up to provide men for the new ministries, but the problem of recruitment remained acute into the present century.

By the 1880s the civil service had become stratified. Recruitment was by patronage and apprenticeship, making the bureaucracy a closed shop. In many ways it soon became traditional in outlook, so much so that the present-day bureaucracy of Turkey seems to have inherited some of this traditionalism. But in the latter half of the 19th century, right up to the fall of the Empire, the new-style bureaucrat had replaced the soldier as the spearhead of modernization in the Ottoman Empire.

Bibilography: In addition to the works mentioned in the text, see Abd al-Raḥmān Shereef, Ta'rîkh-i Devlet-i ʿOthmânîyye, 2 vols., Istanbul 1909, and idem, Ta'rîkh musâhabeleri, Istanbul 1930. The first is a general survey of the period, while the second work is a series of essays on personalities and events in the 19th and early 20th centuries. See also Ahmed Lutfî, Ta'rîkh-i Lutfî, 8 vols., Istanbul 1290-1328 (not seen); Muṣṭafā Nūrī Pasha, Nâṣîr al-dīn al-muṣâhâbāt, 4 vols., Istanbul 1294-1327; and Ahmed Dje wedet Pasha, Tesâhir, ed. Čavid Baysun (Ankara 1953 ); idem, Maʾrûdî, in TOEM, 78-93. The best modern historical survey for the period 1826-1907 is Enver Ziya Karal, Osmanlı tarihi, v-viii, Ankara 1947-62; in this work both Turkish and western sources have been extensively used. The volume Tamîmah, consisting of a collection of essays published in 1940 to commemorate the
The administration of the Kâdîr dynasty, which came to power in 1779 and the last ruler of which was deposed in 1820, followed, until the constitutional revolution of 1905-6, the general pattern of medieval Persian administration, although certain changes, mainly of form, were introduced during the second half of the nineteenth century. The chief minister was known as the sadr-i a'zam and in the early period held the title I'timâd al-Dawla (as had the chief minister in Şafawi times). The chief financial official was the mustawâfi al-mamâlik and the head of the chancery the munshî al-mamâlik. The number of ministers from the time of Fath 'Ali Shah (1797-1834) tended to increase. The shah was absolute, and elevated and degraded his ministers at will. A council of state composed of ministers, leading members of the Kâdîr tribe and others was occasionally summoned to discuss matters of importance and to submit its views to the shah. Its functions were purely advisory. It did not meet regularly and its composition was of an ad hoc nature. It was summoned, for example, when Muhammad Shah (1834-48) contemplated marching in person against Herat in 1836, and advised against the Russian frontier commission, the introduction of the tax collecting service, the sale of the Persian frontier commission, the introduction of the law courts, the abolition of the semi-religious religious class, and the suppression of various intrigues to overthrow the shah.
In an essay entitled *Kīṭdbfa-i ghaybl yā daftar-i tanzimāt*, written between 1858 and 1860, he urged the separation of the legislative from the executive power. He pointed out that the institution of a council of ministers after the fall of Mirzā Aḥmad Khān Nūri had, in fact, made little difference because of the failure to separate these two powers. He proposed that a council of eight ministers, presided over by the shah, should be set up. This would propose legislation to an assembly to be called the majlis-i tanzimāt. He also proposed that the civil service law and regulations for the organization of the various ministries should be drawn up (Majdīmā‘-i āṭārī Mālkhān Khān, ed. Muhammed Muḥīṭ Ṭāṭabbā‘ī, Tehran 1948-9). Malkam Khān sent this essay to Mirzā Husayn Khān Mūṣhir al-Dawla, who became sadr-i ā‘ṣam in 1871. In another essay, *Daftar-i khānīn*, Malkam Khān stated that the fundamental mistake of the Persian system of government was the failure to separate the legislative power from the executive. In *Tanzimāt-i lāghar wa majlis-i idrār yā iniṣāmāt-i lāghar wa majdisi-i tanzimāt* he stated that he pointed out that the greatest achievement of the Kāḏārs was the establishment of different ministries, but that this was not enough: a majdis-i tanzimāt was also needed, and in *Nīdā-yi a‘dālāt* he urged the need for the collective responsibility of ministers (ibid.).

In 1871 a council of state (dār al-ḡawrā-yi khwāra) composed of sixteen members was set up on the orders of Nāṣīr al-Dīn to carry on the affairs of government (Mustawfi, i, 152). On 12 December 1871 Mirzā Husayn Khān Mūṣhir al-Dawla, who had been appointed minister of war with the title sipāḥsādār-i ā‘ṣam on 27 September 1871, became sadr-i ā‘ṣam, the office being filled once more after some thirteen years. He began a thorough-going reform of the administration. On 23 November 1872 an imperial decree was issued reorganizing the council of state, which was now called the darbār-i ā‘ṣam (though it subsequently reverted to its earlier title), and dividing the affairs of the kingdom into nine ministries (interior, foreign affairs, war, finance, justice, education, public works, commerce and agriculture, and court) under the presidency of the sadr-i ā‘ṣam, who was to be the leader of the government (ghāṣbs-i darbār-i ā‘ṣam) and the presiding member of the council of state (ra‘īs-i darbār-i ā‘ṣam). The appointment and dismissal of ministers was to be by the order of the shah on the recommendation of the sadr-i ā‘ṣam. There was also to be a council of ministers (majlis-i wuzūrāt) which the decree stated was “called a cabinet by Europeans”; it was to be presided over by the sadr-i ā‘ṣam. Each minister was to be in full control (kāmīs-e muṣalaf) over his ministry and not to interfere in the affairs of other ministries. The ministers were to meet regularly to consult on all matters of concern to the government and were to be collectively responsible for the affairs of government. They were to report to the shah through the sadr-i ā‘ṣam, who was responsible to the shah (Mustawfi, i, 163 ff.). The council of ministers was opened on 3 December 1872.

Neither the council of state nor the council of ministers had in fact much in common with the cabinet of Western European constitutions. The council of state, perhaps, most closely resembled the Imperial Council of Russia, upon which it was probably modelled. It was a purely consultative body convened sometimes to advise the shah beforehand or, more commonly, to discuss the fulfilment of his orders when already delivered. The shah continued to be the sole executive.

Mirzā Husayn Khān was dismissed in 1873. His reforms proved largely abortive. In 1888-90 the council of state numbered thirty members, but in the later years of Nāṣīr al-Dīn and under Muṣaffar al-Dīn (1896-1907) it seldom met. The number of ministers with and without portfolios varied. In 1900 there were ministers of foreign affairs, war, finance, the court (darbār), justice, commerce, education, telegraphs, posts, agriculture, crown lands, public works, awbāf and pensions, publications, crown buildings, the shah’s cabinet (wāzīr-i Mālkhān), mines and industry, the military, the army, and the air force. The last two being subordinate to the minister of war. The sadr-i ā‘ṣam held the ministries of the interior, treasury and customs. Some of the ministries existed only in name and some of the ministers were rarely consulted.

Among those who campaigned for governmental reform in the early years of the nineteenth century little attention appears to have been paid to the powers and functions of the government. At a meeting of the *sandjūman-i makhkhi* on 9 March 1905 a demand for the codification of the law was formulated; and in the code envisaged the duties of ministers were to be laid down, and limits set to the powers of governors (Nāzīm al-Īslām, Tā‘rikh-i Bīdar-i Īrānīn, Tehran n.d., 182-3). It was not until the constitution was granted by Muṣaffar al-Dīn on 30 December 1906 that a fundamental change was brought about in the position of the council of ministers, who, although not members of the National Consultative Assembly, were made responsible to it and given the right to be present at its sessions and to speak (Fundamental Laws, arts. 29, 31, 40 and 42). The Supplementary Fundamental Laws of 7 October 1909 further laid down that no one could attain to the rank of minister unless he was a Muslim by religion, a Persian by birth and a Persian subject (Art. 58), and excluded from the office of minister princes of the first degree, i.e., the sons, brothers or uncles of the reigning shah (Art. 59). The ministers were made individually responsible for the affairs pertaining to their own ministry and collectively responsible for one another’s actions and affairs of a more general nature to the National Consultative Assembly and the Senate (Arts. 60, 61 and 65). Article 67 stated that if the Nāzīm al-Īslām did not agree with the decision of the National Consultative Assembly or the Senate by an absolute majority declared itself dissatisfied with the Cabinet or with one particular minister, the cabinet or minister should resign or his ministerial functions, and that ministers could not divest themselves of their responsibility by pleading verbal or written orders from the shah (Art. 64). The constitution thus marked the beginning of a new period in the government of Persia in which the ministers were no longer simply the servants of the shah, but were individually and collectively responsible to an elected assembly.

iii.—EGYPT AND THE FERTILE CRESCENT

In Egypt, and in the countries of the Fertile Crescent (modern Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Iraq), the expansion of the administrative system, of the scope and function of government (i.e., generally of the temporal power of the state), occurred under the Mamluks and the Ottomans. In fact, long before the disintegration of the Islamic Empire and the sack of Baghdad by the Mongols in 656/1258, the political and military fragmentation of the realm had been a reality. Thus the caliph, the imam of the community, had not only been shorn of all temporal power, but his spiritual authority had been greatly compromised and, in fact, curtailed. Provincial governors in Egypt and Syria, for instance, had established their own autonomous governments and often founded independent dynasties. Government in Muslim lands became a plain monarchy, in which the will of the strong ruler was supreme. Government was more often than not tyrannical and harsh. Satraps who could legitimize their power by sheer might abounded everywhere. In the Fertile Crescent, traditional sectarian, ethnic and tribal differences and conflicts came to constitute once more the real substrata of politics and government.

The rise of a modern secular government and administration in Egypt is associated with the reign of Muhammad ʿAli (q.v.) “the Great” (805-49). He founded an autonomous modern state ruled by himself and his heirs after him. In addition to creating a strong, modern army modelled on European lines, Muhammad ʿAli established a powerful central administration that closely supervised and controlled all the affairs of state. From Europe he borrowed and applied two major—and for Egypt, novel—concepts of government: rational-secular administrative techniques, and wide governmental functions and regulatory powers. The latter extended over every aspect of public endeavour: agriculture, commerce and trade, industry, and education. Only matters of personal status were left to the jurisdiction of the Sharīʿa law and courts. Yet even this area of life was, under Muhammad ʿAli’s policy of centralization, subject to closer governmental control. Thus, there was the deliberate further bureaucratization of the ādāmāt, the general administration reform of al-Azhar and its institutions, and the eventual fiscal control imposed by the government over waqfs and other properties of religious institutions.

Very early in his reign, Muhammad ʿAli formed a governmental council, al-Diwan al-ʿĀlī, to assist him in all the affairs of government and administration. The Council was headed by his deputy, the Katkhudā Bey, who had extensive powers in all governmental matters. This Council may be considered the forerunner of the modern Council of Ministers; for, until 1878, it was known as the Khedivial Diwan, or Council of Assistance (Diwan al-Muwāwaana). Simultaneously, Muhammad ʿAli organized separate councils for each branch of government, e.g., War (Dīkhādīyya), Navy (Bahriyya), Commerce, Education, Public Works, and Foreign Affairs. These served as executive agencies, or departments, of the government’s Council of State. The expansion of governmental functions led in 1834 to the creation of a new Higher Council of State consisting of the heads of the separate departmental councils. The ruler included in its membership two personal merchants, and notables from the provinces. A Consultation Council (Malāʾiṣ al-Maṣṣawār) founded earlier in 1829 had no more than advisory functions and was intended by the ruler simply to associate with his regime a wider number of local, tribal and other native leaders of the country.

Most significant for the establishment of orderly government and systematic administration in the country (in addition to the ruler’s successful imposition of public order) was the Organic Law of 1837, known as ʿĀkūn al-Siyāsāt. This was actually a government reorganization measure, which defined the system of the government and the area of responsibility as well as the functions of each department. It reorganized the government in seven councils, i.e., departments, or incipient ministries. The original Higher Council of the State (which later became the Khedivial Diwan) possessed, in addition to its responsibility for general internal policy, judicial powers in certain criminal cases involving the maintenance of public order and security in Cairo, as well as responsibility for the administration of state buildings, hospitals, waqfs, and other institutions. A department of revenue supervised all revenue from the provinces in Egypt, from Crete, the Sudan and other foreign territories. It was also responsible for customs revenues and had the authority to appoint provincial and other inspectors. In addition to the War and Navy departments, the Diwan of Schools supervised and controlled the new state school system, the state printing press at Būlāk, and related activities. A Department for “Frankish” Affairs was an embryonic ministry of foreign relations and commerce. Finally, a Department of Factories looked after state industrial enterprises.

Along with this sweeping reorganization, Muhammad ʿAli formed a Special (private) Council (Dīwān Rāḥiyya) to deal with general matters of policy, to initiate legislation, and to issue directives to all government departments. A special council in the department of finance and revenue dealt with fiscal policy matters.

Muhammad ʿAli’s government reorganization and reform constituted the introduction of the first modern administration in the country. All departments of government and all councils had strictly executive functions, and were responsible to him. Furthermore, he reorganized the administrative division of the country into seven provinces and five governorates, for which he appointed the first provincial and district governors as public officials of the central government. He also organized a modern police force headed by a governor, or commissioner, who had under his command officers stationed in the various parts of the country.

Even the judiciary was affected by Muhammad ʿAli’s new system. Although this branch of government continued to be largely the function and responsibility of the religious institutions, Muhammad ʿAli had, by the 1830s, granted judicial powers to his Council of State. In 1842, he introduced a novel institution, al-Dīmāʾiyya al-Ḥabbānīyya, a precursor of an Administrative Council of State, and empowered it to try higher government officials, and to deal with administrative offenses referred to it by the various departments of government. He also founded a Commercial Court (Malāʾiṣ al-Tijdāra) to adjudicate commercial disputes among natives and between natives and foreigners. With this, the tentacles of modern, secular governmental power began to encroach further upon an area of state authority until then reserved for the Sharīʿa.
Another area where traditional authority was eroded was education. State secular schools, new colleges, trade and technical schools, and educational missions to Europe produced a new group of native Egyptian administrators and technicians in the employment of the state, who were to influence further the development of secular administration and modern government in Egypt.

The second major stage in the evolution of modern government in Egypt was under the Khedive Ismail [q.v.] (1863-79). During this period there was a large influx of Europeans into the country. Ismail's development programme in all fields was too ambitious and rapid for the resources of the country. This was to lead to his indebtedness to European creditors, to his eventual bankruptcy, to the imposition of European financial and political control over the Egyptian government, and ultimately to the British occupation in 1882. All these factors, however, prompted further changes in the administrative system. The most significant of these was the establishment of a Council of Supervisors (i.e., ministers), Madjlis al-Nuzār, in August 1878, responsible for the administration of the country. What this meant was that an absolute ruler like Ismail was obliged, under pressure, to introduce a modified version of the European system of cabinet government, in which the council, or cabinet, were responsible for the policy and administration of their respective departments. They were also given control over all public officials, or civil servants, in these departments. The Council had a president, or chief minister, who was now responsible for the selection of the other ministers.

Until that time the Special Council had assisted the ruler of Egypt with the administration of the country. Its members as well as the heads of the various government departments were employees of the ruler without any responsibility of their own. With the new Council, the divāns, or departments (e.g., Interior, Justice, War, Navy, etc.), became in effect ministries, and the Council superseded the old "Special Council" as the legal body recognized as the government of Egypt. But it reorganized the administrative division of Egypt into 13 provinces and 8 governorates, a division which persists almost unaltered today.

The most far-reaching changes occurred in the fields of legislation and the judiciary. While matters of personal status remained within the jurisdiction of the Shari'a and ecclesiastical courts, the encroachment of man-made law in all other areas became pervasive. Commercial, civil, criminal and penal codes modelled on European ones were prepared and promulgated. By the 1880s they became the basis of a national judiciary. Under Ismail a number of magistrate's courts and courts of first instance were organized throughout the country. The work for the creation of National Courts began under Ismail and was completed under Tawfiq Pasha [q.v.] in 1883. The Mixed Tribunals to deal with litigation between nationals and foreigners were founded in 1876. The new Ministry of Justice was responsible for the new National Courts and for all other grades of the judiciary in the country.

With the institution of Dual Control over Egypt's finances in 1876, direct European influence reached the Egyptian government and administration. Budgetary control, fiscal solvency and administrative efficiency were made the most important areas of governmental reform for the next thirty years, and especially during the British occupation. A system of European—later British—advisers to key ministries, directors of public utilities, works and communications, and inspectors became an essential part of Egyptian administration, particularly under Cromer.

From independence in 1923 to the overthrow of the ancien régime in July 1952, the administrative machinery in Egypt was substantially that first developed by Muhammad Ali and Ismail, and reformed under British tutelage. The rapid growth of population and the rise of a small native industry, and with it a small labour force, called for the further extension of governmental functions and regulation of powers. Most significant was the formation in 1939-40 of a Ministry of Social Affairs and within it a department of the Fellāh. This Ministry soon came to deal with matters of labour, social security and welfare, presumably on a national scale. The general working force increased during the Second World War so that a Ministry of Labour became inevitable. The War also produced a Ministry of Supply.

Perhaps because until recently Egypt's economy remained basically agricultural, and dependent on the proper distribution and utilization of the Nile waters, one of the most crucial functions of government has been since Muhammad Ali that performed by the Ministry of Public Works and Irrigation.

The political situation after the War was such as to create a large and influential ruling class of politicians, whatever their political persuasion, and the masses. The hardships of the War and subsequent unemployment raised new problems that called for administrative action. After the War the idea quickly spread that the major function of state and government is to provide social services and welfare on a grand scale. Moreover, state and government came to be viewed by the people as agencies for change and development. Meanwhile Egyptian governments were preoccupied with domestic squabbles involving the political parties and the king, as well as with the evacuation of the British forces from the Suez Canal area. In this interlude (1946-52), the police and security forces—one of the agencies of government most effectively organized and developed over the previous fifty years with British help—sustained the administration. Harassment and sometimes violent, from such groups as the Ikhān al-muslināmin [q.v.], governments were using their security agencies and the various departments of the police to their maximum capacity.

When the parliamentary system collapsed and the monarchy was overthrown by the "Free Officers" in July 1952 and the following months, the latter simply took over the existing government services and placed them under military supervision. After the abolition of the monarchy in June 1953, a republic was proclaimed and by 1956 a presidential form of government was established. This has been characterized ever since by a strong and highly centralized executive power. With its emphasis upon and concern with economic development, social justice, and welfare policies, the new regime made radical changes in the administration in that its functions were greatly expanded. A number of new ministries emerged, as it were automatically, from the regime's commitment to national planning of the economy, rapid industrialization, and mass political mobilization (a small Ministry of Industry had existed before 1952; a Ministry of National Guidance and Culture, for instance, was an innovation).

The extensive nationalization of economic and commercial enterprises in 1961, which inaugurated a socialist policy, further transformed the functions...
of government to embrace practically every field of national and private endeavour. Pursuance of a policy of agrarian reform, land reclamation, and the redistribution of land to peasants (with the resultant policy of agrarian reform, land reclamation, and the redistribution of land to peasants) further expanded the activities of the government in these fields.

Although the state has been committed to free and compulsory education for all Egyptians since 1950-1, governmental activity in this area has recently increased greatly, especially at the higher levels of technical and university training.

The nationalization of the press in 1960 and the take-over of publishing houses by the government has rendered such organizations and occupations too agencies of the state and its administration. The governmental, or public, corporation has also appeared in Egypt under the present régime, of which the most prominent example has been the Suez Canal Authority. The Aswan Dam project, begun in 1960, has been so colossal as to require its own special ministry.

At present (1966) the cabinet in Egypt is strictly an administrative executive. The President, together with one or more vice-presidents whom he may choose to appoint, makes national governmental policy. Under the March 1964 Provisional Constitution, the cabinet is a presidential cabinet, that is, with no strictly independent juridical status. Cabinet ministers administer the affairs of government by guiding and coordinating the work of their respective ministries and by drafting legislation for the President's consideration. But the President in consultation with his government (the vice-presidents and cabinet ministers) draws up the general policy of the State. He issues all security regulations and orders, and supervises their implementation.

Since 1962, a mass political organization has been formed by the state to encourage the participation of the people in national programmes. The Arab Socialist Union is reported in 1966 to have 6 million members. It is organized on the local, the provincial and the national levels. The President is Chairman of its Supreme Executive Committee, whose members he appoints. On the other hand, local government arrangements, a central result of the implementation of the administrative system which has evolved from the past. Local government officers are by and large public officials subject to the Ministry of the Interior.

The organization of the judiciary still follows the old pattern of a Court of Cassation, under which function six Courts of Appeal, several Primary Courts (i.e., courts of first instance), and many more summary courts. One radical change was wrought by the new régime when it abolished the Shari' courts in 1955-6.

To govern Iraq had been for the Ottomans before 1914 both difficult and expensive. Even though the country was by then organized into four major administrative units, namely, the wilayats of Mosul, Baghdad and Basra, and the mutasarrifiyya of Dayr al-Zor, the authority and control of the various governors appointed from Istanbul were for long rather nominal. Inhabited by an ethnically and religiously fragmented society—Kurds, Turcomans, "Assyrians", Shi'is, Yazidis, marshland and other tribesmen—Iraq was difficult to subject to a central authority or to its representatives in Baghdad. The development of some communications and postal services in the 19th century might ultimately have led to its pacification and subjection to central control.

It took the British occupation forces two years (1918-20) to impose some semblance of order and security throughout the country. A civil commissioner under the British Commander-in-Chief founded the nucleus of an administration to govern Iraq by creating new and modern departments of government in Baghdad. The most important were those concerned with public order and security, especially since several regions of the country were openly defiant of the authority of Baghdad. Important also were those dealing with agriculture, public works and irrigation, health and sanitation, not to speak of finance. The administrative authority of the new government departments was exercised throughout the country by means of a provincial organization. This was virtually the same as the system of administrative units which had existed before the First World War, sixteen in number. Today there are fourteen such units.

When military rule ended in October 1920, an Iraq Council of State was formed as the state agency responsible for administration, but advised by British officials. This system of an Iraqi cabinet government under a measure of British tutelage in all departments continued under the monarchy from 1922 to 1932, when Iraq achieved independence and was admitted to the League of Nations. The British Mandate was then formally ended and replaced by an Act of the Iraq Parliament.

The formation of a relatively strong army, air force, and police force in Iraq was essential for the governing of the country. By 1936, all three executive arms of the government were greatly advanced in comparison to those in other states of the Fertile Crescent. Equally essential was the development of a good judiciary, in view of the separatist, tribal and ethnic divisions in the country. In fact, despite the greater centralization of power in Baghdad, special arbitration courts and administrative procedures for the tribes were maintained.

The development of national resources early became a government responsibility in Iraq, particularly in the fields of irrigation and agriculture. Municipalities were encouraged and financially aided to develop their localities (Municipal Law of 1925). As communications improved, direct government administration from Baghdad progressed at the expense of local and other forces, especially the tribal leaders.

The system of provincial courts of first instance closely resembles that in Egypt. In Iraq, however, the Ottoman Civil Code, Meşelle [q.v.], remained in force until 1952, when it was replaced by new codes. But as in Egypt, provincial administration in Iraq is controlled by the Ministry of the Interior, in the capital, so that local initiative remains limited. This is of greater importance in Iraq, where so many groups tend to challenge the authority of the central government. Nonetheless, over the years, a body of permanent civil servants was created, which has increased in number, as in other Arab states, and particularly since the military coups beginning in July 1958 which tended to incorporate wider welfare functions into the state administration. The civil service generally continues to absorb the largest number of educated Iraqis. A law in 1957 has improved Civil Service procedures and established a Public Service Council. As in Egypt, the administration of the labour and social security services became a state responsibility in 1939-40, and was further extended in 1956. A major governmental function since 1953 has been the rational utilization of revenue from oil royalties for major development projects.
Compulsory free education has also been a state responsibility administered by the government since 1940. Yet political instability, as reflected partly in the continuous involvement of the military in politics, various tribal uprisings in the past, and the current conflict between the government and the Kurds has adversely affected the smooth operation of administrative agencies. Efficient government has also been eroded since August 1958, when the Law against Conspiracy led to purges and with it to the rise of parliamentary organizations in political parties, popular militias and other such groups.

Since the 1958 coup d'état, there has been a greater tendency for the military to control the state and the government. This has resulted in a more haphazard functioning of governmental processes. The new Constitution of May 1964 introduced greater executive power (greater than under the monarchy) in a presidential system of government. The President appoints and dismisses cabinet ministers, and governs in conjunction with a Council As in Egypt, a single state political organization, the “Iraqi Arab Socialist Union”, has been announced. Moreover, there is a pronounced state commitment to planning which guides the national economy, a wider cooperative system, and recently a series of nationalizations of enterprises.

In Syria and Lebanon, just as in Iraq and perhaps indeed to a greater extent, political, social and ethnic fragmentation has hampered government at all times. The Ottomans had attempted to maintain some form of administration there, based on a varying division of the country into provinces. Yet, until the Egyptian invasion and occupation in 1831-3, Ottoman governors were able to administer directly only Damascus and other major towns. Elsewhere, tribal chiefs and local potentates ruled undisturbed. The short-lived Egyptian domination attempted to establish a strong central government and to impose regular taxation to counter these separatist local tendencies. As part of the Tanjimî reforms, the Ottoman authorities introduced some measure of administrative reform in terms of regular payment of salaries to local officials, and extended the educational facilities. Soon afterwards European and American influence in the form of religious-educational missions entered the area. This coincided with the development of communications in the country.

Lebanon, or at least the Mountain part of it, was until the mid-19th century governed as a Principality of two powerful families. The last, that of the Shihâbîs, was destroyed in 1842, and the Ottomans divided the province into a Druze and a Maronite sandîqâh. The first sandîqâh of Mount Lebanon. The first constitution in 1926 also formalized the communal-sectarian basis of government, making the Lebanese President a Maronite and the Prime Minister a Sunni Muslim. The emphasis in government has been on a powerful executive authority residing in the President and exercised through the Council of Ministers. The President and Council can initiate legislation and actually issue laws. The machinery of government is highly centralized, so that provincial governors are actually representatives of the central authority and local councils have only advisory functions. Since 1955 there has been an attempt to decentralize the administration to some extent.

Because of the peculiar sectarian basis of Lebanese politics and government, there has been a popular tendency to view cabinet ministers and heads of government departments as representatives rather of communal interests than of the specialized activities of their respective ministries. The allocation of civil service posts, as of cabinet portfolios, has for long been based on the balancing of communal interests. Under the pressure of modern nationalist notions, administrative reform was attempted in 1958-9, and a Personnel Law was passed in 1959, which also set up a Public Service Council. The purpose of this new legislation is to set up generalized, impartial standards and criteria for appointments to the public service.

In many respects, the state in Lebanon governs by adjudicating between the interests of the various religious communities rather than by administering sanctions directly for the enforcement of its effective judgements. It also administers services. There is therefore much government by the “entourage” which one finds surrounding a President, a Prime Minister or a Cabinet Minister. As the President wields considerable power, the Chamber of Deputies (in an unicameral legislature) tends to be subservient to the executive.

In the field of the administration of justice, new civil and penal codes replaced the Ottoman laws as early as 1931-2. The Minister of Justice, however, has merely an executive function. Justice is administered by a Supreme Council of Justice, which has control over judges. Courts are organized much as in Syria and Iraq; that is, there are first instance courts, appellate courts in each major provincial centre, and a Court of Cassation in the capital. There is also a State Council to dispense administrative justice. Unlike the situation in Egypt, however, Shari‘i and ecclesiastical courts continue to function in matters of personal status.

Whereas the political history of Syria during and
since the French Mandate has been more turbulent, the administrative machinery of government followed similar lines, although it lacked the communal or sectarian basis which was formalized and tacitly accepted in the Lebanon. After separating what is now the Republic of Syria into four states (Latakia for the 'Alawis, Aleppo, Damascus, and Djiabal Druze), the French incorporated all of these into one state in 1936. They divided the new state into nine administrative provinces, in addition to the City of Damascus, administered by appointed governors who were assisted by local councils. The 1950 Constitution provided for a Cabinet government responsible to a unicameral legislature. In 1953, under the new Shi'ishkil constitution, these were made responsible to the President, so that in Syria too the trend has been towards greater executive power. The State moreover, as in the other countries, took on greater responsibility for the organization and planning of the national economy.

The organization of the judiciary in Syria closely resembles that of Lebanon and Iraq, although in Syria there have been separate administrative courts and a Council of State. The 1950 constitution introduced a Supreme Court to test the validity of legislative acts and decrees.

Considering the frequent political upheavals in Syria, it is fair to conclude that at present (1966) the administration of the country is controlled by the military.

Jordan, as a constitutional monarchy, places the responsibility of government and administration upon a cabinet, although since 1952 (when the 1952 Constitution superseded that of 1947) the President is responsible to the National Assembly. Further control of the Council of Ministers by the Assembly was introduced in 1955, especially as regards questions of votes of confidence in the government and its resignation in case of a dissolution of the Assembly.

Under the British Mandate (1922-46), the monarch ruled in Jordan (then the Emirate of Transjordan) with the assistance of a Legislative Council (set up in 1929 in accordance with the Organic Law of 1928) and an Executive Council. With independence in 1946, and the proclamation of a kingdom, the latter Council became the Council of Ministers.

As in Iraq, there were in Transjordan British advisers. The representatives of the British High Commissioner to Palestine resident in 'Amman advised the Transjordan administration on all important matters of policy. In fact, all decisions dealing with defence, finance, and external relations had to have his concurrence. The security forces and the Army in particular were, until 1956, organized and trained by British officers and financed by subsidies and loans from the British Government.

Until 1952, the monarch possessed extensive ruling powers, and governed with the help of his security forces. Until 1950, the judiciary largely retained its Ottoman stamp, using Ottoman commercial, civil, and penal codes. Since then, new codes have been promulgated and have come into use. There are now civil, religious, and special courts, in addition to a Special Council (Dīwān Khāṣî) which interprets laws.

While the new 1952 Constitution granted greater powers to the Cabinet and the Legislature, and thus curtailed those of the throne, there was, as a result of the incorporation of Central Palestine into the kingdom, a greater centralization of the administrative functions and a rapid increase in the number of public officials. This was largely due to the large refugee population that came in with this incorporation, and all the new social and economic problems which it brought. Another consequence was that the membership of the cabinet expanded with the transformation of governmental functions. The need for social legislation and economic planning for development led to the organization of such official agencies as the Development Board, the Aqaba Port Authority, the Development Bank, and the Bank of Reconstruction.

The administrative division of the country now (1966) comprises eight provinces (liwa'), each administered by a governor appointed by the central government. These are in turn subdivided into districts administered by a hādīm-mahādīm or district officer, and into wājīyas of villages headed by a mudīr. Moreover, towns and cities usually have elected mayors and municipal councils. The districts have administrative councils.

In both Egypt and the countries of the Fertile Crescent a major feature of government has been the centralization of administration and the rapid transformation and expansion of government functions which has accompanied the greater need for public and welfare services.

Except for Lebanon, where a pluralist system permits the resolution of conflict through a compromise based on the delicate balancing of sectarian-communal interests, government in Egypt, Iraq, Syria, and even Jordan, is highly centralized and ultimately dominated by the military. Whereas in Lebanon one observes a public preference for as little government as possible, this is by no means the case in the other countries of the Fertile Crescent and Egypt. In all of these, to a greater or lesser extent, government is viewed as an agency of change and development, and one which must provide social services and economic benefits. Moreover, in Egypt, Iraq and Syria, government tends towards personal, authoritarian rule. Thus the constitutional provisions in these countries do not reflect accurately the ways of government and administration. Executive power seems to predominate over legislative assemblies wherever and whenever they exist. In the latter, there has lately developed the preference, especially in Egypt, for corporate (or occupational) representation. There is consequently no relation between the life of a cabinet or a government (especially today under presidential systems) and that of a legislature in these countries. In other words, executive power is hardly bound by the strictures of an elected legislative body so long as this power has the support of the army.

Neither in Syria nor in Iraq—and only to a slight degree in Lebanon—has government completely eroded sectarian, tribal, and parochial loyalties. With the exception perhaps of Lebanon, governments in these countries (Jordan being included for a different
reason, namely the Palestine Question) continue to depend rather on coercion than on persuasion for governmental action. The central rôle played by force in the government of these countries is perhaps reflected again in the rule of the state by the military; and failing that, in the mixture of military and civilian elements in their administrations.

Because of their social composition and ethnic and religious diversity, the principal function of government in Iraq and Jordan was, for many years, the imposition of public order and security; in other words, the major task of the central government was to ensure that its authority was widely recognized and accepted by all groups within the state. This was necessary also in order to achieve the more systematic collection of taxes, to provide the revenue essential for the development of agriculture and the execution of public works.

In Syria and Iraq especially, recent political instability, as reflected in coups, counter-coups and purges, has caused the work of their permanent administrative cadres to suffer greatly. A worse consequence has been the resultant public mistrust and suspicion of all administration, which in turn makes the work of any government more difficult.

All the countries considered here have experienced some form of British or French tutelage, which has affected their governmental structures and procedures, especially in the judiciary, in provincial administration, and in the administration of public education. Their real independence is so recent that one may assume that they are undergoing a period of transition. Yet the difference between government in these countries now and in the past is that, in addition to maintaining law and order, it has assumed new and wider functions of planning and, in certain instances, managing the national economy, as well as providing extensive social welfare to the populace.

A more recent development in some of these countries seems destined to lead to ever greater centralization of power and hence to stronger administrative regulation and control; this is the phenomenon of the single-party state political organizations such as the Arab Socialist Union in Egypt and the Iraqi Arab Socialist Union in Iraq. Thus, state control is not exercised only through the government and administration, but also through its mass political organization, which has no competitors since the latter are precluded by law from at least public existence.


(P. J. Vatikiotis)
It was Mahammad Bey's successor, his brother Muhammad al-Safik, who promulgated on 26 April 1859, after having consulted Napoleon III at Algiers in the previous year, a series of legislative measures which might be regarded as a constitution. Its rules concerning the succession to the throne remained unchanged until 1957. A ministry was formed, responsible to the Bey; a supreme council of 60 members appointed by the Bey and the government shared the responsibility for the development of the legal system and for voting the state budget; the independence of the judiciary was guaranteed. These reforms were introduced before public opinion in Tunisia, even among the ruling classes, was prepared for them. And since, in addition, the financial situation led to taxes being raised, in 1864 a section of the population rose in revolt. After this the 1861 constitution was suspended, in fact if not in law.

The last Tunisian to introduce reforms before the establishment of the French protectorate was the general Khayr al-Din [q.v.], who held the office of minister on several occasions, and notably that of Prime Minister from 1873-77. The belief in the need for reform was a result not of circumstances but of his own conviction as is proved by his book: Abwâd al-masmik fi ma'rifat ahwâl al-mamâlik (Tunis 1867). Once he was in power, he made great efforts to introduce his programme of modernization by European methods but within a completely Muslim framework. After four years the manifold intrigues which surrounded him and the inability of public opinion in Tunisia to understand his aims led him to abandon his efforts. After this, the financial collapse of the country, European intrigues, and the incompetence or the doubtful honesty of the new Tunisian rulers merely aggravated the crisis, which ended in the formation of the French protectorate.

The development in Morocco followed a similar pattern, though at a later date. It was not until the middle of the 19th century that Morocco came into closer contact with Europe, through a brief war with France (August 1844), the commercial treaty of 1856 with Great Britain and the Spanish-Moroccan war of 1859-60.

The sultan ruling in 1860, Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmân (1859-73), realized that henceforth the country could not conform as it was. Already in his father's lifetime he had attempted to introduce some reforms in the Moroccan army. When he became sultan, he tried to lead the country towards a modern economy and to curb the corrupt practices of some of the officials by paying them salaries. But his task was made very difficult by European intrigues and the Moroccans' failure to understand his aims; and the agricultural crisis of 1869-70 forced him to renounce his attempts.

His son al-Hasan (1873-94 [q.v.]), also aware of the need to transform the Moroccan state, decided, on his accession, to resume his father's economic and military projects: it was he who brought to Morocco European instructors for his army. However his reforms, limited in scope, perpetually hindered by European rivalries and weakened by the financial crisis which began to be apparent in Morocco in the last quarter of the 19th century, only succeeded in irritating Moroccan public opinion, not only in the towns but even among the dissident tribes. All that remained were a few fortifications on the coast, a few batteries of field artillery and much ill-feeling.

When his son 'Abd al-'Aziz (1894-1908 [q.v.]) came to the throne, the situation was not favourable for reform: Morocco was retreating more than it was advancing. Until the death of his vizier and mentor Ahmad b. Mūses, the new sultan scarcely exercised any power, but once he found himself alone (May 1900), he wished to introduce reforms, partly because of the situation in Morocco but also because of his own modernist outlook. He brought a quantity of machines and equipment in Europe, intending to build a railway to Fez, but chiefly he envisaged a reform of the Moroccan finances by decreeing that all taxpayers were equally liable to pay land-tax (tarîbîh). The violent reactions of the Moroccan tribes against the exacerbated rivalry of several of the European powers plunged Morocco in fresh disturbances that in 1908 'Abd al-'Aziz was forced to abdicate without his attempts at reform having produced any result.

Before he had relinquished power, his elder brother 'Abd al-Hafiz (1907-12 [q.v.]) was proclaimed sultan at Marrâkûsh in order to resist European encroachment, and he finally mounted the throne in 1908. But he was confronted by a financial crisis, tribes who were in an excitable state and ready to revolt, and European powers with heightened ambitions in Morocco. Like his predecessors, he acknowledged the need for the reforms which he was being urged to make by a number of Moroccans, who saw in them the only means of escaping from the hold of the European powers. One of these groups, based in France and reinforced by Syrrians expelled from Tunisia, went so far as to draw up a draft constitution, dated 24 June 1908 and published in a Tangier Arabic journal, Sawl al-Maghrib (French translation of it published by J. Robert, in La monarchie marocaine, Paris 1963, 311-23). This constitution was not adopted by the Moroccan government and the failure of various successive plans for reform led to the signing of the treaty of protectorate on 30 March 1912 at Fez by the sultan and M. Regnault, as representative of France.

Thus it can be seen that the attempts of the rulers in the 19th century to modernize the government of their respective countries were in vain because local opinion was completely unprepared for these changes, which it believed (not without some reason) to be a result of European influence, which it mistrusted, and because no ruler was strong enough over a sufficiently long period to impose a new system of government.

The European occupation of North Africa, mainly French, resulted in considerable changes in the organization of the governments there.

In Algeria, after an inevitable long period of trial and error, the government of the Republic, by the decree of 9 December 1848, divided the country into three departments under the direction, as in France, of prefects; before this the French citizens resident in Algeria had been given the right to send deputies to the National Assembly. It can be said that, as from 1848, in spite of various vicissitudes of no great importance, the administrative assimilation was recognized as an accomplished fact.

All the same, because the administration of the native population presented its own problems, a special department was instituted in Algeria, in 1857, and there was formed at an early date a real government of Algeria, consisting of a governor-general to whom were responsible for most of the time the various public services establishments locally. The office of governor-general was suppressed and replaced, from 24 June 1855 to 10 December 1860, by a minister for Algeria based in Paris. Then the government of the Third Republic, while restoring the governor-general,
made the various officials serving in Algeria directly responsible to their ministry in Paris. This experiment lasted until 31 December 1896, but proved so unsuccessful that the earlier system was restored. In both cases it had been apparent that overcentralization did not produce good results and that Algeria ought to be governed from within the country, under the authority of the French government and the control of the French parliament.

In fact it had been realized from the very first years after the conquest that the French administration needed to be applied without modification, since the customs, the reactions and the innermost beliefs of the Muslim population differed so greatly from those existing in France. Thus, in spite of the prefects, the laws and regulations and all the French institutions which were transplanted into Algeria, there existed always two systems of government, because the one country contained two entirely different populations without enough in common for a unification to be considered. This system began with the Arab bureaus, a military organization responsible for the administration of the Muslim populations, and ended in the statute of 20 September 1947 instituting in Algeria two electoral colleges: one for the Europeans and one for the Muslims, very unequal in number and in composition, however, since Muslim women were not given the vote until 1958.

The staff of the governor-general's office and of the administrative departments under it were usually of French nationality, and it was not until after the Second World War that Muslim Algerians began to occupy a few posts of responsibility in them. Thus the administration of Algeria during the French period was a hybrid one in which the metropolitan French and the French of Algeria played a preponderant rôle, while the Algerians themselves were reduced to a completely secondary position, in spite of their claims, and especially from 1936 onwards.
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three under-secretaries of state, and two directors, one of the broadcasting service, the other of the presidential cabinet. The functions and personnel of this ministry have remained unchanged, except for the death of the Secretary of State for Internal Affairs, who was immediately replaced.

In Morocco there were six successive ministerial cabinets between 4 December 1955 and the promulgation of the constitution of 7 December 1962, the last two of them presided over by the kings Muhammad V (26 May 1960) and Hassan II (2 June 1961). Once the institutions provided for by the constitution were established, King Hassan II appointed as Prime Minister Mr. Ahmad Ben Bella, who formed a cabinet composed of fourteen ministers and five under-secretaries of state. After a re-organization of ministerial posts in 20 August 1964, a new government was formed on 8 June 1965 under the presidency of the king and its composition was slightly altered on 10 July. These arrangements were made after the king had decided, on 7 June, to proclaim a state of emergency as provided for by article 35 of the constitution of 1962. The present government (December 1965) is composed of twenty ministers, three directors of the royal cabinet and two under-secretaries of state. It is responsible only to the king, parliament having been suspended for an indefinite period.

In Algeria, after the confused political crisis which followed the granting of independence, the Assembly elected on 20 September 1962 instructed Mr. Ahmad Ben Bella to form the Algerian government and to hold the office of Head of the Algerian State until a constitution should be worked out and promulgated. This government consisted of a vice-president and thirteen ministers. A reorganization of the cabinet followed the granting of independence, the Assembly having been suspended for an indefinite period.

Before independence, the area which is now East Pakistan formed part of the province of Bengal. This was the earliest territory in India to come under British rule, and was divided into administrative districts of enormous size: for example, the population of Mymensingh District is larger than that of Switzerland. The Collector of the district was the principal official responsible for public order and the collection of taxes. A District Judge was the head of the judiciary. Away from district headquarters, the only representatives of the government were police officers. The Governor of Bengal was assisted by a Council, from which evolved a Legislative Council, out of which Ministers were selected from 1919 onward to take charge of the departments of the provincial government.

The area which is now West Pakistan had none of the uniformity of administration described above. There were three provinces—Punjab, Sind, and the North-West Frontier Province—divided up into administrative districts, which were on a much smaller scale than in Bengal. Because these provinces were the last to be added to British India, there was a frontier character about the administration. At first, all the functions of government in the district (including the judicial) were exercised by one British officer, the Deputy Commissioner, though later separate District Judges were appointed. The Deputy Commissioner was assisted by a strong corps of officials, stationed at the lesser centres of the district. However, only about half of the area now in West Pakistan was under direct British administration. There were also a number of princely states, the largest being Bahawalpur and Kalat together with Amb, Chitral, Dir, and Swat. These were recognized as having complete internal autonomy: Kalat was subdivided into dependent chieftdoms, among which Khair-khan was semi-independent. In addition, a large portion of the North-West Frontier Province and a large part of Baluchistan (in which Kalat is situated) were treated as 'unadministered territory', in which the British law did not prevail. Here the tribes followed their own custom of long standing.

At the apex of the system, in charge of the whole of British India and in tutelary role over the princes, was the Governor-General. He was assisted in the
central administration by an Executive Council. The Members of Council each had charge of one or more departments of government.

Before the period of British rule, the Muslims had predominated in the administrative system. Gradually, the British substituted English for Persian as the language of higher administration while at the lower levels Persian and Urdu were replaced by the vernacular languages, such as Bengali. Also, appointment increasingly depended upon a competition in an open examination in which Western subjects were preferred to the classical, oriental subjects. In consequence, the traditional Muslim administrative families found themselves increasingly at a disadvantage. Their loss of administrative and judicial office was most striking in Bengal. In the old Bengal Presidency (which included Bihar and Orissa, as well as Bengal proper) the Muslims formed 31 per cent of the population, but by 1880 they held only 5.5% of the 'gazetted' (i.e., executive) posts. By contrast in Punjab, where Muslims formed 51% of the population they held 39% of the posts. However, the Muslims did succeed in retaining their position in some of the provinces. In the North-Western Provinces and Oudh (today called Uttar Pradesh, in the Indian Union) Muslims formed 13% of the population but held 45% of the gazetted posts. Throughout India, they retained 20% of gazetted posts: not much less than their proportion to the population of India. The heads of districts (Collectors and Deputy Commissioners) and all their superiors were drawn from the Indian Civil Service. This service was wholly British until 1853, when it was opened to competition under stringent conditions. A candidate from a reformist Hindu sect gained a place in 1864, and thereafter a small but steady stream of Hindus gained admission. The first Muslim was not appointed to the I.C.S. until 1885. By 1915, there were a total of 1,371 members of the I.C.S. Of these, 1,305 were British, 3 were Eurasian, 41 were Hindu, 6 were Parsi, 7 were Indian Christians and 9 were Muslim. However, during the last 25 years of British rule, the Muslims did succeed in securing more places in the I.C.S. At the time of independence there were about one hundred Muslim I.C.S. officers. Of these one third were Punjabi, the remainder came from areas which were to form the Indian Union. There were none belonging to East Bengal, where the standard of education was low.

In addition, Muslims had secured a fair proportion of places in other higher echelons of the public service, especially in the Audit and Accounts Service. Among members of this service, one (Chaudhri Muhammad 'Ali) was to become Prime Minister and another (Ghulam Muhammad) the Governor General of Pakistan. From 1918, Indians became eligible for the officer cadre of the Indian Army, and Muslims also obtained a proportion of appointments and promotions commensurate with their total numbers, with a preponderance of officers from Punjab and the North-West Frontier Province.

After independence (1947) the elite character of the higher civil service was perpetuated. The I.C.S. was replaced by the C.S.P. (Civil Service of Pakistan). Recruitment is by a modified form of competition. The top 20% of places are filled by merit on the basis of open examination; the remaining 80% are allotted in equal numbers to the two 'wings': East and West Pakistan. By 1961, the C.S.P. numbered 357 officers (including 26 still under training). This service continued to supply the great majority of district officers and senior officials in departments and ministries.

The main task in government in the new state of Pakistan was to hold together the two wings, separated by over one thousand miles of Indian territory, and to bring East and West Pakistan into a reasonable balance. The administrative variety of West Pakistan complicated the problem. Gradually, the different elements were reduced to one. The princely rulers of Bahawalpur and Kalat were deprived of their powers. In 1955, the West Pakistan Act created one unit, with its headquarters at Lahore. The tribal areas of Baluchistan and the North-West Frontier, together with the little states of Amb, Dir, Chitral and Swat were excluded from the control of West Pakistan, as was Karachi, the capital city. These remained directly under the central government.

The way was now open to producing a constitution for Pakistan. For the first nine years, the country continued to be governed under the Government of India Act of 1935, somewhat amended. This retained a Governor-General at the apex of the system with a large reserve of power in his hands. Ostensibly, the government was in the hands of a Prime Minister and Cabinet responsible to a national legislature, but actually power was largely exercised by the Governor-General (who, from 1951, was the former senior official, Ghulam Muhammad, followed by another senior official, Iskandar Mirza). Under these men, the administrators and the police officers virtually governed Pakistan.

The 1956 Constitution introduced a number of limitations upon the head of the state, who was now designated President. But political instability continued, and in 1958 the President declared an emergency and abolished the constitution. Iskandar Mirza's successor, General (later Field Marshal) Ayyub Khan further strengthened the position of the president, and under the 1962 constitution (Article 31) 'The executive authority of the Republic is vested in the President'.

In order to safeguard the armed forces, the constitution further provides (Article 238) that the Minister of Defence must be a person who has held the rank of Lieutenant-General, or its equivalent in the navy or air force. Other members of the President chooses the Council of Ministers without outside restriction. Ministers may participate in the proceedings of the National Assembly, but they are answerable to the President.

Shortly after the military revolution of 1958, the capital was moved from Karachi to Rawalpindi, pending the construction of a new capital, Islamabad, nearby. The Ministry of External Affairs remained at Karachi; all other ministries moved to Rawalpindi. There are eleven ministries: Defence; External Affairs; Finance; Commerce; Home and Kashmir Affairs; Industries and Natural Resources; Communications; Education and Information; Law and Parliamentary Affairs; Agriculture and Works; Health, Labour and Social Welfare. Important agencies are the Central Intelligence and the Federal Investigation. The head of the department is termed Secretary to Government. The senior hierarchy is composed of Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and Under Secretaries. In 1956, all 19 Secretaries belonged to the West wing, together with 36 of the 41 Joint Secretaries and 123 of the 133 Deputy Secretaries.
Resentment at alleged dominance by the West Wing causes constant agitation for wider autonomy for East Pakistan. Certain concessions have been made. The railways have been transferred from central to provincial control. The two provinces are administered by Governors, appointed by the President. The governors may be civil servants, army officers, or political leaders. Each province has a Secretariat, composed of the Departments which are under provincial control, such as education, public health, and agriculture. The provinces are divided up into major administrative areas called Divisions. There are four Divisions in the East and twelve in the West wing. The principal administrative area remains the district, under the Deputy Commissioner or Collector. There are 27 districts in the East and 51 districts and 17 divisions in the West wing.

An innovation carried out by President Ayub Khan is the creation of a consultative system of administration for economic, social and political development with its base among the people. Councils, known as Basic Democracies, are elected by the people at the village level and in the wards of the towns. These Union Councils send up members to sub-district councils (Thana or Taqsi Councils) and these in turn contribute to District Councils. At the lower levels, the representatives of the people (the Basic Democrats) predominate, but higher up the infusion of administrators and the technical services becomes stronger. Above these come Divisional and Provincial Councils in which one-third of the members are drawn from the Basic Democrats. A description of government in Pakistan would be incomplete without some reference to the rôle of the armed forces in government. Although the air force is modern and powerful, the main element is the army, with its armoured division and six (or more) infantry divisions. The army has many times been required to restore public order when the civil administration has lost control, while in times of public disaster (such as the cyclones which periodically devastate East Pakistan) the armed forces are the principal organizers of relief. Army officers have been called upon to administer the programme of the Basic Democracies, while the armed forces are authorized to take 10% of the candidates for the C.S.P., and in practice the percentage is often higher. Under these circumstances, it is important that the armed forces are, to an overwhelming degree, recruited from the West wing, mainly from Punjab and the North-West Frontier. In 1935, of the 900 army officers of the rank of Major and above, only 14 came from East Pakistan, and of the 680 air force officers, 40 came from the East.

This imbalance is unlikely to be altered for many years, and is a major cause of the movement for greater provincial autonomy which constantly agitates East Pakistan. However, it appears safe to predict that the two wings will not separate, and that Pakistan will remain a unique example of a single state and government resting upon the two sides of an interjacent state.

See further DUSTÜR-Pakistan, and PAKISTAN. (H. TINKER)

VI.—INDONESIA

From its beginnings in the early 17th century, the United East India Company's authority in the Indies had been exercised by a governor general, assisted by a Council of the Indies (Raad van Indië), with full local legislative and executive powers, but with ultimate control being strictly exercised by the Company's governing board, the Gentlemen Seventeen (Heren Zeventien) in Holland. When the Crown assumed the Company's responsibilities in 1800, the governmental machinery in the Indies remained by and large unchanged, a state of affairs which, in fact, continued even when the Dutch parliament in the years after 1848 wrested control over colonial matters from the royal prerogative (in the East Indian Government Act of 1854 and the Accounting Act of 1864). Though henceforth responsibility for colonial government and the colonial budget lay with a Minister of Colonies accountable to the Second Chamber, there were four Divisions in the East and twelve in the West wing. The principal administrative area remains the district, under the Deputy Commissioner or Collector. There are 27 districts in the East and 51 districts and 17 divisions in the West wing.

An innovation carried out by President Ayub Khan is the creation of a consultative system of administration for economic, social and political development with its base among the people. Councils, known as Basic Democracies, are elected by the people at the village level and in the wards of the towns. These Union Councils send up members to sub-district councils (Thana or Taqsi Councils) and these in turn contribute to District Councils. At the lower levels, the representatives of the people (the Basic Democrats) predominate, but higher up the infusion of administrators and the technical services becomes stronger. Above these come Divisional and Provincial Councils in which one-third of the members are drawn from the Basic Democrats.

A description of government in Pakistan would be incomplete without some reference to the rôle of the armed forces in government. Although the air force is modern and powerful, the main element is the army, with its armoured division and six (or more) infantry divisions. The army has many times been required to restore public order when the civil administration has lost control, while in times of public disaster (such as the cyclones which periodically devastate East Pakistan) the armed forces are the principal organizers of relief. Army officers have been called upon to administer the programme of the Basic Democracies, while the armed forces are authorized to take 10% of the candidates for the C.S.P., and in practice the percentage is often higher. Under these circumstances, it is important that the armed forces are, to an overwhelming degree, recruited from the West wing, mainly from Punjab and the North-West Frontier. In 1935, of the 900 army officers of the rank of Major and above, only 14 came from East Pakistan, and of the 680 air force officers, 40 came from the East.

This imbalance is unlikely to be altered for many years, and is a major cause of the movement for greater provincial autonomy which constantly agitates East Pakistan. However, it appears safe to predict that the two wings will not separate, and that Pakistan will remain a unique example of a single state and government resting upon the two sides of an interjacent state.

See further DUSTÜR-Pakistan, and PAKISTAN. (H. TINKER)
virtual bureaucratic monopoly on the reins of colonial government having failed, the dichotomy between democracy at home and autocracy in the Indies continued until the turn of the 20th century. Beginning in 1903, a few cautious attempts at decentralization were made, and municipalities, in particular, henceforth came to enjoy a modicum of self-rule which, however, benefited the European settlers rather than the natives. It took almost another fifteen years for more far-reaching reforms to be introduced. The first attempt to introduce a semblance of democracy to Batavia of an advisory chamber, the Volksraad (People's Council), which opened in 1918. Shortly thereafter, and in part guided by the recommendations of a Commission appointed by the Governor General in 1918, the home government enacted more far-reaching decentralization legislation, providing an administrative and in part also political underpinning for the hastily-born central People's Council. At the same time, the new basic law for the Indies (Indische Staatsinrichting) of 1925 opened the way towards greater colonial autonomy vis-à-vis the metropolitan parliament, especially with regard to the budget. Decentralization within the Indies—limited to Java until the mid-1930's—attempted to free the native administrative corps, largely recruited from among the Javanese aristocracy, from the micromanagement of European officers in the BinneAland Bestuur. New territorial corporate entities—Provinces and Regencies (regentschappen)—were called into being for purposes of administrative devolution, but also to provide lower-level conciliar bodies, the Provincial and Regency Councils; these were filled partly through appointments though to a larger extent through elections based on a rather narrow franchise. The 6o-odd Regency Councils acted as electoral college for the island's three Provincial Councils which, in turn, served in the same capacity for the Volksraad.

The quasi-democratic scaffolding hastily if belatedly attached to the bureaucratic polity had barely two decades in which to be consolidated before the Japanese occupation of the Indonesian islands. Its success in that short period was uneven, greatest perhaps at the centre, where the Volksraad in spite of many shortcomings, was more than a freely elected inter alia boycotted by many nationalist groups—provided some kind of schooling in modern political procedures. In the late 1920's it acquired a bare Indonesian majority and was also granted co-legislative powers, especially significant with regard to the annual budget. But the increasing radicalization of Indonesian political life, highlighted by armed revolts in 1926-7, and the subsequent strengthening of the bureaucratic apparatus, greatly reduced the usefulness of the Volksraad. Coming so soon after the sweeping decentralization measures had been introduced, the resurgence of bureaucratic power also considerably inhibited the proper functioning of the lower conciliar bodies. When administrative decentralization was extended to the Outer Territories in the late 1930's, it was almost wholly devoid of the political experimentation that had taken place in Java. Dutch rule thus bequeathed to Indonesia a basically centralized state structure still dominated by officialdom, and with only some incipient and frail features of democratic self-rule.

In spite of its brevity, the Japanese interregnum in Indonesia (1942-5) wrought several far-reaching changes in the Dutch system. Quite apart from the temporary dismemberment of the archipelago (the different islands were administered by separate military commands), the Japanese dismissed Dutch officials, replacing them by Japanese and Indonesians, and in the place of the Western-style, quasi-democratic deliberative bodies they provided appointive councils of extremely limited competency. It was in the field of agitational politics, however, that major changes occurred which, combined with Japanese organizational innovations, profoundly affected the population, most notably the younger generation. This rapid mobilization of Indonesian political life, sharpened by ideological cleavages and by the rise to political prominence of military and paramilitary forces, stood in marked contrast to the basically unaltered conservatism of the increasingly Indonesianized bureaucratic administrative machinery. Governmental authoritarianism, albeit in a more ruthlessly arbitrary form, was similarly unaffected by the change in colonial overlord.

Indonesian independence (proclaimed in August 1945) and the subsequent four-year struggle against Dutch military attempts at re-colonization sharply raised the politicization of Indonesian society. The first provisional constitution of the Indonesian Republic [see DUSTRK], promulgated only three weeks after the Japanese surrender and still influenced by Japanese tutelage, provided for a presidential form of government. An elected legislative assembly was envisaged under the constitution, but owing to the revolution and continued armed conflict with the Dutch, national elections took place only in 1955. In the interim, an appointed Central Indonesian National Committee functioned as a legislature; its prestige was considerably heightened when late in 1945 cabinet responsibility was shifted to the (numerically augmented) Committee which very soon was greatly influenced by the emerging political organizations, prominent among them the Nationalist, Masjumi (Muslim), and Socialist parties.

The republican organs of government were only operational in some parts of Indonesia, most notably in Java and Sumatra. Elsewhere, the return of Dutch military forces and administrative personnel inaugurated a wide variety of semi-autonomous 'states' under the Dutch aegis, culminating in the late 1940's in sixteen distinct political entities (including the United States of Indonesia). It was in this bicausural Republic of the United States of Indonesia that the Dutch transferred sovereignty in December 1949; but within less than a year the federal charter gave way to Indonesia's third provisional constitution (1950) which, in turn, remained in force for less than a decade. It established a unitary and parliamentary system. Cabinets were based on coalitions among the three major parties [see U22, viii] that had gained prominence (Nationalists, Masjumi, and Nahdlatul Ulama [Muslim Scholars' Party]) before, but especially after, the general elections of 1955. The fourth important group, the Communist Party, remained outside the government coalitions, though wielding increasing influence at the centre and particularly among the electorate. During the interim period, the liberal-democratic system, though far from properly rooted in Indonesia's political culture, appeared to be working fairly smoothly, a beginning being made with political decentralization proper: regional and local government devolved on elective assemblies. But growing ideological polarization between Islamic and 'secular' groupings—particularly pronounced in the Constituent Assembly, likewise elected in 1955—, proliferation of parties coupled with lack of internal party discipline,
cabinet instability, continued international frustrations caused by the Netherlands’ retention of West New Guinea (Irian Barat), economic deterioration coupled with regional discontent, but also increasing military interference in the political process—all these adverse factors helped to discredit constitutional government among members of the élite and wide sectors of the political public.

In the wake of widespread armed revolt and threatened secession in the outer territories, both the central military authorities and the chief executive embarked on a progressively authoritarian course. The president abrogated the deadlocked Constituent Assembly, proscribed some parties, most notably Maṣjumi, and from 1957 on gradually inaugurated a new political system, “Guided Democracy”. The Republic’s first provisional constitution of 1945, which was reinstated by presidential decree (July 1959), provided the legal basis for the new order. Parliamentary government had thus been forced to yield to a centralized system not too dissimilar, in substance, to earlier forms. The instrumentalities of Guided Democracy, created in piecemeal fashion and by no means clearly coordinated, before long overshadowed the parliament which—reflecting the steep decline of the political parties—was in fact reconstituted as a ‘Mutual Aid’ legislature on an appointive basis in 1960, its membership enlarged by several ‘functional’ groups, particularly the military. New and often unwieldy bodies with overlapping authorities and duties were rapidly added at the president’s behest and choosing, including the High Advisory Council and the People’s Provisional Consultative Assembly (both in fact provided for in the 1945 charter), as well as a National Planning Council, and for that matter a presidential cabinet comprising some 90 ministers. It was the Consultative Assembly (not the parliament), with a membership exceeding six hundred, that served as the nation’s de jure supreme body, empowered to elect the chief executive who, in turn, was accountable to it.

The smooth working of Guided Democracy did not, however, overly depend on the formal structural arrangements that appeared to be lacking in cohesion. Actual political power had been drained from the ten or so political parties still permitted to exist, with the partial exception of the Communist Party, whose massive organization constituted one of the real foci of political strength. It was paralleled and counterbalanced by the increasingly well-disciplined army, whose active participation in political and administrative matters had steadily grown as a result of internal disorder and foreign confrontations (with the Netherlands first, and the Federation of Malaysia thereafter). The army had also been the prime beneficiary of the nationalization of most foreign-owned enterprises, and of the dismantling of the political parties’ strength in the decentralized organs of local and regional government. At the apex of Guided Democracy stood the president, its founder and ideologue par excellence, invested with lifelong executive powers during the Consultative Assembly’s first session. By the early 1960s’ Indonesia’s military essentially moved ever closer to a highly personalized if not autocratic system of government. Yet while the president’s legal as well as extra-legal powers were very wide indeed, they were circumscribed less so formally than by the existence of other power factors.

A major political upheaval which started in October 1965 and whose causes and ramifications have remained partly obscured at the time of writing (mid-1960) may be expected to have profound effects on Indonesian government, even though the fragile constitutional framework of Guided Democracy has for the time being survived. One major result of these momentous events has been the decimation, if not the virtual destruction, of the Communist Party, achieved with the aid of militant Muslim groups. Another, though far less clearcut, result is a seeming diminution of the powers of the president, shorn of his lifetime incumbency by the fourth plenary session of the People’s Provisional Consultative Assembly. As of the mid-1960s’ the army appeared to be the major beneficiary of the political restructuring, to all appearances wielding power in a barely less authoritarian and centralized manner than that of the immediately preceding system. Whether political democracy could, or would, once again be grafted upon this old-new structure and whether, if once more attempted, it would strike stronger roots than before, must remain open questions.
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HULÁ, “ornaments, personal jewellery” [see Libás].

HÔLA, a town reported to be in Nadžd, Central Arabia. The description of this town published in EY, s.v., was apparently based only on a report by W. Palgrave (Central and Eastern Arabia, London 1885, 1, 361 and map). The name, of which there is no modern knowledge or historical record, is erroneous; Palgrave’s description may actually refer to al-Hawta [g.v.], a town to the north of Hula’s reported location. (J. MANDAVILLE)

AL-HÔLA, present-day name of the lake in Israel (35° 40’ E. and 33° 10’ N.), to the south of Mount Hermon not far from the sources of the Jordan, which flow into it. This lake, triangular in shape and 5-6 km. long, issues in the river Jordan at its southern extremity. It is 189 m. below sea-level and thus 256 metres above the level of the lake of Tiberias. Its water is fresh and it is famed for its fish and its aquatic birds. The plain which surrounds it, ard al-Hûla, was formerly a vast swamp covered with papyrus, reeds and giant water-lilies. The marshes in this basin are now almost all drained as a result of the widening and deepening of the bed of the Jordan. Thus the region now comprises
extensive areas of cultivation. But irrigation raises the problem of the distribution of the water among the adjacent countries. This lake has borne throughout the ages various names. The name al-Hula seems to derive from the Aramaean Oualatha, a place mentioned by Josephus. This name was used in 23 B.C. by Caesar, when he made over to Herod the inheritance of Zenodorus, consisting of Oualatha, Paneas and the surrounding region. Josephus calls the lake Semachonitis, and the Talmud Samachai. It is identified with the waters of Mesopotamia, where Joshua defined the arm of Japheth, King of Hazor (Joshua, XI, 5-7). Arabic writers sometimes refer such as al-Kaṭharshehni and Abu l-Fida (see). Sometimes it is reduced to the name of Lake of Baniyās (q.v.), probably because of its proximity to the town of this name. They also mention it under the name of Buhayrat Kadas, from the name of an ancient Hebrew town, the ruins of which are found on top of the mountain; Abu Shama refers to the lake as al-Mallaha (a place to the north-west possessing a good spring), a name also used by William of Tyre. There should also be mentioned the name of Babr al-Khayt, still in use by the local population today.

The names of al-Hula and Buhayrat Kadas have also been given to a lake situated between Hims and Tarabulus, which is often confused with the Palestine lake. It is the lake at Hims to which Abu l-Fida refers when he writes that in 584/1188 Salatī al-Dīn made his camp on the shores of the lake of Kadas; al-Dimashqī confuses the two localities: he refers to the lake of Kadas situated between Hims and Mount Lebanon and adds that the town of Kadas, which gave its name to the lake, was taken by Shurabgil b. Ḥasanā, whereas it was in fact the town in Galilee which the latter conquered.


HULAGÜ (Hulagu or rather Hulā'ū, the inter-vocalic ā being purely graphic), the Mongol conqueror and founder of the dynasty of the Il-Khāns (q.v.) of Persia, born ca. 1217, was the grandson of Čingiz-Khān (q.v.) by the latter's youngest son Toluy (q.v.). Sent by his brother the Great Khān Möngke at the head of an army against the Ismā'īlīs and the Caliph, he left Mongolia in the autumn of 1253, proceeding at a leisurely pace along the rivers for the easier passage of his forces. He delighted to live in north-western Adharbayjān, on the mountain; Abu Shama refers to the lake as the lake of Kadas situated between Hims and Mount Lebanon, was taken by Shurabgil b. Ḥasanā, whereas it was in fact the town in Galilee which the latter conquered.


HULAGÜ (Hulagu or rather Hule'ū, the inter-vocalic ā being purely graphic), the Mongol conqueror and founder of the dynasty of the Il-Khāns (q.v.) of Persia, born ca. 1217, was the grandson of Čingiz-Khān (q.v.) by the latter's youngest son Toluy (q.v.). Sent by his brother the Great Khān Möngke at the head of an army against the Ismā'īlīs and the Caliph, he left Mongolia in the autumn of 1253, proceeding at a leisurely pace along the rivers for the easier passage of his forces. In 23 B.C. he entered into the meadows of Kan-i Gul near Samarqand, where he remained till the beginning of the year November; and it was not till 1256 that he finally crossed the Oxus. Here he received the homage of most of the petty rulers of Persia and the Caucasus area; in the course of the year 1256 the greater part of the Ismā'īlī strongholds were taken without difficulty; on the fall of the dynasty see ALAMŪT, NIZĀRĪ. On 10 Muḥarram 656/17 January 1258 the Caliph's army was routed in a pitched battle; on 15 Muḥarram 656/22 January Hulagu in person sat down before Baghdad, which surrendered on 4 Safar/10 February; for details of the execution of the Caliph and the sacking of his capital see BAGDAD. An attempt made in 658/1260 to conquer Syria failed. Hulagu succeeded in taking Aleppo, and Damascus, deserted by its defenders, surrendered without a blow; but news of the death of the Great Khān caused him to return to Persia. The army he had left behind was destroyed by the Egyptians at ‘Ayn Djalūt (q.v.) in Palestine on 25 Ramadan 658/3 September 1260. On the unsuccessful war with the Golden Horde in 660/1262 see BERKE.

The petty kingdoms in Djazīra, Kurdistan and Asia Minor as well as the Christian territories south of the Caucasus were incorporated as vassal states in the kingdom founded by Hulagu so that his power stretched from the Oxus almost to the Mediterranean and from the Caucasus to the Indian Ocean. The sovereign took the title of Il-Khān ("subordinate khan") and he and his successors down to Ghazān Khān (q.v.) reigned in the name of the Great Khān in Mongolia (afterwards in China). The Christian element amongst his subjects was particularly favoured by Hulagu, and especially by his Christian wife Dokūz Khatun, often to the detriment of the Muslims. The towns destroyed during his wars were in part rebuilt even in Hulagu's time; he himself in times of peace delighted to live in north-western Aḏgharbayjān, particularly on the banks of Lake Urmīya, where many edifices, such as the famous observatory on a hill north of Marāḡa, a palace in Ala-Ṭagh, Buddhist temples in Khūy, etc. were constructed. He restored a strong castle (on the earlier fortification of Yākūt, i, 513) on the mountainous island of Shāhī (now Shaḩī). The remains still survive, according to the archaeologist E. F. Schmidt, “on the almost inaccessible summit of a great rock rising a thousand feet above the shore of the island.” Here he kept the treasures won in battle in Persia and elsewhere, and here was the burial place both of Hulagu himself and of his successor Abākā. Hulagu died on 19 Rabi` II 662/Februay 1265. In accordance with the Mongol custom several beautiful young women were buried with him; this is the last occasion on which human victims are mentioned in connection with the funeral of a Čingizid prince.


(H. BARTHOLOM.-J. A. BOYLE)

HULAGŪ, a Mongol noble of Lāhwār (Lahore), whose brief rise to power in that city in about 735/1335 was symptomatic of the general resentment felt at Muhammad b. Tughūk's rule. When the sultan had left Dīhil for the south of India to put down the
rebellion of Djalal al-Din Ahsan [q.v.] Hulagu lolled Tatar Khan, governor of Lahawr, appointed Gul rebellion of Djalal al-Din Ahsan Tatar Khan, governor of Lahawr, appointed Gul rebels were sent to imprisonment at Gwaliyar the rebellion must have been on a considerable scale. put down the rebellion; since 300 widows of the Khwazlr his independence. On the news reaching Dihli, the Khilafah Hulagu called the rebel Hulajw and his minister Kuldj. and in connexion with this they believe in the transmission of spirits, intihal. With reference to Sura XV, 29, f. they believe that God is embodied in every beautiful being and they therefore make sufjud before a pretty form. This point is mentioned, without names, by al-Ash'ari (d. 327/938) in Makdad al-Islamiyin (ed. Ritter, Bibl. Isl., 1929, 214), and by Mutahhar al-Makdisi, K. al-Badwa 'l-tarikh; ii (composed 355/966), ed. Cl. Huart, Paris 1901, 91 (text) and 81 (tr.). (2) They feel themselves, by their professed knowledge of God, relieved of all prohibitions and thus advocate licentiousness. Hugdjiwiri says that they are connected with "the Sâlimi sect of anthromorphists". These formed a philosophical madkhab in Baqra in the 3rd/9th century. Ibn Sâlim professed God's continued creation, for instance in the voices of reciters of the Kur'an, and he had the idea that God 'on the Day of Judgment will appear in a corporeal human shape, visible to the human eye. There may be some connection on this point, but the pretended tendency to ibâha of the Hulmîyana does not harmonize with the earnest asceticism of Ibn Sâlim and Abu Tâlib al-Makki, who calls him "our shaykh" (Kût al-kulbul, Cairo 1322, ii, 172, i1, 12-35) and who writes in his spirit. Al-Makki does not mention Abu Hulmán, nor does al-Qâzáli, but he concerns himself with the ideas of the Hulmîyana and refutes their works. Thus, in Ihyâ 'ulâm al-din, iv, 218 f. (ed. Cairo 1922) he condemns people who claim to appropriate to themselves divine character and the embodiment thereof through huqul, whereas God has reserved the perfect beauty for Himself. In al-Muhsid al-ansa (Cairo 1322, 110, 114 f.) al-Qâzáli speaks of sûfs who pretend to borrow (isti'âra) God's names and sifât and thus imply huqul. And in Mughbât al-anwâr (Cairo 1922, 51) we find the interesting remark that the idea of God's manifestation in everything of beauty, be it in man, animal or plant, to which the believers make sufjud as to their gods, is to be found among "the farthest Turks who have no religion and no shar'id". Bibliography: Abd al-Kâhir al-Baghîdâdi, K. al-Farîk bayna 'l-turk, Cairo 1328/1910, 215, 247, 245 f.; Hugdjiwiri, Kâtib al-albâbîn, trans. Nicholson, London 1936, 131, 260; L. Massignon, Al-Hallaj, i, Paris 1922, 362; idem, K. al-Tawâdûn, Paris 1913, 171. HULUL signifies etymologically, among other things, the act of loosing, of unfastening, of untying, or with bi or fi, of alighting at a place. Hence its various meanings in the Muslim religious sciences and in falsafa.

In grammar, *hulul* denotes the occurrence of the accident of inflexion (*ittihād*); (2) in law it denotes the application of a prescription; (3) in Hellenistic philosophy (*falsafa*). It denotes: (a) the inhesion of an accident in an object (*ma'addān*); cf. A.-M. Goichon, *Lexique de la langue philosophique d’ Ibn Sīnā*, Paris 1938, nos. 179 and 184; (b) the substantial union of soul and body: *hulul* al-rūḥ fi ’l-badan (al-Fārābī, *Āl al-madānah al-fajlīa*, Cairo 1906, 80); *hulul* al-lāhāl fi l-nūṣlīrāl (*cf. al-Hallāj*); (4) in theology (*kalām*), and mysticism (*taťawwul*), *hulul* expresses "infusion", the indwelling of God in a creature (see further *inma*, *tašāsuh*); it is often a synonym for *ittihād*. (q.v.).

The upholders of atomism, together with al-Ashʿarī, admit the *hulul* of soul in body because they consider the *rūḥ* (the soul) to be a rarefied body, even in the case of angels and demons; but, like the other mutakallimūn, they reject *hulul* in meaning (4).

Muslim authors give various descriptive definitions (*rusūm*) of *hulul*. For some it is the appropriation of one thing by another, or the "infusion" of one thing into another, such that when one is described the other is also described, whether this identification be as the "infusion" of sciences in intellectual beings. The following definition is also found: *al-* *hulul* is qualifying appropriation (*al-tibbātās al-'nādīd*), that is to say the appropriate dependence of two terms which makes one the qualifier and the other the thing qualified. The first is called *al-* *hāl* or the second *al-* *mahāl*. An example is the dependence of the whiteness that covers a body. Finally, *hulul* has also been defined as the existence of one thing in another in a dependent fashion (*al-* *hulul* *al-* *ālāt saḥīl al- tabāsīyya*), a definition that is virtually equivalent to the preceding one.

Two kinds of *hulul* are distinguished: (1) one extensive (*al-* *hulul* al- *saraydīn*) when the infuser (*al-* *hāl*) spreads to all parts of the receptive object (for example, the water rising in the stem of a flower); (2) the other generalized (*al-* *hulul* al- *nalāzīn*) or divided (*al-* *hulul* al- *usṭ-radius*). The "infusion" stands as an equivalent to "inhesion", or metaphorical "inhesion". The following definition is also found: *al-* *hulul* is qualifying appropriation (*al-* *tibbātās al-* *nādīd*), that is to say the appropriate dependence of two terms which makes one the qualifier and the other the thing qualified. The first is called *al-* *hāl* or the second *al-* *mahāl*. An example is the dependence of the whiteness that covers a body. Finally, *hulul* has also been defined as the existence of one thing in another in a dependent fashion (*al-* *hulul* *al-* *ālāt saḥīl al- tabāsīyya*), a definition that is virtually equivalent to the preceding one.

Two kinds of *hulul* are distinguished: (1) one extensive (*al-* *hulul* al- *saraydīn*) when the infuser (*al-* *hāl*) spreads to all parts of the receptive object (for example, the water rising in the stem of a flower); (2) the other localized (*al-* *hulul* al- *nalāzīn*) or divided (*al-* *hulul* al- *usṭ-radius*). The "infusion" stands as an equivalent to "inhesion", or metaphorical "inhesion". The following definition is also found: *al-* *hulul* is qualifying appropriation (*al-* *tibbātās al-* *nādīd*), that is to say the appropriate dependence of two terms which makes one the qualifier and the other the thing qualified. The first is called *al-* *hāl* or the second *al-* *mahāl*. An example is the dependence of the whiteness that covers a body. Finally, *hulul* has also been defined as the existence of one thing in another in a dependent fashion (*al-* *hulul* *al-* *ālāt saḥīl al- tabāsīyya*), a definition that is virtually equivalent to the preceding one.

These various precise definitions have enabled Muslim theologians to refute the idea of God's *hulul* in creatures: (1) such a *hulul* would exclude absolute necessity in God; (2) it would involve the existence of two eternals (God and the receptive object); (3) (God) would become divisible through the division of the receptive object, unless the latter were reduced to an atom, which is unworthy of God.

We see in al-Djurjānī-Tāštāzānī (*Sharḥ al-mawābih*, second marāṣid of the *ilāhiyyāt*, fifih *mahṣad*) how the upholders of *hulul* are classed: (1) the Christians (according to their various positions); (2) the Nusayris and the Igrākāriyya; (3) certain Sophists whose doctrines lie between *ittihād* and *hulul*. Their position, says al-Tāštāzānī, comes round again to that of the Christians.

Muslim authors normally call the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation *hulul*, although Christian authors speak of *taʻannus*, *tajaddud*, and also of *ittihād*. They sometimes use the verb *halla* to say that the Word "descended" into a human nature, or to speak of the descent of the Holy Spirit.

The Sunnis and Shiʿīs condemn the following sects as *hululīyya*, on the same grounds as the Christians: (a) the extreme Shiʿīs (*ghulūd*): Sabāʾīyya, Bayānīyya, Dījānīyya, Khattāṭīyya, Namūnīyya (*Nuṣayriyya, Mukanīyya, Rūzāmīyya, Bātīmīyya, *ʿAzākūra, Druses); (b) Sunni Ṣufis: Ḥusnīyya, Fārsīyya, *ṣīḥat al-ḥulul* (*cf. al-Hallāj*), Shabbāṣīyya; (c) Monists: *Itti- bādīyya* (Ibn Taymiyya refers to their *wāḥdāt al- wudūjād as *hulul* *muṣāb*); cf. *tajaddud al-ʾamāl* according to al-Fargānī, *Munāha l-madārīh*, Cairo 1293, ii, 84-6; cf. *Ibn al-ʿArabī*.


(L. Massignon-[G. C. Amawati])

**HULWĀN**, in Greek Ὠλών, a very ancient town which was situated near the entrance to the Pay- tak pass through the Zagros range, on the famous Khūrāsān highway. Its site has been identified with that of the present-day village of Sar-i Pul-i Duhūbā, which is 33 km. east by south of Kaṣīr-i ʿShīrīn (q.v.) (see H. C. Rawlinson, *Notes on a march from Zohāb to Khudūd*, in *JRS*, London, ix (1890), 46, and the *Guide Bleu, Moyen Orient*, Paris 1956, 605).

In Assyrian times the town was known as Khalman. In those days the town was situated on the natural frontier between Babylonia and Media (see Ritter, *Erkunde*, ix, 388). According to an Arab tradition quoted by al-Ṭabarī (see Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber*, 138), the town was founded by the Sāsānian monarch Kavādh (d. 531), but it is clearly far more ancient than that. From other Muslim sources it would seem that Kavadh established a land survey office in Hulwān, and that registers were kept there until after the Muslim conquest of *Aramey* (A. K. S. Lambton, *Landlord and peasant in Persia*, London 1953, 15, n. 3; cf. Dāfarī, 78a).

After the great victory of the Muslim Arabs at al-Кāsīdiyya (q.v.) in 616 and the subsequent evacuation of Ctesiphon by the Sāsānian court, al-Mādrīdī returned to Hulwān for a time, before continuing his eastward flight. Hulwān fell into the hands of the advancing Arabs. Hulwān then and for some time after was a flourishing town in a fertile district producing much fruit. The town was surrounded by a wall which had 8 gates; the principal mosque was in the centre, inside an ancient castle. The Jews had a synagogue there. Towards the end of the 4th/early 11th century, Hulwān was ruled by a quasi-independent dynasty which had been founded by Muhammad ibn ʿAnnāz and it became very well known under his son Abu ʿl-Šawāk [see *Annāzīds*]. The anonymous author of the *Hudūd al-ʾAjlām* (139) described Hulwān as "a very pleasant town, traversed by a river. It produces figs which are dried and exported everywhere".

Hulwān was taken by the Saljuqs in 347/1056, who set it on fire; its destruction was completed by an earthquake 3 years later. It was subsequently
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rebuilt on a smaller scale and it is now known as Sar-i Pul-i Dhuhab.

Bibliography: further to references in the text: Bibl. Geogr. Arab., ed. de Goeje, index; Yâkût, ii, 316; Le Strange, 191; B. Spuler, Iran, index.

(L. LOCKHART)

HULWAN, town situated twenty five kilometres south of Cairo, four kilometres from the right bank of the Nile and approximately 35 metres above bank level. Hulwan is linked by road and rail with Cairo and is a rapidly growing industrial complex, containing a large steel works and the electricity generating plant for south Cairo. At the 1990 census, its inhabitants numbered about 95,000.

Historically, Hulwan derives its fame from its mineral springs. It would appear that the site was settled in Pharaonic times, for during the excavations of 1946 graves and pottery dating from the First Dynasty were uncovered; remains of Roman baths were also discovered. However, it was not until the period following the Arab conquest and the governorship of Abd al-Aziz Ibn Marwan that substantial settlement occurred upon the site. According to al-Maqrizi, when ‘Abd al-Aziz Ibn Marwan was forced to evacuate Fustat during the disastrous flood of the year 70/690, he moved south towards what is now Hulwan. The position pleased him, possibly because of its proximity to Fustat and its being above the level of the Nile flood. He set up his residence there, built palaces and mosques and planted palm gardens and vineyards. He also ordered the construction of a niometer; this was replaced by the niometer constructed on the island of Rawda in 967/975.

During the governorship of ‘Abd al-Aziz Ibn Marwan, Hulwan continued to prosper and its fame was celebrated in verse by the poet Ibn Kays al-Rukayyat. After Umayyad times, its position declined and, by the Mamluk period, the palaces and mosques had disappeared and the source of the mineral springs had become filled with sand. During the reign of the Khedive Abbas, the springs were uncovered and a centre was established at Hulwan for the treatment of soldiers suffering from skin diseases and rheumatism. Under Isma’îl and Tawfîk, Hulwan continued to grow and Isma’îl built there a palace for his mother (Kawar al-Wâlida). Baths were built near the springs in 1860 and, as the construction progressed, the remains of the Umayyad baths were discovered. The present baths were completed in 1892. On the banks of the Nile, adjacent to Hulwan, King Farouk (Faruk) built for himself a summer residence; this was subsequently known as Ru’kn Hulwan and became a museum and public park.


(J. M. B. JONES)

HULWAN, “douceur”, “donative” [see in ‘AM‘, MÃL AL-BAY‘A‘, FISKÂRA‘.

HUMÁ’(v.), the bearded vulture (Gypaetus barbatus), the largest of the birds of prey of the Old World, which is usually found in the regions of perpetual snow; it carries off the bones of dead animals, breaks on rocks and eats the fragments, which led the Persian poet Sa’dî to say that the humá‘ was superior to all the other birds because instead of feeding on living flesh it ate only bones (Gulistân, i, story 15). It was thought that anyone who intentionally killed a humá‘ would die within forty days. That this bird was considered to be of good omen is illustrated by another verse of the Gulistân (i, story 3): “Nobody will go to seek for the shadow of the owl, even if there were no humá‘ in the world”; it was believed in the ancient world that the shadow of the humá‘ falling on a person’s head predicted his elevation to royalty: thus this verse of the Bûsûdân (ed. Furughi, 26, v. 15): “I wished that, thanks to my fortunate star, the wing of the humá‘ would be spread out over my head”. Hence the epithet humâ‘yân (lit. meaning “august, royal, fortunate, of good omen”), and humâ‘y with the same meaning, which has become a proper name: e.g., Humâ‘y, the mobâd’ of Bahram Gûr, and Humâ‘y, daughter of Gushasp (Wolff, Glossar, s.v.). Humâ‘y, sister of the hero Isfandiyâr (Shâh-nâmâ, Tehran 1935, vi, 1613-4, v. 2077; tr. Mohl, iv, 428), Humâ‘y (Ar. Humâ‘yâ), daughter and wife of Bahman (Araxetxes) son of Isfandiyâr and daughter of Dârâb (Tehrân ed., vi, 1755 f.; tr. Mohl, v, xi-16; see Dârâb). Humâ‘y is the name of the prince of Zaminî ‘Alav and Humâ‘yân that of the princess of China in the verse romance by Khâdîjî Kîrmânî [see Kîrmânî]. The humá‘ is mentioned several times in Firdawsi’s Book of kings: the royal crown is sometimes ornamented with humâ‘ feathers; a steed seems like a humá‘ in full flight; the wings of the humá‘ cover a fortress with their shadow; a place is so terrifying that even the humá‘ is afraid to fly over it (for other examples, see Wolff, s.v.); in short, the poet makes use of the humá‘ to create striking images, but does not attribute to it the magical powers which he gives to the simârîg [s.v.]. On the statement of the Fihrist that the Thousand and one nights were written for the queen Humâ‘y, daughter of Bahman, see ALF LAYLA WA-LAYLA, col. 561a.


(H. HUART-[H. MASSÈ]

HUMÂN B. YÚSUF [see HAWWÂRA (Egypt and the Sudan)],

HUMÂN AL-DIN B. ‘ALÂ‘ TABRIZI, Persian poet of the Mongol period who was for some time vizier of Ardashîrâyûn. He was held in great esteem by contemporary men of standing such as Rashîd al-Din Fa‘îl Allâh and Shâms al-Din Muhammad Djwuwânî, the Safîb-Dawwân. In 866/1492-3 he accompanied the latter to Rûm for the sequestration of the property of the Pârâmîn Mu‘în al-Din—an event to which he alludes in his poems. Towards the end of his life he became the disciple of Shaykh Sa’îd Farghânî, and after performing the hajj, retired to the khânâbâh in which he had founded at Tabrîz with some financial assistance from the Safîb-Dawwân. Several sources state that he died in 713/1313-4 but in the Mudjam al-Yâsîbî it is mentioned that his death took place in 714/1314-5 at the age of 116. His poems were collected on the instructions of Rashîd al-Din Fa‘îl Allâh and edited posthumously with a preface in which he alludes at the age of his death was given as 78. He was buried in his khânâbâh at Tabrîz.

Humân has left a Dvin of 2,000 verses including some Arabic kasidahs in praise of Nadîm al-Din ‘Abd al-Ghaffâr, the Kâdî al-Kudât Mu‘în al-Din, Shaykh Ibrâhîm b. Sa‘îd al-Din Hamawi, Kutb al-Din Shirazi, and the Safîb-Dawwân. Some of his Persian poems are in praise of Ghâzân Khan. His kasâsals,
though elegant enough, show no outstanding originality but imitate for the most part the style of Sa’di. In nearly all the biographical notices of Humayd, his meeting with Sa’di is mentioned but there is no evidence for this in the works of either poet. One of his qasids appears to have been plagiarized by Sa’di and many of his poems are responses to a single bayt of Sa’di.

In addition to āsadīs and qasids, Humayd wrote a mystical mathnawi in the Ḥasaṣī metre entitled Suhbat-nama. This was dedicated to Sharaf al-Dīn Hūrūn, the son of the Ṣāḥib-Dīwān. R. S. Brown, iii, 152-4; Dawlat-shāh, 228-9; Muḥṣīl al-Faṣṣīḥ (ed. Farrukh), 22; Muḥammad ‘All Tariyābī, Dānṣīngīmān-dī Aḏāḥārādyādīn (Tehran 1314/1935-6 edition), 396-8 (containing an extract from the Suhbat-nama); ʿUṯlī All Bī Ṣāḥār, ʿAṣīghāda (ed. Nasīrī), 145-6; Rīdā Ḥūlī Ḥūyādī, Muḥṣīl al-Faṣṣīḥ (Tehran 1340/1961-2 edition), iii, 1449.

Selections from the Dīwān have been twice published: (a) Manṭūhkhirāt (Tehran 1309/1991-3). (b) Dīwān-ī Humayd al-Dīwān Tābīrī (ed. Muḥāyīyād Thāḥbīṭī, Tehran 1333/1954-5).

(G. M. Meredith-Owens)

HUMAYD, HUMAYA [see HUMA].

HUMAYD B. ‘ABD AL-HAMĪD AL-ŪTĪSĪ, ‘Abbāsīd general who was chiefly responsible for the victory of al-Maʿmūn over Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī; he died, poisoned, in 1210/825. His generosity and his magnificence were celebrated by al-Dīwān. Several poems, in particular by All b. Djiyābāla [see al-Sakawuk]. His sons, themselves poets though producing little [see Fihrist, Cairo ed. 235], became in their turn patrons, eulogized in particular by Abū Tammān al-Muḥṣīl and Abū Ṣulṭān al-Ṣadīq. Muḥammad b. Humayd, sent against Bābak [q.v.] and killed in 214/829, was lamented by Abū Tammān, over whose tomb his brother Abū Ṣulṭān erected a cupola; al-Ṣuṭluri dedicated to this Abū Ṣulṭān fifteen poems and also wrote panegyrics on his brothers Abū Ḍafār and Abū Ṣulṭān Musīl.

Bibliography: Dāhīz, Ḥayawān, vi, 421; idem, Rasālīn, ed. Ḥārūn, index; Ibn Kutayba, Muʿārif, index; idem, Shīr, ed. de Goeje, 550-2 (Cairo ed., 840-53); Ṣabārī, index; Aḥqāfīn, xviii, 100-14, passim.

HUMAYD B. THĀWĀR, AL-HILĀLĪ, Arabic poet of the 1st/7th century. Asmāʿī [Ibn] ‘Asākir, Taʿrīḥ Dimashq, iv, 457 calls him a poet of (early) Islamic times, whose language is correct, but he does not consider him a classic. Marzūbān [Muṣawwīshbāb, 80], Diṣmāḥil (Ṭabaḥāl, 113) and Ibn Kutayba [Shīr, 230] call him ilmām. Amongst his poems is a dirge on the murder of Uṯmān [Ibn] ‘Asākir, 458 and verses addressed to the caliph Marwān. Later authorities, however, thought that he was a companion of the Prophet and died in the reign of Uṯmān.

His poems (shīrīn) were collected by al-Asmāʿī, Abū ‘Amīr, al-Shāybaṇī, Ibn al-Sūkkaṭī, al-Ṭūsī and al-Sūkkaṭī [Fihrist, 158, 7; see also Kālī, i, 252/48 and 133]; they were still in the hands of Baṭrayawī [Ṭabaḥāl, 475, 1]. Ibn Ṣabīr [Fihrist, 397, 19] and even Abū al-Kādīr [Khizdān, i, 9] of al-Dabī, as well as a number of his poems were lost. Ibn al-Shaḍyārī, Hamāsa, 207, of the sandgrouse (kāṭā, Aḥqāfīn, vii, 159 = Aḥqāfīn, viii, 260; ʿAynī, i, 178) and of the dove (Yikūṭ, Geogr. Wtb., iv, 1006 f.).

Bibliography: In the article. His Dīwān was published by Abū al-ʿAzīz al-Maymānī, Cairo 1951. (J. W. FīcK)

HUMAYD AL-ARŷz, an Arab poet of the middle Umayyad period. Little is known of his life besides what can be gathered from his verses. His lifetime is fixed approximately by his poems in praise of al-Ḥadīḏādī; one of them [Bakrī, Sīm al-ʿalādīl, 649] in which he ridicules Abū ʿAlāb al-Bī Ṣabāḥy [q.v.] must have been composed during the siege of Mecca in 72/692-2. Another poem [Ṭabhārī, ii, 1139] refers to the war of al-Ḥadīḏādī against Ibn al-ʿAṣībīn and was therefore written somewhere between this date and 85 A.H. (cf. al-Fīrāsīb Muḥārīm, ii, 326). He is also credited with a satire [hīḏāyā] against al-Ḥadīḏādī (Bayhaki, Maḥāsīn, 394) but this seems unlikely. His poems were collected by al-Asmāʿī, Abū ʿAmīr al-Shāybaṇī, Ibn al-Sīkktī and al-Ṭūsī [Fihrist, 158]. His Dīwān was still in the hands of Ibn al-Mustawīfī [Khizdān, ii, 253]. Humayd was famous for his skill in writing ṣaṣāṣā poetry. He is reckoned by the Muslim critics amongst the best ṣaṣāṣā poets. Bayhaki was a forerunner of al-ʿAdīḏādī and Ṣubīn. His verses are not promptums but carefully composed poems which deal with all subjects typical of Arabic poetry. He describes, e.g., a horse (Mubarrad, Kāmil, 495), a hunting scene (Hamāsa, 793), a wild ass (Ibn al-Sīkktī, Manṭīk, 291), a lover's complaint (ibid. 496). There are some verses, referring to Sūra CV and the story of the Elephant, but they are also attributed to Thāwār (no. 77 Abīwardī). He also composed poems in other metres than ṣaṣāṣā (though some of them are also attributed to Humayd b. Thawr, Lane, i, 2112). Amongst them are two (Maydānī, i, 427 and Aynī, ii, 82) in which he blames a greedy guest. This conduct which ran counter to all canons of Bedouin hospitality led to Humayd's being counted as one of the world's greatest misers (Aḥqāfīn, ii, 163). Sometimes he is confused with his namesake Humayd b. Thawr [q.v.].

Bibliography: in the article. (J. W. FīcK)

AL-HUMAYDĪ, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Abū Naṣr Futūbī b. Abū Allāh b. Futūbī b. Humaydī b. Yāsur, Andalusian scholar of Arab origin. His family belonged to the Yemeni tribe of Asd. His father was born in al-Rūṣāfā, a suburb of Cordova, but moved to Majorca, where this son of his was born about 420/1029. Abū Ṣulṭān [Ṭabaḥāl, ii, 82] refers to the war of al-Ḥadīḏādī against Ibn al-ʿAṣībīn and became one of the most admired scholars of his age. His biographer al-Dabī and the latter's continuator al-Dhahabi, as well as al-Maḳkālī praise him in the most warm terms as a jurisconsult, traditionist, historian and poet, but the only work by him which we know, the Dhīḥāwī al-muḥāχībīs fi ḥīḏāyā wa-l-ṣaṣāṣā ṣaṣāṣā wa-l-kāṭā al-ḥadīḏādī, 207, of the sandgrouse (kāṭā, Aḥqāfīn, vii, 159 = Aḥqāfīn, viii, 260; ʿAynī, i, 178) and of the dove (Yikūṭ, Geogr. Wtb., iv, 1006 f.).
his teaching, one might have expected a better book, but since he wrote it to please his admirers at Bagh-
dād, who wished to know the state of letters in Spain, he relaxed upon his memory without having his
hand reference works which might have helped him in his task. It is therefore not a matter for astonish-
ment that the book contains many inexactitudes and is lacking in truly interesting information. In his dates he is content with approximations, which have been the
cause of some confusion and even of serious errors in some cases. For the rest, as Dozy says in a severe
judgement, he may be credited with a certain impartiality as an honest man; but nothing more, for his
mind did not rise above the commonplace.

*Bibliography:* Ibn Bashkawāl, 508, no. 1124; Dabī, 113, no. 257; Khaṣikāli, i, 485; Dha-
habī, Hūfīsā, iv, 17; Suyūṭī, Ṭabākāt al-Hūfīsā, ed. Wūstenfeld, no. XV, 9; Ibn Ṭaghrībīdī, i, 312;
Māqkṣāri, Naḥl al-βī, Kārā, 1302/1884, i, 375; Ibn al-Aḥjīr, al-KĀmīs, Kārā, 1303/1885, x, 88; Abu
l-Fidāʾ al-Tarīqī, Istanbul 1365/1848-9, ii, 218; Časīrī, Būlī, *ar.-hisp. ezcīr.*, ii, 146, 147; Wūstenfeld, *Die
Geschichtsschreiber der Araber*, 74, no. 219; Pons Boigues, 164-7, no. 126; Dozy, al-Bayān, *Introducti-
on*, i, 67; Goldziher, *Die Zähkriten*, 172; Brockel-
mann, i, 338, S I, 578. (A. Huici Miranda)

AL-HUMAYMA, ruined site in Jordan, situated in Ṣn N. and about 35° 20’ E., some 50 km.

south-east of the town of Ma’ān, halfway between there and the gulf of Ṣāba. This place, mentioned by the Arab geographers as belonging to the djiand of Dimashq and to the region of al-Sharāt, is famous in history chiefly as

having been used as a residence by the Abbasid claimants of the secret revolutionary movement of which he

was the leading spirit. There he is said to have bought the “village” and built a fortified dwelling. It was there also that in the

Kādirī period an extension was obtained through the use of the yā-yi muṣhābī: darbār-i

humaymān (the royal court), al’lā sadrāt-i humaymān (the royal majesty). In recent years the epitaph has become obsolete. The Shāh is referred to now as

S̱hāhanshāh-i ārya-мīr.

With the spread of Persian culture and especially Persian chancery practice, the concept already in the

Seldjūk period reached Asia Minor and in the Timurid period, with the Mughal rulers, as far as India.

In India the word was used to about the same extent as under the Șafavīds. In Asia Minor, among the

Seldjūks of Rum, it seems to have remained confined to introductory or concluding formulas in the

various types of documents), and mahri-i humaymān (royal real). In addition there continued to appear

terms like hukm-i shāhānmat (a command, which the [whole] world obeys). In the 10th/16th century the

epitaph was transferred also to the person of the

ruler: naswābi-i humaymān-i mā (our Royal Highness).

Humaymān referred also simply to the state, in the

designation of the administration of the state- and crown-lands as dastar-hānya-i humaymān wa ḫāsā.

In the Kadjar period an extension was obtained through the use of the yā-yi muṣhābī: darbār-i

humaymān (the royal court), al’lā sadrāt-i humaymān (the royal majesty). In recent years the epitaph has

become obsolete. The Shāh is referred to now as

S̱hāhanshāh-i ārya-мīr.
in the introductory formulas of documents: hukm-i humayûn shud (besides hukm-i cdli sddir shud) and in addition in combinations such as farâmin-i humayûn in the adhkarî and, as among the Kâdhârî, farâmin-yi humâynâni.

Etyologically humayûn is obviously connected with the Avestan mâyûd (joy, delight, happiness, blessing) and hu-mâyûd (blessed). This basic meaning has been retained also by the modern Persian humâyn, as is clear from the above-mentioned interchangeability with maymûn. In addition, already in the Safavid period the word was connected with humâ (phoenix, royal eagle). Thus Sebastian Beck in his grammar gives the definition humâynâni “Phönixgleichheit, die kaiserliche Majestät”.

**Bibliography:**

(H. Busse)

**HUMAYûN, Nâsr al-Dîn HUMAYûN PADÎGHâH,** posthumously called Dânînât âghîyânî, eldest surviving son of Zahir al-Dîn Muhammad Babur, posthumously called Diânat Ashiyani, eldest surviving son of Zahir al-Dîn Muhammad Babur, declared himself emperor in 937/1531 subdued the Radja of Kalindjar, besieged Sher Khan at Cînaf in 938/1532. He then advancing from Bihar, led by Bayazid and conducted a campaign against the Afghans and Hindus in Eastern India. He took, in a race to capture Agra. After one year in Agra he set out in Safar 944/July 1537 to combat the growing power of Sher Khan Sîr in Eastern India. He took, leaving Gudîrûd in charge of `Askari, who abandoned it around May 1536, but was forestalled by Humayûn in a race to capture Agra. After one year in Agra he returned to Agra again. Humayûn barely escaped drowning and fled by Dîu. Humayûn entered Bengal by Gâtî, while Sher Khan escaped by Dîhârkand. In Humayûn’s absence in Agra, Hindâl assumed sovereignty in Agra, at which Humayûn set out from Gâtî in Bengal. Sher Khan blockaded Humayûn’s return to Chausa on the south bank of the Ganges. Kamrân then advanced from Lahore and displaced Hindâl at Agra, at which Humayûn negotiated peace with Sher Khan: but Sher Khan then attacked his unprepared army, routed it and drove it into the river on 9 Safar 946/26 June 1539. Humayûn barely escaped drowning and hastened to Agra with a few horsemen. He remained there about six months negotiating with his brothers. Kamrân retreated to Lahore, depriving him of many men, while Shâh Shâh (Sher Khan) advanced from Lahore to Diu. Sher Khan advanced to Kannawdi, near which after a month’s confrontation his forces were defeated and driven into the river on 10 Mubârram 947/1 May 1540. Humayûn once more narrowly escaped drowning and fled through Agra to Lahore, where a council of the royal princes and Caghâtâi Begs was held. Cross the River at `Shâh Shâh’s approach, Kamrân with `Askari took the road for Kâbul and Humayûn turned towards Sind, with whose ruler, Shâh Husâyyn Arghûn, he negotiated from Bhakkar in 948. In Radjab 948 he besieged Sehwan, but was harassed by Shâh Husâyyn, who induced Humayûn’s cousin, Yâdgâr Nâsr, with many soldiers, to desert him. Humayûn then retired by Dîojâs almer to Dîodhpur and then to Ameerqut, the Râna of which offered hospitality. There he by Bayazid May 1540, when 13 October 1542 his son Akbar [q.v.] was born. Humayûn then moved to Dîn, where he passed 6-9 months in desultory hostilities with the Arghûn ruler. In Radjab II 950/July 1543, with camels provided by the Arghûns, Humayûn set out for Kandahâr, but `Askari secured the town against him, and Humayûn travelled westwards to Sistân, narrowly escaping capture and obliged to seek the hospitality of Shâh Tâhâmrâs.
The year 951/1544 was passed in Iran. He was given a princely reception at Herat, and travelled by Mashhad over to Tabriz. Humayun, who joined Shah Tahmasp at his summer camp, in Djumad II 951/August 1544. Humayun gave Tahmasp his great diamond and was forced to sign papers professing Shi'ism. He was treated with alternate hospitality and coldness and remained with the Shah about 2 months. When he left, 12,000 Persian troops accompanied him to aid him. He visited Tabriz and Ardabil, and returned to Mashhad in Ramadan/Dekhad 951. From Mashhad he joined Humayun in October 954. In Djumad II/September 951 Askari surrendered the town, which was occupied by his Persian auxiliaries, but taken from them by Humayun one month later. He then marched on Kabul, taken from Kâmrân without a struggle in Ramadan 952/November 1545. Next spring he marched on Badakhshan, and in the autumn fell ill there, which led to a wavering of allegiance. Humayun then concluded peace with Sulayman Mirza and marched to Kabul with the Shah. A felicitous change occurred in midwinter. Kâmrân, who had reoccupied the town with Arghun assistance, fled in April to seek aid from the Ozbeks. Humayun was detained by dissensions among the Mughal nobles till June 1548, when he went to combat Kâmrân in Badakhshan. On 12 Rajab 950/17 August 1548 Kâmrân submitted, and Humayun returned to Kabul in October. In spring 956/1549 Humayun set out against Pir Mu'âmmad Khan, but retreated after an indecisive stand outside Balkh and was himself attacked by the Ozbeks. He reached Kabul in Ramadan 956/September 1549. In Djumâd II 957/June or July 1550 Humayun set out by Ghûrband against the still rebellious Kâmrân, but was routed and wounded at the Kîpçe Peninsula. Kâmrân surrendered to Humayun; Humayun regrouped his forces at Andarab, defeated Kâmrân within two months at Uglytargarm, and made his third victorious entry into Kabul. In 958/1553 Humayun marched out against Kâmrân, now in alliance with Afghan tribes. On 21 Dhul Qa'da/21 November, Hindal, the most loyal of Humayun's brothers, was killed in a night attack. In spring 1552 Humayun defeated the Afghan tribes, and Kâmrân fled to India. Kâmrân was killed by his Sultan, M. Sakkar. Humayun and, on the insistence advice of the Begs, blinded, probably in Ramadan 960/August 1553. From this Humayun finally achieved ascendency over the resources of his family.

In Dhul Qa'da 959/November 1552 Humayun advanced to Bangash, and in 960/1553 beyond the Indus. He then prepared for Kabul for the invasion of Hindûstân, but was diverted to Kandahar in an unfounded report of Bayram Beg's disloyalty and passed the winter of 960-1/1553-4 there. In Dhul Qa'da 961/October 1554 he reached Kabul again, and in November set out for Hindûstân. In December he crossed the Indus and in Rabî I 962/February 1555 entered Lahore. After an earlier success at Dipâlpûr, on 28 May Humayun's greatly outnumbered forces met the main body of Sikandar Shâh Sûr's army at Sarhind, and on 2 Shasba 962/22 June 1555 decisively defeated it. On 4 Ramadan/23 July Humayun entered Delhi and sat on the throne. On 7 Rabî I 963/January 1556, Humayun, who had gone to the roof of his library to observe the rising of Venus, while kneeling to the evening call of prayer, fell down the staircase and died of his injuries, on 13-14 Rabî I 16-7 January.

Humayun inherited no stable administrative system over the conquests in Hindûstân, and a family tradition of divided territorial inheritances. His 22 years of rule were a long struggle against his family, most of all Kamran, as well as external enemies, and in this he was often reduced to extremities. He lacked the strategic genius of his father, and in his early periods of success sometimes fell into heedless lassitude and opium-eating. His career, like Babur's, is a series of military adventures in different geographical areas, outside which he seldom succeeded in maintaining his control. After his Persian exile he showed a new resolution, and he had the courage and sagacity to keep the valuable final victory and to a conquest which survived his son Akbar's minority. In his later years he was a humane monarch and was devoid of sectarian intolerance. He was a keen patron of mathematics and astronomy, wrote Persian verse, and carried books on the roughest of his travels.

Bibliography: Four contemporary production (nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9 below) shed incidental light on Humayun's reign, but the chronicles of it were produced a quarter of a century or more after his death, and half a century after his accession. The record of his early years of rule in India is sketchy and there are difficulties of chronology, some discussed by Hodivala and by S. Ray (see below). The most copious source and official biography is (1) the Akbar-nâma of Abu 'l-Faḍl 'Allâmi, ed. M. Āṣâ Ahmad 'All and M. Abd al-Rahîm, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1877; English translation by H. Beveridge, Bibli. Ind., Calcutta 1897. The compiler was not one of the Central Asian nobility who had accompanied Humayun and he occasionally misunderstands information he has gathered. Next in importance are three memoirs compiled by those in close contact with Humayun, when the materials for (1) were being collected, ca. 1587 A.D.—(2) Humayun-nâma of Gulbadan Begam, ed. with Eng. tr. Mrs. A. S. Beveridge, Oriental Translation Fund, N.S., London 1902; (3) Tadbîkha-yi Humayun wa-Akbar, ed. M. Hidayat Husayn, Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1941; translations by W. Erskine, British Museum MS, Add. 26,610: partial by B. P. Saxena, in Allahabad University Studies, ii/1 (1930), 71-148 and (1939), 1-84; (4) Tabkhat-i Akbari, ed. and tr. by B. De, Bibl. Ind., Calcutta, text 1913, translation 1913-27 (a succinct account of value); (5) Ḵndâmâr, Ḵndâni-i Humayûnî, ed. M. Hidayat Husayn, Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1940, tr. Baina Prakash, Calcutta 1940; (6) Mirzâ Haydar Dughlât, Tārikh-i Rashîdî, text unpublished; Eng. tr., A. history of the Moguls of Central Asia, by N. Elias and D. Ross, London 1895; (7) Sîli 'All Ra'îs, Mir'ât al-mamâlik, Turkish, ed. Djewdet Pasha, Istanbul 1895; Eng. tr. and tr. by B. De, Bibl. Ind., Calcutta, text 1913, translation 1913-27 (a succinct account of value); (8) ḴnḏNdâmâr, Ḵndâni-i Humayûnî, ed. M. Hidayat Husayn, Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1940, tr. Baina Prakash, Calcutta 1940; (9) Dattu Sarvani, in Lâṭîf-i Kâddâsî, Delhi 1890, 71-92; Eng. tr. by S. Digby, in Indian Economic and Social History Review, ii (1965); (10) Hâdi Hasan, The unique dawat of Humayun Bâdschh, in IC, xxv (1951), 212-76; (11) S. A. A. Ridâvi, Mughlâ Kâln
Humayun Shah Bahmani, the eleventh Bahmani dynasty and the third of the line to rule from Bidar, 862/1458 to 865/1461. He was the eldest son of Alâ al-Din Ahmad II, who designated him his heir shortly before his death, at the same time giving him shrewd if idealistic advice about the management of the kingdom (Nizâm al-Dîn Bâkhash, Tabâba'î-i Abhâr, Bibl. Ind. ed., Calcutta 1931, i, 421). Party faction was rife in the Deccan, and even before his accession, on rumours of Alâ al-Din Ahmad’s death in 859/1455, the king’s brother-in-law Dâjil Khalâl had proclaimed himself king at Nâlgonda. On his accession as (Alâ al-Dunya wa l-‘Ithin) Humayun Shan, he had immediately to contend with the proclamation of his younger brother Hasan as king and with a hired mob of unemployed islanders, regional historians of the Deccan, and gives him the sobriquet of Zalim; the author of the Burhân-i ma‘âthir is less vitriolic, but still gives some account of Humayun’s cruelty; and the poet Nâfîrî in a venomous chronogram gives dhawâh-i dâjâhn (= 865), ‘delight of the world’, as the year of his death. But all these authors were ‘foreigners’ in the Deccan sense, sympathizers with the punished party, and modern opinion is to regard them as grossly distorting the true picture. (T. Wolseley Haig, in Cambridge history of India, iii, 411-2, accepts their view uncritically). The unfavourable reputation, however, had obviously been so much fostered locally that it is the common belief at Bidar that Humayun’s tomb there was split in two when his body was placed in it, God refusing his throne (and his punishment of those seeking his throne (and his imprisonment of his own minister Mahmud Gawan—not a man given to idle flattery— in his letters, who praises his uprightness and kindness (Riyâd al-‘inshâ‘), Haydarâbâd 1948, letters 49 (p. 187) and 145 (p. 399); also his letter to the ruler of Gilân, ibid. no. 21 (p. 102), where he attributes to Humayun the improved stability of Deccan politics). Certainly there is nothing in the first two years of Humayun’s reign for which to execrate his name; and his punishment of those seeking his throne (and his occasional petulance of character.


HUMS, people observing rigorous religious taboos, especially Kuraysh and certain neighbouring tribes. The word is the plural of ahmash “hard, strong (in fighting or in religion)”, but one of the Hums is called ahmasi (fem. ahmasiya). Ibn Hishâm (128) thinks that tabammas, the observance of the taboos in question, was an innovation of Kuraysh about the time of Muhammad’s birth, and some changes may have been made to emphasize the superiority of Kuraysh to other tribes; but the nature of the taboos makes it likely they are older. In particular the Hums, during the period of the sacred Donation (hosha) for the pilgrimage, ate no cheese made from sour
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milk, did not clarify butter, did not enter tents of camel-hair, did not enter the tents of Mecca to take part in the ceremonies at ‘Arafat. The chief difference between the Hums and others was that the others, the Hilla, could not circumambulate the Ka‘ba in ordinary clothes; they must either do so naked, or in clothes borrowed from the Hums; any ordinary clothes worn in circumambulation had to be discarded immediately afterwards, and became taboo for everyone (الكَبَارَ). The Hums connected with Mecca communities, and the following tribes were the Kinda, the Khaza‘a, and certain small tribes connected with Kuraysh in the female line, notably descendants of Mabdīt b. Taym al-Adram. It is possible that there was some observance of التامَسَنَس not connected with Mecca (cf. evidence in Wellhausen, Reste, 85 f.). Many South Arabian tribes belonged to the Tuls, a group with religious observances similar to the Hums in some points and to the Hilla in others. The Kur‘ān forbids some of the practices mentioned: II, 196/5, not entering houses by doors; II, 199/5, not going to ‘Arafat; VII, 31/9, nudity in worship. Bibliography: Ibn Hishām, 126-9; Ya‘qūbī, i, 297 f.; al-Azraqī (ed. Wüstenfeld, Chron. Mecca, i, 118-25, 130 f.; Mu‘addalīyāt, ed. C. J. Lyall, Oxford 1918, i, 259; ii, 89, 124, 304; Ibn Hābilb, Muhājirūn, ed. J. Lichtenfelder, Hyderabad 1942, 178-82; J. Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidenums, 85 f., 110, 245 f.; Wensinck, Handboek, s.v. Hums. 

(W. Montgomery Watt) 

Hūn [see SIKKA—India]. 

Hūnayn, (modern al-Sharā‘?) a deep and irregular valley with clusters of palm trees, situated a day’s journey from Mecca on one of the roads to al-Tā‘if [q.v.], the scene of the famous battle, the second mentioned by name in the Kur‘ān (IX, 25-26), fought early in Shawwāl 8/630 soon after the conquest (فتح) of Mecca. The confederate tribe of Hawazin with its subsection of Thakif began mobilizing its forces soon after the Prophet left Medina. The confederates apparently hoped to attack the Muslim force investing Mecca. As each side maintained spies in the other’s camp, Mu‘ammad, about a fortnight after his conquest of Mecca, marched against Hawazin, and did not of twelve thousand men. The confederate commander, Malik b. ʿAwf al-Nahl [q.v.], brought Hawazin’s families and flocks along, though strong protests at their presence were made by Durayd b. ʿAl-Simma al-Dīghāmi [q.v.], the venerable poet and warrior who fell in the ensuing battle. On leaving the oasis of Hunayn, the road enters winding gorges, suitable for ambushes. Here Malik b. ʿAwf awaited the Muslims, who little suspected the presence of an enemy thought to be encamped at Awtās. Surprised by the precipitous charge of Bedouin cavalry, the Muslims retreated in disarray. From here on it is difficult to reconstruct the course of the battle for the various accounts of the Muhājirūn, Anṣār, Ḥāshimids, and ʾAbīs differ. It appears that the Prophet on his grey mule was isolated for a time with few attendants and in grave danger. The Muslims, however, assembly mountains near by, rallied, and attacked the enemy, who apparently was unable to exploit his initial success because of the congested and narrow battle-front. It is possible that Khālid b. al-Walīd [q.v.], who commanded the Muslim cavalry, deserves the credit for turning the tide, also claimed for the Anṣārīs by the Medineșe school. In any case, within a few hours the rout of the enemy was complete, as is testified by the negligible Muslim losses of some twelve killed, by the vast number of captives, including about 6,000 women and children and by the enormous booty of over 24,000 camels. The fleeing Bedouins, some of whom were pursued to Awtaś, sort out the scattered parts of al-Tā‘if, where Mu‘ammad besieged them. Bibliography: Yākūt; al-Bukhārī, Mu‘jam; Ya‘qūbī, ii, 64; Muslim, Ṣahīb, i, 289; ii, 61, 62, 76; Ibn Sa‘d, Tahāddī, iii, 108-110, 112, 113; ii, 11-12, 124, 195; Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, i, 207, 454; iii, 157, 190, 279, 280; iv, 58, 281, 289, 351; Ṭabarī, i, 166-4; iii, 234-5; Ṭabarī, Taṣfīr al-Kur‘ān, i, ii, i; Ibn Hākim, 84, 43, 459-66; Mas‘ūdī, Tabkīrāt, 229, 269-70; Usd al-ghāib, iv, 59; Nawawi, Tahāddī, 450; Caetani, Annali, ii, 167; Ibn Bulayhīd, Ṣahīb al-ākhdār, Cairo 1951, iii, 126.

(H. Lammens-[Abd al-Hafez Kamal]) 

Hūnayn b. ʾIsḥāk al- ʾIbāḍī, the most important mediator of ancient Greek science to the Arabs. It was mainly due to his reliable and clearly written translations of Hippocrates [see BUKRĀT, in Suppl.] and Galen [see GALEN], that the Arab physicians of the Middle Ages became worthy successors of the Greeks. 

Life: Hunayn was born in 92/808 in al-Hira [q.v.], where his father was a pharmacists. The nisba indicates that he was a descendant of the so-called ibadi, i.e. Arab tribesmen who had once embraced Christianity and who after the rise of Islam remained faithful to the Syrian Nestorian church, refusing to adopt the new religion. Hunayn may be assumed to have been bilingual from his youth, for Arabic was the vernacular of his native town, and Syriac was the language of the liturgy and of higher Christian education. Later in life, when settled in Baghdad, he translated far more books into Syriac than into Arabic, in accordance with the wishes of his clients. He himself showed a certain predilection for the Syriac language at the expense of Arabic, which he blamed for its lack of an adequate nomenclature as compared with either Syriac or Greek or Persian (see a fragment of his Kitāb al-Nuṣba, ed. L. Cheikho, in Maqārib, xx (1922), 373). But in their Arabic translations he and his school avoided mere transcriptions of the Greek, and helped to forge the Arabic scientific terminology. He was also at pains to acquire a sound knowledge of Arabic grammar; he is even said to have studied it at Baṣra and to have brought from there al-Khālli’s Kitāb al- ʾAyn. That he had the advantage of meeting the famous grammarians personally, as Ibn Djalūjī and others point out, is impossible for chronological reasons (see M. Plessner, in RSO, xxxi (1956), 244 f.). The Arab bibliographers unanimously attest that Hunayn was ʾfasīḥ. How Hunayn acquired his astonishing knowledge of Greek is told by the eyewitness report of a certain Yūsuf b. Ḳibrīm (see Ibn Abī ʿUsaybā‘a, ed. Müller, i, 185 f.), which does indeed sound very trustworthy. It relates that Hūnayn began his study of medicine at Baghdad under Yūhannā b. Māsawayh, the famous court-physician and director of the bayt al-ʾikhwān [q.v.]. But as Hunayn used to ask too many troublesome questions, he incurred the anger of his master, who eventually ordered him to leave his school. Hunayn then disappeared from the capital for more than two years. The narrator himself is silent upon his whereabouts, but some sources contend that he went to Alexandria, others that he was staying in būdāl al-Ra‘w. When he came back, he was so thoroughly versed in the Greek language that
he could even recite from Homer. Afterwards he was reconciled with Ibn Māsawāyh, who also encouraged him further to translate from the Greek (cf. Les alexistes médicaux de Yohanna Ben Massawath, ed. F. Rosenthal, in Bulletin of the History of Medicine, xxx [1956], 52-87), whereas Hunayn had the full text before him.

In the Risāla he also gives some occasional remarks on his techniques of translating. They are not different from ours: he used to collect as many Greek manuscripts as possible and to collate them in order to get a sound textual basis for the translation (cf. nos. 3, 20, 74, 84). In search of manuscripts he travelled to Syria, Palestine and even to Egypt (cf. no. 115). But in one respect his philological principles deviate from the modern. Like other Christian translators he seems to have felt the attraction to eliminate all traces of paganism from the works of the ancients, e.g., to replace the pagan gods by the one God and His angels, etc.

Usually this did not impair the scientific value of his translations, but it did some harm to the rich mythological material found in the dream-book of Artemidorus (see G. Strohmaier, in F. Altheim and R. Stehle, Die Araber in der Altertum Welt, v, Berlin, forthcoming).

The Risāla also contains valuable data on the translations of Galen made by Hunayn's predecessors and contemporaries. He does not spare them harsh criticism, if necessary, and he often had to revise their Syriac or Arabic versions. He himself translated either into Syriac for his Christian colleagues or into Arabic for the Muslim sponsors of his work (see BAI m 062). It is remarkable that there is no word about the famous bayt al-khīma; the whole activity seems to have been based on a kind of private enterprise. He engaged two members of his family, his son Iṣḥāq, his nephew Hubayṣh b. al-Ḥasan al-ʿAṣam, and another pupil, ʿĪṣā b. Yāḥyā, who also took part in translating Galen. Since Hubayṣh and ʿĪṣā did not understand Greek well enough, they made Syriac translations after Hunayn's Arabic (nos. 36, 38, 119) or, much more often, Arabic translations after Hunayn's Syriac. This could lead to some deterioration (cf. Galeni Compendium Timaei Platonis, ed. P. Kraus and R. Walzer, London 1951, 22-4), if Hunayn or Iṣḥāq did not have the opportunity to compare these new versions with the Greek original (cf. nos. 20, 49, 56, 86, 113, 126). Usually the colophons in the manuscripts of these second-hand versions mention Hunayn as the only translator, a fact which is also reflected in the Syriac translation. The reason for this is not clear. Perhaps it is due to the modesty of the pupils themselves, or else they wanted to conceal the circumference of the double translation, as Muslim intellectuals had been well aware of its shortcomings.

Unfortunately, there exists no corresponding risāla for the non-Galenic writings, and it remains to be proved by an analysis of the language and by possible mistakes resulting from ambiguities of Syriac words, whether the present Arabic versions were made by Hunayn directly from the Greek or by someone else after his Syriac translation. Nearly all of these Syriac versions are now lost (for the possible ascription of some fragments to Hunayn see G. Führer in ZS, 11 (1924), 28 and J. Schleifer, in RSO, xvii (1940), 348).

Hunayn's own works: Besides his translations Hunayn composed numerous original works, mainly on medical, but also on philosophical, geophysical, meteorological, zoological, linguistic, and religious subjects. He is even credited with a history of the world from Adam down to al-Mutawakkil. His medical treatises are mainly epitomes and rearrangements of classical material. Many of them are written in the form of questions and answers, this curious

HUNAYN B. ISHÂR AL-IBÂDI — HÛR


(G. STROHMAIER)

HUNGARY [see BÁSHTÚR, MAJRÁSTÁN].

HUNS [see HAYÁTÎLA].

HUNTING [see BYÀZARA, FAHÎD, ŞAYD; for hunting-songs see TÁDIIYA].

HUNZA and NAGIR, two principalities in the extreme west of the Karakoram range of mountains, lie between Gilgit in the south, Ishkoman in the west, Afghan Wâkhis in the north and Chinese Turkistsâ in the north and east, i.e., approximately between 74°ro' and 75° 20' E. and 36° 10' and 37° N. The whole area is extremely rugged and mountainous and for the most part uninhabitable. Permanent settlements exist only in the river valleys where terracing and irrigation of the mountainsides is possible, principally along the Hunza river, which traverses Hunza from north to south and west, and its left tributary the Nagar river, which falls into the Gilgit river, a tributary of the Indus, below Gilgit town. The road beside it, skirting Mt. Rakaposhi (25,550 ft./7,780 m.) in the Kailâs range, provides the only access to the territory which does not entail crossing passes at 15,000 ft./4,500 m. or more. Although Hunza is much the larger of the two states, their populations are approximately equal, ca. 13,500 souls each (1931 census). Of these, two-thirds are Burusho, who speak Burushaski, a language with no known affinities. The remainder are Wakhis, in the north west of Hunza, and Shînâ speakers, in the south west of Nagir. The Nagirs are Shi'i Muslims, but the Hunzukuts have for the last four or five generations belonged to the Ismâ'îlî, or Mawli, sect led by the Âghâ Khân.

The Mîrs, or Thams, of Hunza and Nagir are drawn from two closely related families of legendary origin. Their capitals are at Bâtît (altitude 8,000 ft./2,400 m.) and Nagir (7,500 ft./2,350 m.) respectively. Hunza, reputedly the more vigorous of the two states, has maintained its independence since the earliest times, though occasionally paying nominal allegiance either to the Chinese or to the rulers of Gilgit. In the first part of the 19th century the Hunzukuts were responsible for a series of raids on caravans passing between Kâshghar and Kâshmir, many captives being sold into slavery in Badakhshan. When the Sikhs occupied Gilgit they attempted without success to subdue their troublesome neighbour. Only in 1869 did the Tham of Hunza, Ghâzan Kâhan, agree to pay tribute to the Dogra Mâhrâdât of Kâshmir, though no Kâshmirî was allowed to enter the valley. In 1891 the Thâm was murdered by his son Safdar 'Ali, who recommenced raids on Gilgit and accepted Russian overtures. This led to a small Indian force being sent into the states, which were thereafter included in British India. Safdar fled to Kâshghar and his brother Muhammad Nâzîm was proclaimed Tham in his place. He was succeeded peacefully by his son Ghâzan Khan in 1938. For recent history, see KâSHMIR.


HÛR (â.), pl. of hawârdî and its masc. hawârî, adjective from hawârî, the general idea of 'whiteness' (the root hâ.rî, signifying 'purity' or 'astonishment', which has occasionally been suggested, is to be rejected); hawârdî is applied more particularly to the very large eye of the gazelle or the oryx, the clear whiteness of which arises from the contrast with the blackness of the pupil and the iris; by extension, hawârôrî signifies a woman whose big black eyes are in contrast to their 'whites' and to the whiteness of their skin. The plural hârôrî is a substantival adjective used in the Kur'an for the virgins of Paradise promised to the Believers, the hourîs; the latter term has entered European languages through the Persian singular hûrî or hûrî behêshâtî and the Turkish hûrî, whereas the Arabic noun of unity, a secondary formation from hûr, is hûriyya, pl. hûriyyûdî.

The hourîs are mentioned in various verses of the Kur'an dating from the Meccan period, that is to say the period when stress is laid upon the Last J udgment and when the delights of Paradise are contrasted with the torments of hell. The Holy Book announces to the Believers first that they will have as wives hourîs (LI, 20; cf. XLIV, 54) like "the hidden pearl", in recompense for their actions upon earth (LVI, 22-3/23-4); they will be "spotless virgins, amorous, like of age" (LVII, 35-43/34-50; cf. LXXXVIII, 33, LXXXIX, 52) and will have "swelling breasts" (LXXVIII, 33); neither man nor djinn will have touched them (LV, 56, 74); they will keep their eyes modestly cast down (LV, 56, XXXVII, 47/48, LXXXVIII, 52); resembling "ruby and coral", they will be enclosed in pavilions (LV, 58, 72). The only detail added during the Medina period is that they will be "purified wives" (II, 22/25, III, 23/25, LXI, 12, IV, 60/57), which means, according to the commentators, that they are free alike from bodily impurity and from defects of character.

To these rather brief statements, tradition and traditional exegesis have added details giving a more precise form to the hourîs and a more sensual character to the pleasures promised.

Firstly, the verse saying that neither man nor djinn will have touched them suggests to some commentators that there are two classes of hourîs, one sharing the nature of men, the other that of djinn. As for the substance from which they are created, some believe that they are made of saffron, others of saffron, musk, amber and camphor, and that they have four colours: white, green, yellow and red. In any case their flesh is so delicate that the texture of the muscles of their legs can be seen, even through 70 silken garments. Their physical characteristics are described in general terms: their eyebrows are in contrast to their 'whites' and to the skin, the former being a name of Allah and one that of her husband. Their age is equal to that of their husbands, their virginity is perpetually renewed. The Elect will have the bliss of deflowering them, and their pleasure will be a

Afghan Wakhan in the north, and Chinese Turkistan in the north and east, i.e., approximately between 74°ro' and 75° 20' E. and 36° 10' and 37° N. The whole area is extremely rugged and mountainous and for the most part uninhabitable. Permanent settlements exist only in the river valleys where terracing and irrigation of the mountainsides is possible, principally along the Hunza river, which traverses Hunza from north to south and west, and its left tributary the Nagar river, which falls into the Gilgit river, a tributary of the Indus, below Gilgit town. The road beside it, skirting Mt. Rakaposhi (25,550 ft./7,780 m.) in the Kailâs range, provides the only access to the territory which does not entail crossing passes at 15,000 ft./4,500 m. or more. Although Hunza is much the larger of the two states, their populations are approximately equal, ca. 13,500 souls each (1931 census). Of these, two-thirds are Burusho, who speak Burushaski, a language with no known affinities. The remainder are Wakhis, in the north west of Hunza, and Shiî speakers, in the south west of Nagir. The Nagirs are Shi'i Muslims, but the Hunzukuts have for the last four or five generations belonged to the Ismâ'îlî, or Mawli, sect led by the Âghâ Khân.

The Mîrs, or Thams, of Hunza and Nagir are drawn from two closely related families of legendary origin. Their capitals are at Bâtît (altitude 8,000 ft./2,400 m.) and Nagir (7,500 ft./2,350 m.) respectively. Hunza, reputedly the more vigorous of the two states, has maintained its independence since the earliest times, though occasionally paying nominal allegiance either to the Chinese or to the rulers of Gilgit. In the first part of the 19th century the Hunzukuts were responsible for a series of raids on caravans passing between Kâshghar and Kâshmir, many captives being sold into slavery in Badakhshan. When the Sikhs occupied Gilgit they attempted without success to subdue their troublesome neighbour. Only in 1869 did the Tham of Hunza, Ghâzan Kâhan, agree to pay tribute to the Dogra Mâhrâdât of Kâshmir, though no Kâshmirî was allowed to enter the valley. In 1891 the Thâm was murdered by his son Safdar 'Ali, who recommenced raids on Gilgit and accepted Russian overtures. This led to a small Indian force being sent into the states, which were thereafter included in British India. Safdar fled to Kâshghar and his brother Muhammad Nâzîm was proclaimed Tham in his place. He was succeeded peacefully by his son Ghâzan Khan in 1938. For recent history, see KâSHMIR.

hundred times greater than on earth; some—such as Jesus—will have a hundred . . . in 17/638: as the Persian general al-Hurmuzan [q.v.], the defender of al-Ahwaz, was behaving in a threaten-

To complete the picture, we must consider the lot reserved for women-believers admitted to Para-

According to the Km°an, the Elect will meet in their wives and their descendants (XIII, 23; cf. XXXVI, 70 only wives are mentioned). The commentators maintain that every women who was married and virtuous by nature will meet her husband in Paradise and become again his legal wife; those who had several husbands will be able to choose the one they prefer; while polygamous husbands will be allowed to keep all their earthly wives. The women among the Believers will be 70,000 times superior to the houris, will know none of the cares of earthly life and will spend their time enjoying pleasures of every sort. The commentators remain silent on the fate of virtuous women who have remained unmarried, and give the impression that the daughters of Eve are definitely at a disadvan-

tage in comparison with men.

The traditional exegesis, although it readily admits all the concrete amplifications, does not always accept uncritically the popular materialistic and sensual idea of the houris and of the delights of Paradise in general which has become common. Al-

The name Huraymilâ is conventionally spelled with alif mam-

dâl, although its meaning is explained as the dimi-

utive singular of hârâm, a noxious shrub (Rhyza stric-

ta Decne.) common in the area. Huraymilâ and the neighbouring villages of al-Kârâna and Malham are sometimes referred to collectively as al-ghâib, the name locally applied to Wâdi Abû Kitâda. Al Muhârâk were still influential in Huraymilâ in 1965, although they shared the town with settled sections of Subây, al-Dawâsir, Banû Tamîm, Banû Hâjdîr, Kâhtân, and other tribes. The âmr, who reported directly to the Amir of al-Riyâd, administered the neighbouring towns and hamlets of al-Barîn, Malham, Sadûs, Shâlûbhî, Ghîyana, and al-Kârâ. The presence of the Prophet in Huraymilâ have usually not been natives of the town.

The economy of Huraymilâ, like that of other settlements of the area, is based on agriculture. Wheat, lucerne and, more recently, fruits and garden vegetables are grown in addition to the date palm. Sheep, goats, and cattle are fed on forage crops. A relatively dense growth of jak (Acacia sp.) is protected in a kimâd (pasture and forest reserve [q.v.]) in the wâdi bed immediately southwest of Huraymilâ.


J. Mandaville

Hurâkûs b. Zuhâyîr Al-Sâ'dî, Companion of the Prophet, who conquered Sûh al-Ahwâz, took part in the siege of "the House" and became a Khâridjî. Although there is no source which gives the date of his conversion, it can be deduced that it took place at a fairly early date from the fact that he was among the Muslims who swore obedience to the Prophet "under the tree" (6/628) at al-Âhdâybiya [q.v.]. The name of Hurûkûs is mentioned for the first time in the works of the Arab historians in 17/638; as the Persian general al-Hurmuzân [q.v.], the defender of al-Ahwâz, was behaving in a threaten-

slave delights, and at the same time, the allurement of the later fulfiments of Medina—in a word, all the benefits of the classical play of passions in the course of purific.

There is indeed practically no further mention of hours during the Median period when, in the sphere of human affections, the Prophet found his equilibrium.

Bibliography: the Kur'ânic commentaries on the verses cited; the collections of Traditions (see Wensinck, Concordances) and especially Bughârî, R. bâd al-jâhâl, bît fi sîyâs al-djanna; Sîdî b. âbdûn, Maqâmât al-Kurtûbî, Cairo 1300/1882, 112-3; Gazzâlî, Ihyâ', Cairo 1285, iv, 464; Ibn Kayyim al-Djâwâziyya, Hâdî 'l-arâfîh ilâ bidâl-arâfî ilâ bidâl-arâfî, Cairo n.d., passim; S. El Saleh, Les âlices et les tourments de l’au-delà, Sorbonne thesis 1953 (unpublished); see also the references given in the art. DJANNA and the works of oriental-

ists on Islam and the Kur'ân.

Huraymilâ, a town (est. pop. 3,000 in 1965) of al-Mahmâl district in Najîd, Central Arabia; in the early 12th/18th century residence of the reformer and founder of Wahhâbiasm [q.v.], Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhâb. Huraymilâ is said to have been founded by Al Muhârâk of Al Ábl Rabba', a group of 'Anaza stock who left the town of Ushaykîr in al-

Washm after a dispute with Banû Tamîm. In 1045/ 1635-6 they settled on the site of Huraymilâ, where the gha'ib next known as al-Šhu’âb and al-Abkar join Wâdi Abû Kitâda (variant Kidâda). The name

Among Islamologists there are many who have tried to explain the picture which the Kur'ân gives of hours. Carra de Vaux, in the art. DJANNA in EI, suggests that in "some Christian miniatures or mosaics representing the gardens of Paradise . . . the figures of angels [may have been interpreted] as being those of young men or girls", but it is not easy to arrive at the real origin of the sensual concepts set out in the Kur'ân and amplified by tradi-

tion. L. Massignon (Mystique et continence in Islam, in Études carmélitaines, 1952, 95) considers that "the symbols have a deeper sense of Paradise . . . almost basically to the simple regaining, by the human species, of the first Paradise, where sexual life was well established". On the other hand, Ch. J. Ledit (Mahomet, Israël et le Christ, Paris 1956, 117) ob-

serves that the Kur'ân takes account of certain domestic difficulties of the Prophet, considers the houris, and finds in Muhammad's meditation "the compensation for a cruel situation, the sublimation of impulses which refuse to degrade themselves in
HURKOS B. ZUHAYR AL-SA'IDI — HURMUZ

... with the Muslims, 'Utba b. Ghazwan, the governor of Basra, warned the caliph 'Umar about this, and the latter sent troops under the command of Hurkus; having collected their forces, the Muslims marched against al-Hurmuzan and defeated him above the bridge of Sük al-Ahwaz (known more briefly as al-Ahwaz). It was Hurkus who took this town, imposed the jizya on the population of the territory, which extended as far as the outskirts of Tustar, sent to Medina the announcement of his victory and the ﬁfth of the booty, sent 'Umar b. al-Khattab an edict of protection for his tribe, the Banu Sa'd, was able to protect his tribe, the Banu Sa'd, was able to escape the ensuing massacre. The sources do not mention the presence of Hurkus at the Battle of the Camel, it is reasonably to assume that he had followed the policy of his fellow tribesmen who, belonging to the 'Umayyids, the party which was loyal to the caliph 'Umar, had no desire to ﬁght for 'Ali (al-Tabari, i, 3168). He was, on the other hand, present at Siffin in the army of the caliph; al-Dhahabi is the only writer, GO far as is known, to mention his presence at Harura ([q.v.]'Is'i), and his two refusals to become their leader, and finally his death among the Kharidjis of al-Nahrawan, and that he should be identiﬁed with Dhu 'l-Khuwaysra or Dhu 'l-Thudayya or al-Mukhdadj had given Muhammad the occasion to predict this movement, so that it was natural that 'Ali should seek to discover the mysterious personage among the Kharidjis of al-Nahrawan, and that he should be identiﬁed sometimes with Hurkus and sometimes with other warriors who were killed in the battle (citations and details in Caetani, Annali, 8 A.H. § 169 & n. i, 38 A.H. §§ 107, 112 & n. 2, 115, 119, 126, 129 (p. 111), 130, (p. 114), 139, 140, 150-3, 158).

The attitude of the biographers of the Companions towards Hurkus is worthy of note: Ibn 'Abd al-Barr ignores him in his Ist'ibād; Ibn al-Aqīl and al-Dhahabi have accepted his Kharidjism as a fact; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr informs us that there were doubts about the death of such a Companion among the Kharidjis at al-Nahrawan and, since a khaṭīb excluded from Paradise one of the participants in the oath "under the tree", he adds that this excluded individual had been identiﬁed with Hurkus, but he does not accept the responsibility of asserting this.


(L. Veccia Vaglieri)
Zoroastrian year. In the works of Muslim writers (especially the Iranians and particularly the poets) are found allusions which display a very imprecise knowledge of Mazdaism; although there occurs the name of Zoroaster (Zardusht), one searches in vain for the name of Hurmuz (cf. M. Moin, *Masdadavane*, parts 7 & 8) and the introd. by H. Corbin; however, according to Wolff (*Glossar*, s.v.), it is found—once in the *Shah-nama* of Firdawsi, who uses most often the name of Urmuzd (cf. M. Moin, *Zaratusht-nama*, a life of Zoroaster in 1580 verses, written in 677/1278), he mentions only Yazdan and, less often, Izad. On the other hand, the name Hurmuz(d) is found in the works written by the historians of religion: the *Baydn al-adydn* (479-548/1086-1153); the *Tabisrat al-awdmm* of Shaykh Murtadā (7th/13th century); the *Dabistān al-mädahdd (ca. 1064-7/ 1654-7)*. The author of the *Baydn states* (tr., 22) that the Persians called their supreme Divinity Hurmuzd, Izad (Old Iranian Yazata), Yazdn (Old Iranian Yazatahān); it was probably this text that Ak-Madjis followed (*Livre de la création et de Vhistoire*, Paris 1886-7) and by what stratagem Ahriman became the eldest and seized the product of this thought was the devil. It has also been said that, the Almighty created the world, he had a disturbing thought and exclaimed: 'Let me have no adversary!' and the origin of this thought was the devil. It has also been said that, the Almighty being alone, he was afflicted by sadness and there occurred to him an evil suspicion, the product of which was Ahriman. Ahriman gives an account of the Gal Fray the second and the universe, the creation of the two principles, and the age and the universe in the *Dabistān* is found verbatim the passage quoted on the creation of Ahriman (tr., i, 356-7) whereas on other pages (269 and 338) Yazdan appears under the name of Urmuzd. It should be added that Zartušt Bahrām, author of the *Zarautšt-nāma* (a life of Zoroaster in 1580 verses, written in 677/1278), mentions only Yazdan (e.g., in verse 535), Lord (khodvand) of the universe (ed. Rosenberg, Tehran 1959).

The name Hurmuz was borne by five rulers of the Sāsānid dynasty. Hurmuz I, who reigned for only a year (272-3 A.D.), had been governor of Khurāsān and distinguished himself in the war against the Romans; he gave his protection to Mani as his father Shāpūr had done. Hurmuz II (502-9) is said to have persecuted the Manicheans, according to traditions preserved in some Coptic texts (Christensen, 195, n. 7); nevertheless he left behind him the reputation of having been a gentle and just ruler; he was killed by the Arabs after having defeated them; he had two sons, Şāpūr II and a prince Hurmuz who, after being a prisoner for thirteen months, escaped and made his way to Constantinople, where he accompanied the emperor Julian in his Persian campaign. Hurmuz III, during his brief reign, was forced to fight against his youngest brother who had obtained the support of the Hephtalites (see *HAYATI-NA*); he was defeated and killed. Hurmuz IV (579-90) is represented by the Byzantine historians as a proud man of mediocré intelligence; according to al-Ṭabari on the other hand, his justice surpassed that of his father, Khusrav Anūshhvān, he being compassionate towards the common people but severe towards the nobles, which earned him the enmity of the latter and of the clergy; the hostilities continued, with the Byzantines gaining the advantage; Hurmuz having dismissed his best general Vakhrām Ćubin following a defeat, the latter led a revolt which became general; as a result Hurmuz was deposed and executed; this revolt and the love story of this king and Shīrin form part of the subject of several great Persian poems. Hurmuz V, having striven to gain power, was executed on the orders of the last of the Sāsānids (632 A.D.). The name of Hurmuz was borne by other persons who appear in the indices of al-Ṭabari, Yākūt and other writers; the most important was Hurmūzan [q.v.].

*Bibliography:* On Ahura Mazda, *Gr.*, i, ii, 632-3 (with bibli.); M. Moin, *Masdadavane*, ed. tr. Cl. Huart, i, 56); in chapter ii (tr., 35), he mentions again the dualism of Ahriman and Hurmuz; then, explaining the doctrine of Zoroaster, he mentions only Yazdan and Ahriman. Al-Shahrastānī, describing the beliefs of the Zarvans, explains (ed. Cureton, 183; tr. Haarbrucker, i, 277) how Ahriman and Hurmuz were born of Zarvān (cf. Chr. Christiansen, *Sasanides*, 145 ff.) and by what stratagem Ahriman became the eldest and seized the world has two creators: Yazdan, and Ahriman who is Satan (shaytdn); it is said that when the Almighty created the world, he had a disturbing thought and exclaimed: 'Let me have no adversary!' and the product of this thought was the devil. It has also been said that, the Almighty being alone, he was afflicted by sadness and there occurred to him an evil suspicion, the product of which was Ahriman. Ahriman gives an account of the Gal Fray the second and the universe, the creation of the two principles, and the age and the universe in the *Dabistān* is found verbatim the passage quoted on the creation of Ahriman (tr., i, 356-7) whereas on other pages (269 and 338) Yazdan appears under the name of Urmuzd. It should be added that Zartušt Bahrām, author of the *Zarautšt-nāma* (a life of Zoroaster in 1580 verses, written in 677/1278), mentions only Yazdan (e.g., in verse 535), Lord (khodvand) of the universe (ed. Rosenberg, Tehran 1959).

The name Hurmuz was borne by five rulers of the Sāsānid dynasty. Hurmuz I, who reigned for only a year (272-3 A.D.), had been governor of Khurāsān and distinguished himself in the war against the Romans; he gave his protection to Mani as his father Shāpūr had done. Hurmuz II (502-9) is said to have persecuted the Manicheans, according to traditions preserved in some Coptic texts (Christensen, 195, n. 7); nevertheless he left behind him the reputation of having been a gentle and just ruler; he was killed by the Arabs after having defeated them; he had two sons, Şāpūr II and a prince Hurmuz who, after being a prisoner for thirteen months, escaped and made his way to Constantinople, where he accompanied the emperor Julian in his Persian campaign. Hurmuz III, during his brief reign, was forced to fight against his youngest brother who had obtained the support of the Hephtalites (see *HAYATI-NA*); he was defeated and killed. Hurmuz IV (579-90) is represented by the Byzantine historians as a proud man of mediocré intelligence; according to al-Ṭabari on the other hand, his justice surpassed that of his father, Khusrav Anūshhvān, he being compassionate towards the common people but severe towards the nobles, which earned him the enmity of the latter and of the clergy; the hostilities continued, with the Byzantines gaining the advantage; Hurmuz having dismissed his best general Vakhrām Ćubin following a defeat, the latter led a revolt which became general; as a result Hurmuz was deposed and executed; this revolt and the love story of this king and Shīrin form part of the subject of several great Persian poems. Hurmuz V, having striven to gain power, was executed on the orders of the last of the Sāsānids (632 A.D.). The name of Hurmuz was borne by other persons who appear in the indices of al-Ṭabari, Yākūt and other writers; the most important was Hurmūzan [q.v.].

*Hurmuz* (Hormuz, Ormus). The original town, or Old Hormuz, as it has been called to distinguish it from its island offshoot, was situated on the mainland of Persia, on the east side of the entrance to the Persian Gulf, at the head of a creek which has now largely silted up; the existing town of Mināb (27°09' N., 57°05' E.) stands on its site. Nearcharus and his fleet, when on their way from the estuary of the Indus to the head of the Persian Gulf, anchored at the mouth of the Amāris river (now the Mināb creek), in the district of Harmozeia (Hormuz) (see William Vincent, *The voyage of Nearchus and the Persians of the Erythraean Sea*, London 1809, 52, and idem, *The commerce and navigation of the Ancients in the Indian Ocean*, London 1807, i, 328-30). Ptolemy mentions the town as Harmuz, but gives its position incorrectly. It is possible that it may have been identical with Ammianus Marcellinus' *Hermopolis* (XXIII, 6, 49). Ardašīr I, the founder of the Sāsānid dynasty, has been credited with the foundation of the town, but it was probably in existence long before his time. In the 4th/10th century, (Old) Hormuz was already the seaport for the provinces of Kirmān, Sīstān and Khurāsān (see Yākūt, iv, 668; *Haddā al-ilām*, 124; Le Strange, 318). Marco Polo, who visited Hormuz in 1272 and again in 1293, after expatiating on the flourishing and widespread trade of the town, stated that it was a sickly place and that the heat of the sun in summer there was tremendous
HURMUZ

(see The Book of Ser Marco Polo, ed. by Sir Henry Yule and revised by Henri Cordier, London 1905, i, 107). A few years after Marco Polo's second visit, repeated raids by marauding tribes became so serious that Kublai Khan had the island totally abandoned. The city of Hormuz, in 700/1300, abandoned the site and moved all the inhabitants and their possessions to the small island of Diarrun, 60 km to the west and 6 km south of the nearest point on the mainland. A good harbour was constructed at the sheltered northern end of the island, and before long an exceedingly flourishing town grew up, which the Persians, with the assistance of the English vessels, forced the garrison and inhabitants of Hormuz to return known as Hormuz. The name Diarrun was transferred to the small town and port of Surú or Shahrú on the mainland 17 km to the north-west, where goods in transit to or from Hormuz were transshipped; this name became corrupted to Gamru, and further corrupted by Europeans into Gombrun and Gombroon. In 720/1320 King Kublai Khan captured the island of Kāys, which had then long been enjoyed great commercial prosperity, and also that of Bahrayn. Later in the reign of Kublai Khan the intrepid Moorish traveller Ibn Battūta visited Hormuz, which he described as a large and fine city, with busy markets, as it was the true port from which the wares from India and Sind were despatched to the Îrān, Fars and Khurāsān (see Ibn Battūta, ii, 230 ff. = Eng. tr., H.A.R. Gibb, ii, 400 f.; see also the account by Ibn Battūta's contemporary, Friar Odoric of Pordonone, in Cathay and the way thither, by Sir H. Yule, revised by Henri Cordier, London 1913, 112).

For the next three centuries Hormuz was extremely prosperous, despite its lack of fresh water and vegetation and the extreme heat in summer. The Russian traveller Afanasi Nikitin, who visited Hormuz in 1472, stated that it was a vast emporium where there were peoples and goods of every description from all parts of the world; however, he qualified his praise by complaining of the high duties there (Khozeniya za tri Morya, Moscow 1958, 21). The Venetian J. Barbaro, who also visited Hormuz some years later, likewise praised it as a commercial centre (Travels of Josafa Barbaro, tr. William Thomas, London 1873, 290 ff.).

In 1507 a Portuguese fleet under the great Albuquerqued appeared off the island. Realizing its great strategic importance owing to its situation at the entrance to the Persian Gulf, Albuquerqued seized the island, but a mutiny of his men forced him to withdraw. Seven years later, however, Albuquerqued returned, and this time the Portuguese occupation of the island was permanent. Occupied as he was with his great struggle with the Ottoman Turks, Shāh Ismā'īl I could do nothing except protest at this violation of his territory. Under Portuguese rule, Hormuz continued to prosper, but the fact that the island was in foreign hands was always deeply resented by Persia. The kings of Hormuz, who had hitherto been vassals of the Persian monarch, became subordinate to Portugal. The Venetian jeweller Gaspar Balbi, who was in Hormuz in 1580, described it as: una città non molto grande, ma popolosa, posta in un' isola di trenta miglia di grandezza, ma è la più sterile di quante mai io n'habbia viste; perciò che in esse non si trova altro che sale e le legne e le altre cose al viaggio necessarie vi vengono portate dalla costa di Persia, ch'è distante da questa città da 6 miglia; evice ne conducono in tanta quantità, che la città ne resta copiosamente fornita (see Balbo's Discrizione di Ormus, in Il Nuovo Ramusio, vi: Viaggi di C. Federici e G. Balbi alle Indie Orientali, ed. C. Pinto, Rome 1962, 118). The Englishman, Ralph Fitch, who was in Hormuz three years later, described it as 'the dryest island in the world, for there is nothing growing in it but salt' (Purchas his Pilgrimes, London 1625, Part II, 1731).

After Shāh ʿAbbās I had consolidated his power, it became obvious that to so nationalistic a monarch the continued presence of the Portuguese in Hormuz would soon precipitate a crisis. Already, by 1602, Albuquerqued had subdued Bahrayn. Later in the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl, Shahrukh had wrested Bahrayn from the feeble hands of the King of Hormuz, who, like his predecessors since 1514, was merely a vassal of Spain and Portugal. In 1614 the Persian forces occupied Gamru (Gombroon), the last foothold of the Portuguese on the mainland, thereby depriving the garrison and inhabitants of Hormuz of one of their sources of supply of water. Eight years later, Shāh ʿAbbās, by putting strong pressure on the English East India Company, forced it to allow a number of its ships to co-operate with the Persian land forces in an assault on Hormuz. Despite strong resistance by the Portuguese, the Persians, with the assistance of the English vessels, forced the garrison to surrender and to evacuate the island. Hormuz was soon deserted and many of its buildings were demolished in order to provide material for the erection of new buildings in Gamru, which was renamed Bandar ʿAbbās in honour of the Shāh. The part played by the English East India Company on this occasion not unnaturally aroused the anger of the Portuguese. The late Sir Arnold Wilson, in his book The Persian Gulf (Oxford 1928, 149), stated that it was difficult to discover what the East India Company gained from this action. It seems clear, however, that if the Portuguese had been allowed to remain in Hormuz, the East India Company would never have been able to compete with the flourishing Portuguese entrepôt at Hormuz, while its establishments on the coast and also its vessels would have been always in jeopardy from their ships based on that island.

At the present time the population of Hormuz is small and fluctuating. In the cooler months, the numbers increase when the salt and iron oxide and other deposits are carried in by the wind and water from the mainland, especially to Minā. The only relatively stable elements of the population are the fishermen.

AL-HURMUZAN


See also BANDAR SABBÄS. (L. LOCKHART)

HURMUZ, BĀ, a South Arabian makhšāfiy family, to which belongs the Hadrami sūfī 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Umar. Bā'ūrma Hormuz al-Shibāmī al-Akhḍar (b. in Shibam 840/1436, d. in Haynan al-Durrā al-mudPa fi 'l-nisba al-Hurmuziyya. entitled 914/1508). He was the spiritual father of the famous sūfī scholar and poet 'Umar b. 'Abd Allāh b. Ahmad Bā Maḥrāma (d. 952/1545; see MAKHRAMA, BA) and before him. Serjeant is said to have made beautiful women sing and dance to the music of the Maysan, to which he was a dramatic one; the latter obtained amān, thanks to a ruse; he was stripped of his clothing and his ornaments and the Companion Surākā b. Mālik b. Dījshum, who was as thin as he was, put them on, on 'Umar's orders. Al-Hurmuzān was invited to embrace Islam but refused, and the caliph, on 'All's advice, decided to banish the whole group of prisoners to Syria (or Egypt); during the voyage they were shipwrecked and the Persians, having saved embraced Islam; 'Umar then recalled the prisoners to Medina. Apart from these stories, the basic facts of which have evidently been embroidered, the sources supply other information which there seems no real reason to doubt: al-Hurmuzān became 'Umar's adviser on Persian affairs (the pension of 2000 dirhams, which, according to several sources (Ibn Sa'd, al-Balḍāharī, Yahyā b. 'Ādam, etc.) the caliph assigned to him as well as to other diḥāms, was perhaps in reward for their services); he was a person of some consequence at Medina (otherwise his murder would not have become a state matter); he embraced Islam (the sources agree on this point, even though his sincerity is sometimes held in question); officers of the Tribe of Harmānī were the earliest of the Persians who had become a Muslim, and Abū Lūlū'a (the murderer of 'Umar) and Dījafaya (also killed by 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Umar), who remained Christian; al-Balḍāharī, Futāḥ, 453 f. and Yahyā b. 'Ādam assert that he pronounced the formula professing the faith of Islam when he saw that he was wounded, but it is possible that by this detail the traditionists wished to stress his firm adherence to Islam in the face of death rather than to delay his conversion to the final moments of his life. The doubt concerning his conversion rests in fact only on the phrase which 'Uṯmān is said to have uttered: "they [those whom 'Ubayd Allāh had killed] were in our dijama". But the facts which above all have made al-Hurmuzān famous in the annals of Islam are the following: when the Persian slave Abū Lūlū'a stabbed the caliph 'Umar in the mosque at Medina and was killed as he attempted to make a way for himself through the crowd, the suspicion spread that he had had accomplices. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Awf (or 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Bakr) remembered a few days earlier having seen Abū Lūlū'a conferring with his compatriots al-Hurmuzān and Dījafaya (the latter was a Christian from al-Hira whom Sa'd b. Abī Waḳḳās had brought to Medina); the three men,
he said, having got up as he approached, there had fallen to the caliph's son, 'Ubayd Allah, had threatened to make the Muslim pay double if his father died from his wound. The words of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Awf confirmed him in the idea that the Persians who had been seen in conversation with 'Abū Lu'ū'ā had taken part in the attempt on Umar's life, and when Umar finally died (26 Dhū l-Hijādīa 23/3 November 644), he not only killed 'Abū Lu'ū'ā's wife and a young daughter who was a Muslim, but having made a pretext to call al-Hurmuzan aside, he wounded him mortally with his sword, and killed the caliph.

As took his sword away from him; Sa'ād b. al-Âbl Wakkās and 'Abd al-Rahman b. 'Uthman, had witnessed his murder. The words of Ibn al-Kathīr (al-Tabarl, i, 2795) or to some of the historians (al-Tabarl-Zotenberg, iii, 556-8; BГА&Ф, i, 2533-5, 2537 f.; Ibn Abī 1-Hadld, iii, 211, 215 f.; v, 8-10, 84 f.; al-Istakhri, Al-Masdlik wa 'l-mamd-s); Istakhri, K. al-Masdlik wa 'l-mamd-s); but it is also related (Ibn KatMr) that the reason for this is not clear, c; (3) in modern usage, used for both "free" and "slave" [see کررخیی, i]; (4) in modern usage, used for both "free" and "slave" [see کررخیی, i and ii and Ìستکیل].

The have been accused of having committed treason, and the judge, Judge of the tax (al-Tabarl, i, 2795). He was held back when 'Umar finally died (26 Dhū l-Hijādīa 23/3 November 644), he not only killed 'Abū Lu'ū'ā's wife and a young daughter who was a Muslim, but having made a pretext to call al-Hurmuzan aside, he wounded him mortally with his sword, and killed the caliph. This action, for reasons which are not clear, later became a charge of indictment against 'Uthman, and it is probably the resulting polemic concerning his intervention and his decision which gave rise to the divergent accounts of the sources on who were the persons competent to solve the question: it is related that 'Uthman handed over the murderer to the son of al-Hurmuzan, but that the latter renounced his right to vengeance and that, because of this generous act, he was carried home in triumph (Uṣūd, etc.); but it is also related (Ibn Kathīr) that al-Hurmuzan had no heirs; it is reported that he had wished to embrace Islam at the hands of al-Hurmuzan before and during the battle of al-Kādisiyā: 2249, 2258, 2266, 2245; at Bābil: 2240; in the Ahwāz: 2422; his defence of this territory: 2533-5, 2557 f.; 2534-5, 2545, 2555-9; at 'Ustār: 2554, 2555 f.; at Medina: 2555-60, 2569; he advises 'Umar: 2600 f., 2642; his murder: 2795-7, 2800 f.; and index; Tabarl-Zotenog, iii, 556-8; Mas'ūdī, Murâdh, ii, 226, iv, 221, 230, 353, cf. 357, 368; idem, Tambâh, in BGА, viii, 109; 'A'īnî, vii, 245 (only some verses which glorify al-Hurmuzan by placing him on the same level as the Kāris and the Kāysars); Īstâ'hâlī, K. al-Maslîk wa 'l-mamâ-
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AL-HURR B. YAZID B. NASIrYAH B. KANaB B. ATTAB B. AL-HaiTHAM B. AMIR B. HAMMaM AL-RiVaJ, AL-YARb‘uN, AT-TAMMIL came to the head of a group of hones from a Kudsiyya from the vanguard of the forces sent by ‘Ubayd Allâh b. Ziyâd, the governor of al-‘Irâk against al-Husayn b. ‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib [q.v.]. The latter was advancing at the time with a group of his kindred and followers in the direction of al-Kûfa. Al-Hurr was ordered to follow closely the group of al-Husayn so as to bring him to ‘Ubayd Allâh in al-Kûfa; he was however not told to fight. Accordingly he kept close to the camp of al-Husayn and prevented him from leaving his camp to Madîna, but agreed that he should proceed in a direction other than al-Kûfa. The relations between al-Hurr and al-Husayn were not at first hostile: he even prayed behind al-Husayn; he denied at the camp in the barren spot of Karbala’.

When ‘Umar b. Sa‘d b. Abî Wâkîs, heading the forces dispatched by ‘Ubayd Allâh b. Ziyâd, rejected the proposals of al-Husayn and decided to fight him, al-Hurr decided to join al-Musayyin, although knowing the proposals of al-Musayyin and decided to fight him, al-Hurr was ordered to fight the forces sent by al-Musayyin, the latter was advancing at a settled place, compelling them to pitch their camp in the barren spot of Karbala’.

When ‘Umar b. Sa‘d b. Abî Wâkîs, heading the forces dispatched by ‘Ubayd Allâh b. Ziyâd, rejected the proposals of al-Husayn and decided to fight him, al-Hurr decided to join al-Musayyin, although knowing the latter’s situation was desperate. He ex- pressed his regret, went over with a small group of his followers to al-Husayn and the latter promised him God’s forgiveness. He fought bravely, killed 2 warriors of the force of ‘Umar b. Sa‘d and was finally killed (10 Muharram 61/10 October 680).

The tradition about the repentance of al-Hurr, his audacity in the encounter and his heroic death became a part of the story of the martyrdom of al-Husayn.


AL-HURR AL-AMILI, laqab of the ‘Ilâm-‘a‘qarî shaykh Muhammad b. al-Hasan b. ‘Ali b. al-Husayn al-‘Amîlî al-Ma∫gharî (also of his brother, the historian ‘Abîmâd who died in 1120/1708-9 and who succeeded him in Ma∫gharî), was a pupil of the shaykh Yusuf al-Bahrani at the school of the shaykh Husayn al-Mahbûb (d. 1157/1743) and was buried in Mashhad on Friday 8 Râjîb 1033/26 April 1624 at Ma∫gharî in the Djabal ‘Amîlî, where he completed his first studies with his father, his paternal uncle, the shaykh Muhammad, his maternal grandfather, the shaykh ‘Abbâs al-Salâm b. Muhammad, and one of his father’s maternal uncles, the shaykh ‘Ali b. Muhammad, at Djabal, in the same Djabal, he was also the grandson of Muhammad b. Muhammad Al-Din, a great-grandson of al-Shâhî al-tha‘lîn (q.v.).

After remaining 40 years in the Djabal, during which he twice made the pilgrimage to Mecca, Muhammad visited the shrines of Arab ‘Irâk, whence he journeyed to Iran to settle in Ma∫gharî and to remain there as the shaykh al-Islâm of the sanctuary of Imam ‘Ali al-Ri∫î. In the course of another hajj, he passed through Isfahan, where he was favourably received by Muhammad Al-Hasan Al-Mâ‘şî to the Djabal, whence he returned to Isfahan and presented himself to Shâh Sülâyman, who also offered him his patronage although, it appears, he showed some surprise at first at the simplicity and lack of savoir-faire of the shaykh. He died at Ma∫gharî, where he had soon returned, and was buried in the sanctuary, near the madrasa of Mirzâ Dîvân. As a pupil of Zayn al-Dîn, who himself had been the pupil of Muhammad Amin Astarâbâdî (but who was also the grandson of such a well qualified representative of the wâdî school as shaykh Hasan b. Zayn al-Dîn, the author of the Ma∫lîm al-usâlî [see usûhilîyân]), it is not surprising to find him among the Alkabriyyin, whose methodology he strove to justify with arguments considered “more subtle than a spider’s web” (a‘han min bayî al-‘ankabûtî). His principal work is indeed a vast collection of hadîth, the Ta‘rîh usâsîlî al-‘Hûfa ila ‘abhâm al-shâri‘î (even his opponents admire the breadth and erudition of this work although they criticize its faults in juridical elaboration), which makes him the second of the “three great Muhammads of recent centuries” (the first being Mu‘înî-fî Faydî and the third Madjîlisî). The great work, composed over 18 years, was lithographed at Tehrân in 1323-4 (3 vols.) and was “completed” quite recently by Mirzâ Husayn Nârî (ed. Nizâmî, 1924, 129, 130; al-Madjîlisî) and especially of the “non-usîlî” scholars; the third of the three Great Muhammad Scholars was ‘Abbâs Al-Ma∫gharî and the master of the contemporary ‘A‘im A‘b Buzurg Thârîhî, who died at Najafî in 1320, with his Mustadrak al-usâsîlî wa mustanbâz al-mu‘assîlî (3 vols., litb. Tehran 1311-1321).

The second great work of the shaykh al-Hurr on hadîth, Ta‘rîh al-sanîs, is ‘l-‘ahôtîh al-budîsîyya, which also was printed in Tehran, 1302, is regarded as the first collection of hadîth budîsî. But the second Muhammad shared with the third (and these separate them both from the first) that hatred for Sûfism which inspired his Iblînd ‘a‘quarîyîn fi radd al-sûfîyya. He also worked in the field of ‘ilm al-rîdîqî, composing a biographical khdtima for his Wasâsî, and especially his very well-known Amal al-‘amîlî fi ‘llamî Dirâb ‘ámilî (litb. Tehran 1302) on the scholars of his native land, with a section devoted to the ruwâdî, and a continuation on the “non-usîlî” scholars from the time of shaykh Tûsî down to his own day: Tadhkit ar-mu‘alâbahîn ir fi ‘llamî al-mu‘a‘akbaḥârîn. The Amal al-‘amîlî was “completed” by the sayyid Muhammad b. ‘Abbâs b. Huraym b. ‘Ali b. Huraym b. ‘Abbâs Al-Bahrârî (fellow pupil of the shaykh Yusuf al-Bahrârî at the school of the shaykh Husayn al-Mâ‘shî, d. 1157/1743) with a Tadâm Âmîl al-
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... to the concept. Obviously, the actual situation varied greatly over the vast expanse of Muslim history, but some basic lines may be said to define the general picture: The individual Muslim was expected to consider subordination of his own freedom to the beliefs, morality, and customs of the group as the only proper course of behaviour. While he valued his personal freedom and was proud of it, he was not supposed to see in it a good to be defended at all costs against group demands. Politically, the individual was not expected to exercise any free choice as to how he wished to be governed. At times, he did stress his right to be considered and treated as an equal by the men in power. Under special circumstances, there was extensive community participation in the government (as, for instance, in early Islam or among certain sectarians), or, at least, a certain degree of wider distribution of the political power among the population (as, perhaps, in city states such as Seville). In general, however, governmental authority admitted of no participation of the individual as such, who therefore did not possess any real freedom vis-à-vis it. On the metaphysical level, the question of how much freedom could be vouchsafed to human beings in view of the omnipotence of God has occupied the Muslim mind from the very beginnings of Islam (see Hurriyya). Whatever concessions were made, however, were not made in the name of any kind of individual freedom, but in order to assure a better regulated society. Moreover, the widely adopted Ash‘arist solution of the free will dilemma, no less than all the others, was far too subtle for the masses to understand; at any rate it failed to impress them with the importance of the element of human freedom it contained.

Bibliography: F. Rosenthal, The Muslim concept of freedom, Leiden 1960. For modern Muslim works on freedom which also pay some attention to the historical background, see the bibliography to the following section.

(F. Rosenthal)

ii.—MODERN PERIOD

The Ottoman Empire and after. The first examples of the use of the word freedom in a clearly defined political sense come from late 18th century Turkey. The word used is not hurriyya but serbestîyet (later also serbestî), pseudo-Arabic and pseudo-Persian abstracts from serbest, an established Ottoman term connoting the absence of limitations or restrictions (thus, serbestîyet denotes collective rather than personal freedom—i.e., independence rather than liberty in the classical liberal sense. This is in the third article of the treaty of Kudîk Kaynardja [q.v.] (1774), establishing the short-lived independence of the Crimean Tatars from both Turkey and Russia. The two states agree to recognize the Tatars as “free and entirely independent of any foreign power”; the Sultan is regarded as their religious head, but without being “prophet of it, promising their political and civil liberty as established”. The forms of words in the Italian original...
of the treaty for these two phrases are "liberi, immediati, ed independenti assolutamente da qualunque straniera Potenza"; this is rendered in Turkish as serbestiyyet ve ghayri-i ta'alluk mustakbilin edinilmesi bir dewlete tabi olmanak üzre. ... and 'abd olman serbestiyyet-i dewlet ve memlekettekrine khâle getiirmiyeq (Turkish text in Djevol, Ta’rîkhî, i, 356-9; Mefîma‘î-i mu‘âkedâtî, iii, 254; Italian in G. F. de Martens, Recueil des traités ..., iv, Göttigen 1795, 610-2).

The French Revolution gave the word serbestiyyet a new meaning. Morall El-Seyyid ʿAli Endefi, the Ottoman ambassador in Paris under the Directoire, uses it several times in his sefârânâme to translate liberté, chiefly in relation to symbols and ceremonies (e.g., TOEM, no. 23 (1329 A.H.), 1458, 1460. On the display of the 'symbols' of freedom by Frenchmen in Turkey, see Djevol, Ta’rîkhî, vi, 182-3). The Re’sîs al-Kutâb ʿAbî Endefi, in his memorandum of 1798 on the political situation resulting from the activities of revolutionary France, shows a clearer understanding of the new political content of the term, and of the danger that it represented to the established order, in the Ottoman Empire as elsewhere. In his introductory account of the Revolution, he tells how the French nationalized the common people (üzânâm-i nân) to follow them with promises of equality and freedom (masâsüde ve serbestiyyet) as a means of obtaining complete happiness in this world. More specifically, he is alarmed by the actions of the French in the former Venetian possessions which they had acquired—the Ionian islands and four towns on the mainland. By evoking the forms of the government of the ancient Greeks and installing a form of liberty (serbestiyyet), the French had made clear their hostile intentions (Djevol, Ta’rîkhî, vi, 395, 400; cf. B. Lewis in J. Wild.Hist., i (1953), 120 ff. (revised version in G. S. Métraux and F. Croizet, eds., The New Asia, New York-London 1965, 47 ff.), and Slavonic Review, xxxiv (1955), 234-5).

The word liberté was one that the French had landed in Egypt, where General Bonaparte, on arrival, addressed the Egyptians on behalf of the French Republic, “founded on the basis of freedom and equality” (‘alâ asâs al-hurriyya wa-l-taswiya: versions in Dibart, Muṣḥir al-ṭabbâsî, Cairo n.d., i, 37; Nikûlâ al-Turk, Mühâqîrâtî, ed G. Wiet, Cairo 1950, 8; the text also appears in Dibart, ʿAdînâbî, iii, Cairo 1879, 4; Ḥaḍîr al-Shâhîbî Lubûnân, etc.). The word used for freedom is hurriyya, which, however, was still far from being a commonly accepted equivalent to the European term in its political sense. Ruphy’s French-Arabic wordlist, printed in 1802, renders liberté by hurriyya, but with the restriction “opposé à l’esclavage”; in the sense of “pouvoir d’agir” he prefers sarâā (J. F. Ruphy, Dictionnaire abrégé français-arabe, Paris, An X [1802], 120). As late as 1841 the Franshatât Handjeri renders “liberté civile” and “liberté politique” by ruḫšât-i şerîyye and ruḫšât-i mîhiyye respectively (Dictionnaire français-arabe-persan et turc, ii, Moscow 1840-1, 397, with explanations and examples).

Early references to freedom in works of Muslim authorship are hostile, and equate it with libertinism, licentiousness, and anarchy. A significant change can, however, be seen in a passage in the chronicle of Shahîd (1865) under 1230/1848, of discussing the nature of council meetings (keyfîyet-i meydânîs-i meşkveret), which became frequent at this time. Shânîzâde is careful to base the holding of such consultations on Islamic precedent and ancient Ottoman practice, and to give warning against its misuse; at the same time he points out that such consultations are normally held, with beneficial effects, in “certain well-organized states (duwel-i münaqṣama)”—a striking euphemism for the Empire of Europe—and attributes to the members attending the councils a representative quality entirely new to Islamic political thought. The members of the councils consist of two groups, servants of the state and representatives of the subjects (wâkil-i ra’îyyet); they discuss and argue freely (ber wedjîl-i serbestiyyet) and thus arrive at a decision (Shânîzâde, Ta’rîkhî, iv, Istanbul 1291, 2-3; cf. B. Lewis, in BSOAS, xxix (1966), 385-6).

In the decades that followed, the notion of political freedom became more familiar through discussions of European affairs and translations of European works (e.g. the Turkish version of Botta’s Storia d’Italia, Cairo 1249/1834, repr. Istanbul 1293/1876, which abounds in references to liberal principles and institutions). It was also discussed and developed by several Muslim writers, who were influenced more especially by the rather conservative constitutionalism of the post-Napoleonic era—the idea of the Rechtsstaat, or state based on the rule of law, in contrast both to the unbridled absolutism of Napoleon and the licence of the Revolution. One of the most important of these was the Egyptian Shaykh Rîf’î a-Râfî al-Ṭahâwî [q.v.], who lived in Paris from 1826 to 1831. His account of what he saw and learnt was first published in Bûlûk in Arabic in 1834 and in a Turkish version in 1839; it includes a translation with commentary of the French constitution and a description of parliamentary institutions, the purpose of which is to secure government under law and the protection of the subject from tyranny. What the French call freedom (hurriyya), says Shaykh Rîf’îa, is the same as what the Muslims call justice and equity (al-adl wa’l-insâf)—that is, the maintenance of equality before the law, government according to law, and the abstention of the ruler from arbitrary and illegal acts against the subject. (Taḥ邱îs al-ṭibrîs fi taḥ邱îs Bâris, ed. Mahîdî ʿAllâm, Ahmed Badawi and Anwar Lûkâ, Cairo n.d. [1958?], 148). Shaykh Rîf’îa’s equation of hurriyya with the classical Islamic concept of justice [see ‘ADL, INSAF, and ZULM] helped to relate the new to the old concepts, and fit his own political writings into the long line of Muslim exhortations to the sovereign to rule wisely and justly, with due respect for the law and due care for the interests and welfare of the subjects [see RA’UYYA and SYASÍA]. What is new and alien to traditional political ideas is the suggestion that the subject has a right to be treated justly, and that some apparatus should be put in place to secure that right. With remarkable perspicacity, Shaykh Rîf’î sees and explains the different roles of parliament, the courts and the press in protecting the subjects from tyranny—or rather, as he points out, in enabling the subjects to protect themselves. What is far from clear is the extent to which he felt these ideas and institutions to be relevant to the needs of his own country. In his later writings there is little suggestion of any such relevance; even his commendation of the Khedive Ismâ’il for setting up a consultative assembly in 1866 shows a traditional concern with the duties of the ruler—justice and consultation—rather than a liberal concern with the rights of the ruled. In his al-Murshîd al-ʿalîm (Cairo 1862, 127 ff.), he defines freedom under five sub-headings, the last
two of which are civic (madani) and political (siydsi). Both are defined in relation to social, economic and legal rights, without any specific reference to political rights in the liberal sense. The first three sub-headings are natural, social (i.e., freedom of 'conduct') and religious. Political freedom is the assurance of the state to the individual of the enjoyment of his property and the exercise of his 'natural' freedom (i.e., the basic innate power of all living creatures to eat, drink, move etc., limited by the need to avoid injury to himself or to others) (see L. Zolondek, *A大多数人和政治自由*, in MW, liv (1964), 90-7).

Şaykh Rifa'a's Turkish contemporary Şadıık Rifat Paşa [q.v.], though vaguer in his theoretical notions of the meaning of freedom, is more specific on its immediate application at home. In an essay first drafted while he was Ottoman ambassador in Vienna in 1837—and in close touch with Metternich—he discusses the essential differences between Turkey and Europe, and those respects in which Turkey might profitably seek to imitate Europe. Şadıık Rifat is deeply impressed by European wealth, industry and science, in which he sees the best means of regenerating Turkey. European progress and prosperity, he explains, are the result of certain political conditions, of stability and tranquillity, which in turn depend on 'the attainment of complete security for the life, property, honour and reputation of each nation and people, that is to say, on the proper application of the necessary rights of freedom (hubkât-i làzîme-i hüriyyet)'. For Şadıık Rifat, as for Şaykh Rifa'a, freedom is an extension of the classical Islamic idea of justice—an obligation of the ruler to act justly and in accordance with the law; but it is also one of the 'rights of the nation' (hubkât-i millet), and the establishment of these rights in Turkey is a matter of 'the most urgent necessity' (text in Şadıık Rifat Paşa, *Münkebakât-ı a háfar*, Istanbul, 1854). But he is said to have aimed at "republican government" (hükümâna dâjmühriyyâ), probably meaning some form of representative government (Anfûn al-Âaḫlîqî, ed. Yusuf İbrahim Yarbak, *Hwa wa-fima fi l-Ulbân*, Damascus 1938, 87; English trans. M. H. Kerr, *Lebanon in the last years of feudalism . . .*, Beirut 1959, 53. See further P. K. Hitti, *The impact of the West on Syria and Lebanon in the nineenth century*, in J.Wld.Hist., ii (1955), 629-30).

The intensification of Western influence during and after the Crimean War on the one hand, and the growing internal political and economic pressures on the other, both helped to bring a revival of libertarian thought and activities in the eighteen sixties. In Turkey, Şinâsî [q.v.] stressed the importance of freedom of expression in the introductory editorials both of *Terd/Lumdn-i Aftâr* (no. 1, 127/1860) and of *Taşvîr-i Efaâr* (no. 1, 15 June [O.S.] 1278/1862). In Syria, the Christian author Francis Fath Allah al-Marrâgh [q.v.] wrote an allegorical dialogue (chabâl al-bâb, Beirut 1866, repr. Cairo 1298/1880-x), which includes a philosophic and political discussion of freedom, and of the conditions that are required to maintain it. More directly political in content was the work of a Muslim author, the famous Khaýr al-Dîn Paşa [q.v.], one of the authors of the Tunisian constitutional enactment of 1861 (*Akwân al-masâlik fi mašrefat awhal al-mamâtîh*, Tunis 1284-5/1867-8; French trans. *Rformes nécessaires aux États musulmans*, Paris 1868; Turkish version, Istanbul 1296/ 1879). In this rather conservative programme of reform, Khaýr al-Dîn examines the sources of European wealth and power, and finds them in the political institutions of Europe, which secure justice and freedom. Identifying the two, he makes some cautious and rather obscure recommendations on how to secure them in the Islamic state without violating or departing from Islamic traditions and institutions, by reliance on 'consultation' (see MASHWARA), since the consultation of ministers,
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"ulamā", and notables is the authentic Islamic equivalent of the European system of representative and constitutional government. It may be noted that neither as chief minister in Tunisia in the years 1873-7, nor as Grand Vizier in Turkey in 1878-9, did he do anything to restore the constitutions which had been suspended in both countries.

Already in 1836, in an ode addressed to Reshid Pasha on the occasion of the Reform Edict of that year, Shinâsî tells the reforming Pasha "You have made us free (a dabā), who were slaves to oppression (zulm)" and continues: "Your law is an act of manifestation (manifestum) which informs the Sultan of his limits (bildirik haddet)."

The radical implications of these words—the replacement of justice by freedom as the antithesis of tyranny, and the suggestion of a constitutional restriction of the sovereign's powers—were developed and made clear in the late sixties and seventies by the group of liberal patriots known as the Young (strictly "new") Ottomans [see yeni âmâniyât].

The political ideas of the Young Ottomans, though couched in European terms, were related to Islamic traditions, were sometimes with visible effort, to Islamic traditions, are of European origin, and express an Ottoman-Islamic adaptation of the liberal patriotism current in Europe at that time. Their ideal was the British parliament at Westminster, their ideology was drawn from the liberal teachings of the French enlightenment and revolution, their organization and tactics were modelled on the patriotic secret societies of Italy and Poland. In the political writings of the Young Ottomans the two key words are Watân [q.v.], fatherland, and Hürriyyet—freedom. The latter was the name of the weekly journal which they published in exile (London, June 1868-April 1870; Geneva, April-June 1870). In this journal, and in other writings, the Young Ottoman ideologists, above all Nâmîk Kemâl [q.v.], expounded their interpretation of liberty—the sovereignty of the people, to be secured by constitutional and representative government (see for example the article from Hürriyyet published by M. Colonoue in French translation in Orient, no. 13 (1960), 123-33). For Kemâl as for earlier Muslim writers, the primary duty of the state is still to act justly—but justice means not only care for the welfare of the subject, but respect for his political rights. These rights must be enshrined by appropriate institutions: "To keep the government within the limits of justice, there are two basic devices. The first of them is that the fundamental rules by which it operates should no longer be implicit or tacit, but should be published to the world... The second principle is consultation (mecbûret), whereby the legislative power is taken away from the government" (Nâmîk Kemâl, Hûbûk-i Stamped, in İbre, no. 18, 1872; repr. in Ebü'l-Diyâ Tewfîk, Nâmâne-i edebiyâtî-i ʿOthmânîyêt, İstanbul 1936, 357-8, and, in the new Turkish script, in Mustafa N. Özön, Nâmîk Kemâl ve İbre gazetesi, İstanbul 1938, 96-7; English trans. in Lewis, Emergence, 140). Like his predecessors, Nâmîk Kemâl tries to present these imported ideas as natural achievements, not confined the general precepts of law set forth in its preamble to personal freedom (hûrriyyeti şahsîyye) alone, which it interpreted as security of life, property and honour, but also proclaimed such other basic principles as freedom of thought (hûrriyyeti.cf.), sovereignty of the people, and the system of government by consultation [i.e., representative and responsible government], then only could it have taken the character of a fundamental charter..." (İbre no. 46, 1872, cit. Ihsan Sungu, Tanzimat ve Yeni Osmanlılar, in Tanzimat, i, İstanbul 1940, 845; English trans. in Lewis, Emergence, 169).

In 1876, with the promulgation of the first Ottoman constitution, the liberal and parliamentary programme of the Young Ottomans seemed to be on the point of realization. Article 10 of the constitution lays down that personal freedom is inviolable, and subsequent articles deal with freedom of worship, the press, association, education, etc., as well as with freedom from arbitrary violations of the rights of the person, residence and property. In its political provisions, however, the constitution is less libertarian. It derives not from the sovereignty of the people but from the will of the sovereign, who retains important prerogatives and all residual powers; it gives only perfunctory recognition to the principle of the separation of powers; it provides for a consultative assembly, even an elected one, and no other institutions: "To keep the government within the limits of justice, there are two basic devices. The first of them is that the fundamental rules by which it operates should no longer be implicit or tacit, but should be published to the world... The second principle is consultation (mecbûret), whereby the legislative power is taken away from the government" (Nâmîk Kemâl, Hûbûk-i Stamped, in İbre, no. 18, 1872; repr. in Ebü'l-Diyâ Tewfîk, Nâmâne-i edebiyâtî-i ʿOthmânîyêt, İstanbul 1936, 357-8, and, in the new Turkish script, in Mustafa N. Özön, Nâmîk Kemâl ve İbre gazetesi, İstanbul 1938, 96-7; English trans. in Lewis, Emergence, 140). Like his predecessors, Nâmîk Kemâl tries to present these imported ideas as natural achievements, not confined the general precepts of law set forth in its preamble to personal freedom (hûrriyyeti şahsîyye) alone, which it interpreted as security of life, property and honour, but also proclaimed such other basic principles as freedom of thought (hûrriyyeti.cf.), sovereignty of the people, and the system of government by consultation [i.e., representative and responsible government], then only could it have taken the character of a fundamental charter..." (İbre no. 46, 1872, cit. Ihsan Sungu, Tanzimat ve Yeni Osmanlılar, in Tanzimat, i, İstanbul 1940, 845; English trans. in Lewis, Emergence, 169).

"Under 'Abd al-Ḥamîd freedom was a proscribed word, and the ideals which it connoted became all the more precious. For Turkish modernists of that generation, the fountainhead was the West, which provided both material examples of the benefits of freedom, and intellectual guidance on the means of attaining it. "When you look upon this fascinating display of human progress", wrote Sa'dullâh from the Paris Exhibition of 1878, "do not forget that all these achievements are the work of freedom. Under the protection of freedom that peoples and nations attain happiness. Without freedom, there can be no security; without security, no endeavour; without endeavour, no prosperity; without prosperity, no happiness." (Sa'dullâh Pasha, 1878 Paris Eksposisyonu, in Ebü'l-Diyâ Tewfîk, Nâmâne, 288; English trans. in B. Lewis, Middle East, 47).

As an earlier generation had turned to Voltaire, Rousseau and Montesquieu, so the new generation read the writings of Haeckel, Büchner, Le Bon (specially favoured because of his sympathy for Islam), Spencer, Mill and many others. "If there
are today", wrote Hüsün Râmi in 1908, "men who can think, can write, and can defend freedom, they are those whose minds are enlightened by these sparks [of European culture]. In those dark and melancholy days, our friends, our guides were those intellectual treasures of the West. We learned the love for thinking, the love for freedom, from those treasures" (Preface to *Shipşevdî*, Istanbul 1912, English trans. in Niyazi Berkes, *Secularism*, 292).

In more practical political terms, freedom meant constituting voting representatives—the ending of autocracy, the restoration of the constitution, and the safeguarding of the rights of the citizen by free elections and parliaments. But freedom was no longer a purely political matter. For some, the exponents of materialist and secularist ideas, it involved an intellectual liberation from what they saw as the shackles of religious obscurantism. Perhaps the first to conceive of liberation in social and economic terms was Prince Sabâb al-Din [q.v.], who sought to lead Turkey from a collectivist to an individualist social order by a policy of federalism and decentralization and by the encouragement of private enterprise. In 1902 he founded a society dedicated to the achievement of these purposes. Similar ideas inspired the Liberal Entente (*Hürriyyet ve Pîlîdî* [q.v.]), which appeared in 1911 as a rival to the Union and Progress Party (see *îrîîâyiî ve baktîyiî*). An interesting example of the use of the word in a social and individualist connotation is in Kâsim Amin’s (q.v.) famous book *Tabrîr al-mar‘a*, the liberation—i.e., emancipation—of woman (Cairo 1316/1898 and 1905; Turkish versions: Cairo 1326/1908, Istanbul 1329/1911, and, in Northern Turkish, Kazan 1909).

After the revolution of 1908 the establishment, for a while, of effective freedom of thought and expression initiated a period of vigorous discussion, in which the problem of freedom, with others, was examined, analysed, and discussed from many points of view; political, social, economic and religious freedom all find their exponents and defenders. But as the bonds of autocracy and censorship were wound tighter by the Young Turks, the debate dwindled into insignificance. In the new Turkey they met mestuwe in the first and second republic. The discussion of freedom does not differ significantly from that of Europe, and need not be considered here.

Ottoman subjects from the Arab lands played a certain rôle in the libertarian movement almost from the beginning. On 24 March 1867, the Egyptian prince Mustafâ Fâdîl Pasha (q.v.) published in the French newspaper *Liberî* an open letter to the Sultan, advising him to grant a constitution to the Empire (reprinted in *Orient*, no. 5 (1958), 29-38). Besides ending them with their first manifesto, the Pasha also helped the Young Ottoman exiles financially, and was later succeeded in this by his brother the Khâdib Ismâ‘îl, who saw in them a useful instrument of his political purposes. In Hamidian times, one of the first libertarian journals published in exile was started by Salim Pâris, a son of Ahmâd Pâris al-Shidyâk [q.v.]. Published in London in January 1894, it was entitled *Hürriyyet*—a significant evocation of the earlier Young Ottoman weekly. He was later induced by agents of the Sultan to cease publication. Other exiles included the Lebanese amir Amin Arsîân, who published an Arabic journal called *Kashîf al-Nîbâ* in Paris in 1895, and a former Syrian deputy in the Ottoman parliament of 1876, Shahlî Gâhîm [q.v.], who became active in Young Turk circles. The ideas and arguments of the Young Ottomans and of the Young Turks found their echoes also in Arabic publications, which at this period tend to offer a provincial adaptation of ideas circulating among the Turkish ruling class.

Thus, the much discussed appearance of the motto *Hüb b al-waṣl min al-imân—"love of country is part of the faith"*—on the Syrian fortmightly *Al-Dîmân* in 1870 follows its regular use in the Young Ottoman weekly *Hürriyyet* from 1868 to 1870; the growth of federalist groups among the Ottoman Arabs must be related to the federalist movement among the Young Turks.

In Egypt, under Khedivial and then British rule, political thought evolved along different lines, more directly influenced by Europe, and less directly affected by events and movements in the Ottoman Empire—though even here these had their effect. Many of the leaders of thought were Arabic-speaking émigrés from the Ottoman lands; the occasional presence and activity in Egypt of such Turkish personalities as Prince Sabâb al-Din and ʿAbd Allâh Djestâd [q.v.] cannot have passed unnoticed. Wali al-Dîn Yâkân [q.v.], of Turkish origin and a participant in Young Turk politics, wrote extensively in Arabic on political and social problems. A work of some influence was Djestât’s Turkish translation of Vittorio Alfieri’s *Della tirannide*. Entitled simply *Istibbât*, it was first printed in Geneva in 1898 and reprinted in Cairo in 1909. This translation appears to underlie the famous Arabic adaptation of Alfieri’s book by the Aleppine exile in Egypt, ʿAbd al-Râhîm al-Kâwâkbî [q.v.], entitled *Tabâ‘î s-istibbât*, Cairo n.d. (Sylvia G. Haim, *Alfieri and al-Kâwâkbî* in *OM*, xxxiv (1954), 321-34; E. Rossi, *Una traduzione turca dell’opera “Della Tirannide” di V. Alfieri*, ibid., 335-7).

One of the earliest discussions of freedom—little noticed at the time—in Egypt, after Shaykh Râfî‘ (see above) is that of the Azhari Shaykh Husayn al-Marâṣî. In his *Risâlat al-kalim al-thamân—"Essay on eight words*"*, published in Cairo in 1298/1881, he examines and interprets, for the benefit of “the intelligent young men of these times”, eight political terms—“current on the tongues of men” (p. 2). One of them is *hürriyya* (pp. 36-7), which the Shaykh explains in natural and social terms—the difference between men and beasts, the human habit of social cooperation and the mutual recognition of rights. The Shaykh recognizes the necessity of freedom in this natural and social sense, but rather obscurely warns his young readers against untoward extensions of the concept into the realm of politics.

Despite such warnings, the influence of European liberal political thought continued to grow, and found frequent expression in Arabic as well as Turkish writings. The merits of freedom are variously described and defended. For some, a vaguely understood freedom is still the secret talisman of Western prosperity and power; its adoption is therefore desirable in order to achieve the same results. For others, freedom means the overthrow of tyranny, which for social cooperation and the mutual recognition of rights. The Shaykh recognizes the necessity of freedom in this natural and social sense, but rather obscurely warns his young readers against untoward extensions of the concept into the realm of politics.
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defined and safeguarded by civil rights, which in turn are secured by political and legal arrangements and institutions. The action and interference of the State must be kept at the minimum; the freedom of the individual, however, is protected by a free press, an independent judiciary, and a constitutional régime guaranteeing the separation of powers.

Lufti al-Sayyid is concerned not only with the freedom of the individual, but also with that of the nation, which has corporate natural rights distinct from and additional to the aggregate of the rights of the individuals composing it. Rejecting pan-Islamism and disapproving of Arab nationalism, he sees the nation as Egypt, and argues for her liberation from both foreign rule and native authoritarianism.

The liberal interpretation of freedom continued to find exponents, particularly after the Young Turk revolution of 1908 and again after the military victory of the democracies ten years later. But in the meantime a new interpretation of freedom was gaining ground, resulting from the spread of imperialism and the rise of nationalism. As freedom is a synonym for independence—the sovereignty of the nation state, untrammeled by any superior, alien authority. In the absence of any such subordination to aliens, a nation is called free, irrespective of the political, social and economic conditions prevailing within it. This interpretation of freedom had less impact among the Turks, whose independence, though threatened, was never lost, than among the Arab peoples for whom the main theme of political life was the ending of alien rule. During the period of British and French domination, individual freedom was never much of an issue. Though often limited and sometimes suspended, it was on the whole more extensive and better protected than either before or after. The imperial régimes conceded freedom but withheld independence; it was natural that the anti-imperialist struggle should concentrate on the latter and neglect the former.

In the final revulsion against the West, Western democracy too was rejected as a fraud and a delusion, to which the Arab peoples clung with growing dissatisfaction, as the imperial régimes were more disposed to subordination to aliens, a nation is called free, irrespective of the political, social and economic conditions prevailing within it. This interpretation of freedom had less impact among the Turks, whose independence, though threatened, was never lost, than among the Arab peoples for whom the main theme of political life was the ending of alien rule. During the period of British and French domination, individual freedom was never much of an issue. Though often limited and sometimes suspended, it was on the whole more extensive and better protected than either before or after. The imperial régimes conceded freedom but withheld independence; it was natural that the anti-imperialist struggle should concentrate on the latter and neglect the former.

In the final revulsion against the West, Western democracy too was rejected as a fraud and a delusion, to which the Arab peoples clung with growing dissatisfaction, as the imperial régimes were more disposed to subordination to aliens, a nation is called free, irrespective of the political, social and economic conditions prevailing within it. This interpretation of freedom had less impact among the Turks, whose independence, though threatened, was never lost, than among the Arab peoples for whom the main theme of political life was the ending of alien rule. During the period of British and French domination, individual freedom was never much of an issue. Though often limited and sometimes suspended, it was on the whole more extensive and better protected than either before or after. The imperial régimes conceded freedom but withheld independence; it was natural that the anti-imperialist struggle should concentrate on the latter and neglect the former.
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Thus in July 1912 the Khaldskdr Pdbifdn Grubu (the "Group of Saviour Officers"), a military extension of the Liberal Union, intervened, brought down Sa'd Pasha's cabinet (17 July), set up an anti-Unionist régime (21 July), and had the Chamber dissolved (5 August).

The Liberals assumed power at an unfavourable moment. Turkey was at war with Italy and on 16 October the Balkan War broke out. This war proved disastrous for Turkish arms, and as a result the government was discredited. On 23 January 1913, when Kemal Pasha, thought to be going from Istanbul to the Bulgaris, the Unionists overthrew the cabinet in the so-called "Beb-i 'Ali Wâkâfi" and set up a government of their own.

This marked the virtual end of the Liberal Union, though the party was never officially banned. Some of its members, however, were either bullied or bribed into leaving the country, 'Ali Kemâli going to Vienna, Rıfâ (Riza) Nür to Paris and Kamil to Cairo. In May-June 1913 the Liberals attempted to restore Kemâli, and in connexion with this abortive plot Mahmâd Shewket Pasha [q.v.] was assassinated on 11 June. Hereafter the opposition was ruthlessly crushed; some were hanged, some exiled to Sinöb, while others fled abroad. Colonel Sâîfî left for Cairo then to Paris, from where the Liberal organisation under Şarîf Pasha continued to plot against the CUP (see Tunâya, 289-94; and Albert Fua and Rekif-Nezâz, La trahison du gouvernement Turc, Paris 1914).

A second Hürriyet ve İtilâf Fırsâsi was formed on 22 January 1919, and once again the party was the last and most comprehensive attempt at rallying anti-CUP sentiment. In the post-armistice situation, the party advocated collaboration with Britain and the other occupying powers and strenuously opposed the nationalist movement in Anatolia under Muşâfâ Kemâli. Among the founders were 'Ali Kemâli; 'Abd al-Kâdir, a Kurdish senator; Muşâfâ Şâbri; Rıdâ Tewfîk [Bölükâş]; and Mehemd 'All; all five of these entered the cabinet of Dâmdâr Ferîd in March 1919, which has appropriately been described as a "Freedom and Accord cabinet" (I. M. K. Inal, Son sadrasanlar, 1940-1955, p. 2059), although Dâmdâr Ferîd himself did not take any office in the reconstituted cabinet. Rıdâ Nür by 1920 were firmly aligned with the Anatolian nationalists. In May 1919, upon the Greek occupation of İzmir, Şâbri, Rıdâ Tewfîk, and Mehemd 'All left the cabinet and the party, forming a dissident "Müteddi" ("moderate") Hürriyet ve İtilâf Fırsâsi. The party was reunited later under the chairmanship of Colonel Sâîfî. Its influence remained limited to Istanbul, and the elections of the fall of 1919 amounted to a repudiation of its policy not only in Anatolia but also in the capital. Its last general meeting was held in May 1920.

Bibliography: T. Z. Tunâya, Türkiye'de siyasi partiler, 1859-1952, İstanbul 1952, 315-58, 447-57; Rıdâ Nür, Hürriyet ve İtilâf Fırsâs, Istanbul 1923; Ismail Kemal, The memoes of a Kânedân, London 1920; Pasha, Memories of a Turkish statesman, 1913-1919, London 1922, 13 ff. Newspapers for the period: İbdâm (Liberal) and Tanm (Unionist) in particular. See also 'X'.

Hüruf ("ilm al-") is a branch of gîbas on which many Turks are interested, concerned with onomatomancy in the strict sense; but, among some esoteric sects, it became a sort of magical practice, to such an extent that Ibn Khaldûn (Muhaddima, iii, 137-61, Fr. tr. 188-200, Rosenthal 171-82) gave it the name of simâyid (şiiyetâ), which is usually reserved for white magic. It is based on the occult properties of the letters of the alphabet and of the divine and angelic names which they form. Three basic elements are involved in onomatomancy: arithmomancy or gemmata (hisâb al-djummal or, according to Ibn Khaldûn, op. cit., 190-239, Fr. tr. 241-5, Rosenthal, 243-5, hisâb al-nil), the knowledge of the natural properties of the letters ("ilm al-khawâsis"); based on alchemy, and their astrological conjunctures (bîrânâ). In this it is related to the talismanic art from which Ibn Khaldûn considers it derives.

The twenty-eight letters of the Arabic alphabet are divided into four categories, each of seven letters, corresponding to the four basic elements. We give here the classification favoured in the East, with the Western variants: fire: 'â, k, t, m, f, q (west) and dûf (east); air: b, w, y, n, s (west), t, di (east); water: dî, x, k, s (west), d, fî; and y (west): earth; d, h, l, r, dûf, s, m, w (west). It can readily be seen that it is a matter of dividing the Arabic abjad [q.v.] into seven groups of four letters as follows: bûdî, khuz, fîkh, mns (west mns), fûr (west fûr), stûkh (west stûkh), dûfîgh (west dûfîgh); the first letters of each of the seven groups are the fire letters, the second the air letters, the third the water letters and the fourth the earth letters. It is in short a kind of takshîr, "transposition", a procedure which performs a basic function in all forms of dûfîr. There should also be mentioned the harmonious division of the so-called "lunar" and "solar" letters.

The numerical value of the letters is established as follows: from aîf to t, the units (1 to 9); from y to s, the tens (10 to 90); from h to r, the hundreds (100 to 900); and dûf is the equivalent of 1,000. In the Maghribi, given the divergencies in the order of the letters, s equals 390, dûf = 900, gîb = 900 and dûf = 1,000; the four-letter group yûdîgh summarizes this system (see, for the Eastern system, R. Ihsân al-Šâfî, Beirut 1957, i, 51 ff.; P. Kraus, Jâbir Ibn Hayyân, ii, Cairo 1942, 224; for the Western system, Ibn Khaldûn, op. cit., i, 211 ff.; Fr. tr., 242 ff.; Rosenthal, 236 ff.; C. F. Rosenthal, 173, n. 809).

Starting from the principle of alchemy that, by analysing the letters which make up a word, it is possible to establish the qualitative and quantitative structure of the thing which it describes (cf. Kraus, loc. cit.), the literature of hüruf developed in two opposite directions: the first consists of combining the letters so as to obtain a whole possessing particular properties, which are supposed to lead to the required result (divination or magical effect), the second, with the same aim as the first, consists of splitting up certain names to which an esoteric character is attached, often because they are taken
from a sacred book, in this case the Qur'an, in order to apply to their consonantal elements a complex treatment based on numerical, qualitative, quantitative, astrological and theurgical factors.

In this way that between the letters and their numerical values there exists a series of relationships which reverberate from group to group. For example, the connexion between b (2), k (20) and r (200), which represent the different positions of the number 2, is reinforced by the groups d (4), m (40), t (400) and k (8), j (80), dā (800), which are multiples of 2; similarly with the group g (3) and its multiples k (6) and f (56) (on the properties of the numbers, cf. K. Itid†īf al-Sa‘fāf, i, 56 f.).

Arising from their distribution among the four elements, the “fire” letters, in divination and in magic, ward off all evils connected with cold, increasing the influence of heat wherever this is desired, whether in the physical or the astrological plane. Thus, for example, it is possible during a war to increase the influence of Mars by theurgic combination of the fire letters.

In the same way, the “water” letters are used to predict and to ward off all the ills associated with heat, such as the various kinds of fever, and to increase the influence of cold wherever this is required, on the physical or on the astrological plane. Thanks to them it is possible for example to make lunar influences prevail. And similarly for the other letters.

Apart from these conventional elements of numerical equivalents and co-ordination with the four elements, the science of letters consists only of mystical experiments based on the occult properties of the letters.
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of the alphabet; and “to arrange alphabetically” is normally expressed as tarib "al-huruf al-hidjia." The dictionaries already mentioned also record the tartib normally expressed as tartib cald huruf ... true vocalic element: the sound a for alif layyina, the sound u for wdw sdkina, the sound i for ya* sdkina. But what is

The dictionaries already mentioned also record the tartib cald huruf, of the alphabet. See also Diet. of Techm. Terms, i, 319, line 1.

Al-Zajidjadi devoted four chapters to al-hidja (al-Djumal, 206-77). Throughout he is concerned with the condition of the letter of the alphabet. He distinguishes two kinds of hidja: one li 'lam "for seeing"; the other li-raf al-sayn "for seeing with the eye." Of the first he says only: huwa li-thammat wa'in al-ghir, "it is to establish the metre of poetry." The Muhsasas (loc. cit.) says nothing of this. It is probably a question in the verse scansion (tabi'i al-bayt) of division between huruf mutaharrika and huruf sakinah in order to identify or verify the component units (ajda'ia).

Spelling presupposes recognition of the identity of the harf and its pronunciation in accordance with the accompanying haraka; thus huruf al-hidja includes the designation of the sound of which the graphic sign is the symbol. In phonetics, Arab grammarians use buruf, pl. huruf, to mean the articulations of the Arabic language; the phonemes; they recognize 29 principal articulations (ajd). The huruf al hidjia, of course, offer only 28 signs. But it must be borne in mind that alif serves for two: the hamsa and alif lalayina [see HAMZA].

An expression related to huruf al-hidjia is huruf al-mu'djam. Ibn Djinji (Sirr sin'a, i, 38-45) discussed its meaning and grammatical construction. Al-mu'djam is an infinitive, here in grammatical annexation, of the same form as the nomen patientis (see Traité, § 94 n) of a fourth-form verb du'djam, the nominative of ajdama "obscure, lack of clarity," with a privative meaning: "to make the lack of clarity disappear." The huruf al-mu'djam are the huruf which are the object of this action. One must bear in mind the earliest form of Arabic writing, without diacritical marks, and the obscurity which shrouded most of the signs. The enlightenment in question was achieved by the addition of the diacritical points which made clear the graphic and phonetic nature of the harf in a common ductus. The huruf al-mu'djam are thus properly those huruf with diacritical points. In order to avoid any mistake in writing over the identification of a harf the ancient writers follow it with a gloss: mu'djam signifies the harf with point, muhmal the unpointed harf, e.g. khayn mu'djama, 'ayn mukhmal. This is the invariable usage of the Dictionary of Technical Terms (see Bibliography). For further details, see Wright, Ar. Gr., i, 4. In practice, the expression huruf al-mu'djam has become a synonym of huruf al-hidjia, to designate "the letters of the alphabet," but it refers solely to writing (see M. Bravmann, Materialien, §).

The huruf al-hidjia include all the articulations of the Arabic alphabet; we should therefore give here a brief account of the phonetic doctrine of the Arab grammarians concerning them and of the distinctions which they draw. The grammarians simply list these distinctions consecutively; the paragraph titles below have been added to relate them to European phonetics.

I. The genesis of the huruf. The point of departure is the sa'at el-sadr, the resonance emitted from the chest. This sa'at is an 'arad, "an accident," that is, something which exists in something else: the nasaf, "the [expiratory] breath," its marhab, "vehicle," as Râdi al-Dîn al-Astârâba'di says (Sharh al-Shâ'ifya, iii, 259, line 7). For this combination: sa'at el-sadr + nasaf, the Arab grammarians, in this genesis of the huruf, keep the simple name of sa'at; with it they contrast nasaf, the simple expiratory breath, treating them as two not only distinct but totally different realities. This contrast between sa'at and nasaf is fundamental.

The harf is the product of a ma'dhâ, "cutting," in this sa'at as it rises in the throat, then in the mouth, wherever the articulatory organs oppose this ma'dhâ to the moving sa'at. What properly constitutes the harf is its particular sound: dijâr (pl. adîrâs), the result of the application of the articulatory organs to the place of the ma'dhâ; the adîrâs differ according to the different ma'dhâ; for each ma'dhâ there is a dijâr, a harf, and one might say a harf sahib.

The harf, produced in this sa'at as it moves, naturally makes a ma'dhâra, for the pronunciation of which an absolute of nasaf is essential. The articulation of a ma'masa, on the other hand, only modifies the nasaf at the ma'dhâra of the harf; it is produced with and in the nasaf. The question then arises, how one passes from one to the other? The Arabs, from the definitions given by Sibawayh in the Kitâb (ii, 453, l. 21-2 and 454, l. 2-3) onwards, have seen the answer in the energy of the articulation: in strong articulation (awba'a l-'tâmîd), the nasaf is stopped, held back, there is nothing but sa'at for and in the harf and the harf is ma'dhîr; in weak articulation (udîrâ l-'tâmîd), the way remains clear for the nasaf: dijâr l-nasaf ma'a'hâ [al-harf], "there is nasaf with it," the harf is ma'mus.

The consideration of the articulatory force is thus very important, indeed the central pillar of the theory, beside the fundamental contrast between sa'at and nasaf. But in constructing their system so, the Arab grammarians introduced the weakest element: since how could a difference in articulatory force cause the presence of sa'at alone in the one case and of nasaf alone in the other? We have tried elsewhere (Examen, 204-5) to demonstrate what phenomena could have led the first Arab theoreticians to establish such a misleading distinction. However that may be, it should be noted from what a special single theory which opposes the sa'at to the nasaf, or allowing free passage to the nasaf. Their point of view is totally different from that of modern phonetics; we cannot therefore look to Arab theory for arguments against the modern doctrine of voiced consonants when we try to apply this to the sounds of Arabic.

In the genesis of the huruf, we must refer to the particular case of three huruf called al-huruf al-mu'tallal (or huruf al-'illa or al-Istalî), the "sick": these are alif lalayina, waw harf al-madd, and ya' harf al-madd. All three are sakinah by nature. Their ma'dhâra has the peculiarity of being muttassî, "wide"; the ma'dhâra has such amplitude that the ma'dhâ has no longer any means of existence; it takes on the dimensions of the ma'dhâra and loses all efficacity, becoming a word without significance. The sa'at flows in this ma'dhâra continuously and uninterruptedly: these are the huruf al-madd or al-madd wa l-'istallâ: a soft flow without rough friction; these are the huruf al-lin. These huruf al-mu'tallal are thus the continuous or soft huruf and their sa'at designates a true vocalic element: the sound a for alif lalayina, the sound u for waw sakinah, the sound i for ya' sakinah. But what is
it that is flowing with this sa'ar. It is air (hawd*).

They are thus fi 'l-hawd*, or hawd*iyya as well.

The division of the huruf* is thus complete. The karaca is not a huruf* and has no place here; but its description as a "little huruf*" permits its integration into the whole system of the huruf.*

II. The makhâridi or points of articulation. There can be no question of giving here another full account of all the makhâridi. One is easily accessible in the Cours de J. Cantineau (19-20) or in H. Fleisch, Traité (§ 44 b-g). The following notes will suffice:

Al-Khalli alone established terms by which to designate the huruf* according to their articulatory region. They are to be found in a text of which al-Azhari is one of the earliest known transmitters (Le Monde Oriental, xiv (1920), 45, lines 7-12).

al-khalisiyya, literally "the gutturals", are for us the laryngeals. Among these al-Khalli includes only *i, h, k, gh, while Sibawayhi includes also hamza and alif. These, with waw and yâ, are described by al-Khalli as dâfî (pl. adâfî): "because they emerge from the pharynx, the hollow of the chest", without any articulatory region to which they can be assigned except this dâfî; thus he sets them on one side, apart from the huruf* with a normal makhradji. This affected the order of the letters which he adopted in his Kitâb al-'Ay, as well as the arrangement of those lexicographical works whose authors followed the practice of al-Khalli (see Mufakham wa 'l munâm al-asaliyya: z, s, s.

The teaching of the whole grammatical tradition is that k and kh are among the khalisiyya. Modern phonetics considers them as velar, or, more exactly, postvelar [see ghayn].

al-mifîyya, "prepalatals": d, t, t, whereas Sibawayhi, followed by grammatical tradition, places the tongue "at the base of the central incisors" [see dâl].

al-qhalisiyya: r, l, n, and al-asaliyya: s, s, s.

The terms indicate articulation with the tip of the tongue but specify only the form of the tongue: flat and thinned at the tip for the first group and tall; dâfî mufruruf.

The term remains obscure.

It is clear from the foregoing notes that differences existed on the subject of phonetics between Al-Khalli and Sibawayhi, but, curiously enough, they found no echo in the Kitâb. There is an obscure point here in the origins of Arab phonetics.

III. The manner of articulation. (1) madghâra—mahmusa. madghâra, "striking", and mahlmusa, "stifled", express directly the acoustic impression as received and assessed. In reality there can be no doubt that they signify the manner of articulation acknowledged by modern phonetics as voiced and unvoiced. The theory of the genesis of the huruf* as set out above is sufficient of itself to demonstrate that the Arabs ordered them according to the correlation of their sonority. The definitions of Sibawayhi express the result of the test proposed for distinguishing a madghâra from a mahlmusa, the former a huruf* having only sa'ar, the latter being a huruf* with na'as; they also express the discriminatory part played by articulatory force. These are the definitions:

"The madghâra is a huruf* for which the pressure [of the articulatory organs] on the place [required] is made fully and which prevents the presence of [pure] breath with it, until the pressure [applied] for it is concluded and the sound [of this huruf*] is produced."

"The mahlmusa is a huruf* for which the pressure [of the articulatory organs] on the place [required for this huruf*] is made weakly, so that there is [pure] breath with it."

The huruf* al-madghâra are: hamsa, alif, 'ayn, gh, d, yâ, dâl, l, n, r, s, t, dh, b, m, waw.

The huruf* al-mahlmusa are: h, kh, k, sh, s, t, th. The Mufassal brings them together in the mnemonic: sâtsâhâshâhâ nakhâfah.

All the mahlmusa correspond with the unvoiced consonants of modern phonetics; but the presence among the madghâra of hamsa, f and k is noteworthy. As regards the first of these, the difficulty has been dealt with under hamza. For f, it was certainly a voiced consonant in the pronunciation described by Sibawayhi: an emphatic dâl; one text of his is decisive (ii, 455, l. 9), where he distinguishes between f and ñ only by the ildâk* "the velarization". For k: a voiced pronunciation of ñ must have existed, at least in part of the ancient Arab world; if not, it would be difficult to explain why it should be precisely the manner in which this phoneme is pronounced which at the present time has become a distinguishing mark between nomadic dialects (voiced) and sedentary dialects (unvoiced) (see Traité, § 40 b). On the history of the question, see J. Cantineau, Cours, ii-2, Essais, i, 46, b-c. (2) mu‘baka—munafitaka. Ibn Djallal (Sirr sindâ, i, 70, l. 12), taking up the main point of the explanations given by Sibawayhi (ii, 455, l. 5-7), describes al-ildâk* as an elevation of the back of the tongue towards the upper palate, the latter acting as a tabak (lid) over this part of the tongue (cf. Dict. of Tech. Terms, i, 323, l. 16-8). This movement, which presupposes the depression of the front part of the tongue, is in fact produced towards the soft palate or velum; ñbâk is well translated as "velarization" and mu‘baka as "velar". Munafitaka, literally "open, disengaged", designates the huruf* without ñbâk: it may be translated "non-velar".

The huruf* al-mu‘bakka are: s, ñ, t, ñ. All the other huruf* are munafitaka, but we shall have to distinguish those among them which are munafitâya (see (3)).

The huruf* al-mu‘baka are often called "the emphatic consonants"; but emphasis can exist in different forms. In the type of emphatic in the Semitic languages of Ethiopia, there is no velarization, but glottalization: occlusion of the glottis and audition of a hamsa with the articulation of the emphatic (see the details in J. Cantineau, Consonantisme, 291). Ph. Marpa, studying by radioscopy the Articulation de l'emphaxe dans un parler maghrébin (in AEIO Alger, viii (1948), 5-28), discovered another form of
emphasis: pharyngalization. But discoveries in this field may well not be completed. We therefore consider valid the type of emphatic described by the Arab grammarians (see Traité, § 46 k).

The huruf al-mustāʿliyya are the four mubāba that just discussed and b, zh, hh; the other huruf are munḥakfiḍa. The elevation of the back of the tongue for the mubāba makes these mustāʿliyya “raised”. But for b, zh, hh the elevation of the tongue does not go so far as to make a pāṭāb over the tongue, according to Radh al-Dīn al-Azārābdīl (Ṣahr al-Shāfiʿyya, iii, 262, l. 8-9). For him, it is therefore a matter of a diminished velarization or of the beginning of a velarization. The interest of these mustāʿliyya lies in the fact that they prevent i̮māda, as Sibawayh already observed (ii, 285, l. 20). They retain their interest for the student of modern dialects, where they are connected with questions of tāfjam. See J. Cantineau, Cours, 23-4; Traité, § 48b.

IV. The degree of aperture: shādīda—rikhwa—bayniyya.

The huruf al-shādīda are: hamsa, b, d, g, t, d, b. The huruf al-rikhwa are: h, b, zh, hh, s, r, t, th, dh, f.

The huruf al-bayniyya are: ‘ayn, m, n, r, s, d, y, ma, ya, alif.

The Muḥafṣal gives the following mononinics for the first class: ‘asfādā jahabak or ‘asfādūha ḥafṣiḍa; and for the last: līma yaraʿa und or lam yaraʿasen.

Bayniyya means “intermediary”; the term is recent but convenient; it is used by Mub. Makkī in his Niḥyā, completed in 1305/1887 (quoted in M. Bravmann, Materialien, 19). The ancient practice was to use a periphrasis, e.g. Muḥ. (§ 734): “those which are between the shādīda and the rikhwa”.

By their division into shādīda and rikhwa, the Arabs made the same point in fact as modern phonetics does by its own division into occlusive and constrictive. But the terms themselves do not express directly the physiological standpoint presupposed by the terms occlusive and constrictive, but rather greater or less firmness in articulation: shādīda “energetic” ruḫwa “relaxed”.

In the al-Tahānawī’s work the Arabs saw neither a normal occlusive nor a normal constrictive. There is something to be said for this view (see Cantineau, Cours, 22-3; Traité, § 47 c-d), except for ‘ayn, where one can see nothing to set it on one side. But the peculiarities of the bayniyya do not constitute a general third class. Of the explanations of them given by the Arabs, the clearest appear to be those given in Sāhih al-Shāfiʿyya (iii, 260, l. 18 f.) repeated in Dict. of Techn. Terms (i, 322, l. 20 f.).

Other minor divisions of the huruf have been established by the Arabs. It is sufficient to note here:

the huruf al-ḥalalā: b, d, g, t, d, b; the huruf al-ḥalāba: l, r, n, f, b, m (see J. Cantineau, Cours, 24; Traité, § 48 a and c). See further the Dict. already quoted, under hurf (l, 320-5).

For the numerical values of the huruf see Aḥmad: for the use of these huruf in magic, see huruf.
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AL-HIDJÁ—a Hurufiya
que, Paris 1947 (referred to as Essai comparatif).
Finally, a very important text of Sibawayhi, published in H. Fleisch, L’arabe classique, Esquisse
d’une structure linguistique, Beirut 1956, 134-36
(referred to as Esquisse). See also linguistics and
phonetics.
(H. Fleisch)

AL-HURUF AL-MULARA’AT [see al-
KUR'ÁN].

HURUFYYA, unorthodox Muslim sect of
gnostic-cabalistic tendencies founded by Fadl Allah of
Astarabad in Iran at the end of the 8th/14th century.

He was a descendant of 'Abd al-
Rahmán; he began his career as a Sufi famed particu-
larly for the care he took to avoid eating any
unlawful food, so much so that he was known as
halál-khor. He was a sayyid (descendent of 'Ali) and, according to some sources, was named
Muhammad Nafadji, the author of a
Db-náma-yi kabir. Like other “divine mani-
festations” before and after him, Fadl Allah seems
to have sought to convert to his doctrine the princes
and rulers of his time. According to Ibn Haidar al-
'Askallání (his contemporary, in Inbád al-ghumr fi
abná al-'umr), he invited Timurlang to embrace his
religion, and it is certain that he dreamed of marrying
the daughter of Toktamish, the khan of the Golden
Horde. He spent the last part of his life at Shírwán
(now Baku) where he had taken refuge with the
prince Mirán-sháh, son of Timúrlang, from Timúrl-
ang’s sentence against him issued at Samarkand
after a meeting with the orthodox juriconsults of
that city. Mirán-sháh, however, instead of helping
him, had him arrested. From Shírwán, where, in
prison, he wrote his Waqiyay-náma (Testament),
Fadl Allah was taken to the fortress of Alandjak
near Naghélwán, where he was executed in 796/1394.
The place of his execution (maka’t) at Alandjak
became for some time the Mecca of his followers, and
Mirán-sháh became the Antichrist of the new
religion (the Hurufí texts refer to him as Márán-
sháh, “king of the serpents”).

The first bháiifa of Fadl Allah was his disciple
'Ali al-Alá, author of various Hurufí books, whose
ambition was to win to Hurufism the Kara-Koyunu
prince Kara Yusuf, who had defeated Mirán-sháh.
He was also a missionary and had spreading
Hurufí doctrine in the country of Rúm (Anatolia),
where he appears as early as 802/1400, and having
helped to instil Hurufí ideas into the community of
the Bektashis (q.v.): he did indeed visit the tekke
of Hâdidjet Bektash at Kâs-eh. His propaganda
reached as far as Edirne, the Ottoman capital at
that time, and to the territory of the Laz and to
Trebizond. In 848/1444 a Hurufí missionary was
the guest at Edirne of the heir to the throne, Mehmeddem
the future conqueror of Constantinople),
who showed an interest in his doctrines; but he was
burnt alive as a heretic. In Anatolia the Hurufí
disciplines survived, along with others, in the strange
fraternity of the Bektashis, and Turkish literature
contains several good Hurufí poets, notably Nesimi
(q.v.) ([played alive at Aleppo in 809/1404]).

In spite of their short period during which it
was an organized movement, the Hurufí sect
suffered from heresies and schisms, the chief of these
being that of the Nuktawiyá founded by an “ex-
communicated” former follower of Fadl Allah,
Mahmúd Pasákhání, from Gilán.

There are three principal works by Fadl Allah, the
Db-náma-yi kabir, in prose, written half in Persian and
half in the Persian dialect of Astarábéd (a poetic
There exist numerous Hurufi treatises, short tracts and poems written by various followers of the founder of the sect, but of particular importance are the works of his ḥālīṣa and recognized interpreter, ʿAlī al-ʿĀlī, i.e., the Isḥāqī-nāma, the Maḥgūrī-nāma (in prose) and the four muḥāfazān poems Baghāvat-nāma (written in 803/1401), Tawḥīdī-nāma, Kuršīnāma (written in 814/1408), and Kyādārat-nāma (written in 814/1412).

Doctrines: Stress has been laid on the cabalistic character of Hurufism, which has in fact taken its name from this feature (ḥarf, pl. hurāf = "letter"). This is certainly its most obvious characteristic but it would be wrong to consider it the central point of its doctrine. The most important problems of Hurufism are its doctrines on prophecy and on man. The first arose fairly clearly in the following way: Muhammad may truly be called the "Seal of the Prophets" because with him prophecy ends and there begins new cycle, superior to that of prophecy, that of sainthood (wilāya) which in its turn, with the appearance of Fadl Allāh, was superseded by that of the revelation (ṣūhr) of the Divine in man. The second problem, that of the relationship between man and God, is solved not, as some would have it, in a pantheistic sense, but by an exact and continual theophany of the inaccessible divine treasure in man, (and in the Man par excellence, Fadl Allāh) on whose face is written in clear letters the actual name of God, Allāh, the nose being the alif, the two lobes of the nose two lām, and the eyes having the form of hā. The traditional eschatological ideas are, however, rejected by the Hurufis and the Kurʿānic anthropomorphism is explained in the sense that God can be represented only in Man. What other meaning could the following ḥadīth have: "Soon you will see your Lord as you see the moon when it is full; you will not be deprived of the sight of Him"? Man, naturally, is understood to be the particularly pure and holy man, in this case Fadl Allāh. Nesimi asserted that "God is none other than the son of Adam. The thirty-two letters are the words of the speech of God. Know that all the world is God himself—Adam is the soul and the sun is the face".

This leads us to Hurufī cabalism. The fundamental idea is that God (as we have seen, impossible to grasp in his essence) reveals Himself in the Word (Fadl Allāh was well acquainted with the beginning of St. John’s Gospel). Now the Word is made up of sounds, and sounds are always—in Islamic tradition—identified with "letters" (ḥurāf). The whole total of letters (and of their numerical relations according the abjad) is thus the total of all the emanating and creative possibilities of God, and is God Himself made manifest. Hence the enormous importance given to letters and to "interpretative" calculations made with them, the various methods of which are too complicated for examples to be given here: it resulted in an important chapter of the Isḥāqi-nāma of ʿAlī al-ʿĀlī. The ʾaḏān, for example, included formulae such as the following: ʾaḏḥāda anna lā ṭālah ilā ṭā H. F. H "(...) that there is no God but F. H"; the cabalistic formula for Fadl Allāh; ʾaḏḥāda anna ʿAdām ʾalḥāfat Allāh ("that Adam [= Man] is the vicar of God"); ʾaḏḥāda anna Muḥammad-nasāʿ Allāh ("this Imam [= the leader] is the vicar of God"); ʾaḏḥāda anna Ṣafwān ("this Imam [= the leader] is the vicar of God").

The pilgrimage to the place where Fadl Allāh was killed took place in the month of Dhu l-ʿKaʿda (the month in which he was killed) and, according to the same Isḥāqi-nāma, "... after 28 ṣawāf (circumambulations) around the door of the masābīl, they (= the Hurufis) name 40 Knowers of God in the East and in the West of the world, go into the bed of the river, pick up three times twenty-one pebbles, i.e., 63: 21 for the Earth, 21 for Water, 21 for the Air, and throw them into the Fire, which is the origin of Satan, with their faces turned towards the fortress of the accursed and foul Mārāngā (the king of the serpents = Mīrānghā) which is opposite the gate of the fortress of Alāndjak—may it be preserved from disasters and calamities—and is called "the fortress of Sāngār"; then they take off the pilgrim’s dress ...

When it began however, it was not intended that Hurufism should be merely a secret or esoteric religion but that it should become also (a premature ambition at that time) a visible religious organization, with autonomous rites; it was hoped that it would gain some rulers as its adherents. It did not succeed in this, but its doctrines penetrated into various quarters, not only into Bektāšism but also into certain aspects of Persian Sūfism, from some of whose doctrines (and from the ever-present undercurrent of Ismāʿīlī/gnostic beliefs) they had been in large part derived.

Bibliography: C. Huart, Textes persans relatifs à la secte des Hadroïfs ... suivis d'une étude sur la religion des Houroufs par le Dr. Kse Teufa ... (GMS, ix), Leiden 1909 (a useful collection of texts, but the translation is often doubtful and the introductory essay follows out of date historico-religious lines); H. Ritter, Die Anfänge der Hurūfishe, in Oriens, vii (1954), 1-54; Ṣādīq Kiyā, Nuhūtfayyān yā Pashtkhīyayn, Tehrān 1320/ 1941. In the above selection there will be found the whole of the basic bibliography on Hurufism.

AL-HUSĀM B. DĪRĀR, Abu l-Ḥasan, a Kalbi aristocrat of Damascus, who arrived in Spain as governor in the year 125/743 to replace the
successor of Baljî, Thâ'âbâ b. Salâma al-‘Amîlî, who had been mortally wounded at Aqua Portora. He managed to keep the unually Syrian ghunâds away from Cordova by giving them tiffs in the regions of Elvira-Granada, Reiyû (Archidona and Malaga), Jaen, the Algarve (south Portugal), and the district of Tumdrû (Murcia), though it appears that this conciliatory measure was taken on the advice of Ardabasto, the son of Witiza and chief of the Christian âdîmmîs, who had been given the task of collecting the kharâdî from them. But soon his Kalbi partisanship overcame his political prudence and his admiration for the kharâdî, through his bias against his enemies. The opposing Kays faction allied themselves with the Lâkhmî and the Diujdâm under the command of Sumayl who from this moment began to show a considerable activity, making himself little by little the justicification of the government's policy and even, ten years later, playing an important rôle in the rise of the Hispanic-Muslim emirate with Abu al-‘Abâma I. His coalition plans, which had been rejected over the rival of his allies, he succeeded in gaining the adhesion of Ëcija and Morôn, to whose Diujdâmî chief Thâwâbâ b. Salâma he shrewdly offered the command of the coalition. The revolt broke out in Andalusia, and the rebels concentrated in the district of Sidona in Ra¿djab 127/April 745; a little later they encountered Abu l-Khâ¢târ, who had hastened with his troops, on the banks of the Guadalete. Abu l-Khâ¢târ was defeated and taken prisoner and Thâwâbâ b. Salâma, on his triumphant arrival in Cordova, proclaimed himself governor of Spain. Abu l-Khâ¢târ did not long remain in prison; his followers attacked by night the prison in which he was being kept and carried him off to Niebla, from where he strove to re-group his followers, but he failed to get the upper hand over the coalition which had displaced him. As for his good relations with the vanquished Christians, we know only that when Sâra, the grand-daughter of Witiza, arrived in Damascus to complain to the Caliph HiÊhîm b. ‘Abd al-Malik of the dispossessio of which she had been victim at the hands of her uncle Ardabasto, Abu l-Khâ¢târ ordered to return her hereditary property.


Hûsâm al-Dîn [see Timurtash].

Hûsâm al-Dîn, Abu l-Shâwêk [see ‘Annâzîdî].

Hûsâm al-Dîn Cebelî, Hasan b. Muhammad b. al-Hasan b. Aqil Türk (d. 683/1284), fâvûrîte disciple and second murîd of Dijalâl al-Dîn Rûmî [q.v.], was born to a family which had come from Urmiya to settle at Konya (Aflâkî, Manâkîb al-‘ârisîn, ii, 759; tr. Huart, ii, 242). Since he became a murîd of Dijalâl al-Dîn as a young man and knew Shams al-Dîn al-Tabrizî (d. 642/1244), it may be assumed that he was born in about 626/1226 (cf. op. cit., ii, 738; tr. ii, 223). His father and grandfathers were prominent akhîs of Anatolia. Hûsâm al-Dîn lost his father at an early age, but was cared for by various notables of the day. When he reached puberty his beauty captivated all beholders (op. cit., ii, 738; tr. ii, 224). At this time he went with all his servants and young companions to Dijalâl al-Dîn, became his murîd, and released all his entourage from the duty of serving himself. He gave away all his wealth, down to his household goods, to benefit Dijalâl al-Dîn and his circle. His devoted attachment and probity impressed Dijalâl al-Dîn, who gave him the superintendence of the mawâls revenues which accrued to him through the gifts which he received from various persons. All these sums were sent to Hûsâm al-Dîn, who would distribute them first to Dijalâl al-Dîn's family and then among the members of his circle according to their degrees (op. cit., ii, 777; tr. ii, 255). He quickly became prominent among the murîds for his piety and his devotion to Dijalâl al-Dîn, whose regard for him was increased by the fact that he, unlike the others, showed great respect for the spiritual and religious bias against his enemies. The opposing Kays faction allied themselves with the Lâkhmî and the Diujdâm under the command of Sumayl who from this moment began to show a considerable activity, making himself little by little the justicification of the government's policy and even, ten years later, playing an important rôle in the rise of the Hispanic-Muslim emirate with Abu al-‘Abâma I. His coalition plans, which had been rejected over the rival of his allies, he succeeded in gaining the adhesion of Ëcija and Morôn, to whose Diujdâmî chief Thâwâbâ b. Salâma he shrewdly offered the command of the coalition. The revolt broke out in Andalusia, and the rebels concentrated in the district of Sidona in Ra¿djab 127/April 745; a little later they encountered Abu l-Khâ¢târ, who had hastened with his troops, on the banks of the Guadalete. Abu l-Khâ¢târ was defeated and taken prisoner and Thâwâbâ b. Salâma, on his triumphant arrival in Cordova, proclaimed himself governor of Spain. Abu l-Khâ¢târ did not long remain in prison; his followers attacked by night the prison in which he was being kept and carried him off to Niebla, from where he strove to re-group his followers, but he failed to get the upper hand over the coalition which had displaced him. As for his good relations with the vanquished Christians, we know only that when Sâra, the grand-daughter of Witiza, arrived in Damascus to complain to the Caliph HiÊhîm b. ‘Abd al-Malik of the dispossessio of which she had been victim at the hands of her uncle Ardabasto, Abu l-Khâ¢târ ordered to return her hereditary property.


Hûsâm al-Dîn [see Timurtash].

Hûsâm al-Dîn, Abu l-Shâwêk [see ‘Annâzîdî].

Hûsâm al-Dîn Cebelî, Hasan b. Muhammad b. al-Hasan b. Aqil Türk (d. 683/1284), fâvûrîte disciple and second murîd of Dijalâl al-Dîn Rûmî [q.v.], was born to a family which had come from Urmiya to settle at Konya (Aflâkî, Manâkîb al-‘ârisîn, ii, 759; tr. Huart, ii, 242). Since he became a murîd of Dijalâl al-Dîn as a young man and knew Shams al-Dîn al-Tabrizî (d. 642/1244), it may be assumed that he was born in about 626/1226 (cf. op. cit., ii, 738; tr. ii, 223). His father and grandfathers were prominent akhîs of Anatolia. Hûsâm al-Dîn lost his father at an early age, but was cared for by various notables of the day. When he reached puberty his beauty captivated all beholders (op. cit., ii, 738; tr. ii, 224). At this time he went with all his servants and young companions to Dijalâl al-Dîn, became his murîd, and released all his entourage from the duty of serving himself. He gave away all his wealth, down to his household goods, to benefit
the regular practice that the samd* [q.v.] took place after the Friday prayer and that the Mathnawi was read after the Kur'an had been read (Aflaki, ii, 777; tr. ii, 255). It was during its headship of the movement also that Diyal-al-Din's mausoleum was built, so that it possessed a focal point and centre, which might be called a Mawlavi kibla (cf. A. Gölpınarlı, Mevlândan sonra Mevlâvî, 24).


SULṬÂN HUSAYN MIRZA b. MÀSHÎR b. BAYKARA was born in Harât in Muḥarram 842/June 1438. At the age of 14 he entered the service of Abu’l-Kâsim Bâbûr. In 858/1454, when Abu’l-Kâsim Bâbûr made peace with Abû Sa’îd, Husayn Mîrzâ entered the service of the latter, but was imprisoned by him. After his release through the intervention of his mother, he returned to Abu’l-Kâsim Bâbûr, with whom he remained till his death (863/1457). He then joined Mu’âzî al-Dîn Sanghîr, who held Marw, Mâlghân and Djâm, and married his daughter; his eldest son, Badî’ al-Ẓamân, was born of this marriage. A period of struggle with Abû Sa’îd [q.v.] and his sons now began. Immediately after the death of Abû Sa’îd, Husayn Mîrzâ went to Harât and ascended the throne on 10 Ramadân 873/25 March 1469. With one brief intermission, he remained the undisputed ruler of Khorâsân until his death (917/1506). Husayn Mîrzâ showed Shi’i inclinations at the beginning of his reign, but abandoned these entirely under the influence of Naవî and others. He was a brave soldier, fighting personally in many battles. Husayn Mîrzà’s long reign in Khorâsân is more important from the cultural than from the political point of view. Under his rule relatively peaceful conditions were established in Khorâsân and the province enjoyed a period of prosperity. His capital of Harât became an important cultural centre. Poets, men of letters and of learning enjoyed the patronage of both Husayn Mîrzà and his close friend the Turkish poet Nâwî, the last great classical Persian poet Djâmî, the historian Mirghânâd, the miniature painter Bihzad [q.v.] and the calligrapher Sultan ʿAllî Mashhādī being among the most famous personalities of the court. Husayn Mîrzâ himself composed poetry in Turkish and Persian, using the mâkhâs Husâyni. His Turkish Divân contains ghâsals composed throughout in one and the same variant of ramâl, namely ـوــ ـوــ ـوــ ـوــ ـوــ, the most popular metre of the period. In spite of the high praise given them by Nâwî, these poems are of no more than average quality (the fact that the Şafwâdî Sultan Husâyîn ordered a translation of a selection of them into Persian (cf. British Museum, Or. 3379) is to be attributed rather to the importance of the person of the poet than to the intrinsic value of his poetry). He is also the author of a brief treatise in Turkish, a sort of apologia pro vita sua, which is interesting for its exposition of the ideals and concepts of a mediæval Muslim Turkish monarch. The Madâjîls al-şârîfîh, which is ascribed to him by Sâm Mîrzâ, is in fact, as Bâbûr and Khânâmîrî stated, by Kamâl al-Dîn Husâyîn Gâzûrgâhî.


HUSAYN, who was known until his submission to the throne as Sultan Husayn Mirza, was the eldest son of Shâh Sulaymân, the Şâfawî monarch who reigned 1077-1105/1666-94. Husayn, who was born in 1079-1088, was by nature quiet and studious, with an inclination in his earlier years to austerity. Having been brought up in the harem, in accordance with the pernicious practice inaugurated by Shâh ʿAbbâs I, Husayn was completely ignorant of state affairs and, indeed, of the world in general when, at the age of 26, he succeeded his father on the latter’s death. Husayn soon showed himself to be of weak character, and the court eunuchs took advantage of this fact to assume control over the government of the country, but intense rivalry soon developed between them and the madâjîls and mulkîs. Although at first violently against the drinking of alcohol, the Shâh was, by means of a subterfuge, induced to become addicted to it (see Krusinski, The History of the revolution of Persia taken from the memoirs of Father Krusinski . . . . . . by Father Du Corcaux, Dublin 1729, 54-6). Moreover, the Shâh by no means neglected the pleasures of the harem; thus his early tendency to austerity soon became a thing of the past.

The first few years of the reign were uneventful, but peace and calm were to prove transitory. Trouble first arose in Balûcîstân, but it was soon quelled by the able and forceful Giorgi XI, the King of Kartli and Wilî of Georgia; he was known to the Persians as Gurgîn Khan, and also as Shâh Nawâz Khan. A more serious revolt then occurred in Kandahâr, under the leadership of the astute Ghalzay chieftain Mir Wâs, after having Gurgîn Khan murdered, defeated the Georgian garrison. Although several attempts were subsequently made to subdue Mir Wâs, they all failed and he remained virtually independent for the rest of his life. After Mir Wâs’s death in 1126/1715, his brother and successor ʿAbd al-Šâzîr (erroneously named ʿAbd Allâh in certain sources) attempted to make peace
with the Persian court, but he was soon assassinated by Mahmūd, Mir Wāris's ambitious and brutal cousin.

Encouraged by the success of the Ghazazys, the Abdalī tribe, whose main centre was at Herāt, also revolted and frustrated all attempts by the Persians to subdue them. Trouble also occurred in the Persian Gulf, where the Muscat Arabs, under Sultan Ibn Sayf II, captured the islands of Bahrayn, Kishm and Larak in 1717. Two years later the turbulent Lezgis of southern Daghistān ravaged Shirwan and parts of Georgia. When Wādi de Gallois, the VVIP of Georgia and nephew of the late Giorgi XI (Gurgin Khan), had gathered his forces together and was about to crush the Lezgis, he received orders from the Shah to stay his hand. Wākhtang obeyed this order, but he was so enraged that he vowed never to take action in defence of Persia again. Late in the same year Mahmūd of Kandahār, with a force of some 11,000 men, invaded Persia and captured Kirmān. He remained in occupation of the town for several months, but was then forced to withdraw to Kandahār to quell a revolt there (the story that Mahmūd was forced to withdraw after being heavily defeated by Luṭf 'All Khan, the nephew of Fath 'All Khan Daghistānī, the Shah's šīrād al-dawla, though given in a number of sources, has no basis in fact).

In December 1720, Fath 'All Khan Daghistānī's enemies at the court procured his arrest on a trumped-up charge of treason and had him disgraced and blinded; his nephew Luṭf 'All Khan, the commander of the only well organized force in the country, was also disgraced and thrown into prison. It was at this juncture that a Turkish envoy named Dūrrī Efendi arrived at the Persian court. Rumours of the impending disintegration of Persia had reached the Turkish Government and it had sent Dūrrī Efendi to ascertain whether or not these rumours were well-founded. In his report Dūrrī Efendi predicted that the Safavid regime was apparently near its end, as there were no men in Persia who were capable of governing it (Relation de Dourry Efendy, Paris 1870, 54-5). Likewise very interested in the situation in Persia in the late 1720s was Peter the Great of Russia. His envoy Volynsky, who had been in Persia from the fall of the Safavids in 1722, had brought back disquieting reports of the situation in that country. In order to glean further and more recent information, Semeon Avramov, the Russian Consul at Rashīt, went on Peter's orders to the Persian court, where he arrived just after the departure of Dūrrī Efendi. At the same time Peter the Great sent Captain Baskakov secretly to Gilan to make a military report on the terrain. Avramov reported in much the same sense as Dūrrī Efendi (see P. G. Butkov, Materiali dlya Novoy Istoriī Kavkaza, 1722-1803, St. Petersburg 1869, i, 6).

The dismissal and cruel treatment of Fath 'All Khan Daghistānī, who was a Lezgi and a Sunni, so enraged his compatriots and co-religionists in Daghistān that they again invaded Shirwān, where they sacked the town of Shamakhi. Among those to suffer severe loss on this occasion were a number of Russian merchants. The rebels then appealed to the Sultan of Turkey for protection, who accepted them as his subjects. The news of this outrage at Shamakhi gave Peter the Great his excuse for invading Persia, which he did in the following year, advancing as far as Darband.

Meanwhile, Mahmūd, having put down the revolt in Kandahār, had once again invaded Persia. After occupying Kirmān again, he boldly advanced on Iṣfahān. Although greatly inferior in numbers, his men overwhelmed the royal forces near the village of Gahābād, some east-north-east of Iṣfahān. Three days later, Mahmūd had resumed his advance and soon encircled the capital. With Luṭf 'All Khan disgraced and in prison, the only leader capable of defeating Mahmūd and driving him back to Kandahār was Wākhtang VI of Georgia; in view, however, of his vow, he refrained from action. Although Tāhzāsp Mīrzā, the heir to the throne, escaped from the doomed capital during the siege, he made no serious attempt to raise forces to relieve the city, with the result that, after many thousands of the inhabitants had died of disease and starvation, it capitulated in October 1722. Mahmūd, having received the insignia of royalty from the unfortunate Shah Sultān Iṣfahān, entered the capital in triumph and mounted the throne.

Meanwhile, after Peter the Great had staged his invasion, Turkey also invaded the unfortunate country. War between Russia and Turkey then nearly ensued, but it was averted by the efforts of the Marquis de Bonnac, the French Ambassador to the Porte. He managed with great skill to arrange for a treaty to be signed by Turkey and Russia for the partition of much of northern and western Persia in 1724.

After his deposition, Sultan Iṣfahān was kept in confinement in Iṣfahān. In February 1725, Mahmūd, during a fit of insanity, murdered, largely with his own hands, most of the Safavid princes. He wounded the ex-Ṣāḥḥ himself, when he endeavoured to ward off a savage blow aimed at one of the young princes. Soon afterwards, Mahmūd, who had become completely insane, either died a natural death or was murdered by his cousin Aẖṣaf, the son of 'Abd al-ʼAzīz. Aẖṣaf thereupon mounted the Persian throne.

In the following year war broke out between the Ghazazys and the Ottoman Turks. In the late autumn of 1726 Aẖṣaf, on receipt of a rude message from Ahmed Pasha, the Turkish commander-in-chief, that he was going to restore Sultan Iṣfahān to the throne, sent emissaries to Iṣfahān, who put the unfortunate ex-Ṣāḥḥ to death. With the fall of the Safavids Predicted by Tragica vertentis Belli persici Historia per repetitas clades, ab anno 1711 ad annum 1728 continuata post Gallicos, Hollandicos, Germanacos ac demum Turcos Authoris typos Authorhe P. Krusinski, Leopoli 1740; Muhammad Muḥṣin, Zubdat al-tawdrikh, London 1815: Louis-Andre de La Mamie de Etrangeres, Paris, AEP, Vol. vi: Muhammad Khalīl Marashli-yi Ṣafawi, Madżma al-tawdrikh dar ta’riḵi-i ḵoḵār-i Ṣafawīyā wa wakāš-ī ba’da tā sāl 1327 ḡīrāt hamart, ed. ‘Abbās Ḳābkāl, Tehran 1328/1949; J. Malcom, History of Persia, London 1875: Louis-André de La Mamie of Clairac, Histoire de Perse depuis le commencement de ce siècle, Paris 1750; D. M. Lang, Georgia and the fall of the Safavi dynasty, in BSOAS, xiv (1952), 523-39; L. Lockhart, The fall of the Safavi Dynasty and the Afghan occupation of Persia, Cambridge 1958; H. R. Roemer, Die Safawiden: ein orientalischer Bundesgenosse des Abendlandes im Türkentribunalkampf, in Saeculum, iv (1953), 27-44. (L. LOCKHART)
Greek renegade recruited into the ranks of the odiak, Husayn was dghd of the sipahis at the time of the war between Algeria and Tunisia (1704-5). Proclaimed Bey after the capture of Bey Ibrahim by the Algerian troops, Husayn first repulsed the Algerians, then got rid of the Dey, Muhammad Khodja, who was supported by the army, and finally also of Bey Ibrahim after he had been set free. Husayn was recognized by the Ottoman Sultan, who gave him the title of Pasha with the rank of Beylerbeyi, governor of the province of Tunisia (1708); he submitted from the list of his titles dâyi (Dey), which from that time on was given to an official of lower rank. While recognizing Ottoman suzerainty, Husayn at the same time persuaded the council of the highest military officers to grant him hereditary power, to be passed on to his descendants by the order of primogeniture in the male line (1720). Thus was founded the Husaynid dynasty, which continued to reign over Tunisia until 1957.

From 1705 until 1729 Husayn's reign was peaceful; his relations with the European powers were very good, and were distinguished by the conclusion of treaties with France (1710 and 1728), England (1716), Spain (1720), Austria (1725), and Holland (1728). Nevertheless the behaviour of the Tunisian privates, caused the French fleet to stage demonstrations off La Goulette in 1728 and 1731.

Internal political life was severely shaken in 1729 by the revolt of Husayn's nephew, 'Ali Pasha, who, deprived of political power, raised the central tribes with the help of his son Yûnus and, when defeated, fled to Algeria. After at first being interned there, 'Ali Pasha was later on supported by the Dey of Algiers, Ibrahim, and they invaded Tunisia together. Beaten in turn at Smendja (4 September 1735), Husayn retreated to al-Kayrawan, while 'Ali Pasha was proclaimed Bey in Tunis. Husayn endeavoured to take the offensive again, but failed before Tunis and retired once again to al-Kayrawan, where he continued his resistance for five years. The town was finally taken by Yûnus on 16 Safar 1157/25 May 1740, and Husayn was captured and executed a short time later.

During the first twenty years of his reign, Husayn showed much creative activity: he restored the walls of al-Kayrawan and built madrasas at Sousse, Sfax and Gafsa. In Tunis itself he was responsible for putting the aqueducts into good repair and for planning the suddle rs' quarter (Sâk al-sartâjin), for building the dyers' mosque (Pãmi al-hidâia), the madrasas al-Nâghlia, al-Husayniyya and al-Djiyidda, and the mausoleum of the Dey Kara Mustafa. In his reign, 'Aziza Uğmâna, grand-daughter of the Dey Uğmân and famous for her pious foundations, died. She was buried near the Madrasa al-Shamâmâyya. Furthermore, it was Husayn who transferred the centre of Tunisian government to the Bardo.


(R. MANTRAN)

**HUSAYN b. 'ALI, Amir and 'Grand Sharif' of Mecca and the Hijâdż from 1326/1908 to 1335/1916, and King of the Hijâdż from 1335/1916 to 1343/1924, was the elder son of the second 'Ali, of the first Sharifian line of Mecca of the 'Akhîlâ family of the 'Awn branch of the Meccan Sharifs, the famous Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Munîn b. 'Awân (who died in 1275/1858). In spite of almost-successful attempts by the long-dominant Zayd branch of the Sharifs to regain the Meccan amirate, the descendants of Muhammad ibn 'Awân in fact retained it until its disappearance.

Husayn, born in Istanbul in 1270/1853 or 1273/1856, passed his youth partly in the Hijâdż and partly in Istanbul, where he was, after 1311/1893, a permanent resident and political dîtenu. Bilingual in Turkish and Arabic, an abundant and mellifluous talker and writer, combining obstinacy with ambiguity and a dominating temper with outstanding charm, he was prominent in local society and developed the qualities which he was later to demonstrate in high office. His four sons (‘Ali, Abû Allâh, Fâyâsî, and Zayd [qq.v.]) were all Turkish-educated, but all, by order of their authoritarian father, passed prolonged periods also in Arabia. Husayn himself was appointed to the Ottoman Council of State, and moved acceptably in the highest official and Court circles.

One effect of the Turkish revolution of 1326/1908 was to displace into exile the ruling Amir of Mecca, ‘Ali ibn Abû Allâh, first cousin of Husayn. The succession fell to the latter's uncle, ‘Abd Allâh Pasha, but, already old, he sustained a fatal stroke before leaving Istanbul. After some days of eager canvassing between ‘Awân and Zayd interests, the candidate of the former, Husayn, secured the backing of the (reputedly Anglophile) Grand Vizir, Kâmil Pashâ, and was appointed by the Sultan (cf. Hilmi Kâmil Bayur, Sadrâcâm Kâmil Paşa, Ankara 1954, 287 ff.). He was received with great pomp at Djidda and at Mecca in the last days of 1326/1908.

In a situation of extreme delicacy vis-a-vis the Turkish wâli of the Hijâdż wâliâyet, the new Amir displayed at first every sign of loyalty to his Sultan-Caliph. He took up arms against Idrisi rebels in ‘Ašr, occupied Ibbâ, and carried out a partial through successful submission, of Kâmil Pashâ to the amirs' rights. Nevertheless he was, during these years, simultaneously formulating certain ambitions of his own highly inconsistent with loyalty to Turkey, and was insisting on all, or more than all, the privileges of his own position. He obstructed, and in the end through tribal action prevented, the extension of the Hijâdż Railway southward from Madina, successfully resisted Turkish attempts to normalise the administration of the province and to impose conscription, enhanced his personal position by daily entertainment on a lavish scale, and even, though invisibly, placed himself in touch with Arab secret societies in Syria and Egypt working for home-rule for the Arab provinces. His second son, ‘Abd Allâh, held tentative conversations with the British in Egypt.

On the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, the last-mentioned contacts were resumed, and Husayn's ideas for Arab, and personal, aggrandisement took shape. He temporised over the Turkish demand for the raising of Arab forces to aid his suzerain, and found himself unable to support the proclamation, in the Holy Cities, of Holy War for the Caliph. Closer contact was at last made through his son Fâyâsî, and with the British in Cairo through secret messengers. The latter negotia-
tions resulted in the "McMahon Letters" exchanged with Sir Henry McMahon, the British High Commissioner in Egypt: letters which seemed to express a broad Anglo-Arab agreement and later became famous and disastrous from their inconsistent and ambiguous. The impulse to proclaim an Arab uprising against the Turks was increased by Turkish anti-Arab repression in Syria, and not less potently by British promises of immediate aid, in arms and money, for such a revolt. In mid-summer 1335/1916 the Arab revolt was proclaimed by Husayn ibn 'All, military operations (in desert-Arab style) began, the Turks were expelled from Mecca, and soon afterwards from Djidda, the smaller Red Sea ports, and with little delay from almost the whole of the Hijāz except Madina. In the late autumn Husayn announced himself as "King of the Arab Countries" — a title unacceptable, however, to the Powers (Britain, France, Italy), who substituted that of "King of the Hijāz". Whirlwind military operations moved beyond the Hijāz, and particularly when British participation in officers, supplies, money and staffwork became all-important in the Arab forces, King Husayn could no longer control, or even appreciate, the course of events or plans, and perform he ceased, except by distant criticism and in some degree through influence over his active sons 'Abd Allāh and Faysal, to take any part. He stayed in Mecca, locally a dominant figure, eloquent, irritable, increasingly remote from realities, and of little weight in an Arab world less interested in him than he supposed. The end of the war in 1918 found him still hoping for a united Arab kingdom under his rule; but he was soon disillusioned by the course of events in the Levant and by the Allied attitude to his wide claims, though this could not have been entirely unknown to him. The Allied military occupation of all (geographical) Syria and 'Irāq and the arrangements embodied in the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 precluded effective Arab rule. This agreement was published by the Bolsheviks in November 1917; at least the general terms had already been communicated to him by the Allies in May of that year (Dawn, The Amir... , 131). Husayn was powerless to influence these developments or even the acts of his own sons; he was still more at sea in all that was reported to him of the peace-making at Versailles, where Arab claims received little attention. King Husayn was in fact unable to play any rôle in affairs outside the Hijāz from 1337/1918 onwards.

In his own Kingdom, his maladministration became notorious. He failed to extend his rule over any other part of Arabia, and, angrily rejecting the Mandates applied to the northern Arab territories, declined to ratify the Peace treaty. He quarrelled with Egypt over arrangements for the Ḥajj (ceremonial, and, still more dangerously, with the central-Arabian power of Ibn Su'ūd over tribes, oases and rivers. His assumption of the Caliphate itself, while on a visit to 'Ammān, in 1343/1924, when that title and office was abolished by the Turks, was a crowning mistake; he was accepted as Caliph by only a small minority even of Arabs, aroused powerful opposition, and added nothing to his prestige (cf. the attack of Raşḥīd Rīḍa, cited by E. Kedourie in JRAS, (1965), 215).

The end came from the Wahhabī followers of Ibn Su'ūd, whom he had needlessly offended. These, with strong iconoclastic religious emotions and many old scores to pay off, invaded the Hijāz only six months after the assumption of the Caliphate. They swept to the walls of Mecca and forced the old King to abdicate in favour of his eldest son 'All, and retire to Djidda, and thence by British steamer to 'Akhaba. He took with him his whole personal fortune, amounting, according to some sources, to some millions of pounds sterling, mainly in gold coins packed in petrol tins.

After some months passed at 'Akhaba the King was removed by British cruiser to Cyprus, where he lived quietly in a villa at Nicosia. He was accompanied by his youngest son Zayd, and visited periodically by the others. His mood was one of disillusion and bitterness, but he had pleasure in conversation and in his horses. After sustaining a stroke in 1930 he moved—or was moved—via Beirut to his son 'Abd Allāh's court at 'Ammān, and died there in mid-summer 1931. He was buried in the Haram al-Sharif at Jerusalem


AL-HUSAYN B. AL-HUSAYN, the last dey of Algiers, was born at Izmır and ruled from 1818 to 1830. When his predecessor 'Ali Khodja died of the plague on 1 March 1818 Husayn was occupying the high office of khodjat al-khayr (tribute-collector). Husayn was raised to the dignity of dey without having sought it, and being of a moderate disposition opened his reign by gestures of clemency. His reward was two attempts at assassination. Thereafter he remained mostly in the kasbah, dominated the city of Algiers, surrounded by Kabyle guards.

There was unrest in Algeria: the beys of Constantine and Oran were faced with serious local rebellions which were maintained, especially in the Oran area, by religious groups. Thanks to his patience and the
activity of competent and devoted collaborators, Husayn finally re-established calm in 1826 in the east, and in 1828 in the west. Nevertheless external affairs were dominant during his reign. He had to send vessels and men to help the Ottoman government against the Greek insurgents. Previously he had been invited by the European powers, after the congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, to suppress piracy and abolish slavery. As he was evasive, a Franco-British naval demonstration had taken place off Algiers in September 1819.

Later, when he was using forceful measures against Kabyle rebels, the British consul stubbornly refused to hand over to him the Kabyle servants whom he employed. The dey retorted by expelling the consul, so Great Britain sent a fleet to bombard Algiers in June 1824. The effects of these reprisals were slight.

The affair of France's debt to the Jewish merchants Baci and Busnach and the dey himself, which had been simmering longer before Husayn had come to power, occupied him for the whole of his reign and caused his downfall. It was in connexion with this affair that he struck the French consul Deval with his fly-whisk on 30 April 1827 in the course of a very animated interview. As he refused to make the apologies demanded by the French government, the French fleet set up a blockade along the Algerian coast. Then there came the incident of 3 August 1829, when the Algiers revenue department was attacked and a goldsmith's workshop was plundered. The dey immediately resolved to take this as an opportunity to resolve the affair that he had not been able to solve. He decided to demand reparation for the damage inflicted on the French merchant vessels. Husayn had not given the orders for this, but refused to satisfy French demands for reparation. As a sequel the French government decided to organize an expedition to destroy the power of the dey, and on 4 July 1830 Husayn was handed the capitulation proposals from the commander of the French expeditionary force. He set his seal upon them on the morning of the 5th.

He left Algiers for Italy, where he lived for several years, then retired to Alexandria, where he died in 1838.


AL-HUSAYN b. 'ABB AL-LLAH [see ibn SINA]. AL-HUSAYN b. AHMAD [see 'ABB AL-LLAH AL-SHI; ibn 'ALGALAWANY]. AL-HUSAYN b. 'ALI [see ibn MARDUQ: AL-MAGHRIBI; al-TUGHI]. (AL-)HUSAYN b. 'ALI b. ABI TALIB, grand-son of the Prophet and son of 7Atima [q.v.], famous because of his revolt which ended tragically at Karbala` on 10 Muharram 61/October 660.

Childhood and youth. (Al-)Husayn was born at Medina, according to the majority of the sources in the beginning of 621/January 662. He was thus still a child when the Prophet died and could therefore have very few memories of his grandfather. A number of hadiths mention the affectionate Phrases which Muhammad is said to have used of his grandsons, e.g., "whoever loves them loves me and whoever hates them hates me" and "al-Hasan and al-Husayn are the sayyids of the youth of Paradise" (this statement is very important in the eyes of the Shi'is, who have made of it one of the basic justifications for the right of the Prophet's descendants to the imamate; sayyid shabib al-a'lima is one of the epithets which the Shi'is give to each of the two brothers); other traditions present Muhammad with his grandsons on his knees, on his shoulders, or even on his back during the prayer at the moment of prostrating himself (Ibn Khajr, viii, 205-7; there is also a tradition in which the Prophet promised his grandson that if he would pray the Prophet would remain within the house). The majority of the traditions containing accounts of this kind appear curious or, when they include angels, fanciful, but which do not appear so to Muslims, with their belief in the frequent visits of Djibril to Muhammad; it is in other accounts, on which see below under The Legend of Husayn (col. 61a), that the Shi'is influence is apparent. During his youth, Husayn lived in the shadow of his father, obeying his orders (see, e.g., al-Mas'udi, Murid, iv, 271, 279, 281 etc.) and taking part in his campaigns.

Attitude towards Mu'awiya. Even after the death of 'Ali, Husayn still does not stand out as a personality; an example of this is seen in his relationship with Mu'awiya: he reproached his brother Hasan for having renounced power, but himself submitted to the fait accomplis, accepting an appanage of one or two million dirhams; he also went often to Damascus, where he received further largesse. Several times, even before Hasan's death, the Shi'is suggested that he should revolt (e.g., Hudjr b. 'Adi [q.v.], but the reply was always the same: "so long as this man [Mu'awiya] lives, nothing can be done ... the directive is to think continually of future revenge, but to say nothing about it" (al-Baladhuri, 634-v, 636 etc.). Mu'awiya, although informed by his governor at Medina, Marwan b. al-'Hakam, of how the Shi'is frequented Husayn, was not alarmed by it; he prudently counseled Marwan to avoid a clash with Husayn and sent the latter a letter in which he mingled generous promises with the advice not to provoke him. The incident closed with a proud written reply from Husayn, which seems not to have worried Mu'awiya (Ibn Khajr, vii, 162). There is nowhere only one tradition on this question: when Husayn defended against some powerful Umayyads his right to certain possessions (Aghani, vi, 68-70) and when Mu'awiya asked the high officials of state to recognize his son Yazid as his successor; Husayn was then among the five persons who refused to submit to this claim, which introduced a new principle in the succession to the caliphate [see Wali 'am].

Further refusal of the bay'a to Yazid after the death of Mu'awiya and consequences of this. Immediately after the death of Mu'awiya (Radjab 60/March-April 680), the governor of Medina, al-Walid b. 'Uthba b. Abi Sufyán, on the orders of Yazid, invited to the palace at an unusual hour Husayn and 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr [q.v.] with the intention of obliging them to pay homage to the new caliph. Both of them realized that Mu'awiya was dead and, having decided to stand by their refusal to make the bay'a, feared for their lives. Whereas Ibn al-Zubayr fled the following night to Mecca, Husayn went to the palace, but accompanied by his supporters, and, after offering his condolence, asked that the bay'a should be delayed, under the pretext that, in order to be valid, it must be made in public; he succeeded in delaying it for two days and finally escaped at night with his family to Mecca, without however taking an
indirect route. Al-Walid b. Utba, although urged by Marwân to resort to violence, was unwilling to take serious measures against the grandson of the Prophet and paid for his caution with his life, even from his office. The situation created in Mecca by the arrival of Ibn al-Zubayr and Husayn cannot have been a very easy one. The inhabitants of Mecca liked to attend on Husayn, and Ibn al-Zubayr, who was already harbouring secret ambitions, was suspected of jealousy towards him (see al-Tabari, ii, 276).

The sources on al-Husayn's revolt and on his tragic end. Unless something new is transmitted in the Library attributed to Abû Mihâlân [q.v.] (see Ahlwardt, 9028-9, 9031-8)—which the author of this article is in the process of examining—prove to be entirely or partly authentic, the most important texts on Husayn's enterprise and its tragic sequel at Karbala remain al-Tabari and al-Baladhuri. The former relates (1) a great number of traditions on the authority of Abû Mihâlân (d.v. 157/774) with isdâs going back to contemporary witnesses; (2) other fairly numerous traditions of Highâm b. Muhammad al-Kâbi, most of them received from his master Abû Mihâlân; (3) a small number of traditions transmitted with their isdâs by other traditionists, which, however, add few variants to the preceding ones and most of which are unimportant. Al-Baladhuri almost always used the same sources as al-Tabari, but often made résumés of them, introducing them by kâbi; and he provides some additional verses and details. Al-Dinawari, al-Yâqûbî, Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi, etc. add almost nothing to our knowledge since they based almost the whole of their continuous accounts on Abû Mihâlân. So great was the respect accorded even among the Shi'is to the work of this sympathizer of Husayn that it is chiefly from his collection of traditions that their earliest writers (e.g., al-Mufîd, d. 413/1022), or those endowed with enough critical faculty to enable them to eliminate fantastic additions (e.g., the modern Uways), have drawn their narrative of Husayn's enterprise (their Shi'ism showing itself elsewhere). It was only much later (apparently beginning in the 7th/13th century) that the narrative of Husayn's enterprise became all the more important for its collection of romantic anecdotes (single combats in which the enemies of Husayn were killed by the dozen, Husayn defending himself like a lion and slaughtering his assailants, and other such fables). The exaggerations and the misrepresentations of the Shi'is were severely criticized by Ibn Ka'bî (viii, 201 f.).

Invitation from the Kufans. Mission of Muslim b. 'A'âlî to Kufa. The news of the death of Mu'awiyâ was greeted with satisfaction at Kufa, the majority of whose inhabitants were Shi'is. Soon there were sent out from there letters and messengers inviting Husayn to make his way to this town which could no longer tolerate the Umayyad régime, which they regarded as guilty of having seized the jayy [q.v.], allowed the possessions of Allah to pass into the hands of the powerful and the rich, and killed the best men (an allusion to Hudîr b. 'A'dî and his supporters) while allowing the worst to remain alive (see letter of Sulaymân b. Šurad al-Khuzâ'î and of other Shi'is; al-Tabari, ii, 234 f., etc.). Husayn replied that he understood their hope of uniting themselves, thanks to him, in the right way and in the truth. "The Imam," he added, "must not be other than a man acting according to the Book of God, taking [his subjects' money] with honesty, judging with truth, devoting himself to the service of God." Nevertheless, before making a decision he thought it prudent to send his cousin, Muslim b. A'âlî [q.v.], to Kufa to test the ground. Muslim soon gathered thousands of pledges of support and was even able to preside over an assembly from the minbar in the mosque (al-Tabari, ii, 257 f.; al-Dinawari, 252). But his intrigues were rejected by the caliph Yazîd who, no longer trusting the governor of the town, al-Nu'mân b. Bashîr al-Ansârî, gave the control of Kufa to the son of Ziyâd, 'Ubayd Allâh [q.v.], then already governor of Basrâ, with orders to go there immediately to quell the disturbances. Ibn Ziyâd, who had met, during this journey to Kufa, the majority of whose inhabitants were Shi'is, reiterated his advice, and with great insistence, at Mecca (al-Tabari, ii, 274 f.; al-Baladhuri, 639 f., etc.). Even 'Abd Allâh b. al-Zubayr had attempted to dissuade him from the enterprise, but hypocritically, since he was in fact very pleased that Husayn should leave the field free for him at Mecca (al-Tabari, ii, 274-6, etc.). In spite of all this advice, Husayn did not abandon his project. He performed the 'umra [q.v.] instead of the hajj, which his cousin Abû 'AbdAllâh had attempted to dissuade him from, and took energetic measures which terrified Husayn's sympathizers. Muslim, after attempting in vain to organize an immediate revolt, fled and went into hiding; he was discovered and put to death (9 Dhu-l-Hijjâ 60/10 September 680). Unfortunately for al-Husayn, he had written a very optimistic letter on the success of his propaganda and, it seems, had even sent him the thousands of pledges signed by the inhabitants of Kufa.

Husayn's departure for Kufâ. Already Ibn al-Hanafîyya at Medina (al-Tabari, ii, 220 f.), then 'Abd Allâh b. 'Umar and 'Abd Allâh b. al-'Abbâs, when they met him on the road from Medina to Mecca (al-Tabari, ii, 223), and others also, had warned Husayn against the dangers of a revolt: Ibn 'Abd Allâh had reiterated his advice, and with great insistence, at Mecca (al-Tabari, ii, 274 f.; al-Baladhuri, 639 f., etc.). Even 'Abd Allâh b. al-Zubayr had attempted to dissuade him from the enterprise, but hypocritically, since he was in fact very pleased that Husayn should leave the field free for him at Mecca (al-Tabari, ii, 274-6, etc.). In spite of all this advice, Husayn did not abandon his project. He performed the 'umra [q.v.] instead of the hajj and took advantage of the absence of the governor, 'Amr b. Sa'id al-Asdagî [q.v.], who was completing the rites of the Pilgrimage on the outskirts of the town, to slip away together with his own group: about fifty men—relatives and friends able to bear arms—women and children (8 Dhu-l-Hijjâ 60/10 September 680, the day of the tarwîya). The names of the places where he stopped on the way from Mecca to Kufa are still known (al-Tabari, ii, 278 f.; al-Baladhuri; Wellhausen has noted them).

Informed of Husayn's departure, 'Amr b. Sa'id went in pursuit of him a party of men under the command of his brother Ya'byâ, but all that took place between the two groups was a clash with whips and sticks. At al-Tan'm, not far from Mecca, Husayn met a caravan coming from the Yemen and considered that he had a right to seize its load which consisted of cloaks and plants for dyeing destined for the caliph. On the way, Husayn met several people: the poet al-Farazadak who, when questioned, told him frankly that the hearts of the 'Irâks were for him but that their swords were for the Umayyads (al-Tabari, ii, 277 and 278, etc.), and his cousin 'Abd Allâh b. Dja'far who, having obtained from the governor 'Amr b. Sa'id a letter granting him amân, had come to meet him. But Husayn's decision was unshakeable; his replies to any attempts to deflet him from his enterprise were always more or less in the same vein: "God does as He wishes . . . . I leave it to Him to choose what is best ... . He is not hostile to him who purposes the just cause (al-hâbb) ... ." Zuhayr b. al-Kayîn al-Badjâli, who was a supporter of 'Ughmân, and while journeying had avoided pitching his tents at the same place as Husayn, did on one occasion have to make his camp
near to him; invited by ʿUsayn to visit him, he changed his opinion during the interview with him and from then on became one of the most enthusiastic supporters of Ḥusayn.

ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ziyād had stationed men on the roads leading from the Ḥidjāz to Kūfah (al-Tabari, ii, 285 and 288) and had given orders forbidding all persons to enter or leave the territory bounded by them. Ḥusayn learned of this order from the Bedouins, but was not alarmed by it and continued his journey. It was at al-Thaqabiyah that he first heard, from some travellers, the news of the execution of Muslim and of Ḥānī b. ʿUrwa [q.v.] at Kūfah. He would then have turned back, but the sons of ʿAklī, determined either to avenge their brother or to meet the same fate, made him change his mind. Then, at Zubālā, he learned that his messenger (Kays b. Mushir al-Saydāwī or ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥakīr, his foster brother: al-Tabari, ii, 288, 293, 303), sent from al-Ḥadījīz to Kūfah to announce there his imminent arrival, had been discovered and killed. Ḥusayn then read to his supporters a proclamation in which, after informing them of the doleful news he had received and of the treachery of the inhabitants of Kūfah, he invited them to leave him. Those who had joined his group during the journey did depart; and there remained with him only those who were related to him and to Khīlām.

Parties of horsemen were scouring the region. When they appeared on the horizon, Ḥusayn changed his direction towards Dhu Ḥusam (or Ḥusam) and there pitched his tents The horsemen, who were under the command of al-Ḥurr b. Yazīd al-Tamimī al-Yarburī, approached and, as the weather was hot, Ḥusayn gave orders for them to be given water. The situation at this time was still too free of tension that al-Ḥurr and his squadron took part that day in two prayers led by Ḥusayn (al-Tabari, ii, 297, 298) and, later, four Shīʿīs who had come from Kūfah were able to join the insurgents in spite of al-Ḥurr's attempt to oppose this (al-Tabari, ii, 302 f.).

After each of the two prayers, Ḥusayn explained to his adherents the motives which had caused him to send them. 'You are still free to submit and I should have been an instrument of union in the hand of God . . . We are more qualified to govern you than those others who claim things to which they have no right and who act unjustly . . . But if you have changed your minds . . . I shall go away' (al-Tabari, ii, 297 f.). Al-Ḥurr knew nothing of the letters which the inhabitants of Kūfah had sent to Ḥusayn but he did not change his attitude when the latter showed him two sacks full of them; he had received the order to take the rebel, without fighting, to Ibn Ziyād and he endeavoured to persuade Ḥusayn to follow him; when Ḥusayn continued his march, he did not dare to oppose him but instead made some suggestions to him: to follow a route leading neither to Kūfah nor to Medina and to write to Yazīd or to Ibn Ziyād; at the same time, he himself would write to Ibn Ziyād in the hope that he would receive a reply which would allow him to avoid a painful ordeal. But Ḥusayn would not agree to his proposals and al-Ḥurr therefore followed him closely, uttering warnings from time to time: "I remind you of God for your own sake . . . if there is a battle you will be killed . . . " But Ḥusayn did not fear death. When a halt was made in the district (nābiyā) of Nināwā (forming part of the diwān of Kūfah) a horseman arrived from Kūfah; without greeting Ḥusayn, he gave al-Ḥurr a letter from Ibn Ziyād ordering him not to allow the rebels to make a halt except in a desert place without fortifications or water. Zuhayr b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAmr b. ʿAbd al-Ṭālib then suggested that Ḥusayn should attack al-Ḥurr's small detachment and occupy the fortified village of al-Ṭālib, but Ḥusayn refused to open the hostilities.

On 2 Muharram he made his camp at Karbalāʾ [q.v.], a place belonging to the nābiyā of Nināwā; on the 3rd the situation worsened: there arrived from Kūfah an army of 4,000 men under the command of ʿUmār b. Saʿd b. Abī Waqṣārā who, appointed nābi b. al-Ṭabari, 39

On this occasion Ibn Ziyād was given evil advice by Shāmir [q.v. (usually known as Shīmūr b. al-Māʾshūḵ)] b. Dhi Ḥiṣāwān (an ex-supporter of ʿAlī who had fought with him at Siffin: al-Tabari, i, 330 f.); the governor would otherwise have been accommodating, but he was persuaded that he ought to force Ḥusayn to submit to him. Ibn Ziyād, so he had arrived, was in the territory which was under his jurisdiction. Ibn Ziyād therefore gave orders to Ibn Saʿd either to attack the rebel, if the latter refused to comply with the conditions laid down, or to hand over the command of the troops to Shāmir, who was the bearer of this order (al-Tabari, iii, 315 f.). He is said even to have added that, if Ḥusayn fell in the fighting, his body was to be trampled on, because the man was "a rebel, a seditious person, a brigand, an oppressor and he was to do no further harm after his death" (al-Tabari, ii, 316). Ibn Saʿd cursed Shāmir, accusing him of having envenomed an affair which otherwise would have ended peacefully; he was sure that Ḥusayn would not submit, for "there is a proud soul in him in his heart".

On the evening of 9 Muḥarram, Ibn Saʿd advanced with his men towards the group of insurgents. Ḥusayn was seated in front of his tent, leaning upon his sword, his head nodding drowsily; he had a vision in which the Prophet announced that he would soon be joining him. Warned by his sister Zaynab that the soldiers of Ibn Saʿd were advancing, he sent his brother al-ʿAbbās to find out the reason for their approach. While the messenger's return was awaited, warnings, reproaches and insults were hurled from both sides. When al-ʿAbbās returned, Ḥusayn, having learned Ibn Ziyād's demand, requested a respite of one night; this being granted, he delivered
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to his relatives and supporters a discourse which his son 'Ali, the only male of his family to escape from the massacre, was later to recall: "I give praise to God Who has honoured us with the Prophethood and has taken us under the shadow of the Qura'ish... I know of no worthier companions... than mine nor a more devout family than mine... May God reward you all. I think that tomorrow our end will come... I ask you all to go away. I do not hold you back. The night will cover you. Use it as a steed..." (al-Tabari, ii, 320 f.). With a few exceptions, his supporters showed a complete devotion to his cause. Husayn, after reviving and comforting his sister Zaynab, who had fainted in despondency, went out to prepare the defences: the tents were brought close together, and tied to one another with ropes, wood and reeds were heaped up in a ditch ready to be set alight when necessary to prevent an attack from behind, and they passed the rest of the night in prayer (al-Tabari, ii, 317-24, 326). The next day, after the sahib, hostilities commenced.

The battle of Karbala: Main episodes. If we accept that Ibn Sa'd has sent some foot-troops and archers to oblige the rebels to surrender by forcing them to suffer thirst and to capture the Tālibīs by surrounding them (which is what an impartial study of the traditions would seem to suggest), we may accept also that the battle of Karbala was prolonged from dawn until the afternoon in a series of single combats, of attacks and partial repulses, of periods of inaction, of skirmishes in defence of the tents, etc., and that it was not until nearly sunset that Ibn Ziyād's troops, exasperated by the rebels' resistance, and determined to put an end to it, fell upon the surviving Tālibīs and massacred them. In such an encounter, which began as a sort of deadly tournament with only a small number of combatants and a large number of spectators and soldiers on guard, some of the dialogues between adversaries which the sources recount could have taken place. Lammens (Le Califat de Yazid 1er, 169) attributes great importance to a concise tradition of Abū Mīkhnaţ according to which the fighting lasted as long as a siesta (al-Tabari, ii, 374 f., etc.) and from this he deduces that: "The tragedy of Karbala instead of lasting for weeks consisted of only one action and was over in an hour..." Now among the accounts given by Abū Mīkhnaţ there are certainly some which are invented, but taken all together, they do serve to illustrate the narrative and consequently to select one single tradition in so far as it differs or appears to differ from the bulk of others is a critical method of disputable value, particularly as, in the present case, the traditionist is the same and as the tradition in question may be interpreted either as the boasting of a combatant before the caliph or as the description of the last act of the tragedy.

On the morning of 10 Muharram, Husayn drew up his supporters (32 horsemen and 40 foot-soldiers with Zuhayr b. al-'Kayn in command of the right wing and Ḥabbī b. Muẓāhr of the left) in front of the tents, and having entrusted the standard to his brother al-'Abbās, ordered them to set fire to the heaps of wood and reeds. He had had pitches for himself a tent inside which he coated himself with a depilatory paste and perfumed himself with musk diluted in a bowl. Then, on horseback and with the Kur'ān in front of him, he invoked God in a long and beautiful prayer (al-Tabari, ii, 327) and pronounced a discourse to his enemies in which, having declared that God was his walli—and God protects the devout—he invited them to consider well whether it was lawful for them to kill him, reminded them of Muḥammad's statement that he and his brother were the lords of the youth of Paradise, reviewed the great merits of the family of the Prophet, once again reproached the inhabitants of Kūfa for having summoned him, and asked to be allowed to make his way to the Tālibīs, which would offer him safety. When it was repeated to him that first of all he must submit to his cousins, he replied that he would never humiliate himself like a slave (other, longer, versions of his discourse are given in Muhšīn al-Āmīn, 255-60). He then dismounted and commanded that his horse should be hobbled, intending by this to signify that he would not fight, but would go to the Tālibīs to negotiate.

If the numerous accounts of episodes of secondary importance are removed, the phases of the battle can be followed fairly clearly. After Husayn's speech, it was Zuhayr b. al-'Kayn who exhorted their adversaries to follow Husayn; as he received in reply only insolence and threats, he requested them not to kill him (al-Tabari, ii, 331 f.). Then they began to shoot arrows and duels took place (ibid., 335 f.); the right wing of the Tālibīs, which was in command of Ibn Ziyād, attacked, but withdrew on meeting resistance, and the leader ordered his men not to engage in any more single combats (ibid., 337, 342 f.); they preferred to go on shooting arrows from a distance. An assault and an encircling manoeuvre made by the left wing on the orders of Ẓāhir led to losses, and the commander of the cavalry asked Ibn Sa'd for help from the foot-troops and archers (ibid., 344); Ṣahāḥ b. Riḥā', a former supporter of 'Abī who in this action was in command of Ibn Ziyād's foot-troops, when asked to attack, made it plain that he had no wish to do so (ibid., 344 f.) and it was the cavalry on armoured horses and 500 (sic) archers who went into action. Husayn's horsemen, having hamstrung their horses, fought on foot (ibid., 345). As Husayn and the Tālibīs could be approached only from the front, Ibn Sa'd sent some men towards the tents, from the right and from the left, to dismantle them, but the supporters of Husayn, slipping in among the tents, defended them energetically. Ibn Sa'd then gave orders to burn the tents and this was done, at first to the advantage of Husayn because the flames prevented the attackers from advancing on that side (ibid., 346). Ẓāhir, who had approached the tent of Husayn and his wives, would have set fire to this also, but even his comrades reproached him for this and he went away ashamed (ibid., 346 f.).

At noon, Husayn and his followers performed the prayer of the zuhr according to the rite of the ẓādāl al-khawaf [q.v.] (ibid., 347 f., 350). It was in the afternoon that Husayn's party became narrowly encircled; his supporters fell fighting in front of him (ibid., 354 f., 355 f.) and the way lay open through to the Tālibīs who, until this moment, had not entered the field of action, and their massacre began. The first to be killed was 'Alī al-Akbar, the son of Husayn (ibid., 356 f.), then it was the turn of a son of Muslim b. Ṭākī (ibid., 357 f.), of the sons of ʿAbd Allāh b. Ẓafar and of ʿAkkī, then of Kāsim, the son of Ḥasan, whose death is related in touching terms: he was young and beautiful; mortally wounded, he called for help to his uncle who swooped like a falcon on the assailant and struck him with his sword; but it was not Husayn who killed the attacker but the horses of Ibn Ziyād's soldiers who knocked him down and trampled him with their hooves. When the dust cleared, Husayn could be seen to take the corpse of his nephew in his arms, cursing
his murderers, and to carry him in front of his tent, where the bodies of Ali Al-Abi Talib's brother, Husayn, are not given in the texts of al-Tabari or of al-Baladuri, who limit themselves to relating (the former on p. 361, the latter on fol. 657r) that Husayn, overcome by thirst, made his way towards the Euphrates, but was prevented from reaching it; he then prayed to God that he who had prevented him from achieving his object should die of thirst (and of course his prayer was answered); wounded in the mouth and on the chin, he cast upwards towards heaven the blood which he had collected in his cupped hands, complaining to God of the suffering which was being inflicted on the son of the daughter of His Messenger. But there must certainly have existed also some traditions concerning al-Abbas, who definitely also fell at Karbala³, and al-Mufid (240) links them with that concerning Husayn; he relates that the two brothers went forward together towards the river, that al-Abbas, surrounded by enemies and separated from Husayn, fought courageously and was killed on the spot where later his tomb was erected (al-Mufid, 243).

By now Ibn Ziyad's soldiers were quite close to Husayn, but for some time nobody dared to raise a hand against him. Finally a Kifli, Malik b. Al-Husayn, surrounded him in the head, and Husayn's hood was filled with blood. While he replaced it by a balanswana, wrapping a turban round it, Malik seized the burnous, but it did him little good, for he was followed for the rest of his life by poverty and disgrace (ibid., 359). Another pathetic episode is the death of a child whom Husayn had placed on his knees (al-Ya'qubî, 290 f., explains the presence of this child on Husayn's lap at such an unsuitable moment by the fact that it had just been born). An arrow pierced the child's neck and Husayn on this occasion also collected the blood in his cupped hands and poured it on the ground, invoking God's wrath against the evil-doers (ibid., 359 f.).

The slaughter continued. Finally it was Shamir, the cursed of the Shi'is, who advanced with a small group of soldiers against Husayn, but even then he did not dare to strike him, and there merely ensued an altercation between the two of them (ibid., 362 f.). At this moment Husayn emerged from his inertia and prepared to fight (when considering the reason for his unwarlike attitude it should be remembered that he was nearly fifty-five years of age and that he had been ill). A boy placed himself bravely beside him, deaf to the order to return to the tent and to Zaynab's calling him back, and had his hand cut off by the stroke of a sword; Husayn comforted him, assuring him that he would soon meet his ancestors in Paradise. There were not more than three or four rebels surviving, and Husayn attacked the enemy. He was wearing well-made drawers of a shining material, but had rent them in advance because he feared that they would be looted from him after his death, a precaution which proved useless, for he was to be left naked on the field of battle (ibid., 364 f.). Ibn Sa'd having approached, Zaynab spoke to him: "'Umar b. Sa'd, will Abû 'Abd Allah (the kunya of Husayn) be killed while you stand and watch?" Tears flowed from the eyes of Ibn Sa'd (ibid., 365). Husayn fought vigorously. There are some sources (al-Ya'qubî, 291, and other Shi'is) which state that he killed many enemies, even dozens, but one tradition states that if his enemies had wished they could have killed him at once (ibid., 365). Finally, in spite of his last threat of Divine vengeance, he was wounded in the hand and the shoulder and he fell with his face to the ground (ibid., 366). Ibn Sa'd and Sinan b. Anas b. 'Amr al-Nakhî who, after striking him yet again, cut off his head, since Khawali b. Yazid al-Ashâbi, whom he had ordered to do so, was trembling too much to be capable of it. Sinan gave the head to this Khawali, who then carried it to Ibn Ziyad.

The combat having thus ended, the soldiers turned to pillage; they seized Husayn's clothing, his sword and his baggage, his dye-plants and the Yemeni cloaks, and they seized from the women their ornaments, and their cloaks (ibid., 366). A sick boy was lying in one of the tents and Shamir would have killed him also, but was restrained; Ibn Sa'd came up and forbade anyone to enter this tent (ibid., 367), and this boy, 'Ali, who was to be given the name of Zayn al-'Abidin [q.v.], was the only one of Husayn's sons to survive the massacre; as a sign of Divine favour, there were descended from him all the numerous line of the Husaynids. The martyrs of Karbala³ or of al-Taff— they are known also by this toponym [q.v.]—numbered 72, 17 of them Tâlibis (for a critical analysis of the other figures, see Muhsin al-A'min, 352; 88 soldiers of Ibn Ziyad fell on the field of battle (ibid., 368 f.). The latter total is given also by Muhsin al-A'min, although it is difficult to reconcile this figure with the notes scattered throughout his book (138, 267, 268, 269, etc.) on the number killed by this or that combatant: 40 by al-Hurr, 30 by Burayr, 12 or 13 by Nâfî etc., and a great number killed by Husayn.

Minor episodes of the battle. The account of the battle is filled with a large number of episodes; we give here the references for those which have formed the subject of the longest narratives and which have become fairly well-known (the figures in parentheses refer to al-Tabari, iii): the repenance of al-Hurr, his fighting beside Husayn and his death (332-4, 341, 345, 349 f.); the murder of a Kalbi and his wife for Husayn's cause (335, 336 f., 344, 346); death of Ibn al-'Abâb al-Huwáza following a prayer by Husayn (337 f.); Nâfî wounded, taken prisoner and executed (341 f., 350 f.); brothers fighting on opposing sides (341); 'Abis, an old and valiant fighter, killed by stones (353 f.); a supporter who fled (354 f.); heroes who fell in duels: Muslim b. 'Awaqda, a warrior who had taken part in expeditions against the infidels (343 f.), Burayr, the sayyid of the readers of the Kur'ân (338-40), Habib b. Muzâhir (348 f.), Zuhayr b. al-Kayn (349 f.), and others passim.

Events after the battle. Husayn's body, covered with wounds (ibid., 366), is said to have been trampled by the horses of ten men who volunteered to inflict this final indignity on the grandson of the Prophet. After Ibn Sa'd's departure, the headless body was buried with those of other "martyrs" by the Asadis of the village of al-Ghâdiriya in the spot where the massacre had taken place (ibid., 368) (on the sanctuary which was erected there in their honour, see karbala³). Husayn's head, with those of other Tâlibis, was taken first to Kûfa, then to Damascus. Ibn Ziyad and Yazid, when it was placed in front of them, each reacted differently: the former was insulting, knocking out some teeth with his switch, while the latter, according to most of the traditions, was respectful and appeared to regret the haste with which his governor had acted,
going so far as to curse "the son of Sumayya"; he is reported to have declared that if Husayn had come to him he would have pardoned him. The Tālibi women and children were also taken first to Kūfa, then to Damascus, where the caliph in the end treated them kindly, although at the beginning of his interview with them he addressed them harshly, to which Zaynab and 'Ali replied in a similar manner. The women joined Yazid's wives in their laments for the dead; they received compensation for the property stolen from them at Karbala\textsuperscript{2} and a few days afterwards were sent back to Medina with a reliable escort. 'Ali, who had run the risk of being executed because it was stated that he was already an adult, was treated by Yazid with an almost affectionate courtesy and instructed to accompany the Tālibi women to Medina. There are diverse accounts on the place where Husayn's head is buried: (1) beside his father 'Ali, i.e., at al-Najaf; (2) outside Kūfa but not beside 'Ali; (3) at Karbala\textsuperscript{2} with the rest of his body; (4) at Medina in the Bạḳī\textsuperscript{3}; (5) at Damascus, but exactly where is unknown; (6) at al-Rạḳja; (7) in Cairo, where it was allegedly transferred by the Fātimīds [see \textit{Aṣkālān}], and exactly in the place where there was built the mosque which bears his name (Muḥṣīn al-Amin, with many details, 390-4).

On the repentence of the inhabitants of Kūfa and their "revenge" in 65/683-5, see \textit{Sulaymān b. Shụrād al-Insānī} and \textit{Tawwābūn}; for the ceremonies commemorating the battle of Karbala\textsuperscript{2}, see \textit{Muḥrahā}; for the Persian popular dramas of which Husayn is often either the protagonist or a character, see \textit{Tāziya}.

**The Legend of Husayn**

In the legend of Husayn, a first distinction may be made between those beliefs in which the element of cosmogony predominates and an important part is played by "light", those which have an eschatological character and finally those (the most numerous) in which Husayn remains the historical personality known to us, but endowed with a halo of marvels which elevate him above the common run of human beings. In the first group, Husayn has in general a function of being the forerunner of that of the descendants of the \textit{aḥl al-bayt} [q.v.] and completely equal to that of his brother Hasan. For a detailed study of these beliefs, arising from the influence of metaphysical systems of a much earlier date than Islam and elaborated by the extremist \textit{Shi}\textit{is} (zhūlād), see \textit{Ismā'īliyya, Umm al-Kitāb}. We give here an example (Ibn Rustam al-Ṭabarī, 59): 7,000 years before the creation of the world, Muhammad, 'Ali, Fāṭima, Hasan and Husayn, figures (\textit{aṣghāb}) of light, praised and glorified the Lord before His throne. When God wished to create their forms (\textit{ṣawwar}) He forged them like a column (\textit{ṣawmi}) of light, then threw them into the loins of Adam and made them pass from thence into the loins and the wombs of their forbears. They are not tainted by polytheism or heterodoxy. Among the eschatological accounts is the following (which should perhaps be connected with the beliefs of the \textit{Shi}\textit{is} sect of the Mughirīyya founded by al-Mughira b. Sa\textit{'}īd al-\textit{Udālī}, d. 115/737), (Ibn Rustam al-Ṭabarī, 78): Husayn went to the Rādāw mountains where he will remain on a throne of light, surrounded by the Prophets, with his faithful followers behind him, until the coming of the Mahdi; then he will transfer himself to Karbala\textsuperscript{2} where all the celestial and human beings will visit him. Others of these eschatological accounts belong to the cycle of those which promise to the members of the \textit{aḥl al-bayt} a privileged position in Paradise; for example (Ibn Shahrāshūb, i, 219) Muhammad, during his \textit{mi\textacircumflex{a}}\text{ṣīd} [q.v.], saw a castle made of pearls and learned that it was intended for Husayn; as he advanced, he saw an apple, grasped it and cut it in two; from it there emerged a young girl, with the corners of her eyes like those of eagles, also destined for Husayn. Marcel are \textit{Sīgī} for the authors cited: Bal. = al-Balāḏūrī; \textit{T.} = al-Ṭabarī, ii; \textit{IIRT} = Ibn Rustam al-Ṭabarī; Mufl. = al-Mufīd; ISh. = Ibn Shahrāshūb, iii; Shi. = al-Ṭabarī, iii; IKh. = Muḥṣīn al-Amin. Details of later stories of a fabulous nature will be found in the book by Muhammad Mahdī al-Māzāndārānī al-Ḥārī which sometimes mentions as a source the \textit{Bihār al-anwār} of al-Maḍjlīsī, but also some recent texts.

\textit{Marvels concerning the birth and childhood of Husayn.} (IRT, 71; ISh., 209, 231, 237) Husayn was born three months prematurely and survived this very early birth—an extraordinary circumstance which occurred only to 'Isa and, it is said, also to Yābūy b. Zakariyyā\textsuperscript{3}. (ISh., 209, 239) Muhammad cared for him for 40 days, putting his thumb or his tongue or his own saliva into his mouth. (IRT, 79; ISh., 228 f.; parallel account: IRT, 73; ISh., 213) The number of angels who descended from heaven to rejoice, with Muhammad, at his birth, was about thousands (IRT, 72; ISh., 200; Muḥṣīn A. 163) Dījbīr brought to Muhammad at the same time the congratulations and the condolences of God. (Muḥṣīn A., 163) He gave him a handful of earth from Karbala\textsuperscript{2}. (ISh., 229) He handled Husayn while his mother was asleep. (IRT, 49; ISh., 228 f., etc.) An angel benefited from Husayn's birth: banished by God to an island as punishment, with his wings broken, he saw passing over him the band of angels on their way to offer their congratulations to Muhammad; having begged them to take him with them, he mended his broken wings simply by rubbing them against the newly-born child; he was pardoned through Muhammad's intercession and took his place again in Paradise, from then on being called the \textit{masāli} of Husayn. (IRT, 79) It is he who takes note of the visitors to Husayn's tomb at Karbala\textsuperscript{3} (IRT, 72, 193; ISh., 200; Muḥṣīn A., 234 f.) Muhammad had on his knees his son 'Ībrahim and Husayn; having learned through Dījbīr that God would not leave both of them alive and that he could redeem the life of one of them with that of the other, he, in tears, gave up 'Ībrahim in order not to make 'Ali and Fāṭima weep.

\textit{Marvels connected with his death:} When Husayn fell on the battlefield (Bal., 667r; Mufl., 251; ISh., 212 f.; Muḥṣīn A., 302 f., 305 f.) the day became dark and the stars were visible, etc., the sky became red etc. (Bal., 660v; Muḥṣīn A., 303 f.) It rained blood, which left traces on the heads and the garments of people as far as Khurāṣān etc. (Bal., 667v; ISh., 212, 218, 238; Muḥṣīn A., 304 f.) Blood appeared beneath the stones in Syria and elsewhere (similar accounts: ISh., 213, etc.). (Muḥṣīn A., 304) Blood exuded from the walls. (ISh., 213, 236; IKh. 200 f.; Muḥṣīn A. 163) On the night of Husayn's death, Umm Salama [q.v.] or Ibn 'Abbās saw in a dream Muhammad with his head and his beard soiled with earth, pouring blood into a phial. (IRT, 73; Mufl., 250 f.; IKh., 213; IKh. 199, 200 f.) The earth of Karbala\textsuperscript{2} which Dījbīr or another angel had given to Muhammad and which Umm Salama had preserved, turned into blood on the ninth following night. Umm Salama realized that the tragedy was accomplished and cried out; she was the first to cry out at Medina
(AL-)HUSAYN B. ‘ALI B. ABL JALIB

(All these accounts which show Muhammad collecting the blood of the martyrs of Karbala etc. are presented in the form of hadiths, with different isnads and many variants, especially in the musnads (canonical and non-canonical); for a collection of them arranged by subject see al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, cited in bibl.).

The givers wept and recited poems; the wives of the grooms lamented; Umm Salama and other women heard them. The angels wept when Husayn's head was taken to Damascus. (ISh., 238) Even the wild beasts and the fishes wept. (Muh.A., 164 f.) ‘Ali knew that his son would be killed at Karbala and, when he passed by this place, halted and wept and recalled Muhammad's prophecy. He interpreted the name of Karbala: karb wa-balá (affliction and trial). (I.Ka.b., 199) The martyrs of Karbala will enter Paradise without any accounting for their actions. (T., 385) An unknown person, heard by all but seen by none, recited during the night before the battle threatening verses.

Marvels of the severed head: (ISh., 217 f.) While the head was being transported, a mysterious quill wrote threatening verses on a wall. The same verses had been written in a church of the Rüm, built 300 years before Muhammad's birth. The head emitted a perfume; and a monk, impressed by the miraculous light emanating from it, paid a sum of money to be allowed to keep it in his cell; during the night the head spoke and the next day the monk embraced Islam; the dhimams which he had paid changed into stones. A snake crawled into one nostril of the severed head. (IRT, 77 f., etc.) The head recited verses of the Kur’an. (T., 369; ISh., 217 f.) Khawali having taken it to his house on the night of his arrival at Kufa and having put it under an urn, a column of light descended from the sky and a white bird circled around the urn.

Punishment of those who had insulted and wounded Husayn: All those who had wronged Husayn were visited by some immediate or eventual misfortune: (ISh., 214-6; Muh.A., 345-51) there are mentioned: murder, blindness, leprosy, unquenchable thirst, hands as dry as wood in summer, damp in winter), death from burns, stings from scorpions, loss of vigour, poverty, a man driven from his house by his own wife (some of these misfortunes are related by al-Tabarî, passim). Those who stole property belonging to Husayn were also punished: he who put Husayn's turban on his own head was afflicted with madness; he who put on his cloak, with poverty; he who used his perfume, his dye-plants and his clothes, with leprosy or the falling out of his hair. The items stolen underwent changes which made them unusable or caused them to lose their value: (ISh., 215, 218) the meat of the camels became bitter or caught fire; the dye-plants and the perfumes changed into blood, the gold into copper or fire in the hands of the gold-smiths; the saffron caught fire. On the marvels of the tombs, see Karbala.

Supernatural attributes of Husayn which caused marvels. (ISh., 230) His forehead was so white that he felt joy. God then revealed to him the fate of his future grandson. The mysterious verses of the Kur’an interpreted by the Shi’is as referring to Husayn. For a series of these verses, see ISh., 206 f., 236 f.; cf. Muf., 199. An example is verse XLVI, 14/15, which speaks of the pregnant mother bearing her child with suffering and giving birth to him with pain; it is interpreted as an allusion to Fatima, who, having conceived Husayn, was much distressed when she heard from Muhammad that he had received God's condolences on the fate of his future grandson. The mysterious letters K.H.Y.A.S., with which sûra XIX begins, had been explained by God to Zakariyya as follows: K = Karbala; H = halak al-sura; Y = Yezid; A = wa’shak; S = sabruhu. This explanation is merely a detail in a rather involved narrative (ISh., 237) forming part of a group of curious comparisons between the fate of Husayn and that of Yahyâ, the son of Zakariyya (perhaps owing to the motif of the severed heads placed on a dish): Zakariyya, who had learned the names of the Five from Djibril, was astonished by the fact that when he uttered the name of Husayn his eyes filled with tears, while when he uttered the name of Yahya it did not move him. He felt joy. God then revealed to him the destiny of Muhammad's grandson, and Zakariyya wept and sobbed, asking God to give him also a son who could cause him to endure a sorrow similar to that which He was to inflict on his beloved Muham-
mad. God granted him a son, Yabya. At each stage of his journey from Mecca to Kufa, Husayn recalled that his father, Yaftya, had done, and in order to quieten it God will kill 70,000 hypocrites, unbelievers and wicked believers, as he had also done for Yabya.

**Judgments on Husayn.** Throughout the Muslim world there was sympathy and a high regard for Husayn. It was only the adherents of the Umayyad movement who presented him as a ba'du* in'shā'āl al-bay'a*, that is as a rebel against the established authority, and thus condoned his murder by Yazid, but their opinion was opposed not only by those who despised the Umayyad régime (for an echo of the protests of the latter and their denial of the validity of the bay'a* to Yazid, see al-Mukram, 12-6, and Muhsin al-Amin, 67), but also by those Muslims who refused to recognize that the murderers had acted according to their consciences and at the same time sought pretexts to refrain from blaming either the rebel al-Husayn or the Companions and the *tabi* 'ūn who had remained neutral in order to avoid civil war (see Ibn Khaldun, Mukaddima, Būlāk 1284, 177, 181, fašī fi wilāyat al- ʿābd). In this almost universal exaltation of Husayn due to his descent from the Prophet and to the conviction that he had sacrificed himself for an ideal, it is not possible to make a clear distinction between the opinions of the Sunnis and those of the Shi'īs, except in the case of certain privileges and attributes which only the Shi'īs accord him. The very favourable attitude of the Sunnis was probably strongly influenced by the pathetic accounts which Abū Mīkhaṣaf collected, either directly or with a very short *imād, mainly from the Kufans who repented of their behaviour towards the Prophet's grandson; it was these traditions, suffused with the sentiments of the Kufans and marked by the notoriously pro-'Alīd character of Abū Mīkhaṣaf's collection, which formed the basis of the account of the later historians and through them spread throughout the Muslim world.

As there exists no work which can serve as a guide to the ideas of all the groups of Shi'īs concerning Husayn, we limit ourselves here to the following notes: Husayn in his capacity as *imām* [see IMAMA] shares the various privileges accorded to the *imāms* (see Bausani, La religione . . ., 346 f.) by the Twelver Shi'īs [see ITHNĀ-ASHARĪYYA], the Ismā'īlīs [see ISMA'ILĪYYA], the Zaydis [see ZAYDIYYA], etc.: like the other *imāms*, he is a mediator with God for those who call on him; it is through his intercession (ta'awwūl) that his faithful followers obtain guidance and attain salvation. As a member of the holy Five he received the same divine grace as his brother Hasan [see ARL AL-BAYT, ARL AL-KISA', PĀTIMA, MUBĀHILA, etc.]. As a grandson of the Prophet he had the right to receive reverence (burma). In addition he possessed personal qualities, above all the attribute of piety, demonstrated by his 25 pilgrimages on foot from Medina to Mecca and the 1,000 *ra'as* which he performed each day (on this number, which is considered to be exaggerated, see Muhsin al-Amin, 124 f.). It was because of his longevity that he had little time to spare for his wives and consequently had few children. Other qualities which he possessed were generosity (there are several stories to illustrate this), forbearance (*kihm*), humility, eloquence (as a proof of this there are mentioned speeches and poems by him), and finally the qualities which may be inferred from his actions, such as his contempt for death, disdain for a life of humiliation, his pride, etc. (see, e.g., Muhsin al-Amin, 125-39, 132, 156 f.). But the basis of the exaltation of Husayn by the Shi'īs is found in the noble motives for which he sacrificed himself and of course in the moving fact of his edifying exploit. From the belief that the *imāms* know all that was, that is, and that is to come, and that their knowledge does not increase with time, it is inferred that Husayn knew in advance the destiny which awaited him and his followers; he thus set off from Mecca towards Kufa aware of his imminent sacrifice and yet without any hesitation or any effort to escape from God's will. A tradition according to which he was invited by God to choose between sacrifice and victory (helped by an angel) gives yet more value to his enterprise, since it makes of it a voluntary action, and hence of great significance. The question arises as to his aim in thus sacrificing himself. The Shi'ī texts are very clear on this point: Husayn gave his person and his possessions as an offering to God to "revive the religion of his grandfather Muḥammad", "to redeem it", and "save it from the destruction into which it had been thrown by the behaviour of Yazid"; furthermore, he wished to show that the conduct of the hypocrites was shameful and to teach the peoples the necessity of revolt against unjust and impious governments (*fāsīks*), in short he offered himself as an example before the Muslim community (see, e.g., Muhsin al-Amin, 135, 152 f.). The idea that his intention was to redeem men from their sins by his blood and to save them, that his action was a redemptive sacrifice for the salvation of the world, is, in these actual terms, foreign to Shi'ī beliefs; at least the writer of this article has found no trace of it in the texts consulted. It is possible that it penetrated later into the Shi'ī literature and its influence is discernible in recent poems, since the transition from ta'awwūl to this idea is an easy one and it may have been helped by the influence of Christian ideas.

Among western Islamic scholars, Wellhausen and Lammens have formed judgements on the character of Husayn after careful study of the sources available to them. The former, guided by his subtle intuitions of historical facts, painted a fine picture of the situation (see, e.g., Wellhausen, Die Chronologie und der innere Aufbau des Islames, xxvii ff.) among the Shi'īs concerning Husayn, considering them to be later forgeries. But although it is probable that the traditionists have re-cast or modified this material, it must nevertheless be admitted that there emerges from it as a whole and, more important, from the facts themselves, the figure of a man impelled by an ideology (the institution of a régime which would fulfil the demands of the true Islam), convinced that he was in the right, stubbornly determined to achieve his ends, as in general are all religious fanatics, and admired and encouraged by supporters who were also convinced that their cause was just. This interpretation may not be a true picture of Husayn as an individual; it was nevertheless that which the following generation, for motives either of sentiment (respect, pity for his death), or of politics (the campaign against the Umayyads), gave of him, which was shared by the
later Arabic historians and which led to his exaltation and his legendary position among the Shi'is.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Sa'd, *Tabaqat*, ii/2, 89, iii/1, 21, 26, 252, v, 107, 125, 176, viii/204 (the numerous inaccuracies (some are merely to facts which are well-known or are not important for the biography of Husayn); Baladhuri, *A'mad, ms. Paris: biographical notices 437v-438r, 632r-633v, invitations from the Shi'is.

For other reference, see L. Caetani, *Chronographia Islamica*, 687 (61. §8), and the notes in the work of al-Muqram cited below.


**Modern Shi'i sources:** Muhsin al-Amin al-'Amili, *A'dâm al-`amâra*, iv, Beirut 1359/1949, 121-405 (an account covering more events than that of al-Tabari, making some fairly balanced attempts at criticism and indicating many Sunni and Shi'i sources (but without giving exact references); in the account of Husayn's enterprise there appear only a few details of a Shi'i tendency; marvels on 302-10, 348-51; Fahmi *'Uways, Shahîd Karbalî*, *al-imâm al-Husayn b. 'All b. Abî Tâlib*, Cairo 1948, 200-217; *'Abd al-Razzâk al-Musawî al-Makmûr, Marâhi al-Husayn al-`adlî al-`ams fi hadîth Karbalâ'*, Nadjaf 1376/1956 (with quotations from the sources); Muhammad Mahdî b. *'Abd al-Hâdi al-Mazandarâni al-Hâ'iri, Marâti al-sîlahyin fi abwâl al-`aswad wa-l-Husayn*, Nadjaf 1380/1960, i, 60-656, ii, 488-804 (work containing many legendary accounts).

**Works by western scholars:** A. Mûller, *Islam in Morgen- und Abendland*, Berlin 1885, i, 358-65, ii, 468-804 (work containing many political and historic-religious statements); A. Bausani, *Oppositionsparteien im alien Islam*, 358-65; J. Wellhausen, *Islam in Morgen- und Abendland*, Berlin 1885, i, 60-465, ii, 468-804 (work containing many political-religious statements).

Later Arabic historians and which led to his exaltation and his legendary position among the Shi'is. Baladhuri, *A'mad, ms. Paris: biographical notices* 437v-438r, 632r-633v, invitations from the Shi'is.

For other reference, see L. Caetani, *Chronographia Islamica*, 687 (61. §8), and the notes in the work of al-Muqram cited below.


**Modern Shi'i sources:** Muhsin al-Amin al-'Amili, *A'dâm al-`amâra*, iv, Beirut 1359/1949, 121-405 (an account covering more events than that of al-Tabari, making some fairly balanced attempts at criticism and indicating many Sunni and Shi'i sources (but without giving exact references); in the account of Husayn's enterprise there appear only a few details of a Shi'i tendency; marvels on 302-10, 348-51; Fahmi *'Uways, Shahîd Karbalâ'*, *al-imâm al-Husayn b. 'All b. Abî Tâlib*, Cairo 1948, 200-217; *'Abd al-Razzâk al-Musawî al-Makmûr, Marâhi al-Husayn al-`adlî al-`ams fi hadîth Karbalâ'*, Nadjaf 1376/1956 (with quotations from the sources); Muhammad Mahdî b. *'Abd al-Hâdi al-Mazandarâni al-Hâ'iri, Marâti al-sîlahyin fi abwâl al-`aswad wa-l-Husayn*, Nadjaf 1380/1960, i, 60-656, ii, 488-804 (work containing many legendary accounts).

**Works by western scholars:** A. Mûller, *Islam in Morgen- und Abendland*, Berlin 1885, i, 358-65, ii, 468-804 (work containing many political and historic-religious statements); A. Bausani, *Oppositionsparteien im alien Islam*, 358-65; J. Wellhausen, *Islam in Morgen- und Abendland*, Berlin 1885, i, 60-465, ii, 468-804 (work containing many political-religious statements).
imprisoned first in a dar at Medina (140-1/758) and then in a horrible prison at Kufa (144/762) by the Abbasids immediately attempted to re-occupy the mosque, and although at first they dispersed because their leader had been killed by Yabyya and Idris b. 'Abd Allah, they later took part in further fighting; hence the whole town did not fall into the hands of the rebels, whose situation became so precarious that, after having provided themselves with food and drink, they camped in the mosque and remained there for eleven days. Abu 'l-Faraj does not mention this active and passive resistance at Medina, nor certain actions of the occupiers of the mosque which shocked other Muslims and rendered it unsafe. Finally, on 24 Dhul-Qa'da, al-Husayn decided to extricate himself from this situation, which had reached an impasse, and, at the head of a group of 300 armed men who were joined en route by reinforcements from Mecca, he marched towards that town. Several members of the 'Abbásid family (notably al-'Abbás...
b. Muhammad, the uncle of al-Mahdi, and his son 'Ubayd Allâh, Sulaymân b. Dja'far al-Manṣûr and his sons Muḥammad and Músâ, Músâ b. ʿIsâ and his brother ʿIsâḏî b. ʿAbd Allâh b. Sulaymân d. 740 (whereas that of Muḥammad al-Nâs al-Zâkiyya and his brother was primarily of a legitimist character). There are resemblances between the formula of the bâṣaʾ prescribed by this Zayd to his adherents and that which al-Husayn proposed to his: in the former, Zayd promised to defend the oppressed, to give [benefits] to whoever had been excluded from them (al-mâhrâmîn) and—what is more striking—to share fairly the fāyʾ (q.v.) (his revenues or the fāyʾ itself?); al-Husayn also promised justice and equal shares, and, although he did not specify which resources were to be distributed, it may be guessed that he too was referring to the fāyʾ, since one of his first actions in his capacity as imâm was to distribute the money which he found in the treasury of the town and 10,000 dinârs which remained from the ʿâsâʾ. In addition it is interesting to note that, in his bâṣaʾ, the duty of the subjects to obey him depended on his keeping the promises which he had made and that a similar condition is found in the appeal of the founder of the Zaydi state in the Yemen, al-Hâdî ibn ʿIbâḥ (Van Arendonk, 122 f.). Al-Husayn's order, which proves that he intended to make social concessions to the Shiʿis of this region, was addressed also to slaves; it was proclaimed at Mecca that those who joined the revolt would be granted their liberty, and there were some slaves who took advantage of this opportunity; all the same al-Husayn had to return some of them to their masters who demanded them back (since the law did not permit an emancipation of this type).

Within his design of social welfare for his followers, al-Husayn succeeded in making the revolt a social phenomenon. Quite early (see Mulâṣîn al-ʾAmin, xvi, 403) describe al-Husayn's rebellion as "Zaydî", and rightly, in the sense that it had a social character, as did certainly that of the Shiʿis of this region. Many rebels saved their lives by hanging with the pilgrims, notably two ʿAlîs who were later to become famous: ʾIdrîs b. ʿAbd Allâh (q.v.) and Yâbîy b. ʿAbd Allâh (q.v.). When the news of al-Husayn's defeat reached Medina, al-ʿUmâr emerged from his hiding-place and, having returned to office, burned the houses of the ʿAlîs and of some of the supporters of al-Husayn (he even burned some palm trees) and confiscated their possessions as being war booty (zawâfî). Thus ended the revolt which, in the number of ʿAlîs killed, was surpassed only at Karbalâʾ. The sources give as its motive the events at Medina mentioned above, except for al-Yaʿkûbî who connects it with ʾIṣhâʿ urrest in Khorâsân which was caused, he says, by the harsh measures of the governor appointed by al-Hâdî and fomented by the local Tâlîbis; his information is most probably correct, since it was on reinforcements from the pilgrims going to Mecca that the organizers for the revolt were relying, and an agreement to this end had already been established; but, as there is too little time between the accession of al-Hâdî (8 Mar. 165/4 April 785) and hence the appointment of his governor, the appeals of ʾIṣhâʿi pilgrims and the beginning of the revolt at Medina, these troubles and the reaction of the central government must be traced back to the final years of the caliphate of al-Mahdi, particularly since there exists evidence of a reversal of the policy of this caliph, who at first adopted a conciliatory policy towards the ʾIṣhâʿi until he later became hostile, at least to the Ẓâdîs; al-Hâdî merely pursued this hostile policy more vigorously. The ʾIṣhâʿi sources (see Mûṣîn al-ʾAmin, xvi, 403) describe al-Husayn's rebellion as "Zaydî", and rightly, in the sense that it had a social character, as did certainly that of the founder of the Zaydi movement Zayd b. al-Husayn (q.v.), killed in 122/740 (whereas that of Muḥammad al-Nâs al-Zâkiyya and his brother was primarily of a legitimist character). There are resemblances between the formula of the bâṣaʾ prescribed by this Zayd to his adherents and that which al-Husayn proposed to his: in the former, Zayd promised to defend the oppressed, to give [benefits] to whoever had been excluded from them (al-mâhrâmîn) and—what is more striking—to share fairly the fāyʾ (q.v.) (his revenues or the fāyʾ itself?); al-Husayn also promised justice and equal shares, and, although he did not specify which resources were to be distributed, it may be guessed that he too was referring to the fāyʾ, since one of his first actions in his capacity as imâm was to distribute the money which he found in the treasury of the town and 10,000 dinârs which remained from the ʿâsâʾ. In addition it is interesting to note that, in his bâṣaʾ, the duty of the subjects to obey him depended on his keeping the promises which he had made and that a similar condition is found in the appeal of the founder of the Zaydi state in the Yemen, al-Hâdî ibn ʿIbâḥ (Van Arendonk, 122 f.). Al-Husayn's order, which proves that he intended to make social concessions to the Shiʿis of this region, was addressed also to slaves; it was proclaimed at Mecca that those who joined the revolt would be granted their liberty, and there were some slaves who took advantage of this opportunity; all the same al-Husayn had to return some of them to their masters who demanded them back (since the law did not permit an emancipation of this type).
possibly in the 150s, since he could remember an
incident that occurred in 160/775. With his childhood
friend Abū Nuwās [q.v.] he studied the "classics" in
his native town, but, more important, he was
present at gatherings of men of letters; he thus
learnt the poet's profession, and awaited a favourable
opportunity for the realization of the aspiration of
all Bahārāns who, if they felt themselves to possess
any talent, wished to receive the approbation of the
capital. Abū Nuwās was the first to learn to try his
fortune in Baghādād, and reports of his success soon
spurred Husayn to follow him. He seems quite
rapidly to have won sufficient renown to guarantee
a secure existence, though he was obliged to content
himself with singing the praises of a certain number
of exalted persons without ever securing admission
to intimate acquaintance with al-Rahlīd; however,
he entered the service of a dissolute prince, Sālih b.
al-Rahlīd, whose life of pleasure he shared and who
thereafter, despite some passing shadows, always
remained an active patron of the poet in times of
difficulty. At the same time he also attached himself
to another of the caliph's sons, Muhammad, the
future al-A'mīn, whose constant companion he was
until the end. On the latter's death (198/813), in
spite of the advice of the probably more astute Abu
'Alī b. al-Rahlīd, he decided to leave in order to
safeguard his future, he allowed it to burst forth in a
series of threnodies which caused al-Ma'mūn to take
ummbrage; this fidelity to the dead caliph—which
even included a refusal to believe in his death—and
the graceless allusions which he made to the rival
at the time of the conflict between the two brothers
alienated al-Ma'mūn who, on his entry into Baghādād,
struck Husayn off the list presented to him and
refused him admittance to the court. Traditions
concerning the poet's fortunes during al-Ma'mūn's
calliphate are not very clear, but it is certain that al-
Khalīfī returned to Bahāra, where the affluence that
he owed to al-A'mīn al-Makhlīfī allowed him to wait
for happier days, and he made various attempts to
be reconciled with the caliph who did indeed recog-
nize his talent; the intervention of Sālih b. al-Rahlīd
and his connections out of his tribe must have
influenced him, but it is possible that, as a result of a
particularly successful panegyric, al-Ma'mūn gave
orders that the regular payment of his pension should
be resumed.

On his accession (218/833), al-Mu'taṣim recalled
him to court and rewarded him for his first panegyric
by filling his mouth with pearls, which he then had
made into a necklace so that no-one might remain
unaware of the esteem in which he held the poet. He
took him with him to Syria and provided a house for
him at Sāmarra. Husayn was once again a privileged
courier, as is clearly shown on the accession of al-
Wāḥīk whom he saluted with a long kāṣida without
joining in the throng of poets who had come forward
to proclaim their self-interested praises. He remained
in al-Wāḥīk's service throughout his caliphate, taking
his turn of duty both by night and day in
response to his master's whims, playing backgammon
with him, accompanying him on hunting expeditions,
taking part in his royal potations and writing inci-
dental poems on varied but mostly frivolous
subjects.

On the accession of al-Mutawakkil (238/847), the
poet, who had now reached a very advanced age,
possibly to have kept aloof from the court, though still
continuing to lead a dissolute life as the caliph, was
also appreciated his talent, called upon him to give
proof of it and was able to affirm that old age had in
no way diminished the perversity of his tastes. He
survived al-Mutawakkil, whose death he nevertheless,
and himself died shortly afterwards, probably in
250/864, almost a hundred years old.

Husayn al-Khalīfī maintains with a certain simplic-
yty that all the successive caliphs, from al-Rahlīd to
al-Wāḥīk, struck at him, either through jealousy or
because he had a pernicious influence on their
children, and it can be understood that he should
have been looked upon as a dangerous companion
for the 'Abbāsid princes, since he could not fail to
encourage the strong tendency that they already
possessed towards frivolity and debauchery. Abu
'Alī-Farādž al-Iṣfahānī, who is certainly lavish with
scandalous details, reports numerous anecdotes
concerning the dissolute nature of this man who
spent the greater part of his time drinking with
caliphs, princes or others of exalted rank, listening
to singing girls and dallying with young men.

The attraction of Husayn b. al-Dāḥhāk's company
resided in his light-hearted and original character,
and also in the facility with which he tackled the
poetic forms favoured in his day. In the fraction of
his work which we have survived, we find first of all
all kāṣidas of a "modernist" type in praise of the
caliphs; written in relatively simple language,
these panegyrics naturally lay stress upon the
qualities, whether real or imagined, of the personages
to whom they are addressed, and in them can be
observed the recurrent idea that God has chosen the
best of men to govern Islam. It is only in these
circumstances that he mentions the name of God,
and one cannot fail to be struck by his utter detach-
ment from matters of religion while noting that,
unlike Abū Nuwās and other dissolute poets, he
seems to have written hardly any zākīyya to
prepare for the after-life, although he did make the
pilgrimage to Mecca. His bacchic poems are not
lacking in originality, and tradition has it that Abū
Nuwās was sometimes rather put out by them, but,
when not shamelessly plagiarizing them, he consoled
himself for their success and felicities with the thought
that posterity would not fail to attribute to him,
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... Al-adawi al-taghlibi, the first member of the Hamdani family. Husayn b. Hamdan was active not only locally in the Djazira but also in Baghda and in other regions of the empire. His career benefited from an opportunist support of the caliph al-Mut'adid by giving up to him in 282/895 Ardumush, whose defence his father had entrusted to him as he fled, and becoming a valued ally of the caliph. In the following year, placed by the latter at the head of a large body of troops, he was chiefly responsible for the capture of the Kharidji Harun al-Shari, which enabled him to secure the liberation of his father who had been captured, the lifting of a tribute imposed on the Taghlibis and the command of a body of 500 Taghlibi horsemen.

He next distinguished himself in the operations against the Dulafid of the DJbail, Bakr b. Abd al-Aziz b. Abd al-Dulaf, probably in 283/896; this is alluded to in a verse of the bashida which Abu Firas devoted to the glory of the Hamdani family.

During the caliphate of al-Muktafi (289-95/902-8), in 291/905, as lieutenant of Muhammad b. Sulayman, sahib al-aqaykh, he gained in Syria a brilliant victory over the Karmati Husayn b. Zikrawayh (the Sakhb al-khali), who fled and was soon afterwards captured. With the same Muhammad b. Sulayman, he took part in the re-conquest of Egypt from the last Tulfunin in 292/904-5, as commander of the vanguard. It was he who first made contact with the conspirators who were plotting to rid themselves of the Tulfunin and who pressed him to march on Fustat. According to one tradition, Muhammad b. Sulayman offered him the governorship of Egypt, but he refused, preferring to return to Baghda, taking with him a considerable amount of booty.

In 293/905-6, he was put in command of an army sent against the Kalbis of Syria who had revolted at the instigation of the Khatami and behold he had been appointed caliph. He undertook, or was instructed, to remove the vizier al-Abbas b. al-Hasan al-Djurdjuri who, unlike the secretary Muhammad b. Dawa'd, uncle of 'Ali b. 'Isa, had approved al-Muktadir's accession. With two other conspirators he attacked and killed al-Abbas on 20 Rabii I 296/17 December 908 and tried to assassinate the young caliph, but unsuccessfully, for the latter had already left the hippodrome where Husayn was intending to take him by surprise and had shut himself in the palace. After the conspirators had proclaimed Ibn al-Mu'tazz caliph, Husayn went to the Hasani Palace to force al-Muktadir to dethrone him, being assumed that he would readily accept his dethronement. But Husayn encountered the resistance prepared by the chamberlain Sawsan and the two Mu'nis (al-Khidam and al-Khazin). Although he set fire to the gates of the palace, he was unable to force a way in. Al-Muktadir's party triumphed and Husayn fled to Mosul, then to Balad and spent some time wandering with his adherents in the Djazira. His brother 'Abd Allah Abu 'l-Haydib was sent in pursuit, but it was Husayn who surprised and defeated his pursuers. Encouraged by this success, Husayn, through his brother Ibrâhim, asked the vizier Ibn al-Furat for aman and although, with Muhammad b. Dawa'd and the kadi Abu 'l-Muhannan, he had been one of the main conspirators, he was restored to favour; but, to remove him from the capital, he was appointed governor of the districts of Kumm and Khashan in the Djibal. As governor of this region, he gave support to the caliph's troops under Mu'nis al-Khidam against the Saharid al-Layth b. 'Ali who had made himself master of Sijistani and of Fars, then against the latter's general, Subkarâ, who, after abandoning al-Layth's party and joining Mu'nis against him, had risen in rebellion at the instigation of his lieutenant al-Kattal. In 298/910-11 the two rebels were defeated and, while Subkarâ took refuge with the Sâamand, al-Kattal was taken prisoner, by Husayn himself according to the bashida of Abu Firas.

This same bashida states that Husayn was offered the governorship of Fars, which he refused. In any case he returned to Baghda. The vizier Ibn al-Furat, who seems to have mistrusted him, sent him away again, to be governor of the Djurdjuri. In this capacity, he was in command of a campaign against the Karmatis and the Ktabi in 301/913-4. For reasons which are not clear, perhaps because the vizier had deprived him of the financial administration of the province, perhaps because Husayn did not fulfil scrupulously his financial obligations, or perhaps because he aspired to independence, a conflict arose between him and the vizier 'Ali b. 'lsa and he came out in open rebellion, probably in 302/914-5. A first army sent against him met with defeat, and it was Mu'nis, recalled from Egypt, who took him prisoner while he was attempting to reach Armenia, in Sha'ban 303/February 916. He was taken to Baghda and exhibited dressed in a cap of shame and a long brocade tunic, made to ride on a camel all the way from Bab al-Shammasiya to the Palace, and then imprisoned under the guard of Zaydan, the intendant of the Palace. He remained in prison for over two years and was executed in Djumad l 306/October-November 918, on the orders of the caliph al-Muktafi, for reasons which are not clear.

Very probably his execution was connected with the revolt of the governor of Ardabaryan and Armenia, Yusuf b. 'Abi 'l-Sajj, which also coincided strangely with the dismissal of the vizier Ibn al-Furat.
It appears that at one point either Munis or the vizier Ibn al-Furat may have suggested that Husayn be released in order to put him in charge of the war against Yusuf, which he refused. It may be that the caliph suspected an alliance between Yusuf and Husayn against him and gave the order for Husayn's execution. Or Ibn al-Furat may have been involved in a conspiracy designed to further the Shia cause to which both he and Husayn were devoted. Ideas on this matter can only be hypothetical. In any case the caliph must have feared that if Husayn were released he would once again start a revolt, either on this matter can only be hypothetical. In any case the caliph must have feared that if Husayn were released he would once again start a revolt, either against the caliph or in support of a Shia caliph. In order to avoid attempts by those (probably numerous) who desired his release to secure it by force, the caliph preferred to take a measure which put a stop to all intrigue.

Among the generals of the caliph of this period, Husayn b. Hamdan stands out more clearly than the supreme commander Munis or any other military leaders. But his valour and the service he gave by his action in many battles are not enough to cancel the memory of the spirit of rebellion which too frequently possessed him, and his pride and ambition. It appears nevertheless that even in his acts of revolt his motives were disinterested and honourable. He seems to have thought that it was necessary to support Ibn al-Mu'tazz in order to bring about a beneficial change in the system of administration and a reform in the government. Like many who had Shia sympathies at this time, his ambition was to see prevail an ideal Muslim government which for many people the 'Abbasids no longer represented, and which it was possible to imagine realized only by the imminent or future accession to power of a family glorified by the sacrifice of so many martyrs and endowed with real or imaginary qualities which contrasted with the "vices" of the 'Abbasids.

Certain characteristics of Husayn b. Hamdan show him to have been an unusual man. In addition to the prestige of his Arab birth, which distinguished him among the mawali of all races, and to the native qualities of his Taghlibi family, he seems to have had an open-mindedness not possessed by the other military leaders, and an understanding of the great ferment of ideas which was discriminating the Muslim world at this time. It was certainly not an accident that he was in communication with the famous mystic al-Hallaj and that the latter dedicated a political work to him.

The founder of the Hamdanid dynasty was not Husayn b. Hamdan but his brother, 'Abd Allâh Abu 'l-Haydja*, but he was the first member of the family who really brought glory to it, inculcating in it the realization of its valour and strength and developing in it the ambition for glory and power. All this is attested in the verses of Abu Firas.

Bibliography: A biography of Husayn b. Hamdan is found in Ibn 'Asâkir, iv, 291-2. See also the historians Tabari, 'Arîb, Miskawayh, Kamâl al-Din, Ibn al-Âthîr, index. See also Ibn al-Dawwâdârî, 86, 81. For further details on his historical rôle, see M. Canard, Histoire de la dynastie des Hamîdînides ii, 397-40 and the sources mentioned in the notes. The great básida of Abu Firas to the glory of the Hamdanid family (ed. S. Dahan, ii, 103 ff., 154 ff.) with the commentary by Ibn Khâlawayh on the verses relating to Husayn b. Hamdan (ibid., 126-30, 150, 165-7) provides details which are sometimes lacking in the historians. On his political rôle at Bagdad, see also D. Sourdel, Vizirat 'abbâsida, 370-1, 373, 389, 403-13. (M. Canard)

**HUSAYN B. AL-SIDDIK AL-AHDAL** [see AL-AHDAL].

HUSAYN ‘AWNI PASHA, Ottoman general and Grand Vizier under Sultan ‘Abd al-Aziz, was born at Gelendost, a village of the sanjak of Isparta (muhiyet of Koyua) in 1236/1820-1; his father was a poor peasant named Ahmed Agha and was promoted to staff captain in 1264/1848. After a few years of teaching at the same institution, on the outbreak of the Crimean War (1853) he joined the army with the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel. He distinguished himself on the Balkan front, especially at the battle of Cetate and participated later in the Mingrelian campaign as chief of general staff of the serdar-i ezem ‘Omer Pasha. On the conclusion of the war (1856), he was appointed director of the Mektebi Harbiye, during the war with Montenegro (1862) he commanded a division. Back in Istanbul he was nominated, early in 1863, to the presidency of Dār-i Şâhârd-yi ‘Asheri (High Military Council) and promoted to muhtir (general commander) in Safar 1280/July-August 1865; during the second grand vizierate of Fu’ad Pasha [q.v.], he was appointed ser’asker hâkim-mâbâmi (interim War Minister), a position he kept until his dismissal on 5 Şâban 1282/24 December 1865. He was sent to Rumelia in Dhu l-Hijjah 1283/April 1867 as commander of Yanya and Yefi-shehr, but he left for Crete when, on 16 Djumâdâ II 1284/15 October 1867, he was entrusted with suppression of the Cretan revolt. His success in crushing the revolt resulted in his nomination, on 29 Shawwâl 1285/12 February 1869, to the office of ser’asker in ‘All Pasha [q.v.]’s last cabinet. The military reforms he accomplished on the Prussian model, during his first period of office in the War Ministry which lasted two and a half years, rightly established his reputation as the re-organizer of the army. But the death of ‘All Pasha on 20 Djamâdâ II 1288/September 1871 and the treatment of his enemy Mahmûd Nedim Pasha [q.v.] to the grand vizierate, brought about his dismissal and banishment to Isparta. Recalled from exile in Djumâdâ I 1289/July-August 1872, he was sent to Izmir in Ramadan/November of the same year as ‘All Pasha and transferred, on 17 Dhu ‘l-Hidjdja 1290/25 January 1873, he was appointed Minister of the Navy in the cabinet of Muterdjîm Medîmed Rüştî Pasha, which took place on 7 Djamâdâ I 1305/10 May 1876 to the office of ser’asker for the fourth time. He played the principal part in the deposition of Sultan ‘Abd al-Aziz, which took place on 25 March/13 April 1876, as a result of his collaboration with the Grand Vizier Muterdjîm Medîmed Rûştî Pasha, the Shaykh al-Islâm Hasan Khayr Allâh Efendi and Mîhad Pasha [q.v.]. He was shot dead by a young officer called Cârkes Hasan, seemingly for a personal grievance, on the night of 13-16 June 1876, at a ministerial council held in Mîhad Pasha’s house in the Başýedî quarter and was buried in the courtyard of the Suleymaniye Mosque.

An intelligent and authoritarian soldier, he favoured absolutism; his collaboration with the constitutionalist Mîhad Pasha was due to his personal hatred for ‘Abd al-Aziz fostered since his exile in 1871, probably mixed with a sincere desire to save the Empire from misgovernment.


**HUSAYN BAYKARA** [see HUSAYN].

**HUSAYN DJAHÅNŞâZ** [see HUSAYN].

**HUSAYN DJÂHÏD** (mod. Turkish Hüseyin Çarîf Vâlçeyn, 1847-1935), Turkish writer, journalist and politician. His parents were from Istanbul. He was born at Balikesir while his father ‘Ali Rıdâ was serving as government accountant in the province. He attended the primary school at Serres in Macedonia and the lycée at Istanbul. On completing his studies at the School of Political Science (Mekteb-i Mülkiye) in 1869 he became a civil servant in the Ministry of Education. In the meantime he had taught himself French. He taught Turkish and French in various schools and became the headmaster of the f'dâii school of Merdijan, one of the leading lycées of the time.

Upon the restoration of the Constitution in 1908, which put an end to ‘Abd al-Hamîd II’s despotic rule, he entered political life, joined the Committee of Union and Progress, and founded the newspaper Tanin, which he made the organ of the Committee. He was elected a member and later president of the Parliament. During the Mutiny of 31 March/13 April 1909, a counter-revolution by the reactionary elements, his printing-house was raided and destroyed by the rebels and another deputy, and the members of his family were arrested. Soon after he later served as creditors’ delegate to the Administration of Ottoman Public Debts. Soon after the armistice of 1918 he
was exiled to Malta by the British, together with a number of leading Turkish intellectuals and politicians; there he learned English and Italian, and on Gökalp's advice translated historical works (see below). On being released from Malta he resumed the publication of Tann (1922) and began to criticize violently the new Ankara régime of Mustafa Kemal.

During the first years of the Republic his unsympathetic attitude towards the authoritarian administration of the government, which was carrying out a series of radical reforms, was considered defeatist and he was twice tried by the Tribunal of Independence. His indignation as an 'advocate of freedom and democracy' protesting against the 'arbitrary rule' of the Nationalist government were found 'grotesque' as coming from a man who for years had defended and excused the many abuses and crimes of the Unionist régime of the pre-1918 period. He was first acquitted but in the second trial he was sentenced to banishment to Corum in Central Anatolia; on being set free in 1926, he retired from politics.

In 1930, during the First Turkish Language Congress which had been proposed by Mustafa Kemal himself in order to initiate the government-sponsored language reform, he was the only prominent writer publicly (and in the presence) to opt for the Persian alphabet, maintaining that it would do more harm than good and that the language should be left to its own course of natural development.

Until 1938 Husayn Djahid's publications were confined to non-political matters. After Atatürk's death he re-entered political life, was a deputy (1939-50) and resumed the publication of his newspaper Tann. Later he was made the editor of Ülas, the organ of the Republican People's Party. His violent criticisms of the Democrat Party government caused his arrest and imprisonment for a few months (1954), but he was set free because of his advanced age. He died in 1957 in Istanbul.

Husayn Djahid's career may be divided into two distinct periods, before and after 1908. Before the Second Constitution he was a prominent member of the Progressive Party [q.v.] literary movement and was known as a novelist, short-story writer and particularly as a critic. After 1908 he gave up literature and became active as an ambitious politician and a combative journalist, with more tranquil intervals as a prolific translator and author of didactic magazine articles.

As a child Husayn Djahid was particularly impressed by the novels of Ahmed Midhat [q.v.]. At the age of fourteen he wrote his first novel Nâdide, which was a successful imitation of the 'Master's' genre, with sickly sentimentalism, endless moral exhortations and philosophic remarks. By spending all his savings he was able to publish this enormous volume.

Under the influence of French authors, whom he constantly read and translated, and of his writer friends of the Therwe-i Funun, he soon got over this early enthusiasm and became a staunch defender of the modernist movement of the Edebiyyat-i Dîdide (New Literature). His other novel Khayal tâinde (In a Dream, 1901) and his novel short stories (collected in three volumes: Hâyât-i mahyâyet (A Dreamed Life, 1890), Hâyât-i habîbîyê şahenleri (Scenes of Real Life, 1910), and Nişan aldâvîlarîmîş? (Why do they Deceive?, 1924), where realism is mixed with sentimentalism and sympathy for the poor and the weak, cannot be reckoned among the best productions of the school; but they impress by their unadorned, natural language and style, as compared with the very involved, recherché language of the leading members of the movement such as Tewfîk Fikret, Djenaş Shâhâbeddin and Khâlid diyâ. But this characteristic of Husayn Djahid, shared by his novelist friend, Mehemd Ra'ûf (and later by Khâlide Edib of the following generation), was not a matter of policy but was due simply to the fact that these writers, having an insufficient background of Arabic and Persian, were incapable of handling the involved Ottoman Turkish. Husayn Djahid himself confessed that the 'naturalism' of his style, admired by later critics, was due simply to his 'ignorance' (see Edebî hâtâralar, 133).

Husayn Djahid's real contribution to the movement was his articles on criticism, which defined the aims of the Edebiyyat-i Dîdide writers, and his defence of them against the ceaseless attacks of various hostile groups which accused them of destroying the old dîdide tradition in literature, of being blind imitators of French writers, of ignoring the splendours of the old Arab-Muslim culture, or of being too exclusive, even 'decadent'. Most of Husayn Djahid's articles on literary criticism, which are of documentary importance for the literary history of the period, have not been published in book form and are scattered in many reviews and newspapers, particularly in期刊 Therwe-i Funun and Tanîm). Some of his polemics have been collected in the volume Kânhâlarım (My Polemics, 1910).

After 1908, Husayn Djahid gave up his literary interests and became an uncompromising 'Unionist', which he remained all his life, devoting most of his time and energy to defending the principles and actions of the Committee. Hence his hostile attitude towards the early Republican régime, which liquidated the last vestiges of the Union and Progess Committee.

Husayn Djahid's contribution to Turkish culture as a translator is remarkable. Apart from hundreds of articles on literary criticism and social and political problems, mostly published in reviews and newspapers, he translated from French, English and Italian a great number of important works on history, sociology, political science and literature.

Husayn Djahid is also the author of the first Turkish grammar which is not based on the method of the Arab grammarians (Türkiye zâre ve nabû, 1911), an adaptation of the French grammar to Turkish. His biography of the Unionist leader Ta'alat Pasha (Ta'alat Pasa) is not unbiased. From the 1930 onwards, apart from his valuable literary memoirs (Edebî hâtâralar, Istanbul 1935), Husayn Djahid serialized his memoirs in various papers and reviews, which have not yet been published in book form: Malta adasında: esaret hâtâraları, in Yedigün, nos. 87-122, 1934; On yihin hikâyesi: 1908-1928, in Yedigün, nos. 120-250, 1933-37; Meşruyetîl hâtâraları: 1908-1928, in Fikir hareketleri, nos. 1-224, 1935-38; Meşruyetîl devri ve sonrası, in the daily Halkû, nos. 170-375, 13 June-31 December 1954; Mercan'dan Babâtdîye, in Yedigün, nos. 267-84, 1938. These memoirs, although somewhat tendentious because of his 'Unionist' approach to most events and problems, are of great documentary value, as he had first-hand knowledge of Turkish literary and political history during the last decades of the Ottoman régime.

Bibliography: The best source for Husayn Djahid's life and works is his memoirs listed in the

HUSAYN DJAHID — YUSAYN HEZARFENN

Isma'il Habib, *Turk edebiyati tarihinde*, Istanbul 1340, 536-40; and section nine (very short) with the discovery of America. MSS are numerous: Babinger, 229-30; 1st. Kut. TCYK, i/i, 324-7.

Husayn Efendi, known as Djinji Khodja, preceptor and favourite of the Ottoman Sultan Ibrahim (q.v.), was born at Zaferanbolof (Safranbolu, now a kaza of the vilayet of Zonguldak), the son of a certain Seyyid Mjemud, son of Seyyid Ibrahim; he claimed to be descended from the Shar al-Din al-Konewi (q.v.). He was an able student, but he more than compensated for this failure by the political influence and the material wealth which his skill at sorcery gained him the nickname Djindji (“sorcerer”). He amasses wealth for himself by the selling of offices. He persuaded two dragomans of the Porte to translate his History (no. i below) he used Greek and Latin sources (as had Kātib Celbi [q.v.]; some years earlier): he had no knowledge of the languages, but persuaded two dragomans of the Porte to translate for him (see TM, x, 368, n. 14). Furthermore he was persuaded by the translator of the "Arabian Nights" (Antoine Galland, 1646-1715), who used his *Nights*, compiled the *Harîb-i mülûk*, and, about 70 years old in 1671 (Babinger, 228, n. 2), the date given by Mehemed Tahir, 1089/1679-8, is more likely.

His works are intrinsically of secondary importance, but Hezārfenn himself is of some interest in that for his History (no. 1 below) he used Greek and Latin sources (as had Kātib Celbi [q.v.] some years earlier): he had no knowledge of the languages, but persuaded two dragomans of the Porte to translate for him (see TM, x, 368, n. 14). Furthermore he was known to various European diplomatists and orientalists resident in Istanbul: the French ambassadore de Nointel and Antoine Galland (1646-1715), the Austrian envoy Niggl (1646-1715), the English ambassador de d’Antoine Galland, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1881, ii, 150-1 and (?) 58); and Count Marsigli (1658-1730), who used his *Talkhis al-bayān* (no. 2 below) when compiling the *Stato militare dell’impero ottomano* (Amsterdam 1732), spoke of him as “persona che passava per il più letterato di Costantinopoli” (Babinger, 228, n. 2, and E. Rossi, in OM, xi (1931), 416, and others).

His principal works are: (1) *Tanzih tawārīkh al-mulākā*, a fairly short universal history, composed about 1081/1670 and 1083/1673; mainly abridged from the works of Djinji (q.v. in Supp.), Mirkih*ān*, ‘All, and Kātib Celbi (qq.v.), it is in nine sections (contents listed in Hammer-Purgstall, ix, 184 f.); the part of section four dealing with the Dūälāmdīs is translated by A. D. Mordtmann in *ZDMG*, xxx (1876), 468-71; section five, on the Ottomans, reaches to 1083/1672; section six, on Ancient Rome, contains a chapter on the ‘sayings’ of the philosophers (see H. F. v. Diez, in *Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien*, i, 71 ff.) section seven deals with the history of the Byzantine Empire, section eight with China, the East Indies and Ceylon, and section nine (very short) with the discovery of America. MSS are numerous: Babinger, 229-30; Ist. Küt. TCYK, i/i,
Ijusayn Hezarfenn — Husayn Kamil

The work was used by Demetrius Cantemir (1673-1723) in his History of the Ottoman Empire (Eng. tr. from Latin, London 1734) (Karatay, no. 2773), may be identical with (3). In a collection of 38 tales (Karatay, no. 2773), composed in 1080/1669-70, on 'good government', partly based on the treatises on the subject by Lutfi Pasha (q.v.), and 'Ayn-i 'Ali and on the Dastur al-'ulamâ of Katib Celebi (ed. A. Anhegger, in StLT, iv, 243-5; Babinger, 228-31 (with further references); Bombaci, SALT, 402 f.). (V. L. Ménage, Les Histoires de l'histoire et de l'histoire politique, ii, 243-5; Babinger, 228-31 (with further references); Bombaci, SALT, 402 f.)

Bibliography: Further references to the text: Bursa Mehmed Tahir, "Ijusaynî mu'elîfleri, iii, 243-5; Babinger, 228-31 (with further references); Bombaci, SALT, 402 f.)

Husayn Hilmi Pasha (Hüseyin Hilmi Paşa), twice Grand Vizier of the Ottoman Empire, was born in Mitylene (Mîdiillî) in 1855. He came from a modest background, being the son of Kü tahyalizâde Mustafâ Efendi, an ordinary merchant. After receiving a traditional education — first in a medrese, then in a rûçîye (secondary school), and learning fiqh (Islamic jurisprudence) and French from private tutors — Hilmi entered the local bureaucracy in 1872.

He remained in Mitylene for a further nine years and then saw service in Aydîn (1883), Syria (1885) and Baghîdî (1892); he became governor (secilî) of the Yemen in 1898. In 1903 he was appointed Inspector-General of Macedonia, as one of the officials implementing the scheme to reform that province. In this post Hilmi won a reputation for honesty, efficiency, independence and liberal ideas, both among Europeans and among the Young Turks.

After the constitutional revolution of 1908 Hilmi became Minister of the Interior in Kâmil Paşa's cabinet, and kept his position even when the new regime's political aloofness lost him the support of all groups. Hilmi Pasha's detachment would have been a great asset in less turbulent times, but in the chaos which followed the re-establishment of the constitution, his many talents were destined to be wasted and go unrecognized.
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the official opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, after which he was sent on a diplomatic mission to Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, in Florence. In 1870, he returned to Egypt for good and was given a succession of posts in the administration. As Inspector of the Delta, he lived for a while in Tanta and supervised the improvement of irrigation canals in that area. He also served at various times in the ministries of Education, Waqfs, Public Works, Interior and Finance.

In 1879, upon the deposition of his father, Husayn Kamil went with him into exile to Naples, where he stayed for three years. He returned to Egypt after the revolt of Urabi Pasha [q.v.] in 1882.

During the reigns of Khedive Tawfik (1863-92) and of his nephew Khedive Abbas II (1892-1914) he devoted most of his time to his private business and agricultural interests. He served on the boards of many foreign companies such as the Delta Railways. His greatest contribution, however, was to the improvement of Egyptian agriculture. He founded the Khedivial Agricultural Society, which played an important rôle in the organisation of the Ministry of Agriculture in 1913. Earlier, he had organized agricultural exhibitions in Alexandria (1896) and Cairo (1898), as well as a joint industrial-agricultural exhibition in 1900. With the help of privately subscribed funds, he opened an industrial trade school in Damanhur. He was also active in the organization of agricultural societies such as al-Djamhurya al-Khayriyya al-Islamiyya and Djamhuriyyat al-Islamiyya.

Turkey, the suzerain power over Egypt, declared war on Great Britain in November 1914. Suspicious of the young Khedive Abbas II's sympathies with Turkey and familiar with his past activities in support of anti-British nationalists in Egypt, the British authorities proceeded on 18 December 1914 to declare a Protectorate over Egypt [see HIMAYA]. With this declaration, Turkey's sovereignty over Egypt was for all practical purposes terminated. At the same time, Britain deposed Abbas, then in Turkey, from the Kedivial throne of Egypt, and appointed Prince Husayn Kamil, the oldest male member of the family of Muhammad Ali, Sultan of Egypt.

The acceptance of the sultanate by Husayn Kamil in these conditions was, from his point of view, a dangerous political step. It met with the opposition of the nationalist elements in the country who considered Husayn's acceptance of the sultanate under the conditions of a British occupation, military government, and protectorate as constituting a national humiliation. Many among them viewed his acceptance as an act of treason against the Muslim Ottoman Empire at war with infidel Britain. However, Husayn's refusing the post could have endangered the survival of the ruling house in Egypt.

This situation, together with the difficulties of wartime conditions, led to a deterioration of public security in the country. A series of terrorist political acts aimed against members of the Egyptian government and the Sultan himself were committed in 1915. Both the Sultan and the wartime Egyptian government of Husayn Ruhud Pasha were considered by the extreme nationalists as mere tools in the hands of the British occupation authorities to be used for the prosecution of the War. They were viewed, moreover, by these nationalists as having left the pale of the Islamic community and its consensus (bimarja min al-ijma'). As greater hardships and privations caused by the necessities of war affected greater numbers of Egyptians, especially in 1916-17, so the public became increasingly alienated from this government and from the Sultan.

Soon after his assumption of the duties of Sultan, Husayn Kamil proceeded to remove the remaining vestiges and institutional manifestations of Turkish sovereignty in Egypt. Thus, when he was presiding over a meeting of the Egyptian Council of Ministers on 21 December 1914, the decision was taken to abolish the office of Kadi of Egypt (the Kadi had always been appointed by the Ottoman Sultan in Istanbul).

Yet Husayn Kamil's relations with the British authorities in Egypt were not always amicable or close. The British in Egypt looked askance at the Sultan's frequent visits to schools and institutions of higher learning, and at his tours of the provinces, suspecting that he sought to strengthen his links with a nationalist movement. The Sultan on his part felt that the material and human demands of the British military authorities and the burdens which they placed upon the country were too great and that they caused undue hardship to a poor people. Another cause of this deterioration in the relations between Husayn Kamil and the British authorities in Egypt was the frustration the Sultan experienced under the strong hand of a wartime British government, that was prompted in its policy perhaps solely by the needs of the Great War. Thus while the British disapproved of the Sultan's attempts to project the image of a popular leader, the Egyptian public disapproved of him as a tool of the British.

Husayn Kamil's health began to deteriorate in 1916; he was ill for most of 1917, and died on 9 October 1917. Earlier his son, Prince Kamal al-Din Husayn, had publicly renounced his right to succeed to the Egyptian throne. Thus Prince Ahmad Fu'ad succeeded Husayn Kamil, later to become King of Egypt (1917-1936).


[HUSAYN AL-KHALI (see (AL-)HUSAYN B. AL-DAHABIR).]

[HUSAYN NIZAM SHAH, the third ruler of the Nizam Shahi sultanate of Ahmadnagar, reg. 961-72/1554-65. He was the eldest son of Burhan I Nizam Shah, whose example he followed in adopting the Shafi'ite forms of worship (for the political implications of this in the Deccan see NIZAM SHAH); he succeeded him as al-Mu'ayyad min 'ind Allah Husayn Shah (regnal title from Burhan-i ma'dh); no coins of this reign are known) without difficulty, having been able to remove other possible claimants from Ahmadnagar city during his father's lifetime, but was soon faced with further claims on the succession from other sons of Burhan Shah, especially 'Abd al-Kadir, who had refused to accept Shi'ism and was supported by the Dakhni faction at court. Miran Shah Haydar, a younger half-brother, also made an attempt to seize the throne, supported by
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his father-in-law Khwaja Djahan of Parenda; defeated by Husayn ʿAdil Shah, who also coveted the fortresses of Kalyani and Sholapur [q.v.]. Thus began an almost constant warfare between the ʿAdil Shahi and the Niẓām Shahi sultanates; the other sultanates, Barār, Golkonda and Bīdar, were drawn into the conflicts by one side or the other—associations were formed by both. More significant was the participation of the ruler of Vidjayanagara, Rām Rāy, brought in by the Bidjiapur ruler to strengthen his hand against Aḥmadnagar. The excesses of this Hindū ruler and his troops against Islam, and his demands from his allies after each campaign, caused Muslim rivalries to be set aside, and Husayn entered into an offensive alliance with the other Muslim rulers of the Deccan whereby Rām Rāy was beaten, and the Vidjayanagara empire broken up, at the battle of Tālīkōfā [q.v.] in 972/1565; here the centre was commanded by Husayn, whose courage won the day against enormous odds. Half a year later Husayn died in his capital.

His whole reign was spent in almost continual warfare, mostly with Bidjiapur, and little could be done to stabilize the internal affairs of the kingdom; he was undoubtedly a courageous and intelligent soldier, and he left behind him a reputation also for piety and justice. There is little evidence of cultural progress in Aḥmadnagar during his reign, although it is known that after the defeat of Vidjayanagara the Aḥmadnagar court was enriched by the migration of poets and painters from Hampi, encouraged no doubt by Husayn’s brilliant daughter Când Bibī. Husayn Niẓām Shah ii, the fifth sultan of the dynasty, succeeded his insane father Murtada I in 996/1588, after having brought about his death by confining him in an overheated bathroom. He was a drunkard, debauched and bloodthirsty, and effective power was in the hands of Mīrzā Khān al-ʿawbī. The following year Husayn was deposed in favour of his cousin Ismāʾīl. Husayn Niẓām Shah iii, the last sultan, was raised to the throne by his troops against Islam, and little could be done to stabilize the internal affairs of the kingdom; he was undoubtedly a courageous and intelligent soldier, and he left behind him a reputation also for piety and justice. There is little evidence of cultural progress in Aḥmadnagar during his reign, although it is known that after the defeat of Vidjayanagara the Aḥmadnagar court was enriched by the migration of poets and painters from Hampi, encouraged no doubt by Husayn’s brilliant daughter Când Bibī. Husayn Niẓām Shah ii, the fifth sultan of the dynasty, succeeded his insane father Murtada I in 996/1588, after having brought about his death by confining him in an overheated bathroom. He was a drunkard, debauched and bloodthirsty, and effective power was in the hands of Mīrzā Khān al-ʿawbī. The following year Husayn was deposed in favour of his cousin Ismāʾīl. Husayn Niẓām Shah iii, the last sultan, was raised to the throne by his troops against Islam, and little could be done to stabilize the internal affairs of the kingdom; he was undoubtedly a courageous and intelligent soldier, and he left behind him a reputation also for piety and justice. There is little evidence of cultural progress in Aḥmadnagar during his reign, although it is known that after the defeat of Vidjayanagara the Aḥmadnagar court was enriched by the migration of poets and painters from Hampi, encouraged no doubt by Husayn’s brilliant daughter Când Bibī. Husayn Niẓām Shah ii, the fifth sultan of the dynasty, succeeded his insane father Murtada I in 996/1588, after having brought about his death by confining him in an overheated bathroom. He was a drunkard, debauched and bloodthirsty, and effective power was in the hands of Mīrzā Khān al-ʿawbī. The following year Husayn was deposed in favour of his cousin Ismāʾīl. Husayn Niẓām Shah iii, the last sultan, was raised to the throne by his troops against Islam, and little could be done to stabilize the internal affairs of the kingdom; he was undoubtedly a courageous and intelligent soldier, and he left behind him a reputation also for piety and justice. There is little evidence of cultural progress in Aḥmadnagar during his reign, although it is known that after the defeat of Vidjayanagara the Aḥmadnagar court was enriched by the migration of poets and painters from Hampi, encouraged no doubt by Husayn’s brilliant daughter Când Bibī.
Sha'bân 1100/May 1689 he was appointed muftî, with the rank of vizier, of Sedd al-Bahr at the entrance to the Dardanelles (op. cit., ii, 433). In Sha'bân 1103/May 1691 he was summoned to Istanbul to act as kâdim-i hadâ'îd. At an assembly of the Grand Vizier (op. cit., ii, 570); in Djamâdâ I 1103/January-February 1692 he was dismissed and sent back to his Dardanelles post, but was recalled to serve as kâdim-i havâmân again from Djamâdâ I-Shawwâl 1105/January-June 1694 (op. cit., ii, 738).

In Djamâdâ I 1106/December 1694 he was appointed Kapudân Paşa (Grand Admiral) and ordered to proceed immediately to the Levant (T. Sakîz [s.v.]), recently occupied by the Venetians (Şafvet, Kapudân Maşumârma Hüsyan Paşa, Istanbul 1327, 87 f., 93 f.; Sildâr Findikhü Mehem Ağâ, Nüsurnâmâ, ed. I. Parmaksızoğlu, Üz, Istanbul 1962, 10). In two engagements fought off the Köyün Adaları (Spaldamîr Islands) in the Bay of Chios in Djamâdâ II-Ra'dâb 1106/February 1695 he defeated the Venetians, who immediately abandoned the isla (M. Gallibet, Histoire de Venise, Paris 1847, 433 f.; Nüsurnâmâ, ii, 11-18). At the end of Ra'dâb 1106/May 1695, Hüsyan Paşa was appointed muftî of Chios, but a few months later (in Rabî I 1107/November 1695) was sent as governor to Adana and after one year (in Rabî I 1108/September-October 1696) he appears as muftî of Belgrade. The advice which he gave in the council of war held there in Muharram 1109/August 1697 was overridden; but after the disastrous battle of Zenta (q.v.) and the death of the Grand Vizier (Elmas) Mehem Pasha (q.v.), Mustâfa II summoned him to the Ottoman camp to succeed him.

Next year, while the peace negotiations were proceeding at Carlowicz (see Karloviç, Hüsyan Paşa remained with the army at Belgrade, prepared for action in case of a breakdown in the discussions. After the conclusion of the peace (Ra'dâb 1107/January 1699), Hüsyan Paşa remained in office for less than three years: the growing influence over the Sultan of Fâyîd Allâh Efendi (see Muştafa II) and his own poor health led him to resign office on 11 Rabî' I 1114/4 September 1702. He retired to his estate at Silivri, where he died very shortly afterwards (29 Rabî' I 1122/29 September 1702).

The sources agree that Hüsyan Paşa was an honest and efficient statesman (P. Lucas, Voyage au Levant, The Hague 1709, ii, 154; Marquis de la Gall, Histoire du Levant, Paris 1907, i, 371v., 372v., 207v. ff., 211r., 225v., 228r. ff., 261r. ff., 264v., 273r., ii, 180v.; Sâhnîzâde, Taβîhî, iv, 104; Hâmâr-Purgstall, vi and vii (passim); I. A, s.v. Hüsyein Paşa, pp. 646-50 (of which the above is an abridgement), with further references.

(Orhan F. Köprüölü)

**Hüsyan Paşa** (Küçük Hüsyein Paşa)
Husayn Pasha — Agha Husayn Pasha

Pazvandoghlu Othma'n (q.v.) (10 April 1798). Under his command on this expedition were some of the leading men of Anatolia, such as Kara Othma'noglu and Djahhab-rade, as well as the sulûls of Rumelia and Anatolia, and Tepedelenli Ali Pasha. Küçük Hüseyin Pasha first captured the places in the vicinity of Vidin which had fallen into the hands of Pazvandoghlu and finally besieged Vidin itself, both by land and, with a small fleet, from the Danube. He met with unexpected resistance, however, and through lack of men and supplies and inability to receive money in time, he failed to bring the siege to a successful end. Finally, the sultan Ilhami Hüseyin Pasha was himself wounded and no longer able to prosecute the siege of Vidin because of the French landing in Egypt, Pazvandoghlu Othma'n offered his submission to the Ottoman government. Küçük Hüseyin Pasha then returned to Istanbul. He sailed to Alexandria, with the fleet which he had prepared, in the summer of 1799. Although not showing much activity at first, he joined with the Egyptian fleet in the squadron which went to the Mediterranean, following the signing of the agreement of 20 June 1801, whereby the French were to evacuate Egypt, he entered Cairo on 10 July 1801. He caused the khâlîqa to be read in the name of Selim III and was active in the punishment of some Mamluk beys. Although this latter activity lead to coolness in his relations with some of the British admirals, the affair was closed by his return to Istanbul.

Küçük Hüseyin Pasha went out on Mediterranean campaigns in 1802 and 1803, but in November of the latter year illness forced him to return to Istanbul. He died on 7 December 1803, in the residence of Esma Sultan at Kurucesme on the Bosphorus, and was reburied in the Topkapu cemetery in Istanbul.
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Husayn Pasha noted for his leadership in the suppression of the Janissaries in 1826, was born at Edirne in 1790/1776-7. His father, Hâkümdâr Mustafa, believed to be from Rusçuk (q.v.), moved to Bender (q.v.), where Husayn enlisted in the 9th Janissary boltûk (q.v.) and reached Istanbul in 1203/1788-9. He had begun his career as a porter, then took part in the campaign against Russia in 1807-12. Husayn became an usta (serasker) and associated with (Silâhdâr) Ali Pasha, who recommended Husayn to Mahmoud II between 1811 and 1817 when Ali was the sultan's sword-bearer (Djewdet, Ta'rîh, xii, 72; Siğîlî-i 'Othmânî, ii, 562-2). Thanks to 'Ali Pasha's influence and despite the enmity of Hafiz Efendi (q.v.), Husayn became taşkıdârî başîl (q.v.) and colonel of the 64th regiment, i.e., the third most senior of the Janissaries, on 23 Safar 1238/10 November 1822, three days before Hafiz Efendi's dismissal. Benefiting from Mahmoud II's promotion of trustworthy officers, he rose to be hui kebîhîdadî on 10 Rabî'I 1238/25 December 1822 and Agha (commander) of the Janissaries on 14 December 1822. He was dismissed after his forces were defeated by Ibrahim Pasha (q.v.) at Baylan (q.v.) on 9 May 1827, but was unable to prevent the loss of the forts of the Milas Idrasî, and set out with the new army for the Russian front four days later. He defended his headquarters at Shumla, but was unable to prevent the loss of the forts of the lower Danube to Russia. Reshid Mehemet Pasha took command in the spring of 1829, when Husayn became muhâfsîz (fortress commander) of Rusçuk, and won others to his cause. Made a Vizier for these services in the autumn of 1823, he became known as Agha Pasha. To shield him from reprisals by the Janissaries, Mahmoud II replaced him as Agha on 20 Safar 1239/26 October 1823, and appointed him governor of Bursa and Kogjaeli and commander of the European Bosphorus forts, so that he was available nearly in case of need.

Husayn strongly supported reform, including Mahmoud II's abortive Efkâmîdî (q.v.) reorganization of the Janissaries in May-June 1826. He led the loyal artillerymen and infantry who quickly shattered the resistance of the Janissaries along Diwan Yolu and at their barracks in Et Meydanî, and finally put an end to their uprising on Thursday 15 June 1826.

Husayn, retaining his positions, also became serasker (q.v.) of the new army ('asâkir-i mansûrê) whose formation was decreed simultaneously with the Janissaries' abolition on 22 Dhu 'l-Qu'da 1241/27 June 1826. Replaced as serasker by Khüsrew Pasha (q.v.) on 9 May 1827, Husayn retained his governorship and on 13 Rabî'I 1241/25 February 1826, appointed him governor of Bursa and Kogjaeli and commander of the European Bosphorus forts, so that he was available nearly in case of need.

Husayn was powerfully built, fearless and intelligent, and, despite his illiteracy, favoured reform. Among the buildings he commissioned are the Serasker's fire tower (now in the grounds of
Istanbul University), military hospitals in Edirne and Vidin, a fountain in Rãskãyã, a stone clock tower at Mirgãn, the water system and a stone bridge at Şumula, and a mosque and school in Silifke.


(H. A. Reed)

**Hâgâr HÜSAYN PASHA**, known as **MEZZOMORTO**, Algerian corsair and Ottoman admiral (d. 1113/1701); he owes his Italian nickname "half-dead" (Turk: *helemed*; *helemede*; *helemeda*) to the fact that as a well-known corsair, in 1674 (Grammont, *Relations entre la France et la Régence d’Alger au XVIIIe siècle*, Algers 1955, 53), and gradually made himself one of the most prominent figures of Algiers. When the resistance against Baba Ilasan, killed him, and had Baba Hasan, but he persuaded the French admiral to send him back on shore. He led an insurrection against Baba Hasan, killed him, and had him executed. Opposing fire on the French fleet, he obliged Duquesne to raise the blockade; in 1684 he made peace with Louis XIV (Grammont, 83; E. Plantet, *Correspondance des Dey’s d’Alger with the cour de France*, 1579-1833, Paris 1889, 84; Zinkelsen, *GOR*, v, 51 f.).

In 1686 the Ottoman government summoned him, as *begierbebi* of Algiers, to send ships for the campaign in the Morea. The peace with France was soon broken, and when the French fleet bombarded Algiers again in 1688, Hüsâyn retaliated by attacking the French coasts and shipping. In 1689, the Porte had decided to appoint Hüsâyn Pasha Grand Admiral of the Ottoman fleet (*Kapudan Paşa* [q.v.]; but before the summons reached Algiers, Hüsâyn Pasha’s power there had been seriously shaken by internal dissensions; he was obliged to flee to Tunis, and thence to Istanbul (and the post of *Kapudan Paşa* was given to Mürzîzâde Ibrâhim Pasha).

In 1101/1690 Hüsâyn Pasha was appointed to command the Danube fleet, with orders to support the operations against Austria in the Danube valley. He later commanded in the Black Sea; and in 1104/1691, a time when anxiety was growing over the threat of Venetian action in the Aegean, was made *sandik-begi* of Rhodes, with command of the Imperial galleons (balâyân). When in 1106/1694 the Venetians occupied Chios (Turkish: *Sâlde* [q.v.]), Hüsâyn Pasha played a prominent part in the two engagements (*Rzâddâ* 1106/February 1693) which led to the recovery of the island (*Saîvet*, *Koyun Adalari* *Güše-i Hüseynê* ve *Saîkitê kurartilishi*, in *TOEM*, i/3 (1326), 150-77).

In Ramadan 1106/May 1695 Hüsâyn Pasha was rewarded with the post of Kapudan Paşa, in succession to (‘Abdûzâde) Hüsâyn Pasha [q.v.] (*Silahdar Fundukhî Mehmet Ağa, Nursetnâme*, ed. I. Parmakszûzhoğlu, i/1, Istanbul 1962, 28-9), and turned all his efforts to the expulsion of the Venetians from the Aegean: in Şafar 1107/September 1695 he defeated, off Lesbos (Midilli), a Venetian fleet bound for Chios and Cos; in the course of operations in the Morea in 1696 he brought the Venetian fleet to battle between Andros and Euboea; on 15 Dhu ‘l-Hijjâda 1108/July 1697 he defeated a Venetian fleet under Alessandro Molino off Tenedos and again, on 14 Şafar 1109/September 1697, off Andros. On 15 Rabî I 1110/21 September 1698 he brought the Venetian fleet under Giacomo Cornaro to battle off Lesbos: Western sources (*Zinkelsen, GOR*, v, 183) depict the engagement as a Venetian, Turkish sources (*Silahdâr*, *Râşîdî*, ii, 440) as an Ottoman victory.

Hüsâyn Paşa did not live long after the conclusion of the peace of Carlowitz: in 1113/1701 (the exact date is uncertain; his successor as Kapudan Paşa, *Abîl-Fettâh Paşa* was appointed in Rabî I 1113/August 1701) he died on the island of Paros and was buried on Chios (*İstanbul Başvâklet Arşivi, Mühimme defteri no. III, p. 644; A. de La Motraye, i, 210*).

Hüsâyn Pasha’s services to the Ottoman Empire were not confined to the winning of battles; he also played an important part in the reform and strengthening of the Ottoman fleet and in the regularizing of the naval service by a code of regulations (*hânam-nâme*) which he drew up (see I. H. Uzuncarsılı, *Osmanlı devletinin merkez ve bahriye teskilatı*, Ankara 1948, 498-9, 523, etc.).

Husayn Rahmi, in modern Turkish HÜSEYIN RAHMI GÖRPINA (1864-1944), Turkish novelist and short story writer, who although outside all the literary currents and movements of his time, remained the most popular writer from the 1900's until the late 1920's.

Husayn Rahmi was born in the Ayaspasa quarter of Istanbul on 17 August 1864, the son of Mehmed Sa'id Paşa, an aide to Sultan 'Abd al-'Aziz. The family came originally from Aydin. He lost his mother at the age of three, when his father was serving in Crete. He attended primary and secondary schools in Istanbul and later the Istanbul University, where government clerks were trained. At the same time he was taught French by a private tutor. In 1878 he entered the School for Political Science (Mülkiye), but left after two years because of ill-health. He became a government official and served in the Ministries of Justice and Public Works until 1908, when he resigned to devote all his time to literature. In 1912 he moved to Heybeliada, where he built a villa from the income of his novels. In 1919 he took a role in the Turkish parliament as deputy between 1936-43.

Husayn Rahmi began his first experiments as a writer at the age of twelve and saw his first writing in print at the age of twenty (1884). He published his first short story, Istanbulda bir Fransız in the same paper, on 29 November 1889.

He wrote his first novel Şıkik in 1886 and sent the first part to Ahmed Midhat, the leading popular novelist, publicist and journalist of the time, who immediately recognized his talent and invited him, by a flattering open letter published in his newspaper Terjemi-i Hikayet, to come and see him in his office. He urged him to complete the novel, which was serialized in the newspaper in 1887 and then published in book form in 1889. Ahmed Midhat took him onto the staff of his newspaper and the young writer began to fill the columns of the paper with a flood of articles (mainly didactic), short stories and novels, mostly translated from the French (Paul Bourget, Emile Gaboriau, Paul de Kock, etc.). In 1894 Husayn Rahmi left the Terjemi-i Hikayet and joined the staff of the İblam, where several of his novels were to be serialized.

After the publication of his novel Mürübbiye in 1897 in İblam his distinct literary personality was recognized by the critics and his popularity was secured. This occurred, strangely enough, just at the time when the exclusive and fashionable Terjemi-i Hikayet movement with its slogan 'art for art's sake' was at its zenith.

Husayn Rahmi is the author of some 40 novels, several volumes of short stories, a few minor plays and a number of translations. Most of his articles, polemics, criticisms and a few short stories and novels published in various newspapers have not yet appeared in book form. His major novels, typical of his genre are: (1) Şıkik (The Snob, 1888), his first novel, a sketch on the type of some of his later novels (nos. 4, 6, 8) where the 'Westernizing snob', the blind imitator of European manners and customs, is ridiculed; (2) Ilif (1897), the story of a well-educated young girl who, falling into poverty, struggles to save her honour in the face of most difficult circumstances; (3) Mutatâba (The Divorcee, 1898, German translation Die Geschiedene by Imhoff Pascha, 1907), describes the tragic consequences of chronic quarrels between a daughter-in-law and her mother-in-law; (4) Mürübbiye (The Governess, 1898): Dehri Efendi, a retired civil servant and a blind admirer of 'Western ways of life' hires a Frenchwoman to 'educate' his two sons and his grandson. She settles in his sea-side villa and soon dominates and disrupts the whole household by seducing all the male members of the family, ending up with Dehri Efendi himself; (5) Bir Mu'addele-i Sevda (A Love Equation, 1899) is a strong social criticism directed against the traditional custom of parents choosing their sons- and daughters-in-law without regard for their children's wishes; (6) Mufrade (The Mistreated, 1900), another satire against 'Westernizing snobs' of the turn of the century with the unusual inclusion of a woman snob; (7) Tesādūf (Chance Meeting, 1900) exposes with satirical humour all the tricks of the traditional fortune-teller who used to pester the lower and lower-middle class families of Istanbul; (8) Şikşer (Always in Love, serialised partly in İblam in 1901, suspended by the censor, published in full in Sabâh in 1908, first published in book form 1912, German translation Der Liebeskranke Bey by Mubins, 1916) usually considered his masterpiece, is a further development of the theme already treated in his earlier novels. This is a powerful character study of a snob. Meftün Bey is a flippant young man. On his father's death, his rich uncle sends him to Paris, where he learns only to live the life of Parisian idlers. When his uncle dies, he has to rush to Istanbul, to be the head of a crowded konak in the country. He immediately begins to reorganize the house alla franca ('Alaforgança') was the original title of the novel when it was first partly serialized in İblam in 1901) and to re-educate the whole household, imposing on them European dress, food, manners, etc.; (9) Güllü Yabanı (The Ogre, 1912) and (10) Deli Dehri (The Wise Witch, 1914) are satires on the superstitious beliefs and naive credulity of some people of the period; (11) Tesabsim-i Elem (A Sad Smile, serialization in İblam suspended in 1914, published in book form 1923), an interesting analysis of awkward relations between men and women of the period; (12) Son Âres (The Last Wish, 1918), the unhappy love of a young girl forced to marry a man she does not love; (13) Diktenemmi (The Damned, 1919), against the marrying of young girls to elderly men; (14) Bakka Sıkikhindik (God Preserve Us!, 1919), the sufferings of the lower and lower-middle classes during the years of the 1914-18 War in Istanbul; (15) Tutuşmâr Gençler (Hearts Aflame, 1922) and (16) Biliyor Kalb (A Heart of Crystal, 1924), both on the problem of the emancipation of women in post-war Istanbul; (17) Mezhlâmelde Hanımlar (Ladies in a Tavern, 1924), a warning against the 'excesses and misunderstanding' of the emancipation of women; (18) Ben Deli Mişim? (Am I Mad?, 1925) where most of the controversial philosophical topics of the post-war period are discussed; (19) Ummâma Adam (The Shameless Man, 1930), a social satire in the form of a character study of a man who succeeds in life by completely ignoring all rules of the moral code.
Husayn Rahmi's short stories (about 70) have been collected in eight volumes.

Husayn Rahmi occupies a unique place in the history of pre-Republican Turkish literature. Unlike most of his contemporaries he did not follow any earlier Turkish or French model; but assimilating very soon various influences he developed a powerful independent literary personality. As an admirer of the prolific popular writer Ahmed Mïdhat (1844-1912) he owes a great deal in his narrative technique, conversation, imitation of the minorities, handling of certain topics, to the traditions of the Turkish popular arts and literature (i.e. karargâh, meddâh, fulâdâ technique in ortaoylu and folk tales of various kinds). Whereas in Ahmed Mïdhat these elements are used freely and loosely with a mixture of such French influences as Alexandre Dumas père, Husayn Rahmi polishes them and assimilates them for his own purpose, blending them successfully with the technique of the French realists and naturalists, particularly Maupassant and Zola. This combination of the colourful Turkish popular tradition of story telling, the careful study of the naturalist technique, an accurate observation of the life and types of Istanbul lower and lower-middle class families, a penetrating analysis of the burning social problems of his time, an acute sense of humour and satire, made Husayn Rahmi the most original of all Turkish novelists until the 1930's.

Husayn Rahmi's novels and short stories are almost of documentary value. The everyday life of families and individuals and their development within the disintegrating Ottoman society and all the social problems arising from the impact of western ideas and customs are meticulously studied, with the addition of humorous, satirical and grotesque elements. The tendency to imitate blindly everything Western, the inferiority complex vis-à-vis Europe, the demoralizing customs are meticulously studied, with the addition of certain episodes, even for the preference of certain topics, to the traditions of the Turkish popular arts and literature (i.e. karargâh, meddâh, fulâdâ technique in ortaoylu and folk tales of various kinds). Whereas in Ahmed Mïdhat these elements are used freely and loosely with a mixture of such French influences as Alexandre Dumas père, Husayn Rahmi polishes them and assimilates them for his own purpose, blending them successfully with the technique of the French realists and naturalists, particularly Maupassant and Zola. This combination of the colourful Turkish popular tradition of story telling, the careful study of the naturalist technique, an accurate observation of the life and types of Istanbul lower and lower-middle class families, a penetrating analysis of the burning social problems of his time, an acute sense of humour and satire, made Husayn Rahmi the most original of all Turkish novelists until the 1930's.

Husayn Rahmi's technique is unequal. Most of his novels consist of a series of powerful sketches loosely connected by (mostly irrelevant) passages of philosophical or didactic remarks and observations which rather spoil the type of Western, the inferiority complex vis-à-vis Europe, the demoralizing customs are meticulously studied, with the addition of certain episodes, even for the preference of certain topics, to the traditions of the Turkish popular arts and literature (i.e. karargâh, meddâh, fulâdâ technique in ortaoylu and folk tales of various kinds). Whereas in Ahmed Mïdhat which he has not been able to cast out. His style, too, although much more polished than that of Ahmed Mïdhat, suffers from the same defect: when he reproduces direct speech he is masterly. He uses the most natural, fluent spoken Turkish, but when he begins to argue or elaborates some social or philosophical theory he falls back to the type of flowery style which he himself condemned in his various writings. However, he noticed this shortcoming in the 1920's, after the triumph of the 'New Language' movement and, like most of his contemporaries, began to simplify the style of his novels and short stories in their later editions. His complete works are being edited with some alterations in the light of recent changes, and there are signs that a revival of Husayn Rahmi's popularity is possible in spite of the radical change in theme and scope in the Turkish novel since the 1930's.

Bibliography: Refik Ahmet Sevengil, Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar, hayatî, natsralarî, eserleri, münâkâsalarî, İstanbul 1944; Niyazi Berkês, Hüseyin Rahmi'nin sosyal görüşleri, in AÜDTCDF, iii/3 (1945); Medîha Berkês, Hüseyin Rahmi'nin romanlarnda aste ve kadın, in AÜDTCDF, iii/3 (1945); eadem, Hüseyin Rahmi'nin romanlarında kadın tiplerî, in AÜDTCDF, iii/5 (1945); Pertev Nâîli Boratav, Hüseyin Rahmi'nin Romançılığı, in AÜDTCDF, ii/2 (1945); Mustafa Nîhar, Hüseyin Rahmi'den seçilmiş parçalar ve eserleri hakkında mutlaaalar, İstanbul 1946; Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, in IA, s.v.; Suat Hizârç, Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar, hayatî, san'atî, eserleri, İstanbul 1953; Hilmi Yuçebea, Bütün cepheleriyle Hüseyin Rahmi, İstanbul 1964; Ağâ Sîrî Levend, Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar, Ankara (TDK publication no. 129) 1945; Bozoklu in Phioloji ve Edebiyat, ii, Wiesbaden 1965, 556-8. The following four studies are unpublished theses in the library of the Türkiat Enstitüsü in Istanbul: Mustafa Gürnes, Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar, hayatî ve eserleri, 1939, no. 98; Südy Baybars, Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınarın yaratılığı tiplerî, 1948, no. 320; Aydın Köksal, Hüseyin Rahmi'nin II. Meşrutiyetde kadar yazmış olduğu romanların kronolojik olarak têkîbi, 1953, no. 477; Gökşin Yüzar, Hüseyin Rahmi'nin II. Meşrutiyetinde Cumhuriyet dönemi kadar yazılmış olduğu romanların kronolojik olarak têkîbi, 1954, no. 451. (FAHIH İZ)
date of its conquest is yet to be established). An enlightened and liberal ruler, he treated his Hindu subjects with generosity and appointed many of them to high offices. He built mosques, madrasas and other buildings of public utility, for whose maintenance he created endowments. He "was unquestionably the best, if not the greatest of the medieval rulers of Bengal ... and had almost become a national institution ...". He died in 926/1519 and was succeeded by his son Nūrān Shah.

**Bibliography:** Ghulām Husayn ‘Sallm’, Riyāḍ al-salām, Bīb. Ind., Calcutta 1890, 186-36; Fīrīgha, Gulshan-i Islām, Eng. trans. by J. Brigg, Calcutta 1910, iv, 349-50; *The History of Bengal*, ed. Jadūthār Sarkar, Dacca 1948, ii, 140-52; *Camb. Hist. of India*, iii, 270, 276, 607; *JASB* (1874), 244-5, 303; (1917), 143-51; (1921), 149; (1932), 155-64. (A. S. Bazmī Ansāri)

**HUṣAYN SHAḤ (2), b. Ṣaḥbārī, al-Dīn Husayn ‘Sallm’, reg. (849/1443-863/1458) was the last of the line of the Shah Sultanī of the independent kingdom of Dāvwāpur. Al-Dīn Ṣaḥbārī, who ascended the throne in 838/1434 after the death, in an armed conflict, of his elder brother Muhammad Shāḥ, at that time engaged in hostilities against Buhūlā Lōdī [q.v.], the king of Delhi. Husayn, immediately on his accession, concluded a four-year truce with Buhūlā. He utilized the respite by leading a powerful army into Tirhut and Orissa, both of which he reduced, compelling the Hindu ruler of Orissa to pay a huge ransom. In 871/1466 he laid siege to the fortress of Gwāliyār [q.v.], held by the Rājput prince Pur-bī Sūltān, al-Dīn Husayn Shāh, c. 878/1473, taking it after a bitter struggle. But while his victorious army was retreating, Buhlūl fell upon it. In 879/1474 Husayn, losing all hope of recovering his lost possessions, repaired to Kahlān and joined the service of Bahūrūn, with whom he had to flee for his life, the ladies of his harem, including the queen, falling into the hands of his conqueror. But this offer was contemptuously rejected by Husayn. Urged by his favourite queen Bibi Khānunza (not Dariālā, as given by the *Camb. Hist. of Ind.*, iii, 231, 255, which is a misreading for Ḩālīla, cf. Fīrīgha, Lucknow ed., ii, 602), entitled Malik-i Dāhshān, a daughter of the fugitive Sayyid king of Delhi, al-‘Aẓīm al-Dīn, to regain her father’s lost possessions, he marched against Delhi in 878/1473, taking advantage of Buhūlā’s absence in the Pāndjāb. Buhūlā, his army vastly outnumbered, sued for peace, and this offer was contemptuously rejected by Husayn. In the ensuing conflict the scales turned against him and he had to flee for his life, the ladies of his harim, including the queen, falling into the hands of the victor. But his army turned the Tables and defeated and killed in battle. On the death of his father al-Dīn Husayn Shāh was proclaimed the ruler of upper Sind at Nasīrpūr where he was then however, outmanoeuvred and overcame Barbak, who had been captured, and he had to flee into Bihar, closely pursued by Buhūlā, his army vastly outnumbered, sue for peace, and was taken captive, and absorbed his principality into the Lōdī kingdom of Delhi. Husayn, losing all hope of recovering his lost possessions, repaired to Kahlān and joined the service of Bahūrūn, with whom he remained for two years. The domestic quarrel having been patched up he returned to his father. In 926-27 he was deputed by Shah Bēg to help Dāwandī, the ruler of Thāffa, whose territory had been invaded by his rival Dāwandī al-Dīn, whom he defeated and killed in battle. On the death of his father in 926/1521 Husayn Shāh was proclaimed the ruler of upper Sind at Nasīrpūr where he was then


**HUṢAYN SHAḤ ARGḤŪN** (also known as Mirza Husayn Ḩasan) b. Shāh Bēg Arghūn, the founder of the Arghūn dynasty of Sind, was born in 896/1490 most probably at Kandahār which was then held by his father. On Bābur’s occupation of Kandahār in 913/1507 Shāh Bēg came to Sind and occupied the adjoining territories of Shāh and Siwī (modern Sibi). In 921/1515 Husayn Shāh fell out with his father and joined the service of Hamtār, from whom he remained for two years. The domestic quarrel having been patched up he returned to his father. In 926-27 he was deputed by Shāh Bēg to help Dāwandī Pirūz, the ruler of Thāffa, whose territory had been invaded by his rival Dāwandī al-Dīn, whom he defeated and killed in battle. On the death of his father in 926/1521 Husayn Shāh was proclaimed the ruler of upper Sind at Nasīrpūr where he was then
camping. Soon afterwards he marched against Thaffa, as Djam Furuz had refused to recognize his suzerainty, defeated him in a closely contested battle and occupied the town. The Djam fled to Godlarat [q.v.] where he died in exile.

In 931/1524 Husayn Shah marched against Multan [q.v.], capturing and destroying the forts of Siwär, Ma‘ūn and Uchq [q.v.] on the way. The latter place was given to plunder and the fortified and deserted of the fort carried to Bhakkar [q.v.]. Hearing of the invasion Mahmūd Khān Langāh, the ruler of Multan, marched out to meet the enemy with an army 80,000 strong but at the very first stage of the expedition fell ill and died. His successor Sultan Husayn Langāh II [q.v.] considered it prudent to make peace with the invader. Frustrated and baulked of his booty Husayn Shah marched against the desert fort of Derawar (in the former Bahawalpur state) which was said to contain a huge hidden treasure. After a stiff resistance the fort surrendered and the treasure was secured. Burning with ambition and anxious to extend his rule Husayn Shah again thought of conquering Multan. Towards the end of 932/1526 he set out on his campaign and laid siege to the town which dragged on for a year. Unable to stand the terrible famine during which even dogs and cats were used as human food, the garrison ultimately surrendered without a fight. All the inhabitants between the ages of seven and seventy were either made prisoners or put to the sword and a very large booty fell into the hands of the invader. According to Firūṣta (Gulshan-i Ibrāhīmi, ii, 321), Husayn Langāh was also taken prisoner and the government of Multan entrusted to Khādīja Shams al-Din Mahūnī (cf. Ta’rikh-i Ma’sūmī, 150). After his victorious return to Bhakkar, Husayn Shah learnt that Rāy Khāngār of Khuch (Kashqā) was preparing to attack Thaffa. Husayn Shah immediately left for that town, engaged the enemy in battle and completely routed him. Hamūyūn [q.v.] on his arrival in Sind in 947/1540, after his defeat at the hands of Shīr Shah Sīr [q.v.], sought the help of Husayn Shah in the hope that as a former servant of his father he would not hesitate to come to his help. Husayn Shah, however, doubted Humāyūn’s intentions and sincerity, procrastinated. Enraged at his cold behaviour Humāyūn occupied the fort of Bhakkar [q.v.] and appointed his uncle Yadgar Nasir Ma’mūr, as its commandant. On a rapprochement being effected Husayn Shah agreed to render some help. Husayn Shah, however, doubting Humayun’s intentions and sincerity, procrastinated. Enraged at his cold behaviour Humayun occupied the fort of Bhakkar [q.v.] and appointed his uncle Yadgar Nasir Mirza, as its commandant. On a rapprochement being effected Husayn Shah agreed to render some help to Humayun but as soon as the latter left Sind, he promptly drove Yadgar Nasir Mirza out of Bhakkar and reoccupied the fort.

In 962/1554 the Arghuns and Tarkhans of Thaffa conspired and rose in revolt against Husayn Shah, who had been ailing for long and was unable to discharge the functions of state. A compromise was, however, effected and the revolt consequently fizzled out. Enfeebled and paralysed Husayn Shah did not live long and died at the village of Allpōta on 12 Rabī‘ I, 974 February 1555 after a rule of 34 years, aged 66.

He was first buried under a dome in the Maklī necropolis, near Thaffa, but after a lapse of two years the coffin was transferred to Mecca where it was interred near the grave of his father. A grand building was erected over his grave which is no more in existence.

A brave and cultured ruler, Husayn Shah was well-versed in the traditional sciences and held the maghsūm, ‘ulamā‘ and scholars, on many of whom he had settled stipends, in great esteem. A poet in Persian, he used to compose verses occasionally under the name of plume of Sipāhī. He had two wives, one of whom was his cousin Māh Bēgām, a daughter of his uncle Muhammad-Maktoom. Another daughter, Cūkā Begām, was married to prince Kāmrān, who had been blinded by Humayūn, and in spite of her father’s entreaties, remained firm in her resolve to accompany her ill-starred husband to Mecca, where he had been exiled.
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(A. S. Bazmee Ansari)

**Nāṣir al-Dīn ḤUSAYN SHĀH CĀRKH** [see KASHMIR].

**HUSSAIN SHAH LANGAH I,** son of Rāy Sāhār entitled Kūt al-Dīn, the founder of the Langāh dynasty of Multān, who had usurped the throne by treacherously ousting his son-in-law, Shaykh Yūsuf Kurayyshī, succeeded to the rule on the death of his father in 874/1469. Adventurous by nature, he began his reign by launching a succession of campaigns against the neighbouring forts of Shīr (modern Shorkhā), Cuniṣh [q.v.] and Kahrī (modern Kahrī Pucca), which he easily reduced. At this time Shaykh Yūsuf Kurayyshī, who had taken refuge with Buhāl Lōdī, the king of Delhi, persuaded his protector to march against Husayn Shah in recovering his lost kingdom. Buhāl set out twice from Delhi with the intention of conquering Multān, but had to abandon the attempt owing to the threatened invasion of his capital on both the occasions by the Şāhī sultans, Maḥmūd and Husayn Shah [q.v.]. It is difficult to fix the exact dates of these two abortive attempts as the authorities widely differ. The third time, when Husayn Langāh was occupied with quelling the rebellion of his brother, who had assumed the title of Shīhāb al-Dīn and proclaimed himself king at Kahrī, which he had assigned to him, Buhāl deputed his son Bābak Shīhāb to reduce Multān. He was joined en route by the forces of Tātār Kān Lōdī, the governor of the Pandīb, Husayn Langāh, hearing of the invasion and having completely crushed the revolt of Shīhāb al-Dīn, reached Multān by forced marches and gave battle to the invaders, who suffered a crushing defeat and fled to Delhi. It was during his reign that Ismā‘īl Kānī and Fath Kān, the two Balūc brothers and founders respectively of Dīra Ismā‘īl Kānī and Dīra Fath Kān [see DERĀDĀT] came from Mukrān [q.v.] and joined his service. This event marks the settlement of the Balūcs in large numbers in the neighbourhood of Multān. In his old age Husayn Shah...
Langah abdicated in favour of his son Firuz, a dissolute and worthless youth, who was poisoned by the prime minister 'Imad al-Mulk to avenge the death of his son Buhbol Lodi. Husayn Shah Langah, a boy of only three who had been proclaimed king, was protected by the regent and patronize Shi'a and Tashkhi and Tashkhi, the second son of Bubur, the independence of Multan was lost for ever and it became, shortly afterwards, a dependency of the Mughal empire.
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HUSAYN SHAH LANGAH II, son of MAHMUD LANGAH (reg. 904/1498-9—931/1524-5), the ruler of Multan, while he was only one or two stages away from his death, was poisoned by the traitor Langaf Khan, who in his turn was replaced by Mirza Karmar, the aged father of Bubur. The independence of Multan was lost for ever and it became, shortly afterwards, a dependency of the Mughal empire.
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HUSAYN WAT'K KASHFI [see KASHIFI].

HUSAYNABAD, called Husaynabad the Great (bussurg), is to be distinguished from two other Husaynabads, one of which existed in the modern Murshidabad district and the other in the 24 Parganas. Husaynabad the Great was a town, now in the Malda district of West Bengal, which flourished during the times of the Bengal sultans Husayn Shah, Nasrat Shah, Firuz Shah and Mahmud Shah III. The name appears on the coins and inscriptions of Husayn Shah, but only on the coins of the other three sultans. It is not certain if it was identical with Gaur, in which case it was named after Husayn Shah, or it was a suburb of the city actually built by the Sultan himself. The latter opinion, however, appears to be more probable. According to Ghulam Husayn Salim, Husayn Shah transferred his seat of government to Ekdal adjoining the city of Gaur. This Ekdal was situated near the village of Ramkeli on the western outskirts of the city. It is possible that this Ekdal was later re-named by Husayn Shah as Husaynabad the Great. Besides being the metropolis during Husayn Shah's reign, Husaynabad the Great also appears to have been the capital of the western region (iklim) of the kingdom. The capital of the eastern region was probably Mumgarmanabad (near Mymensingh).


HUSAYNI DALAN, a Shii shrine in the old city of Dacca, seems to have been originally built in 1052/1642 by one Sayyid Murad during Prince Shujji's governorship of Bengal. Prince Shujji, although himself a Sunni, was eager to preserve and patronize Shii institutions. The tradition is that Sayyid Murad, having seen al-Husayn in a vision erecting a ta'ziya-khanna (house of mourning), was inspired to raise the building, which he named
Husayni Dālan—Husaynīds

Hisaynī Dālan. The original building may have been a small structure, expanded to its present form in later times. It was repaired in 1807 and in 1810 by the East India Company, and a portion of the building was reconstructed after the earthquake of 1897.

The building stands on a high platform ascended by a flight of steps on the east side, and consists of two main halls placed back to back. The shīrīnī hall, facing south, is coloured black to indicate sorrow and mourning for the death of al-Husayn, and the muḥba hall, facing north, is a minarī with seven wooden steps. In the latter hall are hung several religious symbols. To these two halls have been added subsidiary halls in two storeys on the right and left, probably meant for women. The southern façade of the building is flanked by two three-storey polygonal hollow towers, crowned by domes. The parapet of the building consists of coloured merlons, and over its four corners are four kiosks. The building, as a whole, gives a modern appearance with remnants of older architecture here and there.

From the first to the tenth day of Muharram, the Husayni Dālan becomes the chief attraction of the city. Mourners, including Sunni Muslims, assemble there, listen to sermons and join in passion plays [see ta'ziya]. On the 3rd of Ziyara [q.v.], a great procession parades through the main streets of the city to a place in the western part of the city called Karbalā.


(A. B. M. Husain)

Husaynī Śādāt Āmīr, popular name of Husayn b. 'AḤīl b. Aḥ-Sāḥān al-Husaynī, an Indian mystic poet and a distinguished disciple of Shaykh Bahā al-Dīn Zakariyyāy of Multān [q.v.] (d. 1210-35). Owing to disturbed conditions in his home-land, he seems to have spent a considerable time in Multān during the reigns of Balban (664-86/1266-87) and Dījalāl al-Dīn Firdūs Ṣāḥib Khādījī (689-95/1290-96) (some of his verses in praise of the latter are given in Rāhnumā-yé Kūtīb, see Bibl.). He died in Harāt after 729/1328 (the date given by Dījalāl, 16 Shawwāl 718/November 1318, is obviously wrong, as he completed his work Zād al-mutāṣfīrīn in 729/1328) and was buried near the tomb of 'Abd Allāh b. Di‘ā‘ar Tayyār.

Husaynī was a notable mystic thinker; he, 'Irākī and Awhadī form that famous Suhrawardi trio which played a very prominent part in popularizing mystical ideas through their works—Lāmā‘at, Tārdī‘ and Zād al-mutāṣfīrīn. Dījalāl Ṣāḥib calls him a second Ḫunayd in scholarship and eminence; a modern literary critic places him next to Sa‘dī and Rūmī in the history of Persian literature (Rāhnumā-yé Kūtīb). He possessed a unique gift of communicating mystic ideas through the medium of stories and fables. His works embody mystic reactions to the social and moral anarchy that came in the wake of the Mongol invasions. Of his works, the Nūḥat al-awrād (Mudi-tābāt Press, Delhi; commentaries by 'Abd al-Wahīd Ḥirbārī Bilğrāmī, MS Bodleian 1257; and Bahā al-Dīn Budd, MS personal collection), the Ṭabār al-muṣafārīn (MS I. O. Ethē no. 1289), the Zād al-mutāṣfīrīn (MS I. O. Ethē no. 1283), which was probably written by Qādī Yākub in 1284, whereas the name of the author is wrongly given as 'Abd Allāh Ṣāḥib Wāzīr al-Kāshīfī, and the Kāns al-rumāz (MS Brit. Museum, Rieu, CM, ii, 845 b; I.O. nos. 1830-31) are well known. A poetical collection Haft gandji has recently come to light (Rāhnumā-yé Kūtīb). Copies of other works, like the dīwān, Shirāt al-mustahkīm, Anbā‘ muğārib, Rūh al-arwād and Sīrādīma, probably perished as the result of the Mongol cataclysm. For some stray prose and versified compositions reference may be made to Aṣghar-i muṣafārīkā, MS I. O. Ethē no. 1747, fol. 68 a; Bodleian 1212, fol. 1074; Kalandar nāma, MS Brit. Museum Add. 7611, fol. 549b; Brit. Museum, Rieu, ii, 834a; Mājmū‘ al-insād, ed. Muḥ. Amīn-i Banī ‘Īsā‘ī, MS I. O. Ethē no. 2122.


(K. A. Nizami)

Husaynīds, a dynasty which reigned in Tunisia from 1705 until 25 July 1957, when the Tunisian republic was proclaimed. The founder of the dynasty was al-Husayn b. ‘Allī [q.v.] who came to power in 1705, after the defeat and capture by the Algerians of the Bey Ibrahim al-Sharif. Proclaimed Bey and later recognized as Beylet beyi (governor) of the province of Tunisia by the Ottoman Sultan Ahmad III, Husayn persuaded his Council of military leaders to adopt a system of hereditary succession within his family by primogeniture on the male side. The greater part of his reign passed with-out problems, but the end was troubled by the suc-cessful revolt of his nephew, ‘Ali, who, with the help of the Algerians, dethroned him and was created Bey in his place (1755-56).

For nearly twenty years, ‘Ali Paša ruled without incident but in 1752 he was faced with the revolt of his son Yūnus, and, more serious, in 1756 with that of his cousin Muhammad, son of Husayn, who con-quered Tunis with the help of Algerian troops. These sacked the town which was poorly defended by native soldiers whom ‘Ali Paša had recruited in the place of the Turkish Janissaries.
Muhammad (1756-9) was succeeded by his brother, Ali Bey (1759-82), who returned to the earlier policy of excluding Europeans in the Tunis. While recognized by the Ottoman Sultan only as Governor of internal affairs, at any rate until 1835, and the Bey was able himself to sign treaties with European powers. Differences of opinion between Tunisia and France first arose under Ali Pasha in 1764-1, concerning the Africa Company and, much more seriously, in 1769-70, under Ali Bey, in connexion with the annexation of Corsica by France and the monopoly of coral-fishing. Thanks to the intervention of the Bey’s son-in-law and Chief Minister, Mustafā Kaḥdīa, the dispute was settled, and from that time on a French Consul-General was established in Tunis.

The next Bey, Hamūdā Pasha (1783-1814), found himself in violent conflict with the Venetians (1784-92), who bombarded Susse and Goletta, and with the Algerians, who twice, in 1807 and 1813, invaded Tunisian territory. In Tunis itself, Hamūdā Pasha had to deal with a revolt of the Janissaries. With the help of Yūṣuf, Sāhīb al-Ṭawāf (guardian of the state seals) and in effect Chief Minister, he was able to put down the rising and finally dissolved the Corps of Janissaries (1811). Hamūdā Pasha was responsible for the construction of the Dār al-Bey near the qaṣba, as well as of the palace of Mūnūba.

After the brief reign of Uṯmān Bey (September-November 1814), his brother Māḥmūd (November 1814-March 1824) returned to the practice of recruiting Janissaries in the Orient in order to repel the Algerian attacks; finally, however, he made peace with the qaṣba of Algiers in 1821. Most important of all, he had to suppress the privateer raids upon the demands of the European powers after the Congresses of Vienna and of Aix-la-Chapelle (1819); this meant an important loss to the Tunisian economy. Husayn Bey (1824-35) supported the Ottoman Empire in the various phases of the “Eastern Question”, the result of which was the destruction of the Tunisian fleet at Navarino [q.v.]. He thought also of intervening in Tripolitania following the incidents which occurred there Company between 1819 and 1835, but when the Turkish government once again made Tripolitania a province directly administered by Ottoman officials, he gave up these pretensions. Under Muṣṭafā Bey (1835-37) and Ahmad Bey (1837-55), tension grew between Tunis and Istanbul. The Sultan, supported by Great Britain, tried to bring Tunisia back to more strict obedience, while Ahmad Bey, upheld by France, endeavoured to protect its autonomy. Finally, the Bey succeeded in his refusal to pay the tribute claimed by the Porte, received the titles of wāḥl and muṣḥūḥ, but was obliged to continue the practice of receiving firmans of appointment to office and certification in it. Furthermore, Ahmad Bey showed his allegiance to the Sultan by sending a Tunisian expeditionary force to Turkey during the Crimean War. He was also the first to introduce reforms in the Tunisian public works and to launch great public works. All this involved enormous expense, and caused the Bey to contract debts, which mainly profited European businessmen and the Minister of Finance, Muṣṭafā Khaṇznādār, and involved levying new taxes. In addition, Ahmad Bey abolished slavery and did away with the statute which had kept Tunisian Jews in an inferior position.

Muhammad Bey (1853-59) and his brother Muḥammad al-Sādīk (1859-82) were determined reformers, but often badly advised. The first instituted the ‘Uyun al-Mustafa, a model of the “Facte Fondamentale” [Fundamental Law] on 10 September 1856 on the model of the Ottoman Khattat al-umumyyān of February 1856 [see TANZIMAT]. This pact gave all Tunisians equality, liberty of conscience, and freedom in commercial matters. It also allowed foreigners to acquire property in Tunisia and to take part in every kind of economic activity. The administration was re-organized on the European model and in 1861, Muhammad al-Sādīk, who was the first to introduce the conception of state-seals (Moncef) Bey (19 June 1942-13 May 1943) retrieved some of the prestige of the Beys’ throne by putting himself at the head of the nationalist movement, at that time deprived of its other leaders. During his short reign, he showed himself an energetic sovereign, who rallied the bulk of the population around him and caused his dynasty to be regarded as a kind of guarantee and repository of national sovereignty.
Munṣīf Bey was forced to abdicate shortly after the reconquest of Tunis by the allied armies and was replaced by his cousin, al-Ambī (Lamine) Bey (13 June 1953–25 July 1957). He did not possess his cousin's strength and energy of character, and after the war political initiative returned to Ḥabīb Bourguiba and the other leaders of the Néo-Destour. From 1952 to 1954, Lamine Bey tried rather timidly to resist French demands, and his passive resistance, combined with the militant behaviour of the Néo-Destour, brought the French government to agree to his first resignation (25 June 1955) and then to full independence (20 March 1956).

A short time after this, the family of the Bays ceased to enjoy any special privileges and, by a decree of 3 August 1956, the exercise of power was taken away from the Bey and given to the First Minister. On 25 July 1957, the Constituent Assembly proclaimed the fall of the Husaynid dynasty and the establishment of a republican régime. For a short time placed under house arrest near Tunis, Lamine Bey was later given complete freedom. He died in 1964.

The Husaynid dynasty, although of foreign origin, was able at times to go—though never to a very marked degree—the impression of being the national dynasty of Tunis. Turkish in origin, it preserved the traditions of the Ḥanāfī school of law, marriage to Ottoman princesses, and recognition (until 1881) of the suzerainty of the Ottoman Sultan.

Bibliography: Works cited in the art. Al-Husayn (pp. 605-6) and those mentioned by R. Brunschvig in art. Tunisia, in ET, pt. 3, Turkish period, and pt. 4, French Protectorate (bibliography very complete up to 1931), further: Farragia di Candia, Monnotés hussemites, in RT, nos. 11-12 (1932), 379-98; nos. 13-14 (1933), 215-30; no. 17 (1934), 73-92; no. 21 (1935), 15-36; Grandchamp, Les différends de 1832-33 entre la République de Tunis et les royaumes de Sardaigne et des Deux-Siciles, in RT, N.S., no. 5 (1931), 1-91; idem, Le différend tuniso-sarde de 1843-44, in RT, nos. 13-14 (1933), 127-215; idem, Documents relatifs à la révolution de 1864 en Tunisie, 2 vols., Tunis 1935; P. Marty, Histoire de la mission militaire française en Tunisie (1837-1882), in RT, N.S., no. 22 (1935), 1, 7; no. 24 (1935), 2-15; no. 26 (1936), 11-26; no. 27 (1936), 27-33; no. 31 (1940), 1-31; no. 34 (1943), 32-40; L. Berchet, En marge du building of houses, the working of mines and the use of iron, in the foundation of Babylon, Susa and the Caspian Sea. His place in the series of the mythological kings (Pishdadiyan) is vague: sometimes he is the contemporary of Tahmūrāḥ [g.v.]; sometimes his successor; sometimes Gayūmār comes before both of them. The Pahlavi texts add little to the Avestan texts. The Arabic texts, which supply much detail, also disagree over the place of Hūshang in the series of the Pishdādiyān, but recognize him as the first civilized: al-Ṭabārī-Balā'īnī, then al-Thālibī, attribute to him the initiative in the building of houses, the working of mines and the use of iron, as re-cast by Ibn 'al-Mu‘affa, whereas Firdawsī bases himself on the early Iranian edition of this work (see Firdawsī, col. 918b). Thus the recension followed by the Arabic authors attributes to him a reign of forty years, whereas Firdawsī has only thirty. Firdawsī makes him the grandson of Gayūmār (the first man) and the avenger of his own father Sīyāmāk; to the enterprises of Hūshang mentioned above, he adds the creation of canals to water the land; he is the only one in these details and circumstances of the discovery of fire, as a result of the clash of two stones, one of which was thrown by Hūshang at a dragon “and he gave orders that prayers should be said facing a fire, saying: It is the spark given by God (Isād); worship it if you are wise”; completely contrary to this account, Abu 'l-Mā‘ālī, the author of a Bāyān al-adīsān in Persian (485/1092), declares (perhaps under the influence of Islam) that Hūshang was a promoter of idolatry, because he went into a
state of contemplation before a statue of his deceased daughter. Al-Tabari and other early writers in Arabic wished to introduce Gayumard and Hushang into the genealogy of the personages of Biblical antiquity, the former being Adam and the latter Mahalaleel (Genesis, v, 12-7) or his son, or else Heber the descendant of Noah. Some writers stressed the proofs of wisdom given by Hushang, to whom they attributed a collection of moral sayings (Diividan khvād, “The eternal wisdom”).


HUSHANG SHAH GHURI, ruler of Malwa [q.v.] from 808/1405 to 831/1432. He is first mentioned as Alp Khan, the eldest son of Dilawār Khan [q.v.], by Fīrūghta, who represents him as ambitious for Malwa’s independence from Dihlī and resentful of his father’s homage to Mahmūd Khaldji of Dihlī when the latter was a fugitive in Dhār from the Timūrid invasion in 808-9; indeed, during Mahmūd’s presence at Dhār he withdrew from the court to Māndū [q.v.] where he put in order the fortifications of the old Paramāra stronghold, and after Mahmūd’s return to Dihlī in 804/1401 he encouraged his father to assert his independence. When Dilāwār Khān died suddenly in 808/1403 Alp Khān succeeded to the throne as (al-sultan al-aḍādi) Husmān al-Dunya wa-l-Din Abu l-Mudhjīd Hushang Shāh (cf. H. N. Wright, Catalogue of the coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, Oxford 1907, ii, 246-7); suspecting that Dilāwār Khān’s sudden death was the result of poison administered by orders of his son, Muzaffar I of Gudjārāt marched on Malwā the following year to avenge his death, captured Hushang, and took him off prisoner to Gudjārāt. Hushang was later restored to his kingdom, but finding a cousin, Mūsā Khān, had usurped his power in Māndū; but he regained that stronghold by collecting the revenues of the kingdom before Mūsā had the chance to do so, and thus deprived Mūsā of the means of paying an army.

After his restoration (at the hands of Ahmad Khān, the grandson of Muzaffar I of Gudjārāt; later Ahmad Shāh I) he was soon engaged in repeated hostilities with Gudjārāt from 812/1410 to 816/1415. In 820/1417 Hushang supported Nasr Khān of Khāndēsh [q.v.] against his younger brother Hasan in that divided kingdom (he had previously married their sister); Hasan was championed by Ahmad I of Gudjārāt, whose dominions were invaded by Nasir at Hushang’s instigation. Hushang gave Nasir only lukewarm support, and the latter was obliged to swear loyalty to Ahmad I. The discovery of Hushang’s complicity Ahmad retaliated by invading Malwā in 822/1420 and 823/1420, effecting little but the plunder of some outlying districts, but at the same time convincing Hushang of Gudjārāt’s superiority in arms.

It was thus most probably to reinforce the strength of the army that Hushang set out on his most adventurous expedition, in 824/1421, against the rādīa of Djamnagar in Uṣīrā [q.v.] in order to obtain elephants. The story of Hushang’s strategy, in the disguise of a horse-coper, is told in full by Fīrūghta (Eng. tr. Briggs, i, 178-9). During Hushang’s absence Ahmad Shāh again invaded Malwā, but on this occasion the superiority was with the Malwā army, and Malwā thereafter experienced no trouble from Gudjārāt. (A Hindū source, the Siwandān of Kommana, claims a victory ‘of the sultan of Dhār’ by the Reddi general Allāda, an ally of the rādīa of Uṣīrā; this probably refers to the skirmish in which Hushang relieved the rādīa of his elephants. See N. Venkataramanyya, The Gajapati Prakhadeva, i, in Prakriti, 1928.)

It seems to have been on his return from Uṣīrā that Hushang overcame the Gond rādīa of Khershī [q.v.], a small principality to the north of Barār, and exacted tribute; this seems to have been Hushang’s first serious attempt to extend his possessions. In 825/1422 he turned his attention to the north, capturing first Gagrawn (24° 38’ N., 76° 12’ E., in south-east Rajālisān) and then besieging Gwālīr [q.v.] until it was relieved by Mubārk Shāh the Sayyid king of Dihlī. In 831/1428 Hushang’s new tributary the rādīa of Khershī was attacked by Ahmad Shāh Bahmani; Hushang marched to his relief, and pursued the retreating Bahmani army for three days until the latter turned to give battle. Hushang at first succeeded, but an ambush put the Malwā army to flight.

In 834/1431 Hushang attacked the town of Kalpi [q.v.] on the river Djamnā, a nominal possession of the Sayyid kings of Dihlī, simultaneously with Ibrahim Shārkgī of Dānwvpur who later withdrew. Hushang accepted the surrender of Kalpi from Kādir Khān, the governor, whom he appointed as his own governor. The details of his career after this are not clear, but it is known that he spent some time superintending the destruction of the Bhōjīśāgara dam at Bhōpāl, and Malwā thereafter experienced no trouble.

Hushang’s reputation rests on his military achievements of his twenty-seven years’ reign, which saw the Malwā territories extended northwards to Kalpi and southwards to Kershī, involving conflict with Dihlī, Dānwvpur and the Bahmani kingdom as well as the old rival Gudjārāt. He had a fine taste for architecture, which made Māndū a magnificent city (for his works there, especially the Djamnā masjīd, the Dihlī darwāza, and his own tomb, see MĀNDŪ) as well as an impregnable stronghold. He was well served by his ministers (especially his cousin Malik Muqīth and Muqīth’s son Maḥmūd Khān, the later Maḥmūd I Khaldji [q.v.], seems to have been an impartial ruler (for the dedication of Djamnā images in his reign see Campbell, op. cit. below, 161), and was popular with his subjects, his tomb acquiring sanctity and receiving a yearly ‘urs in his honour, still held in 1844 when the ‘Bombay subaltern’ was writing.

He was succeeded by his eldest son Ghazni Khān as Muhammad Shāh, who exterminated his collaterals and alienated his nobles and was promptly poisoned; for a few days his son Maḥmūd Khān was raised to the throne, but Maḥmūd Khān, having first offered the crown to his father Malik Muqīth, ascended the throne himself, and the Ghōrī line came to an end.
HÜSHANG SHAH GHURİ — AL-HUSRİ

(For the *nisba* Ghuri, see under DILAWAR KHAN.)


(H. Burton-Page)

HUSN AL-KHÂTIMA [see INTHÂ].

HUSN AL-MÂKTA* [see INTHÂ].

HUSN AL-MÂTLA* [see IBTÎDA*].

HÜSNÜMANSUR [see ADIYÂMAN].

HUSREV [see HUSSEY].

Al-Hûşri, the name of two men of letters of the same family, who take their *nisba* from al-Hûş, a village near Kayrawân: 1—Aâb Ishâq Ibrâhîm b. ‘Ali b. Tamîm al-Kayrawânî, died near Kayrawân at al-Mansûriyya in 413/1022. Little is known of his life, which appears to have been passed peacefully at Kayrawân, then a flourishing centre of Arabic culture. A famous poet and man of letters, he became a central figure for the young people of Kayrawân—especially Ibn Rashîk and Ibn Sharâf (qq.v.)—who profited from his vast erudition in matters of literary tradition and from his ideas concerning the concept of adâb. Although we possess a number of his verses which, incidentally, mainly reveal his technique but which are without a fine sensibility, his fame rests chiefly on his prose works, entitled *Zahr al-îdâb, Djâmî al-îdahshîr, Nûr al-îrât wa-naur al-îrâf*, and *Kitâb al-Maşrûn fî sîr al-âlâî al-mâkânîn*. The author recognized that his function was limited to making a choice from this, but this nonetheless indicates the quality of the monk who named it and reveals a â-Hûşri's individual conception of the literary form, adâb, and his own didactic methods. He ignores everything that is too well-known and, indeed sometimes licentious side of this literary form was thought to be incompatible with the seriousness of the "great" work (al-kišib al-kabîr). Furthermore, the student, the apprentice âdab, the future writer, needs to be prepared gradually for a fruitful use of this perfect work; *Nûr al-îrât*, written like *Djamî al-iđâshîr* after *Zahr al-îdâb*, answers mainly practical and didactic needs.

1. *Zahr al-îdâb wa-thamâr al-âlîb* was printed first on the margin of the 'Idh and then edited by Zakî Mubârâk; ‘Ali Muḥ. al-Bâdâjwî finally published a more complete and reliable edition in Cairo in 1372/1953. This work is an anthology, in which al-Hûşri, faithful to the fundamental principle of adâb, which involves instructing but never boring the reader, used only varied and relatively short texts, so that they could be learned by heart and used as models. The book passes from serious to pleasant matters, and from poetry to prose, although prose forms the main subject-matter.

The author strives, however, to achieve a certain homogeneity, especially in his constant endeavour to draw almost exclusively on representative extracts of the rich and "flowery" style in the works of the "moderns". The book was printed together in 405/1014-5 at the request of a secretary to the Chancellery, Abu 'l-Fadl al-Abbâs b. Sulaymân, to whom also the two following works seem to have been dedicated, and who had brought back from the East a vast collection of contemporary literary data. The author recognized that his function was limited to making a choice from this, but this nevertheless indicates the quality of the monk who named it and reveals a â-Hûşri's individual conception of the literary form, adâb, and his own didactic methods. He ignores everything that is too well-known and, like Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, confines himself to eastern material, which he wanted first to reveal and then to make familiar to his young disciples. This too-much neglected work was known in Spain and formed part of the curriculum of literary studies (see Ibn Khayyâr, *Fihrist*, i, 380; H. Pürse, *Poezie andalouse*, 28 and index; Ibn Barri, among others, made an abridged version of it).

2. *Djamî al-iđâshîr fî l-îlâlîk wa-l-nâsîrâr* first published in Cairo under the title *Dhayl Zahr al-îdâb*, then in 1372/1953 by ‘Ali Muḥ. al-Bâdâjwî under its real name, is comparable to the *Zahr al-îdâb* in the method followed, but differs from it by the choice of material, which is more limited and homogeneous, although it comes from the same collection brought from the east by al-Hûşri’s patron. It is, in fact, essentially a collection of anecdotes, of "modern" jokes and tales about love from which, however, anything indecent is omitted, the author’s aim being to teach the art of conversation which is amusing and refreshing, without ever causing offence or becoming boring.

3. *Nûr al-îrât wa-naur al-îrâf* (Escurial*, 392, Gotha 2129; *Kišib al-Naurây* according to Yâkût), is conceived in the same spirit and drawn from the same sources as *Zahr al-îdâb*, which it could replace for a reader with too little time or knowledge to use it. Far from merely repeating themselves, these works form a real trilogy which shows admirably al-Hûşri’s conception of the literary form adâb. Although this is on the whole identical with that of traditional adâb, for him it is more strictly defined in its characteristics, and above all in its practical and didactic aim. *Djamî al-iđâshîr*, in fact, fills a lacuna in *Zahr al-îdâb*, in which the pleasant, light, indeed sometimes licentious side of this literary form was thought to be incompatible with the seriousness of the "great" work (al-kišib al-kabîr). Furthermore, the student, the apprentice âdab, the future writer, needs to be prepared gradually for a fruitful use of this perfect work; *Nûr al-îrât*, written like *Djamî al-iđâshîr* after *Zahr al-îdâb*, answers mainly practical and didactic needs.

4. *Kitâb al-Maşrûn fî sîr al-âlâî al-mâkânîn* (Leiden Or. 2593/463), which might, to a certain extent, be linked with adâb because of the literary detail in which it abounds, reveals an aspect of İbrâhîm al-Hûşri’s literary activities hitherto unknown. The work deals with the sentiment of love in general and principally with its manifestations in a thousand different aspects in spite of a desire, conscious or not, to conceal it. It is a monograph of encyclopaedic character, which endeavours to be "technical" or even scientific on matters concerning love. In contrast to al-Hûşri’s other works, where information and subject-matter are for the greater part second-hand, the development of the theme here, apart from quotations in prose and verse, is the author’s own work. The authorities cited are not all Arabs—names of Greek thinkers, scholars and philosophers recur frequently—and the whole conception of the work in dialogue form suggests Hellenistic inspiration. Al-Hûşri also contemplated a work on the "classes" of poets, probably of Kayrawân, but he seems to have abandoned the project after the virulent protest of Ibn Rashîk, who, as the youngest, did not want to be "classified" last.

By his direct teaching, by the didactic aspects of his work, al-Hûşri enriched his own concept and his method in dealing with adâb, above all by his vast knowledge, İbrâhîm al-Hûşri while still young—he was to die in the prime of life—asserted himself as a master whose influence transcended the limits of Ifrikiya and, in a short time, had a profound effect on the astonishing progress in the art of letters in the Muslim West in the 5th/11th century. His example as a writer and his anthologies, which are not unlike those of al-Taḥṣîlî (qq.v.), contributed to the
spare of a taste for a compressed and artistic prose style. He introduced into Ifrījīya the literary form of the makāma, which was soon to be developed so successfully by at least one of his pupils, Ibn Sharaf. His project, too quickly abandoned through a weakness of character manifested in other ways, of a work on the "classes" of poets, probably inspired the Unmudhādī of another of his pupils, Ibn Raḥīl. Finally, it seems very likely that the Kitāb al-Maṣṣān had a direct influence, whether profound or not, on the Taqwā al-Ḥamīma of Ibn Ḥażzm of Cordova. But traditional adab, being at its apex under the influence of the Arabian core, was to triumph in that same 5th/11th century and the ʿAlīūr little by little fell into obscurity, the victim of his own revolutionary impulsiveness (cf. al-ʿUmarī who quotes Ibn Bassām. See Bibli.).
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II.—Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Ṣanḥ Āl-Ḥusrī, celebrated blind "reader" and poet, born at Karwānīn about 400/1010. Probably the nephew, rather than the cousin of al-Ḥusrī, he left his native city in 418/1028-9 to conform with the death of his father, Bānū Hilāl and, after a stay in Ceuta, went to Spain about 462/1069-70 in response to a long-standing invitation from al-ʿAlīūr maddī ʿAbd, ruler of Seville, and lived there until approximately 468/1075-6. Courted by the mulāḥ al-faṣāṣīfī, who outbid one another in generosity towards him, and feeling the envy and numerous enemies aroused by the favour of princes towards him, his poetic talent, the extent of his knowledge, his arrogance, his little-disguised contempt for Spain and some of its petty kings, its people and its scholars, not to mention aggressive and bitter satires, he moved from one place to another in the peninsula. He stayed mainly in Malaga, Dénia, Valencia, Almèira and Murcia, before finally settling in 483/1090 in Tangiers, where he died in 488/1093.

He was well-versed in the ʿUrfānic sciences, which he taught all his life and in which he acquired the reputation of a great master (al-ustadī al-āṣāṣr according to Ibn Ḥūyā in particular). He was a letter-writer, a talented poet of astonishing virtuosity, combining all this with a vast knowledge of Arabic and complete mastery of versification. ʿAll al-Ḥusrī is thus considered one of the greatest representatives of the startling literary progress which took place under the Zāirīds, whose brilliance he, along with other İfrīkiyan exiles, helped to spread into Spain, where he was regarded as a literary leader (raʾīṣ adāʾiṣ), according to Ibn Bassām.

His works, apart from his epistles (most of which have been lost), are the following:

1. A didactic poem of more than 200 lines on the Qurʾān "readings" of ʿNāṣīf (in ms. at Tunis, according to Abu l-Ḥasan al-Ḥusrī, 67, n. 4. See Bibli.).

2. al-Mustakṣans min al-āṣāṣr, a collection of his panegyrics of al-Muʿtamid, which he offered in a supreme and touching homage to his former patron when this deposed king passed through Tangiers in 840/1051-2, his way to exile. (This might perhaps be the Kitāb al-ʿAṣāṣrī which Ibn Kunfudh attributes to him).

3. al-Muʿaṣṣākardī (this is No. 5 in Brockelmann attributed wrongly, as is also No. 4, to Ibn Rāhīm; published in Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Ḥusrī, 212-40); it consists of "ten line stanzas" in which each letter of the alphabet is used for the rhyme and for the beginning of the ten lines which make up each of these 29 short poems, lām-ḥayf counting as one of the letters. ʿAll al-Ḥusrī is said to have invented this form. The poet here laments an unhappy love in the pure tradition of the perfect ḡawrī lover; a great sense of desolation emanates from these poems, caused by the infidelity of a beautiful woman. The unity of tone and subject-matter and the evident sincerity of the sentiments, seem to point to the abandonment of the ageing poet by his young and beautiful wife, whom he loved passionately. If this is so, because of their personal lyricism and despite the dazzling technical virtuosity of their art, these "ten-line stanzas" form one of the most beautiful love-poems in all Arab poetry.

4. ʿIrshād al-ḥarīr wa-ʿṣīrāt al-ḥarīr (published in Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Ḥusrī, 256-490) was written upon the death of his favourite son, which probably occurred in 475/1082-3 after a grave illness, and the flight of his mother, the unfortunate wife. It was put together five years later. This work includes, apart from three introductions: (a) one part in ornate prose (confused by the authors of Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Ḥusrī with the third introduction): there is a homely, serm and expression of hope in God after his heavy trials; (b) another part in verse comprising poems ingeniously arranged by the rhyme according to the letters of the alphabet; these, arranged about 2,600 lines and they are the only ones of his enormous production which al-Ḥusrī decided to collect for preservation. These poems are a most valuable documentary source for the biography of the author. By their extent, their moving expression of the father's profound sorrow, these poems, where the poetical skill of al-Ḥusrī, without stifling his sensibility, reaches its highest point, are likewise the most successful examples of the poetic form of threnody and, together with the Muʿaṣṣākardī, assure ʿAll al-Ḥusrī's place as one of the greatest of Arabic elegiac poets.

5. Among the fragments and poems preserved in books of adāb (collected partly in Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Ḥusrī) appears the most famous of all, Yā layl al-ṣābāb, which has continued to inspire imitators up to the present day. Finally, Ibn Saḥīr al-Mukhī (Dar al-ṣāḥīf, 39) includes the following about 2,600 lines and the writers of muwāṣṣakāhūt; but these, like the greater part of his satires and panegyrics, have not come down to us. The extraordinary virtuosity ʿAll al-Ḥusrī showed in the construction of his poems, the structure of his lines, his use of the inexhaustible resources of the Arabic language in ornate style and complicated rhymes, have caused him to be compared with al-Maʿarrī. Like him, al-Maʿarrī was a blind poet.

**AL-ḪUTAYM** [see *Muğdâb*; *Yâkût*; *Zûj*].

**AL-ḪUTÂY’A,** nickname of the Arab poet Dârwâl b. Aqîs, who traced back his genealogy sometimes to the *'Abîs*, sometimes to the Dhîhîl, but who, in reality, was probably the natural son of a woman named al-Dârâh; his nickname probably derives from his ugliness and appears to signify "deformed". He belonged to the *mukhadramûn* [*q.v.*], and Ibn Sallâm places him in the second class of the poets of the *gâhiliyya*; since he is regarded as the *ra'isi* of Zhâbîr b. Aqîs [see *Zûj*], he must have been born about forty years before the *ḫidrâ* and his earliest poetic activities probably took place about a time well before Islam, but the major part of his surviving work belongs to the Islamic period. His conversion to Islam appears to have been merely superficial, since he apostatized at the time of the *riddâ* [*q.v.*] which took place during Abu Bakr's caliphate; his reversion scarcely seems to have been sincere, if we are to place any credence in traditions regarding his "testament," which depict him as confessing to follow the Islamic rules in respect of the apportionment of inheritance between boys and girls.

The character of al-Ḫutayṭ’â is presented in a very unfavourable light; his avidity (see Ibn Raṣîhî, *'Umda*, i, 50), avarice (he ranks as one of the four Arab misers [see *Bukhârî*]) and venality constitute the principal elements motivating his literary career; his malice was so dreaded that men gave him gifts to safeguard themselves from it. Passing from tribe to tribe, and changing his genealogy according to whether he was satisfied or displeased with the treatment accorded him, he appears as an itinerant mendicant poet, lavishing dithyrambic poems on any liberal patron but threatening the less generous with his vituperation. Passing from tribe to tribe, and changing his genealogy according to whether he was satisfied or displeased with the treatment accorded him, he appears as an itinerant mendicant poet, lavishing dithyrambic poems on any liberal patron but threatening the less generous with his vituperation.

During the *riddâ* he violently attacked Abu Bakr, and later, under the caliphate of *'Umar b. al-Khaṭîb*, he poured invective upon the governor of Medina, al-Zâribkân b. Badr, though not without also attacking the caliph, who threw him into prison and released him only on the intervention of Kurayyî notables; at the same time he heaped panegyrics upon an eminent member of the Banû Anf al-Nâkî, Baghdî b. 'Āmir. It is not known with certainty in what year he died, but his connexion with Sa'dî b. al-Šârâf, governor of Medina after 41/661, confirms the tradition that he survived into the reign of Mu'âwya. Arabic critics place great emphasis upon the talent of al-Ḫutayṭ’â and his skill in the successful handling of inventive, panegyric, personal glorification and *nasib*; the author of the *Aghâni* held him in high esteem, Ibn Shârâf regarded him as an immortal poet, and later poets looked on him as a distinguished precursor (see *ZDMG*, xvi, 41; al-Kumayt, ed. and trans. Makkarî, *Nakt*, no. 4, v. 11; Bahâ‘î al-Din Zuhayr, ed. Palmer, 217) and he has been held up as a model for imitation in modern times, since critics recognize that his poetry, which he wrote with great ease, is flawless.

Hammâd, the grandson of Ibrâhîm al-Mawṣûlî, wrote his biography under the title *Akkâh bâl-Ḫutaym* [*q.v.*], but this work is lost, while the works of philologists of the 2nd and 3rd/8th-9th centuries who set out to collect his *Diwân* have survived in part. The recension of Abu 'Amr al-Shâybânî and Ibn al-Aqsâ'î, which dealt very leniently with the apocryphal parts of the *Diwân* which had suffered from interpolations at an early date, notably by Hammâd al-Râwîyâ, has survived in its entirety, while the recension of Abû Ḥâtim al-Sidjastânî, who took a stricter attitude towards suspect passages, has survived only in fragments.

The *Diwân* of al-Ḫutayṭ’â was published in Istanbul in 1890, and subsequently by I. Goldziher (in *ZDMG*, xvi-xvii and reprint, Leipzig 1893) with an introduction and explanatory notes; Ahmâd al-Shânikî produced a new edition in Cairo in 1905 with al-Sukkârî’s commentary and glosses; the edition of 'Isâ Sâbî, Beirut 1951, although providing notes, is rather more commercial, while that of N. A. Tâhâ, published in Cairo in 1958, with the commentaries of Ibn al-Sikhtâr, al-Sukkârî and al-Sidjastânî and notes partly based on the apparatus criticus of Goldziher, is of an informed scientific character.

There were at least two prominent works in the 6th/12th century who bore the name al-Ḫutayṭ’â (see al-Subkî, *Tabâkât al-Ḫâfîfiyya*, iv, 234, 279).
certainly is that the noble Arab tribes unanimously hold that members of Hutaym are not asil, i.e., hold that members of Hutaym are not asil, i.e., Arabs of noble race, such as the neighbouring folk of 'Anza, Harb, and Shammar, do not intermarry with Hutaym. Although Hutaym in turn are not supposed to intermarry with negroes, Doughty found violations of this rule in certain villages of Najd.

The head of the section of Āl Barrāk, who in 1963 was Nāḥīl Ibn Barrāk, is the paramount chief of the tribe. Among the other sections are Āl Kālādān, Āl Ṣumayyān, the Ṣaqqāra, the Nawāmsa, and the Fuhayghtāt.


**HUWA HUWA,** literally "he is he", or "it is it", means:

*A in logic:* what is represented as entirely identical, e.g., "Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh" and "the Prophet". (Peano and the modern logicians express this equation by the sign $\equiv$;)

*B in mysticism:* the state of the saint whose perfect personal unity testifies to divine unity in the world.


**AL-HUWAYDIRA** [see AL-HADIRA].

**AL-HUWAYṬAT,** tribe with its main centre in northwestern Saudi Arabia and southern Jordan. The tribal range extends from the vicinity of al-Karak in the north to the vicinity of Taymā' [qv.] in the south, and from the Red Sea in the west to Wādī al-Sirḥān and al-Djawf [qv.] in the east. The eastern part of this range is properly the homeland of Banū 'Atiyya, with whom the Huwayṭāt as good allies share watering and grazing rights. This whole area corresponds in a general way to that occupied by the tribes of 'Udhra and Ḫuwaḥam [qv.] in the late Ḫubāliyya and the early days of Islam [see the map in EI, i, 981].

According to a story current in the tribe, mankind originally consisted of three professions: tentmakers, farmers, and raiders, with the raiders being the Huwayṭāt. The suggestion that the Huwayṭāt are descendants of the Nabataeans [qv.] seems to stem largely from the fact that the tribal range is roughly identical with ancient Nabataea. Equally improbable is the suggestion that the Huwayṭāt are sharifs of the lineage of the Prophet. The genealogical table given by Oppenheim for the tribe shows the eponymous ancestor as Huwaṭ b. Barakāt, Barakāt [qv.] being a name common among the sharifs of al-Hidjab. More weight may be given to the tradition that Huwaṭ was an Egyptian who came to al-'Arab as a pilgrim and became associated with Banū 'Atiyya. Some members of the Huwayṭāt name Hām rather than Barakāt as the father of their ancestor. It is not, however, likely that an Egyptian strain is dominant in the Huwayṭāt of Arabia and Jordan. Despite the various suggestions of a non-Arab origin, the Huwayṭāt are not classified as pariahs.
like the Şhârdât [q.v.], some of whom roam in their range, or Hutaym [q.v.], in the area southeast of Banû 'Aţâyj, which they are called the Huwaytât. Since the 12th/18th century the Huwaytât have been split up into several branches, which at times have come into conflict with each other. In the late Ottoman period the branch known as Huwaytât Ibn Dîjât cupped along the Syrian pilgrim route in the region of Ma‘ân in summer and farther east, in the region of the 'Awdas, Tukayjk, and Wâdî al-Sîrân in winter. The Ottoman authorities paid these Bedouins to maintain security along their stretch of the pilgrim route, and the inhabitants of Kāf in Wâdî al-Sîrân, of Dîjât, and of Taymâ paid them ḥâkay (q.v.) to refrain from raiding their oases.

The Alâlîwîn, semi-nomads north and east of al-‘Akkâba, used to protect Egyptian pilgrim caravans part of the way when they came overland. This branch of the tribe is also known as Huwaytât Ibn Nîjîd (wrongly given by Shukâyj, Jaussen, Mûsil, etc. as Ibn Dîjât) after the name of its paramount chief. South and east of al-‘Akkâba is the branch of Alî 'Îmrân, along the coast where the port of Hâkî lies. Its chief, Ibn Mâbkûû, owns palms in al-‘Akkâba, as does Ibn Nîjîd.

The southernmost branch is Huwaytât al-Tahama (see Oppenheim, i, 157). Its members hold the coast of northern Madyan and the highlands of Hîmâş facing the sea; its shukâyj, Abu Tukayjka, has his headquarters in the Red Sea port of Dâbâ. In this area the Huwaytât have almost entirely supplanted Banû 'Ukbâ, descendants of Dîjûtâd. Bordering the area to the south is the range of the tribe of Balî, traditional enemies of the Huwaytât, but even here the aggressive Huwaytât are sending immigrants in. Other old foes are Shamar in the east and Banû Şâhîr to the north (q.v.).

The Sa‘dîyûn of the depression of al-‘Arâb south of the Dead Sea, now a virtually independent tribe, reveal their origin in their war-cry: Ŝubâyj al-Huwaytât (see Oppenheim, ii, 299 for the connection with the line of Huwaytât).

Even though the Huwaytât may think of themselves as the world's first raiders, the shirâmât indications that the core of the bulk of the tribe to nomadism took place fairly recently. Doughty found some of the tribesmen subsisting as nomad herdsmen, but others as "husbandmen of palms and savers of grain". In his eyes the Huwaytât resembled Syrian villagers much more than "the lithe-limbed and subtle-brained and supple-tongued Arabians of landward Najd". After feasting with Ibn Nîjîd and his men, Doughty thought that "he had not ever seen such a strange thick-faced cob-nosed cobblers' brotherhood" (Ar. Des., i, 275, 276, 85).

When the Huwaytât adopted nomadic ways, they did so with a vengeance. Two decades before the outbreak of the First World War, the chieftainship of Ibn Dîjât was challenged by the clan of the Tawâyjja. ‘Awda b. Ḥarb Abû Tâyj, who became head of the clan in 1325/1907, won fame as the most formidable Bedouin raider of modern times. T. E. Lawrence described him in 1917 as "tall and straight, usually built, spare and powerful . . . His lined and haggard face is pure Bedouin: broad low forehead, high sharp hooked nose . . . The Howeïtât pride themselves on being altogether Bedu, and Auda is the essence of the Abu Tayj. His hospitality is sweeping . . ., his generosity has reduced him to poverty, and devoured the profits of a hundred successful raids. He has married twenty-eight times, has been wounded thirteen times, and in his battles has seen all his tribesmen hurt, and most of his relations killed. He has only reported his ‘kill’ since 1900, and then they now stand at seventy-five Arabs; Turks are not counted by Auda when they are dead. Under his handling the Towihaḥ have become the finest fighting force in Western Arabia. He raids as often as he can each year . . . and has seen Aleppo, Basra, Tail, Wejh, and Wâdi Dawasir in his armed expeditions" (Secret dispatches, 113-32; cf. Seven pillars, 228).

Among the Huwaytât, all the sections siding with one another in battle form an 'ilâm, at the head of which is an 'âlam. ‘Awda was the 'âlam of one 'îlam, and Ibn Dîjât the 'âlam of another.

In 1335/1917, before the capture of al-‘Akkâba, ‘Awda joined the šurif Faysal of Mecca in the Arab Revolt against the Turks and distinguished himself as a dashing commander in the field from then until the fall of Damascus in 1337/1918. ‘Awda died in 1342/1924, not long after he had shown a leaning towards the cause of ‘Abd al-‘Azîz Al Su‘ûd of Nađjd. When the Iḫwân of Nađjd thrust close to Ammân less than a month after ‘Awda’s death, Huwaytât of Jordan joined in opposing them, and a nephew of ‘Awda’s fell in the fight. The Jordanian Huwaytât continued to be embroiled with forces of Ammân for some years thereafter. In 1351/1932 Abû Tukayjkâ of the southern Huwaytât joined Ibn Rîfâdâ of Bâlî in an unsuccessful rebellion against King ‘Abd al-‘Azîz.

In Sinai the range of the Huwaytât is a wedge of island territory southeast of Suez in the vicinity of Djabal al-Râbâ. Of all the Arabs in these parts, the Huwaytât are regarded as the most recent immigrants and they are said to be swarthier than the rest, perhaps because of a negro admixture (Murray, 243). The Huwaytât of Sinai have especially close ties with the Tukayjkât of Huwaytât al-Tahama. In the dichotomy of Sinai tribes (Sa‘d and Harâm) the Huwaytât belong to the faction of Harâm, in which they are allies of the Tûwara, the Ûhaywât, and the Tarîbân. The Tayjâh and others belong to the faction of Sa‘d.

Elements of the Huwaytât are scattered about in different places in Egypt. Some are nomads in the rugged country south of the road from Cairo to al-Îsmâ‘îliyya, while others have becomefellahs near Tantâ. The Huwaytât of al-Kalûbîyya were formerly suppliers of camels to the Egyptian pilgrim caravans, and the guides for these caravans hailed from this group. In Upper Egypt there are Huwaytât in al-Fayûm. If members of the tribe have penetrated into the Sudan, they would appear to have lost their identity there.

The Huwaytât are not among the great camel-raising tribes, but in the past they have been active as camel merchants. One of their busy routes crossed the mouth of the Gulf of al-‘Akkâba from the port of al-Shaykh ‘Ummayd on the Arabian side to al-Nabâk on the Sinai side, whence the journey to Suêz took ten days or so.

AL-HUWAYYAT — HUWIYYA


(G. RENTZ)

HUWAYYAT [see HAWIZA].

HUWIYYA is one of the abstract words that were coined in order to express in Arabic the nuances of Greek philosophy. It has been translated in a number of ways, in mediaeval Latin as well as in modern European languages. “Ipseity” would seem to be the term with which it most precisely corresponds. In modern Arabic it is retained with the meaning “identity”.

Huwiyya is formed from the pronoun huwa and the normal abstract termination -yyya, according to the explanation given by Ibn Rushd. He attributes this formation to a desire to avoid the ambiguity of the word mawjud, translating ṭū ḫv, as the Arabic participle has the original meaning of “found” (cf. Munk, Mêlanges de philosophie juive et arabe, 242, note 2, referring to Abbé de Metaphysique, beginning). The term was established early by the translator of the work for the Latin translation of Aristotle’s Metaphysics and is found also in the so-called Theology attributed to the same author. One, at least, of the translations of the Metaphysics was made by Ustāth for al-Kindī (Walzer, Greek into Arabic, Oxford 1962, 187). A curious passage in a Risâla of al-Kindī (ed. Abū Rida, i, 161-2) exhibits the word assimilated into the language in the form of a triliteral root ṭ ḫv ṭ, which possesses a fifth form verb, with a mawdar, sometimes given a plural, and a passive. The discussion concerns the One; among sensible things, a being is both one and many. “… If there were no unity there would be no multiplicity. Thus every multiple (being) is made what it is (or: is made itself by unity) tawāhuw huwā ḫusūṣ huwa biʾ-ʾwāhāda. If there were no unity the multiple would have had huwiyya (ipseity).” The flux of unity that comes from the first and true One is the tawāhuwi of every sensible being*, its establishment as an individual being, as it were. It is thus the One that is “the creator of all the mutahawwiyyāt (all the beings that are constituted as individual beings, that are characterized). There is thus no huwiyya (ipseity), except because of the unity that is in it”. Cf. also p. 123, line 5, and the explanation given at 129, note 4: “… a huwiyya, that is to say a thing subsisting by itself”, and so a substance (referring to huwa huwa).

In the Liber de Causis, ed. Bardenhewer, 89, huwiyya is used in the singular and the plural with the meaning of “being”, ens and entia (reference given by S. Afnan, Philosophical terminology in Arabic and Persian, Leiden 1964, 123, but four out of seven of the references indicated in notes are incorrect). The word is applied to “the first huwiyya, which established the things that have no limit”, then to the intellectual and the sensible huwiyyâ; in other terms, to the first Being, to the beings that are pure intelligences and finally to the beings that possess sensibility.

The so-called Theology of Aristotle, the texts of which are now identified with long fragments of the Ennéades (cf. Plotiniana arabica, ii, ed. P. Henry and H.-R. Schwzyer, Platoniana arabica, with English translation by G. Lewis, Paris-Brussels 1959), also uses huwiyya, generally translated by “identity”, and more rarely by “own self” (383) and “being” (393). “Ipseity” translates mawjud; huwiyya, which is opposed to ḥayyiyya, “otherness”, ḫruwiyya (Lewis, 271, rendering Theology, ed. Dieterici, 109, lines 7-8, ed. Badawi, 112, line 11). At the beginning of chapter X of the Theology, however, the account of the first huwiyya, the huwiyya of intelligence, is not suited to the translation of au ṭōtō ḫv by “identity” (Lewis, 291, Dieterici, 136, Badawi, 134), for the accent is on the action produced by a substance. This is more precisely stated subsequently (Lewis, 293, Dieterici, 137, lines 13-16, Badawi, 135, lines 13-15), and it is difficult to allow the transposition: “The true One originates the identity of the mind because of the intensity of its repose. When that identity looks at the true One…”, etc. The discussion obviously concerns a substantial form, which is engendered by the true One and contemplates it. “Ipseity” therefore seems preferable.

In the translation of Aristotle’s Metaphysics which accompanies the Commentary of Ibn Rushd, huwiyya is commonly used to render ṭū ḫv and ṭū ḫv, “being”; in the plural, “beings” (cf. ed. Bouyges, Index C a, principaux sujets traités, pp. (38) and (97-8), and Index D a, termes de sciences philosophiques, p. (270), with references to the text and for the usages totally disregard the idea of identity, being concerned either with being, the supreme abstraction: al-huwiyya waʾ-ʾwāhāda, being and the one, translating ṭū ḫv xal ṭū ḫv (1001 a 4), or with beings, ṭū ḫv xal ḫ, huwiyyâ, engendered from the elements (1001 a 16). In Metaphysics 1017 a 22, xl ḫ, huwiyyâ, is said to assume as many meanings as Aristotle has Categories (ed. Bouyges, 555, 2). The translator thus adopts it in order to render all the meanings of the word “being”, whether applied to substance or to accidents. “Ipseity indicates what a thing and its truth are, al-huwiyya tadull ‘alad innisyiyat al-ṣayr wa-ḥabbiṣātiḥ” (1017 a 31, where the much-discussed term annisyiya or inniyya is used to translate ṭō xal̲sīyya)

Ibn Rushd states that the word is applied to the Categories like the word mawjud (559, 15). It is, then, not, in Rushd’s usage in the Commentary, giving several meanings according to what is generally understood by it, but a kind of ʾisṭārāk al-ʾism, indicating here a relationship founded on reality, since the categories exist only through substance (805, 5-11; Ibn Rushd’s expressions are very close to those of Metaphysics Γ 2, 1003 a 33-5). He points out another analogous use: “The noun huwiyya that denotes the essence of a thing is something different from the noun huwiyya that denotes what is true (actual, existing). It is the same with the word “being”, maʾwjud” (562, 5). In other words the word has a conceptual, logical meaning, and an actual meaning, as explained by the commentator (739 d and 740 g) on Metaphysics 1027 b 18, trans. 736, 12, where he demonstrates the difference between the huwiyya qulm and...

Ibn Rushd later uses huwiyya in an abstract meaning, different from that given by the translator. Lafaṭ al-huwiyya denotes the use of the pronoun huwa as a copula. This is in connexion with huwa in the phrase “Socrates is not-white” (1017 a 34), translated as: ḫlas huwa aḥāba. Ibn Rushd here distinguishes between lafaṭ al-huwiyya indicating the copula that is in the spirit, and (the word) indicating the essence that is external to the spirit, and so actual (562, last line—562, line 1). But contrary to the interpretation of S. Afnan (op. cit.,
HUWIYYA — HYPOSTASIS

(22), the word huwiyya is not used as a copula, this role being reserved for the pronouns huwa, hiya, etc. Study of the passages indicated in Bouyges's Index is fundamental for determining the meaning of the word.

The terms that express identity are translated in the Metaphysics by huwa huwa or even al-huwa huwa, but not huwiyya. Sometimes the word is omitted: thus ta'utotik (995 b 21) does not appear, and only kafunotik is rendered by al-mutafiddd, contrariety (172, 14); the commentary does not rectify this omission, but later (178, 516) writes al-huwa huwa wa-l-ghayr, "the same and (the) other". The fragment corresponding with another use of the same word (1018 a 7) is missing in the translation. The expressions ḍ alūts and ṭ alūts are always translated by huwa huwa or hiya hiya, for example in chapter I 3 (1054 a 1 and b; trans. 1286-92), and the commentary follows this. Shay' wāhid, the same thing (346, 2-3), is also found, but never huwiyya.

The Arabic-speaking philosophers thus found this word already well established. They used it without explaining it as Ibn Rūḍīd was to do subsequently. Al-Fārābī begins his Fugās with a distinction between conceptual essence and essence actualized in an existing individual: "We have accepted that every existing thing has a quiddity (essence) and an ipseity, māhiyya wa-huwiyya, but its quiddity is not its ipseity or even an integral part of it. If man's quiddity were his ipseity, the concept of man's quiddity would be the concept of his ipseity, and by conceiving what man is, mā l-insān, you would conceive: huwa l-insān, he is the man (in the sense of: there is a man), and you would recognize his existence". For al-Fārābī, then, huwiyya expresses man as nature actualized and existing. A. Nader gives "ipseity" as the translation of huwiyya, p. 158 of the glossary accompanying his edition of the Kitdb al-Insān, another work of al-Fārābī (Beirut 1959). The same translation is given by Gardet, La pensée religieuse d'Aïcence (Paris 1951, 167). But, quoting the Libr de Causis where the word is applied to the first Cause, he writes "1'Existant pur", "the pure Existing Being" (ibid., 634).

From the examination of a certain number of uses of huwiyya in the texts of Ibn Sinā, which eleven are noted in A.-M. Goichon's Lexique de la langue philosophique d'Ibn Sinā, no. 735, the most precise equivalent of the term would seem to be "subject-substance, first substance, as opposed to māhiyya, quiddity, which denotes second substance, predicative substance. Its abstract form expresses 'being a first substance'". Again, huwiyya denotes "a concrete being considered universally" (Introduction to the French translation of the Shifa by Ibn Sinā, 48; cf. also 305 and 307, n.). The meaning "ipseity" is confirmed by al-Ghazālī in a line of argument designed to prove that the soul subsists by itself (Ihtījāt, ed. Bouyges, Index C no. 826, and p. 321, 5). The glossary accompanying the critical edition of the Metaphysics of the Shifa (Cairo 1960, 477) gives three renderings of the word according to the mediaeval translation: Id quod est, essentia, identitas. This last seems somewhat ill-chosen in the following chapter heading: "Consequences of unity consonant with huwiyya (identitas) and its divisions ..." (303). In the extant fragment of the Latin translation of the Logic it is also translated as identitas (Index ed. Cairo 1952, p. 157, on Madqal, 13, 5 and 7). However, al-huwiyya is here joined with al-waḥda, and is thus connected with the usages considered above, where being and the one are inseparable; identitas, then, is unjustified. Huwiyya does not appear in the indices to the other volumes. According to that of the Sophistic (Shifa, M a n i t b, vii, 132), the idea of identity is rendered by huwa huwa, with or without the article.

The ancient meaning of huwiyya refers to the peculiar characteristics of that being which is huwa, exclusively itself, rather than to a recognition, a comparison or an identification of such a being. The modern meaning does not involve an incorrect usage. Huwiyya is habitually used to translate into Arabic the expressions "identity card", ḏ aḥbat al-huwiyya, and "identity papers", awrād al-huwiyya (see Ṭ aḥkīrah). 'Urifī huwiyyatuhu, "to be identified", is also used. The modern meaning correctly refers to the idea of subject-substance, in order to denote precisely the person who exists specified by the card.

Bibliography: apart from the references in the text: Dūjdzjānī, Ta'brūjīīt; this definition was cited verbatim by Dūyī, ii, 707, who however was unable to identify it and refers only to the Muḥīt al-mukhīt.

HUWWĀRA (see HAWWA=R). HUWWĀRIN or HAWWARIN, place in Syria between Damascus and Palmyra, half way between Ṣadad and al-Karyatayn. On the site of an antique town, Huwwārin is known mainly for the fact that the Umayyad caliph Yazīd I had his residence, died and was buried there, as is attested by the poets of the period. A building still existing there, and still partially remains of the residence of the caliph, who is known to have planned to irrigate the fertile area round Huwwārin by means of a canal which was never completed. Some vestiges of this canal, which according to the sources was intended to permit the development of the high plain of Sabṣḥān, have been identified within the boundaries of the region of Hims.

Bibliography: R. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, 280; Le Strange, Palestine, 456; Yāḥūtī, ii, 355; H. Lammens, Études sur le règne de Muḥammad 1r, Beirut 1908, 381-2, 400, 408, 417, 420; idem, Le califat de Yazīd 1r, Beirut 1921, 471-21; J. Sauvaget, Remarques sur les monuments omyyades, i, in ΣΑ, 1939, 54-9; idem, Notes de topographie omyyade, in Syria, xxxiv (1940), 105-10; Tābarī, ii, 203, 427, 488; Aḥkālī, Diwān, ed. Šalbānī, 232-7; Aghānī, xvi, 88.

(D. Sourdell)

HYDERABAD (see HAYDARĀBĀD). HYDRAULICS (see MĀ'). HYMN (see IL Kl). HYPERBOLE (see MURĀŁA=GA). HYPOCRISY, HYPOCRITES (see MUNĀFĪK, RIVYĀ'). HYPOSTASIS (see IMĀMA, TANĀSU taraf).
‘Ibad [see Naṣārā].

Ibadan, town in the Western Region of Nigeria, originated during the 1820’s on the site of an Igbaa village as a war encampment set up by groups of wandering Yoruba soldiers from the old Oyo Empire, Ile Ife and Ijebu. Those were times of great upheavals in Yorubaland. The Oyo Empire had been rapidly disintegrating as a result of serious internal cleavages and mounting external pressure. The Fulani had been pushing southward, using Ilorin as a base, and eventually in 1837 they forced the evacuation of old Oyo, whose inhabitants fled southward. Some of the refugees built up the new city of Oyo, about 100 miles to the south, while others settled in Ibadan. In southern Yorubaland a fierce strife went on among the Yoruba states over the capture of slaves and the control of trade routes to the coast.

Ibadan grew rapidly, as more and more refugees from both the north and the south of Yorubaland sought the protection of its hills and the military might of its soldiers. By the middle of the 19th century its population was estimated at between 60,000 and 100,000. In the 1911 census the population reached 172,000 and in that of 1932 459,196. To-day Ibadan is the largest city in tropical Africa. Except for a relatively small number of migrants from other ethnic groups (only about 5% in 1952) all of its population are Yoruba (p.c.), hailing from different sections of Yorubaland. Ibadan has often been described as a ‘city-village’ because a large proportion of its population live from farming in the surrounding countryside.

In the course of the 19th century Ibadan developed an elaborate political constitution which was geared to war and defence and which differed markedly from that of the typical traditional Yoruba kingdom. By its military prowess and strong defences Ibadan succeeded in halting the Fulani onslaught and in repulsing all pressure on it from the southern Yoruba states and eventually became a great power in its own right with many vassal states around it.

That period of long war came to an end when the British extended their control northwards from the coast and finally, in 1893, imposed a treaty, on Ibadan. Peace and British power undermined the authority of the city’s chiefs. But with the development of Indirect Rule, the British placed Ibadan under the legal and spiritual authority of the Alafin of Oyo who, in collaboration with the British Residency, controlled the appointment of the chiefs. However, this subversion of Ibadan to a small and weak Oyo could not last for long, and in 1936 Ibadan became finally independent of Oyo and the Alafin assumed the new title of ‘Olubadan’. In 1952 Ibadan became the capital of the Western Region of the Federation of Nigeria.

Islam penetrated into Ibadan from the north early in the 19th century through the activities of Muslim traders and itinerant maulims. During the 19th century its military chiefs appointed Muslim imams so that there would use their magic, prayers, charms, and blessings to secure victory in war. But the massive conversion to Islam in the city began only when the British came; it has since been progressing rapidly and peacefully, often at the expense of better organized and more adequately financed Christian churches and missions.

Apart from a relatively small number of people who are affiliated to the Ahmadiyya sect, all the Muslims of the city are Sunnis who follow the Maliki school. Some of these Muslims have adopted the Kadijitya order but not the Ijma order of the Tijaniyya order (q.v.). There are in the city several formally organized Islamic associations, most of which are mainly concerned with the development of Islamic schools and the establishment and maintenance of mosques. There are also some Islamic missionary organizations. A council of ‘ulama’ supervises and administers the affairs of the city’s Central Mosque and selects the Chief Imam and his two assistants, though the formal appointment of the Chief Imam is officially made by the Olu of Ibadan in a special ceremony.

The Friday mid-day prayer at the Central Mosque is regularly attended by many thousands of men. Between 1948 and 1952 a series of bitter disputes arose between the city’s Imam and the migrant Hausa community, when the latter decided to secede from the predominantly Yoruba Central Mosque and to hold the Friday prayer in a special mosque within their Quarter, which is locally known as ‘Sabo’. Despite sustained opposition by the Olu of Ibadan and by the British officials, the Hausa have continued to hold a separate Friday prayer. A few other Muslim groupings have since done the same. To-day the only occasion on which all the Muslims of the city gather together is the massive, colourful, but brief ceremony held in the open just outside the city on the morning of the first day of each of the two Muslim feasts. This division of the Friday ritual congregation, which is unknown in the Islamic cities of northern Nigeria, is symbolic of the fact that Islam in Ibadan is not formally associated with political authority.

beginning where the former leaves off. Both are now being prepared for publication. A collection of scholarly papers by a number of specialists dealing with many fields of life in the City, including one dealing specifically with Islam, is now published: P. C. Lloyd, A. Mabogunje, and B. Awe (eds.), The City of Ibadan, Cambridge 1967.

(A. COHEN)

'IBADAT' (pl. of 'ibadā), submissive obedience to a master, and therefore religious practice, corresponds, together with its synonym iḍā's, in the works of fikhi, to the performance of the duties prescribed by the Law (we do not say "cult", see below), as opposed to the muṣâmalat which include more or less all the rest (but which, in the strict sense, correspond to synallagmatic contracts only). The distinctions are elusive, as some often in these matters. Sālāt is quite certain an 'ibadā, but some affirm that marriage is also one (which is the more remarkable in that the Muslim marriage does not imply any religious ceremony), and here it must be understood that it is a matter of a "pious practice". Moreover, distinctions between the different sections of muṣâmalat are also discussed by the authors (see W. Heffening, Zum Aufbau des islamischen Rechtes, in Festschrift P. Kahle, Leiden 1935). In treatises of fikhi, subjects are not set out in any uniform order, except that the 'ibadāt always appear at the beginning, while in treatises of 'aman (judicial practice) this subject is obviously absent.

If we translate 'ibadāt as "cult" we are committing something of a theoretical error (Tor Anderæ), for it has quite correctly been said that, strictly speaking, Islam knows no more of a cult, properly speaking, than (Snouck Hurgronje) it does of law; nor, we should add, of ethics. Fikkī is, in fact, a deontology (the statement of the whole corpus of duties, of acts whether obligatory, forbidden or recommended, etc.) which is imposed upon man. Therefore, what we call "cult" is a part of the duties prescribed by Allāh and formulated in minute detail by learned writers in the works of fikhi, whereas in other religions the object of the cult there is to bring the believer closer to the divine and into contact with it; it is not concerned solely, or even principally, with carrying out the divine will. This is purely theoretical; speaking sociologically and from the psychological point of view, the matter appears to be far less clear-cut: from both these points of view Islam is certainly familiar with a cult or forms of worship: to be convinced of this one need only interrogate, for example, the pilgrims who have performed the salāt around the Ka'ba, an observance which, incidentally, in that place, is curiously enough not an obligation of the hadīth (this demonstrates once again the difference between theory and reality; here, on two grounds).

In the books of fikhi, the 'ibadāt precede the muṣâmalat; questions of ritual purity (taḥārā), a necessary condition for the valid performance of prayer, appear at the beginning. The remainder almost always come afterwards in the following order: prayer, salāt, fasting, pilgrimage. The first "pillar" of Islam in the strict sense has to be pronounced at the time of prayer, so simple a matter that the books of fikhi make no mention of it. In connexion with the 'ibadāt other subjects are dealt with, about which we must say a few words. Circumcision is, in theory, no more than recommended; although the sociological reality is quite different, and the scholars barely refer to it when considering the 'ibadāt. Here too may be mentioned the proper way of fulfilling natural needs, the veiling of nudity, and the attentions that have to be given to dress and body for the Friday prayer, etc. Everything relating to funerals is examined in relation to prayer (since the prayer for the dead is considered a religious duty), etc. The spiritual retreat, or 'ibādāt, is studied in connexion with fasting. It is also possible to link with 'ibadāt, as scarcely belonging to the muṣâmalat: the provisions relating to food and drink, whether licit or illicit, those dealing with hunting and ritual slaughter, vows and oaths (together with methods of expiation in the case of perjury). To give only one example, in the Tafsīr al-Khallī (Maliki), the laws in connexion with it). The holy war is not a fard 'āyn (it is an obligation which falls only on the community in general, provided that there are enough volunteers), nor is it one of the five fundamental obligations of Islam, but it has an obvious religious character. In the above-named work it occurs at the end (after criminal law); in the Muhākharat of al-Shāfī (Maliki), on the other hand, it occurs among the 'ibadāt.

In their general outline, the provisions relating to 'ibadāt are the same, not only in the four Sunni schools but also in the Shi'ī and Ibadī schools. There is thus no necessity to discuss them further in this general article on 'ibadāt. So much for the theory.

In regard to actual social practice, one of the most urgent and interesting present-day tasks that is still to be undertaken in this field, and indispensable for religious sociology in general, consists of studying the extent (which is extremely variable) to which the practices of a religion, in this case Islam, do in fact correspond to the requirements laid down by theory, in this case by fikhi on the subject of 'ibadāt; this is to be done, particularly, according to the methods first demonstrated, for Catholicism, by Le Bras. In this field, from the start, facts of a qualitative kind will be discovered, and they will show us what the religious life there really is. Some of these studies, even the early ones, still retain their value—Lane, Manners and Customs of the modern Egyptians, for example, and Snouck-Hurgronje's Mecca, which are admirable. For Indonesia, one may consult G.-H. Bousquet, L'Islam indonésien, in REI, 1939. But, for future work, this stage ought to be regarded as superseded, and a new and more promising stage will be discovered, and it is that statistical stage which must now be reached. In this respect, Muslim sociology is very backward (some indications in this direction, though cautious and inadequate, can be found in G.-H. Bousquet, concerning religious practice in North Africa, especially Morocco, in Études d'orientalisme ... Léo-Procemai, ii, 1962, 495-501). As a very rough approximation, it can be suggested here that (1) ritual practice, considered as a whole, varies less from one country to another than does the practice of these duties envisaged singly; (2) in fact, in certain regions a fundamental obligation may be very much neglected, while in other parts it is scrupulously observed (for example, fasting in Java and North Africa respectively); (3) in backward regions, in the process of Islamization, practice coincides with the standards of the Law; (4) on the other hand, it is relaxed in those countries where European civilization is developing (for example, increasing disregard of fasting in North Africa). Of course, external piety is only an indication, and often an insufficiently accurate one, of internal piety. However, religious sociology in general is not yet in a position, in this last instance, to be of assistance to Islamic studies.
Bibliography: The regulation of Ḥbdūd has its somewhat restricted basis in the Kur'ān. It is developed very fully in the Sunna (cf. Wensinck's 
Handbuch für die verschiedenen moslemischen Glaubensbekenntnisse). The same is true of the books of fīqh of the various schools and in works of ikhṭilāf. A more detailed bibliography can be found by consulting such articles as Ǧawwāl, Ḍaqq, etc. A general, clear, but necessarily brief survey is given in G.-H. Bouquet, Les grandes pratiques rituelles de l'Islam, Paris 1949. (G.-H. Bouquet)

Al-Ibādīyya, one of the main branches of the Khāridjīs (q.v.). The Wellhausen School of which are today found in 'Umān, East Africa, Tripolitania (Djiabal Nafusa and Zuagha) and southern Algeria (Wargla and Mzab). The sect takes its name from that of one of those said to have founded it, 'Abd Allāh b. Ṭabarqa al-Mūźabī. The form usually employed is Abādīyya; this is true not only of North Africa (e.g., in the Djiabal Nafusa, cf. A. de C. Motylinski, Le Djiabel Nefousa, Paris 1895-9, 41 and passim), or even among the Christians of the Ist/Ist century, as by the Ibādī writer al-Barrādī (Kūtāb Dādurah al-
muntahāt, Cairo 1302, 155), but also of 'Umān (Niebuhr, Voyage en Arabie, 1780, ii, 198); nevertheless, the contemporary Ibādī writers often use the first form as being more correct (cf., e.g., Muhammad b. Yusuf Atīfiyyah al-Miṣrī, Risāla šīfāyī fi baḏ' al-tawḥīd, Algiers, n.d., 49). Yet another form of the name is known: Ḥmāja (al-Handānī, Ǧisāf Dīnīat al-ʿArab, ed. D. H. Müller, Leiden 1884-91, i, 88). According to Niebuhr (op. cit., i, 198 200, 201), the Ibādīs of 'Umān also had the name of Bāsiās, Belāsī or Bāmādī (cf. also Badger, History of the Imāms and Seyyids of Omdurman by Sallal-ibn-Raschīd, London 1871, 387). It appears that the last name (for Bayādī) is connected with Mubāyūdīya, a name given to the Khāridjīs in general (see Brūnnow, Die Charidschiten unter den ersten Omayyaden, Leiden 1884, 30 n.). The Ibādīs also give themselves the name of Shūrāt [q.v.], in which fact refers to the first Khāridjīs al-Muḥākkima (al-Barrādī, op. cit., 175; A. de C. Motylinski, Chronique d'Ibn Sağhir, in Actes du XIV* Congrès Intern. des Orient., Algiers 1905, 81; cf. also al-Yaḵūbī, Bulāḏīn, 352).

According to the tradition recorded towards the middle of the 2nd/8th century by Abū Miğīnaq, this sect appeared in 65/684-5, represented by Abū Bilāl b. Ḥanāṣīr who broke away from the Khāridjī extremists over the attitude to be adopted towards the other akhī al-ṭawḥīdī (Brūnnow, op. cit., 60-1; W. Wellhausen, Die religiö-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam, Berlin 1901, 28-9), but in fact the origins of the Ibādīyya seem to be much older than modern scholars have thought. The present author's view is that the pre-history of this sect, together with that of another moderate Khāridjī sect, the Sufrīyya [q.v.], should be connected with that group of the baʿada (quietist, see Brūnnow, op. cit., 29; Wellhausen, op. cit., 29) Khāridjīs which grew up towards the middle of the 7th century at Baṣra around one of the men most venerated by the Khawāridjīs, Abū Bilāl Mīrāḏ b. Uṣayyā al-Tamāmī. Ibādī tradition mentions Abū Bilāl among the precursors of the Ibādīyya, or even among the first imāms of the sect (al-Shammakī, Kūtāb al-Šīrāzī, Cairo 1301, 66 ff.; al-Barrādī, op. cit., 167 ff.; b. Sālimī, Kūtāb al-Luʾma al-murdiyya, 1326, 187; Siyar al-ʿUmāniyya, University of Lwów, MS no. 1082, ii, 135, 654-5; it should be mentioned that the other writers have considered Abū Bilāl to be the imām of the Sufrīyya, see, e.g., al-Isfaraʾīnī in Haarbrücker, asch-Schah-

Rastānī's Religionserhebungen und Philosophien, Halle 1850, ii, 406). This tradition seems very probable, particularly if it is remembered that among Abū Bilāl's intimate friends there were several who later became prominent Ibādīs after the death of the Ibādīyya, as, for example, the real organizer of the sect, Dābir b. Ẓayy (see al-Šīrāzī, op. cit., 79) and al-Walid al-ʿAbdī, one of the leaders of the moderate Khāridjīs who broke away from the extremist Nāṭī b. al-ʿAzrāk (al-Shammākhi, op. cit., 79). Furthermore, the doctrines preached by Abū Bilāl, such as, for example, the defence of ʿaṣıraḏ (quietism) of Ibn Ibaḏ was probably prompted by the hope of reaching an understanding with the Azbāqīs in 63. The extremists pronounced a khuṭbah against the Zabāyrids and left Baṣra, while Ibn Ibaḏ left the city some months later with his supporters (al-Barrādī, op. cit., 135-6). Thus began the first period in the history of the Ibādīyya, which can be called the period of the kitāmān (= secret, on this term see below and al-Barrādī, op. cit., 136).

Very little is known of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd. According to the Ibādī writings, he was the first scholar of the sect (Siyar al-ʿUmāniyya, 74, 198). He is often called in Ibādī sources ʿīmām ʿalī al-taḥkīk, ʿīmām al-mudālimīn or ʿīmām al-baʿwa (al-Shammākhi, op. cit., 77; Siyar al-ʿUmāniyya, 108, 111; al-Barrādī, op. cit.; P. K. Hitti, al-Baghdādīs Characteristics of Muslim Sects, Cairo 1924, 87). It seems that this title belongs only to the period in which Ibn ʿAbd took part in the defence of Medina (64/683-4); the state of kitāmān in which the Ibādīs lived after 65 seems to exclude the possibility of the existence of an imāmāte in the political sense of the word. Perhaps also there should be seen in this title an allusion to his rôle as president in a sort of secret theocratic Ibādī government known as dījmat al-Muslmīn, which is mentioned by historians of the sect. This was a council composed of a number of the most important ʿaṣīrīs (among them al-Walid al-ʿAbdī) which may be compared to the council of the ʿaṣīrīs of the North African part of the umma for the collapse of the imāmāte of the Banū Rustām. The ʿuṣīd (quietism) of Ibn ʿAbd was probably prompted by the hope of reaching an understanding with the new Umayyad caliph ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān (65-86/685-703). In fact, he succeeded in entering into correspondence with this ruler, and there are preserved in the Ibādī chronicles two ʿaṣīrī letters (letters of good advice) from Ibn ʿAbd which bear witness to their friendly relations; one of these letters is a reply from the Ibādī leader to a communication which had been sent to him by ʿAbd al-Malik through the intermediary of a certain Sinān b. ʿAṣim (see al-Šīrāzī, op. cit., 77; al-Barrādī, op. cit., 135-67; Siyar al-ʿUmāniyya, 445-55; Sachau, Religious Anschauungen der Ibādīschen Muslmänden, in MSOS A.S., ii, 52-9). The first of these letters must have been written after 67/686-7, since it mentions the defeat of al-Μukhtar b. Mṣṭah, the brother of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd-az-Zabāwī, which took place in that year (al-Barrādī, op. cit., 163; cf. Brūnnow, op. cit., 86-90). The letters of Ibn ʿAbd contain a brief account of Ibādī principles, which is the first of this type (see also on Ibn Ibaḏ's relations with ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān, R. Rubinacci, Il califfo ʿAbd al-
Malik b. Marwan e gli Ibbiditi, in *Al-Ibādiyya*, n.s. v (1954), 99-121). According to al-Shammakhi (op. cit., 77), Ibn Ibad was also the author of *munaẓẓāt* (polemical writings) against the extremist Khāridjīs. The date of his death is not known; the Ibadī biographies reveal only that he belonged to the second *fabaka* of scholars. The opinion of al-Shahrastānī (*Mīlāt*, ed. Cureton, 100) and of al-Kazwīnī (*Yāqūt*), ed. Wustenfeld, i, 37) that Ibn Ibad was still alive as a very old man under Marwān b. Mūhammad (127-34/745-52) does not seem very convincing.

Ibn Ibad’s policy at Basra towards the Umayyad caliphs was continued by his successor Abu ‘I-Sha’ībā'ī Dīābīr b. Zayd al-Asṭīl, the chief scholar of the Ibadī sect and an eminent traditionist. This scholar, who came from ʿUmnān, from near the town of Nazwā (see *Siyār al-Umamīyya*, 675; Yāḥūt, ii, 243-4), is considered by the Arab authors to be one of the chief Khāridjīs of the early period (al-Shahrastānī, *op. cit.*, 102). His probable date of birth was 18/639, and the date of this death is given as 93, 96 or 103 (see al-Barrādī, *op. cit.*, 155; al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 77; al-Sālimī, *Lumā‘*, 172; *Siyār al-Umamīyya*, 686). He was thus the contemporary of ʿAbd Allāh b. Ibad. Dīābīr b. Zayd was one of the best friends and disciples of ʿAbd Allāh b. al-‘Abbas (q.v.), from whom he received a number of hadiths (4-6, 243-4; al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 70, 96; al-Barrādī, *op. cit.*, 151). It was probably owing to this fact as well as to his profound scholarship that Dīābīr was held in great esteem by all the Muslims of his time; al-Shammākhī (*op. cit.*, 70) mentions in this connexion the opinion of Mīlāk b. Anas. He was probably the author of the earliest collection of traditions. His work, called *Dīābīrī*, consisting of five parts, is identical with our Maskalā (identical with our Maskalā) who died in a battle against Abd al-Ragman’s army a detachment composed of men from Kūfa and Basra and under the command of one Bīstām b. Māskūla probably identical with the Bīstām who died in the battle with all his men (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 111; Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, 46-7; Pèrier, *op. cit.*, 173, 176, 184, 191-3). The activity of these Ibadī zealots led to the withdrawal of al-Hādījī’s support. The immediate cause of his definite break with Dīābīr was probably the murder, at Dīābīr’s instigation, of one of al-Hādījī’s spies (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 75). He began a cruel persecution of the Ibadīs. The majority of the Ibadī leaders and notables were either exiled to ʿUmnān (Dīābīr himself, for example, and another important Ibadī Shaykh, Hubayra; cf. al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 76, 81) or imprisoned (on this see also *Siyār al-Umamīyya*, 250). Among the Ibadī leaders imprisoned was the most scholarly of Dīābīr’s pupils and his future successor as president of the Ibadī community in Basra, Abū ʿUbaydā Muṣliḥ b. Abī Karīma al-Tammī (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 87), who was probably the greatest, both as scholar and as statesman, of all the Khāridjī leaders known to us and who played an important political rôle under the last Umayyads.

Abū ʿUbaydā was probably of Iranian origin (according to *Aḥābi*, xx, 97, his personal name was Kūdīn; and according to al-Dīābīr, *Risāla*, i, 132 and ii, 126, it was Kardīn or Kūrīn and *mawālī* of the Arab tribe of the Banū Tamīm (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 83). He studied with Dīābīr and also with other famous Ibadī Shaykhī of the second *fabaka*, such as Dīāfār b. al-Sammāk al-ʿAbdī b. Şuḫar al-ʿAbdī (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 79, 81). After the death of al-Hādījī (95/714), who was succeeded by Yazīd b. al-Muhallab, Abū ʿUbaydā was released from prison with the other Ibadīs and appointed leader of the Ibadī community in Basra (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 87). The Ibadī writers refer to him as *imām al-Muslimīn* (Siyār al-Umamīyya, 111), but he seems in reality to have been, as was his predecessor relations between them deteriorated. It appears that one of the causes of this change was the death of the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik (86/705), who was, as mentioned above, fairly well disposed towards the Ibadīs. Another was that the Ibadīyya of Basra entered into dealings with the family of the Muhallabids, which the powerful governor of Iṣrāʾīl detested. In fact among the most fervent Ibadīs of Basra was ʿĀtika, the sister of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab, the former governor of Kūrsaʿn, who had been deposed through al-Hādījī’s efforts, and imprisoned by him in 86/705; among the Muhallabids converted to Ibadism was there another woman, Halbiyya, who lived at Mecca in about the first half of the 2nd/8th century (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 88, 117; J. Pèrier, *Vie d’al-Hādījī* ibn Yousof, Paris 1904, 221, 232). In addition to these two facts, a third should be mentioned: the increasing radicalism of the Ibadīs of Basra, among whom the revolutionary elements gained control, that is the supporters of the Khāridjīs who wished to change their position as kāfara for that of ḥurāt. From the writings of the sect we know the name of one of the leaders of the revolutionary party: Bīstām b. ’Umar b. al-Mūsīb al-Dabbī, known also as Maṣkāla, a former Shīʿī and supporter of Shābūb (q.v.), who, after Shābūb’s defeat in 776/696, was embraced by the Ibadīs. He was not only a famous warrior but also a mutakallim (theologian). It appears that the Ibadī zealots of Basra took part in the revolt of ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān b. Mūhammad b. al-Aṣḥāb b. al-ʿAbbas (81-2/701-2); in fact we find in ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān’s army a detachment composed of men from Kūfa and Basra and under the command of one Bīstām b. Maṣkāla (probably identical with the Bīstām who died in the battle with all his men). The Ibadī zealots led to the withdrawal of al-Hādījī’s support. The immediate cause of his definite break with Dīābīr was probably the murder, at Dīābīr’s instigation, of one of al-Hādījī’s spies (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 75). He began a cruel persecution of the Ibadīs. The majority of the Ibadī leaders and notables were either exiled to ʿUmnān (Dīābīr himself, for example, and another important Ibadī Shaykh, Hubayra; cf. al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 76, 81) or imprisoned (on this see also *Siyār al-Umamīyya*, 250). Among the Ibadī leaders imprisoned was the most scholarly of Dīābīr’s pupils and his future successor as president of the Ibadī community in Basra, Abū ʿUbaydā Muṣliḥ b. Abī Karīma al-Tammī (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 87), who was probably the greatest, both as scholar and as statesman, of all the Khāridjī leaders known to us and who played an important political rôle under the last Umayyads.

Abū ʿUbaydā was probably of Iranian origin (according to *Aḥābi*, xx, 97, his personal name was Kūdīn; and according to al-Dīābīr, *Risāla*, i, 132 and ii, 126, it was Kardīn or Kūrīn and *mawālī* of the Arab tribe of the Banū Tamīm (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 83). He studied with Dīābīr and also with other famous Ibadī Shaykhī of the second *fabaka*, such as Dīafār b. al-Sammāk al-ʿAbdī b. Şuḫar al-ʿAbdī (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 79, 81). After the death of al-Hādījī (95/714), who was succeeded by Yazīd b. al-Muhallab, Abū ʿUbaydā was released from prison with the other Ibadīs and appointed leader of the Ibadī community in Basra (al-Shammākhī, *op. cit.*, 87). The Ibadī writers refer to him as *imām al-Muslimīn* (Siyār al-Umamīyya, 111), but he seems in reality to have been, as was his predecessor
Djabir, only the president of the djamd'at al-Muslimm of Basra and the mukaddam (leader) over the Ibadiyya of Basra and the mukaddam (leader) over the Ibadiyya of Basra, and even over his former teacher, Dja'far b. al-Sammak (see Siyar al-'Umdniyya, 672). Abū Ubayda was an eminent scholar and the author of a collection of the hadīths transmitted by Djabir b. Zayd, Dja'far b. al-Sammak and Šuhār al-Abdī (Lewicki, Une chronique ibadite, in RÉ, 1934, 72; see also al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 85; al-Sālimi, Lum'a, 185). The Ibadiyya from all parts of the Muslim world turned to him (see Abd Allāh b. Yahyā al-Bārūnī, Risāla sullam al-'āmma wa l-mubāditin ilā ma'ṣīfati al-imām al-dīn, Cairo 1324, 6-8). Abū Ubayda's policy at first conformed completely with Ibn Ibād's tendency to come to an understanding with the Umayyads. This was facilitated by the benevolent attitude of the new governor of Irāk, Yazaḍ b. Muhallāb, who was closely linked with the Ibādis of Basra through his brother Atīka, a fervent Ibādi as mentioned above. The hopes of the Ibādi Shaykh of winning the Umayyads to their cause increased with the accession to the throne of the devout caliph Umar II (99/101/717-20). Abū Ubayda sent to this ruler an embassy, among whose members were Sālim al-Hilālī and the scholar Shaykh Dja'far b. al-Sammak who, because of his connections with the Ibādis, was considered by them as imām al-Muslimm. This mission was still at the court of Umar II at the time of the death of his son, 'Abd al-Malik b. Umar (al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 79-82; Siyar al-'Umdniyya, 111, 665, 666). It should be added that the Ibādis were not the only ones wishing to reach an agreement with Umar II.

It is known that another Khurāṣī group, whose leader was Shawkānī (on him see Wehlhausen, op. cit., 48) and which lived in the district of Rabi'ā' in Mesopotamia, sent a mission to this ruler (see Mas'uḍī, Murāḍī, v, 434+). The results of this mission are not known; it may have been due to it that the Ibādi Iyābī b. Muḥāwiya was appointed bāṣīlī of Baṣra (al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 81). But this favourable state of affairs for the Ibādiyya did not last long. When Yazaḍ b. Muhallāb died in 717-18, his successor Yazaḍ Yezīd was unfavourably disposed towards the Muḥallābīs, the patrons of the Ibādis of Baṣra. Details of the fortunes of the Ibādiyya of Baṣra during the first two decades of the 2nd/8th century are not known; there certainly took place at this period a complete change in their attitudes and there even appeared some revolutionary tendencies. Leaders of the revolutionary party which favoured direct action were Abū Nūh, the supporter of a definitive rupture with the caliphate, and a famous ḥanīfī, Abū Muhammad al-Nahdī, who, in his sermons delivered in the mosques of Baṣra, overtly incited the crowd to revolt against the governor of Irāk, Khālid b. 'Abd Allāh (105-207/723-38) (see al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 88, 97; al-Sālimi, Lum'a, 185). The activities of the zealots of Baṣra were facilitated by the attitude of indifference of the governor of this town, Bilāl b. Abū Burdā al-Ashtar (al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 97). Abū Ubayda was at first opposed to direct action since he still hoped to win the caliphs to Ibādism. He also saw that the chances of an Ibādi khurāṣī similar to the revolts of the Azrākī extremists were very slender; but in the end, after consulting the important members of the sect, he was obliged to change his attitude through fear of a khurāṣī revolt from the Ibādis of Baṣra, the majority of whom wished to move from the position of ḥanīfī to that of ṣuyūṭi (see below; cf. al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 83-8). Yet he adopted a line of action completely different from that of the other Khurāṣī leaders. He did not wish the Ibādis of Baṣra to leave the town in order to found an imāmāte somewhere outside the capital, following the example of Nāṣīf b. al-Azraq; on the contrary, he planned to make use of the rich and numerous Ibādi community of Baṣra only as a base for Ibādi propaganda, which should embrace the whole of the Muslim world. He decided to provoke Ibādi insurrections in the various provinces and to create a universal Ibādi imāmāte on the ruins of the Umayyad caliphate. In order to achieve this, Abū Ubayda formed a kind of revolutionary government in which he himself was in charge of everything concerning religious action and missions, and another eminent Ibādi Shaykh of Baṣra, Ḥādīb al-Tā'ī, dealt with matters of war and of finance (al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 92, 114; Siyar al-'Umdniyya, 665). A bayt al-māl was formed; its assets must have been considerable since it is stated, for example, that a single rich Ibādi merchant, Abū Tahir, paid a net sum of 10,000 dirhams (al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 114-5). There was created at Baṣra a centre of learning where Abū Ubayda secretly trained for the task of being missionaries who came to him from all the Muslim provinces. These missionaries were then sent out in teams commanded by the Ibādiyya of Baṣra, and these khulāṣī al-'ilm were to spread propaganda in the various provinces of the caliphate and, after gaining a certain number of adherents, to pronounce the state of ṣuyūṭi (see Masqueray, op. cit., 29, 20, 21; al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 124; Siyar al-'Umdniyya, 676; al-Sālimi, Lum'a, 185). According to the Ibādi historians, Abū Ubayda sent such teams to the Maghrib, the Yaman, Ḥadramawt, 'Umān and Khurāṣī (al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 114; al-Sālimi, loc. cit.). The operation had a tremendous success; in the midst of the general disorder which preceded the fall of the Umayyads, the influence of the Ibādis spread widely. After only a few years, there were Ibādis in various Muslim countries. To the Ibādi historians, Abū Ubayda placed the candidate for the dignity of imām and the future Ḥādīb. These khulāṣī al-'ilm were to spread propaganda in the various provinces of the caliphate and, after gaining a certain number of adherents, to pronounce the state of ṣuyūṭi (see Masqueray, op. cit., 29, 20, 21; al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 124; Siyar al-'Umdniyya, 676; al-Sālimi, Lum'a, 185). According to the Ibādi historians, Abū Ubayda sent such teams to the Maghrib, the Ḥadramawt and 'Umān, several Ibādi revolts which constituted a greater threat to the caliphate than did the Azrākī movements (see below).

During this period of Ibādi expansion, the Ibādiyya of Baṣra continued to live in a state of kitāman, keeping their beliefs secret. The advent of the Abūbāsīdids nothing to change this situation except that the Ibādiyya succeeded in gaining the protection of some influential members of the family of the new caliphs. Among these should be mentioned especially the aunt of the caliph al-Mahdī (158-69/775-86) and her husband 'Abd Allāh b. Rabi', whose son even became an Ibādi (al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 107-8).

It appears also that the caliph Abū Dja'far (136-58/ 753-75) was for a time fairly well disposed towards the Ibādis; it is known, for example, somewhere that he was much in sympathy with Ḥādīb al-Tā'ī (al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 91). Abū Ubayda and Ḥādīb both died during Abū Dja'far's reign (al-Shammakhi, op. cit., 83, 91). The statement of the 5th/11th century Ibādi historian Abū Zakariyya? Yahyā b. Abī Bakr al-Wardījīn that Abū Ubayda died during the reign of the Rustāmidīdūm Abū al-Wahhāb b. Abd al-Rahām (160-80/776-93; Masqueray, op. cit., 51) should in turn be rejected.

After the death of Abū Ubayda there began the decline of the Ibādi community of Baṣra, as, if
we may believe the sectarian sources, had already been observed by the caliph Abu Djacfar ... it was Abd Allah b. Sacid al-Hadrami who was considered as the successor of this imam by the Ibadis of the tladra-

Yet soon after the affair of al-Nukkar, al-Rabi and the other Ibadis emigrated to Umân, where already al-Rabi's successor, Abû Sufyân Mahbûb b. al-Ra^î, was resident (on al-Rabi and Abû Sufyân see Siyar al-^Umâniyya, 667; al-Salîmi, Lum'a, 182, 186; Masqueray, op. cit., 124 n. 2, 136-7; Lewicki, Une chronique, 70-2; idem, Notice sur la chronique ibadite d'ad-Dargini, in RO, xi, 159-60).

The Ibadî groups outside Basra

(a) At Kûfa. In spite of the opinion of Wellhausen that the Khâridji of Kûfa disappeared completely after the massacre of 59/679, the available sources enable us to establish that the Ibadîyya remained in this town during at least the whole of the 2nd/8th century. In fact it was from Kûfa that there came the founder of the Ibadî sect of al-Hâritîyya (see below), which existed in the first half of the 2nd century. Among the Ibadî-Wahbî jâhîks of Kûfa may be mentioned Abu 1-Muhâdjîr al-Kâfî, one of the doctors of the second half of the 2nd/8th century (see Masqueray, op. cit., 139 n.; al-Shamâmkhi, op. cit., 121; Wellhausen, op. cit., 54).

(b) In the rest of Irâk, Ibadîyya, belonging to various groups of this sect, probably lived in villages on the road from Basra to al-Mawâslî (see al-Shamâmkhi, op. cit., 120-1).

(c) At al-Mawâslî Ibadîs were to be found. Among the Ibadî doctors of this town there should be mentioned, on the evidence of the Ibadî sources, one Abû Bakr al-Mawâslî. It seems very probable that there were some Ibadîs among the Khâridji mentioned by the authors of the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries in the province of al-Djazîrât, to the west of al-Mawâslî (al-Salîmi, Lum'a, 180; Siyar al-^Umâniyya, 667; al-Mas'âdi, op. cit., vi, 230-1; Hûdud al-^âlam, 140).

(d) Hîdžâz. It appears that the Ibadîs were fairly numerous at Medina and Mecca and that even in the 2nd/8th century there were Ibadî doctors in these towns. Mecca was probably in the 2nd century one of the centres of very vigorous Ibadî propaganda. Remnants of the Ibadîyya still existed in Mecca in the 6th/12th century. Among the Ibadî doctors of Hîdžâz in the 2nd and 3rd centuries were: Abu 1-Hurr 'Ali b. al-^Usayn al-Anbari, Muhammad b. Hâbîb, Muhammad b. Salîma and Ibn 'Abbâd al-Mawâslî (see al-Shamâmkhi, op. cit., 64, 125-3, 147; al-Shamâmkhi, op. cit., 97-9; al-Salîmi, Lum'a, 485; Siyar al-^Umâniyya, 679).

(e) Central Arabia. Abû Ubâyda seems to have sent hamalaat al-^Umm to the centre of the Arabian peninsula, perhaps to the Yamama where there had existed shortly before a Khâridji imâmate of the Ibadîyya sect, linked to the doctrines of Ibn Ibad (see al-Bârdînî, Sallam, 7; Wellhausen, op. cit., 29-32; Brünnow, op. cit., 64).

We cannot, however, take all the Ibadîs of Syria and Arabia as forming a single sect. The opinions of the Ibadîs and their practice of religious observance were quite diverse, and the political and social conditions in which they lived were very different from time to time. Among the Ibadîs there was a movement for the recognition of the authority of desert hajjîs, who were chosen by the Ibadîs as successors of the imâm by the Ibadîs of the Hâdrâmawt and Yemen. The origins of Ibadîsm in the Hâdrâmawt and Yemen are rather obscure. The Ibadîs were perhaps the most ardent in the spread of this movement by the first leader of the Ibadî sect, 'Abî 'Abd Allah b. Ibad, who died, according to Ibn Hawâlî (i, 37), in the canton of al-Mughaykhîra in the south-west of the Yemen. Ibn Ibad's arrival in the Yemen was probably connected with the conquest of southern Arabia by the Khâridji, which took place between the years 65 and 73/685-92. The Khâridji's control of this country did not last long and ended in 73 with the Ibadî agitators in the south-west of the Yemen, to the west of al-Mawsil (al-Salîmi, op. cit., 121; Wellhausen, op. cit., 183; al-Masqueray, op. cit., 185; Shammakhi, op. cit., 120-1).
mawt and by the Ibadi *masākiyr* of Başra. The Ibadi imāmāte still existed in the 5th/6th century. According to al-Hamdānī, it was the town of Dawʾan (198/813) in 822/233 CE, which was the capital of the imām of the latter part of the 3rd/9th century. The last mention of the Ibādīs of the Ḥaḍramawt belongs to the second half of the 5th century.

Of the history of the Ibādīyya of the Yemen after the defeat of the imām ʿAbd Allāh b. Yahyā almost nothing is known. Crushed in 130/748 by the army of ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbbāy, they then became subjects of the ʿAbbāsīd state. Several Ibadi groups still existed in the Yemen at least until the middle of the 6th/12th century. They became the vassals of the Ḥaḍramawt and ʿUmān, also professed the Ibādī doctrine. The population of this country paid tithes to the imām of ʿUmān at about the beginning of the 3rd century. There were also Ibādīs outside the former imāmāte of Talib al-Ḥakk, on the island of Soocotra, whose inhabitants were related to those of Mahra. According to al-Hamdānī, there was on this island a group of al-Shurāt (what is this writer calls the Ibādīs) who were hostile to the Sunnis and the Kharijī (as al-Kuland b. al-Djuland), who was the descendent of the former princes of the country of Mahra. For the later history of the Kharijīs of Mahra, see T. Lewicki, *Les Ibdites dans l’Arabie du Sud au moyen âge*, in *Folia Orientalia*, 1 (1955), 3-18.

(6) ʿUmān. Another region in which the Ibādīs were active in Arabia was ʿUmān. Not much is known of the origins of the Ibādīyya in this country. The prehistory of Ibādīsm there appears to be closely linked with the activity of the pre-Ibādī Khāridjī group of Abū Būlāl. It is known in fact that, towards the second half of the 1st/7th century, the inhabitants of ʿUmān were fervent admirers of this Khāridjī hero. Moreover, for some time until the year 73, ʿUmān belonged to an imāmāte formed in Arabia by the Khāridjī sect of the Naǧjadīs. From the end of the 1st/7th century, the Khāridjīsm of the inhabitants of ʿUmān took on a purely Ibādī character, perhaps owing to the activity of Ḥawīr b. Zayd, as well as to the influences of other Ibādī doctors of Basra who had been exiled there by the Khāhidjīs. The modern Ibādī scholar ʿAbbāsīyah is thus right in stating that the history of the Ibādīyya in ʿUmān begins with the period of the Tābiʾīn because it was the first half of this state in the 3rd century that the more serious preaching of Ibādī doctrines begins, probably owing to the hamālat al-ʿimām who were appointed by the inhabitants of ʿUmān at this time by Abū ʿUbaydah. These missionaries were helped by a famous faṭḥ of ʿUmān, one ʿAbīr b. Sālim al-Tāʾi, and another doctor of the country, Mūsā b. ʿAbī Dābī al-Azkanī. As a result of this preaching, an Ibādī revolt broke out in ʿUmān in 132/749. At the head of the rebels was the descendent of the former princes of the country, al-Djuland b. Maṣʿūd (referred to by al-Barrādī as al-Kuland b. al-Djuland), who was elected imām. This Ibādī imāmāte, which extended also to the ʿAṣīr and the Yemen, lasted only a short time and collapsed in 134/752 as the result of an ʿAbbāsīd expedition led by the general Khāzm b. Khuzayma; the imām was killed in a battle. The Ibādīyya of ʿUmān seem to have been considerably weakened by this defeat, although the ʿAbbāsīd governor placed in the country by al-Saffāh appears to have been tolerant towards the sect’s doctrine. But already towards the second half of the 2nd/8th century, as a result of new hamālat al-ʿimām (in particular the famous al-ʿAṣīr b. al-Muṣṭahir) sent to this province by Abū ʿUbayda’s successor, al-Rabit b. Ḥābīb, and of the activities of Mūsā b. Abī Dābī, the Ibādīs rose up again and recommenced their activities in ʿUmān. The centre of this new movement was the town of Nazwa and it was then that, in 177/793, a council held under the presidency of Mūsā b. Abī Dābī al-Azkanī, there was proclaimed imām of ʿUmān Muḥammad b. ʿAffān (known also as Muḥammad b. ʿAbī Allāh b. Abī ʿAffān or Muḥammad b. Abī ʿAffān), a member of the Axī tribe of Banū Ḥamīd. It seems that under the reign of his successor, al-Wāriʿ b. Kaʿb al-Kharṣ (179-92/795-808), the *masākiyr* of Basra transferred themselves to ʿUmān, which then continued to exist as the centre of the spiritual geography of the ʿAṣīr and the Hadramawt. The Ibādīyya this Ibādī saying is significant: *bāda ʾ-l-ʿimām bi-ʾl-Madīna wa-farrābā bi-ʾl-Basra wa-fāra ʿl-ʿumān, “Knowledge was laid in Medina, hatched in Basra and flew to ʿUmān” (see al-Sālimi, *Lum’a*, 1, 183). It should be added that the identification of al-Wāriʿ b. Kaʿb al-Kharṣi with al-Wāriʿ b. Kaʿb al-Ḥaḍrami, the Ibādī imām of the ʿAṣīr, who lived in the second half of the 2nd/8th century, is very possible. Among the other Ibādī imāms of ʿUmān should be mentioned Ghassān b. ʿAbī Allāh al-Yahmadi al-Azdī (died 207/822-3), “Abī al-Malik b. Ḥāmid (who reigned for 18 years), and al-Muḥanna b. Dīʾaʾar (226-37/841-52). During the latter’s reign, the Ḥaḍramawt formed part of the kingdom of ʿUmān. His successor, al-Ṣalt b. Mālik, reigned until 273/887. One other Ibādī imām of ʿUmān of this period is known: Rāghī b. al-Nadr, who reigned immediately after al-Ṣalt b. Mālik. He then had now already begun the period of discord and internecine strife (the war between the Nizārī and the Hinawī tribes). During the 3rd/9th century, certain Ibādī chiefs of ʿUmān bore the title of wāṣī (governor) or of mutaḥaddīs (chief), since during this period it was the Rustomids who were recognized as universal imāms of the Ibādīyya. Nevertheless, these Ibādī rulers of ʿUmān were elected by the inhabitants of the country and not appointed by the imāms of the Maghrib. ʿUmān was divided into several districts with governors in charge of them. The imāms or the mutaḥaddīms lived at Nazwa. In 280/893 ʿUmān was reconquered by the ʿAbbāsīds, it was theçe of Musa b. Abī Dābī al-Kharusi (179-92/795-808), the Ibādī imām of the ʿAṣīr, who was killed. ʿUmān’s dependence on the ʿAbbāsīd caliphate was only superficial; in actual fact the Ibādī imāmāte continued to exist there without interruption. The Ibādī sources mention the names of several imāms who reigned in the 4th/10th century. During the first part of this century the Ibādīyya of ʿUmān continued to exercise their authority over the country of Mahra. For the later history of the Ibādīs of ʿUmān reference may be made to the plentiful literature on this subject which is cited at the end of this section. It should be mentioned that the chronology of the facts mentioned above is not always certain and there will be found some discrepancies between facts given here and those in earlier works by this author.

Little is known about the precise distribution of the Ibādīs in Yemen during the Middle Ages. From the chronicles of the country, such as Siyar al-ʿUmānīyi-ya, *Kashk al-khummä*, etc., it can be established that the most important Ibādī groups in ʿUmān were found to the south of an imaginary line drawn between the towns of Şuḥrā and Tawwām (now al-Tawwām or al-Bereyma). The Ibādīyya occupied particularly the district of al-Bātina and the surroun-
of the Ibadī cants and districts mentioned in the sources. Among these places were: the Talid al-Hadrami. Under these two leaders, who also depended on the Hawwara, the remainder of what is now Tripolitania was referred to by the mediaeval Arabic authors as Uman. Today, the majority of the Ibadis in the 6th/12th century (al-Idrisi, tr. Jaubert, 92, 205; op. cit., fol. 4v.). Salama’s activity appears to have been fairly successful, the limits of the area occupied by the Ibadis were much narrower than those of Uman itself, especially during its greatest period in the 3rd/9th century. Today Ibadism is the religion of the main fractions of the Uman tribes of Ghāfīrī and Hīnā (al-Shammakī, op. cit., 78, 93 and passim; al-Dardjīnī, Kitiš Tabābālī al-maṣāyib). MS no. 275 of the Cracow collection, f. 14v-15v; the Barrādī, op. cit., 170; Siyar al-Umāniyya, 174, 219, 277, 667, 676, 677 and passim; Masqueray, op. cit., 136-43; Al-Salīmī, Tuhafat al-ayyām bi-sīrat al-Uman, i-ii, Cairo 1247, passim; al-Tabarī, iii, 78, 81, 484, 501; Sāli ibn Razīk, History of the Imamas and Seyyids of Oman,.., tr. G. F. Badger, London 1871, passim; E. Sachau, Über eine arabisch chronik aus Zanzibar, in MSOS, i, 19-19; C. Huart, Histoire des Arabes, ii, Paris 1913, 257-82; L. Massignau, Annuaire du monde musulman, 56-60; H. Klein, Kapitel XXXIII der anonymen arabischen Chronik Kalif al-Qumma al-Gaṃīs, aṣṣābūn al-umma beteiligt, Aṣṣāb al-Uman min aṣsalāmātik til ḥaftā kalimatikhu... (thesis), Hamburg 1938; Le Vecchia Vaglietti, L’imamato ibadīs da’l’ Omaņ, in AIUON, n.s. iii (1949), 245-82; T. Lewicki, Les Ibadites dans l’Arabie du Sud, passim; several references to the Ibadis of Uman are found also in the works of many Sunni Arab geographers and historians).

The origins of the Ibadīyya on the coast of Africa (the Bilād al-Zanj) are found in the 6th/12th century. Among the Ibadī ghayyabs of the 6th/12th century is found an East African doctor, al-Walīd b. Bārid al-Kūlī al-Ibadī, from the town of Kilwa. The Ibadī element in the Bilād al-Zanj appears to have grown in the 11th-12th/17th-18th centuries when the major part of the east coast of Africa was linked with Uman. Today, the majorities of the Ibadīs of East Africa live in Zanzibar (Sāli ibn Razīk, op. cit., 92, 205; Siyar al-Umāniyya, 671).

(K) Egypt. At a comparatively recent period, the Ibadī doctrine was spread also in Egypt, which soon became one of the main centres of Ibadī learning together with Basra and Medina. The Ibadī sect mention two persons from ‘Uman and Basra who were at the same time merchants and Ibadī scholars, Abū ʻUbayda Abū Allāh b. Kāsim al-Ṣaghīr and al-Nazar b. Maymūn, who went to China in the 2nd/8th century (al-Masquray, op. cit., v, 231; al-Salīmī, Lum’a, 183; Sāli ibn Razīk, op. cit., 35); Lewicki, Les premiers commerçants arabes en Chine, in RO, xi, 173-86).

(L) Idrīsīya and the Maghrib. The Ibadī groups of North Africa played for a certain period a predominant role in the history of this sect. The first to preach the Ibadī doctrines there was Salāma b. ʻAbd (Salma b. Sa’d), a ghayyab of Basra who appeared towards the beginning of the 2nd/8th century at Kayrawān accompanied by the Şūrfi missionary Ikrīma, a mawāl of Ibn ʻAbbās (d. 1077/725-6; cf. Masqueray, op. cit., 3-4; al-Shammakī, op. cit., 98; al-Dardjīnī, op. cit., fol. 4v.). Salāma’s activity appears to have been fairly successful, since we find in Tripolitania, about twenty years later, a fairly large Ibadī group under the leadership of a certain ʻAbd Allāh b. Mas’ūd al-Tajjībī. This leader drew his support at first from the Berber tribe of the Hawwārā [q.v.], which in the Middle Ages occupied Tripoli and the region to the east of it as far as the ṣaḥba of Tārūgha. The authority passed next to two Ibadī chiefs, ʻAbd al-Di‘abār b. Kays al-Murādī and al-Harībī b. Talīd al-Haḍramī. Under these two leaders, who also depended on the Hawwārā, the remainder of what is now Tripolitania should be mentioned in particular Abū Ghanīm Bishr b. Ghanīm al-Kurāshī (3rd/9th century), the author of the famous work known under the title of al-Mudawwana, Ibadis are also found at about the beginning of the 2nd/8th century in Fars. It is not known whether the Ḥamzīyya, whose existence in Persia is mentioned by al-Mas’ūdī, were followers of the Ibadī sectarian Hamza al-Kūfī (see below) or were a sub-branch of the ʻAdārīda (al-Shammakī, op. cit., 87, 88, 113, 116, 118, 119; Siyar al-Umāniyya, 667; al-Salīmī, Lum’a, 185, 186; al-Mas’ūdī, op. cit., v, 230-1; al-Sahbāstānī, tr. Haar- brücker, i, 44-5; A. de C. Motylinski, Le nom berbère de Dieu chez les Abadistes, in RAfr., (1905), 146).

(M) Idrīsīya and the Maghrib. The Ibadī groups of North Africa played for a certain period a predominant role in the history of this sect. The first to preach the Ibadī doctrines there was Salāma b. ʻAbd (Salma b. Sa’d), a ghayyab of Basra who appeared towards the beginning of the 2nd/8th century at Kayrawān accompanied by the Şūrfi missionary Ikrīma, a mawāl of Ibn ʻAbbās (d. 1077/725-6; cf. Masqueray, op. cit., 3-4; al-Shammakī, op. cit., 98; al-Dardjīnī, op. cit., fol. 4v.). Salāma’s activity appears to have been fairly successful, since we find in Tripolitania, about twenty years later, a fairly large Ibadī group under the leadership of a certain ʻAbd Allāh b. Mas’ūd al-Tajjībī. This leader drew his support at first from the Berber tribe of the Hawwārā [q.v.], which in the Middle Ages occupied Tripoli and the region to the east of it as far as the ṣaḥba of Tārūgha. The authority passed next to two Ibadī chiefs, ʻAbd al-Di‘abār b. Kays al-Murādī and al-Harībī b. Talīd al-Haḍramī. Under these two leaders, who also depended on the Hawwārā, the remainder of what is now Tripolitania...
AL-IBADIYYA

came under the control of the Ibadiyya. Among the Berber tribes converted to Ibadism at this period were the Zanata of western Tripolitania and the Nafusi of the coastal road which linked the Tripolitanian Djebel which today still bears their name. Al-Harbîh is said to have been proclaimed imâm al-akhkâm, but it is more likely that al-Harith and Abd al-Djabbâr reigned together (Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, Futûh Mısır, ed. Torrey, 244; al-Barrâdî, op. cit., 170; al-Shammâkhî, op. cit., 175, 597; T. Lewicki, La répartition géographique des groupements ibadîtes dans l’Afrique du Nord au moyen-âge, in RO, xxi (1957), 297; Ibn Khâdir, Vies des Berberes, tr. de Slane, i, 219). After the deaths of al-Harbîh and of Abd al-Djabbâr, who killed each other in 133/750 (or in 132/749-50), it was Ismâ‘îl b. Ziyâd al-Nafûsî who was elected leader by the Ibâdi Berber tribes of Tripolitania with the title of imâm al-dîfî* (imâm of the caliphate), but it was killed near this town in an encounter with the troops of Abd al-Rahmân b. Habîb, the Arab governor of Kayrawân. His death took place soon after his election (T. Lewicki, Études ibadîtes-nord-africaines, part i, Warsaw 1957, 23, lines 1-2 and 127-8). It was probably at this time that there appeared the Ibâdi (of Berber origin) 'Umar b. Imkaten. According to the early Ibâdi chronicles he was the first to teach the Kurân in the Djaral Nafûsî, having learned it himself on the great coastal road which linked the Maghrib to the East, in the region of Maghmâdâs (the Macomades Syrtsis of antiquity and the present day Marsa Zâfrânî; al-Shammâkhî, op. cit., 142; Lewicki, Études ibadîtes nord-africaines, 55). After the death of Ismâ‘îl b. Ziyâd al-Nafûsî, the Ibâdi state of Tripolitania collapsed, but the population remained Ibâdi. It was from Tripolitania or from the neighbouring districts of southern Tunisia that, in the years after 140/756, several Berbers came to Başra to study under the president of the Ibâdi madhâhîl there, Abû 'Ubayyadâ al-Tamîmî. Among these persons, who later returned to preach the Ibâdi faith in Tripolitania, were a certain Ibn Mağhîr (Ibn Mughîr), a Nafûsî who was still alive in about 195 (Strothman, Les Berbères, xvi, 266; Lewicki, op. cit., passim; al-Shammâkhî, op. cit., 34; al-Bakri, op. cit., text 7, tr. 22; Ibn Khâldûn, op. cit., i, 374-5; Fournel, op. cit., i, 358-60; Lewicki, Études ibadîtes-nord-africaines, 113-4). The remnants of the Ibâdiyya either withdrew into the interior of Tripolitania or crossed into the central Maghrib. Gradually there arose new centres of resistance against the 'Abbasids. Thus Abû al-Rahmân b. Rustâm, the former Ibâdi governor of Kayrawân and one of the hamalât al-ilm, fleeing from the Arab army which had re-taken Ifrîkiya, went (by way of Sûf Adjîdûlî to the west of the Bilâd al-Djarîd, where there had collected several Ibâdi scholars from Tripolitania) towards the present-day Algeria, where he founded (or rather rebuilt) the town of Tâhert. Soon several of these Ibâdi fractions (most of them probably emigrés from Ifrîkiya), such as the Lamâya, the Lawâtâ and the Nafzawî, rallied to this leader. Abû al-Rahmân b. Rustâm seems to have been fairly powerful, since the leader of the Ibâdiyya of Tripolitania after the death of Abû 'l-Khaṭṭâb, the Hawwâri Abu Hatîm al-Malzûzî, for a time sent him the zakât, thus acknowledging his supremacy. In addition to these two leaders, there were others in North Africa at this time, as for example 'Aṣîm al-Sadrâtî, who is even referred to as imâm by the Ibâdi writers, and al-Miswâr al-Zanâtî (Masqueray, op. cit., 40-2; al-Shammâkhî, op. cit., 133, 135, 138, 141; al-Bakri, op. cit., text 68, tr. 140; Ibn Khâldûn, op. cit., i, 220, 221, 375, 380; Fournel, op. cit., i, 371). As a result of the activity of these various leaders, there broke out in North Africa, in 135/768, an Ibâdi revolt which the Sûfrs also joined. At the head of the rebels was Abû Hâtîm, who took the title of imâm al-dîfî'. The Arabic sources provide details of this revolt, the most famous episodes of which were the capture of al-Kayrawân by Abû Hâtîm, who took it from the Arabs, and the siege of Tûbûna in the Zâb. After some years of fighting, Abû Hâtîm yielded to the army of the 'Abbasids general Yâsîr b. Hâtîm, which had attacked him in the east of Tripolitania, and he died in 155 (Masqueray, op. cit., 41-9; al-Shammâkhî, op. cit., 135-8; Ibn Khâldûn, op. cit., i, 221-3, 375-8; al-Barrâdî, op. cit., 173; Fournel, op. cit., i, 364-80). After the defeat of Abû Hâtîm and the collapse of the Ibâdi imâmâte of Tripolitania, there took place a migration towards the west of the Berber Ibâdi fractions of Tripolitania and Tunisia. It was probably which was then in the possession of the Sûfrs of the Berber tribe of Warri'djûlûm. As a result of these successes of Abû 'l-Khaṭṭâb there arose a fairly important Ibâdi state, which included the whole of Tripolitania from the western frontier of Barka, Tunisia and the whole of the east of present-day Algeria, including the country of the Ketâmâ in the north of the department of Constantine. It even seems that Abû 'l-Khaṭṭâb also exercised a certain influence over the Sûfrs of Sûflûmâs (Masqueray, op. cit., 34; al-Shammâkhî, op. cit., 130 and passim; al-Bakri, Kitâb al-Malâkh was-łamamâkhî, ed. de Slane, 149, tr. 112-4). Ibn Khâldûn, op. cit., text 375; H. Fournel, Les Berbers, Paris 1875-81, i, 357; Lewicki, Études ibadîtes-nord-africaines, 112-4).
as part of this migration that some Kharidii fractions from Ifrikiya crossed into the country of the Kerad in 156, as mentioned by Ibn Khaldun. These emigrants probably joined ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Rustam, and the headquarters of the North African Ibādiyya became the town of Tāḥert. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Rustam was elected imām in 160 or 162 (Masqueray, op. cit., 49 ff.; al-Shammākhī, op. cit., 138 ff.; A. de C. Motylinski, Chronique d’Ibn Saḥghir, 63-4). With this there began the consolidation of all the Ibādī groups of North Africa around the imām of Tāḥert. It was under the two successors of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Rustam, namely ʿAbd al-Waḥhāb b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (168-208/984-823) and al-ʿĀlāb b. ʿAbd al-Waḥhāb (208-58/823-72), that the Ibādīsm of the Maghrīb reached its peak. <Abd al-Waḥhāb (208-58/823-72), that the Ibādīsm of Ifrikiya in the same year, 171, tr., p. 73), all the country between Tlemcen and Tripoli. To the west, the Rustamid state included the district around Tāḥert, as well as the territory of Sārū inhabited by the Ibādī factions of the Berber tribes of Tlemcen and Sārū (Kastīliya), Kāntara, Nafzawa, and Harthān. The remains of the state of Tāḥert continued to exist until 224/839, when the Aghlabid army, the last Rustamid imām, Abu ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿArifī, who founded the Fatimid state in Ifrikiya (cf. al-Shammākhī, op. cit., 88-9, tr. 63; Ibn al-Fakhīr, al-Buldūn, 79; M. Vonderheyden, La Berberie orientale, Paris 1927, passim; T. Lewicki, La répartition géographique des groupements ibaadites dans l’Afrique du Nord au moyen-âge, in RO, xxi (1957), 301-43; ibid., Les Ibādītes en Tunisie au moyen-âge, Rome 1959; idem, Un document ibādī inédit sur l’émigration des Nafusa du Gabal, in Folia Orientalia, i/2 (1960) 175-91, ii (1950), 214-6). Outside North Africa, the Ibādī groups of ʿAṣrā and throughout the East also recognized the supremacy of Ibn Rustam and of his successors and dated with his name their books and their testaments (Masqueray, op. cit., 53; A. de C. Motylinski, Chronique d’Ibn Saḥghir, tr. 65-71). This was probably the reason why the Ibādī rulers of ʿUmān sometimes, in the 3rd/9th century, bore the title of wāli (governor) or of muṭābaddīm (leader) together with that of imām (see above).

Towards the second half of the 3rd century, the imām of Tāḥert, split by the political schisms of al-Nukkār, of the Ḥulafāʾīyya, of Ibn Māṣūla (who created an independent Ibādī state in Tāḥert) and others (see below), and cut into two separate parts because of the success of the Aghlabids in conquering the whole of southern Tunisia, was approaching ruin. Rustamid influence in Tripolitania was completely destroyed in 283/896, when the Aghlabid army defeated in the famous battle of Mānūn (between Tripoli and Kābīs) the powerful Ibādī Berber tribe of the Naṣūf, which had been the main support of the Rustamid state in Ifrikiya (cf. al-Shammākhī, op. cit., 267-9; al-Dardjīnī, op. cit., fol. 31v; Masqueray, op. cit., 194-202; Ibn ʿIthārī, op. cit., i, 129; Fournel, op. cit., i, 575; Vonderheyden, op. cit., 44-5). The remains of the state of Tāḥert continued to exist until 296/909, when it finally fell before the armies of Abu ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿArifī, who founded the Fatimid state on the ruins of the Ibādī state, and the Fatimid states of Sigīlmsīa the new and powerful Fāṭimid kingdom. After Tāḥert had been taken by the Fāṭimid army, the last Rustamid imām, Abu Yūsuf Yaʿkūb, fled, with his family and with the most important scholars and men of influence from Tāḥert, to Sārū (in the oasis of Wargla) on the southern borders of the state of Tāḥert, where for a time they dreamed of re-establishing the Ibādī imām in this locality (al-Shammākhī, op. cit., 535;
Masqueray, op. cit., 251-8; Fournel, op. cit., ii, 52-93).
This idea was abandoned, perhaps as the result of a
Fatimid expedition in the direction of the oasis of
Wargla, mentioned in the works of Ibn Khaldun (op. cit., 220-1). Moreover, a
new Ibadi imamate was already being formed in
the Djibal Nafusa, where the Fatimid army did not
penetrate until very much later.

There should be mentioned here the activities of
Abū Yabāy Zakaryây? al-Irdjâm. This leader, who
is given in the Ibādî sources the title of ḥākim or of
imām muḍḍaf, and who lived in the Djibal Nafusa,
ruled for about fifteen years. This is the very example
known of a North African Ibādî-Wahbi chief taking
the title of imām after the fall of the imamate of
the Banû Rustam. His power did not extend beyond the
limits of the Djibal Nafusa, but he nevertheless
succeeded in preserving the independence of this
territory from the Fatimids. He died in 311/923-4. His successors, who bore the title of ḥākim, were
also in fact independent of the Fatimid state. Later,
one of the ḥākims of the Djibal Nafusa was forced, in
about 450-50, to recognize the supremacy of the
Zirids. The semi-independent Ibādī ḥākims (and later sha'yâkhs) of the Djibal Nafusa still existed in
the 8th/14th century (T. Lewicki, Ibādītica, 2: Les
Ḥākimī du Gabal Nafūsa, in RO, xxvi [1962], 97-123).

In the first half of the 4th/10th century, there took
place a further unsuccessful attempt to re-establish
the Ibādī state in North Africa. This time it was a
member of the Nukkāris sect, Abū Yazid Maḥlab b.
Kaydād (d. 335/946-7), who rallied round him the
Ibādī tribes of Tripolitania, the Zāb and the other
districts of the Maghrib (see EI 1, suppl., AL-NUKKĀR).
Twenty years later, the Ibādīyya of the Maghrib
made a further attempt, and declared in 358 a
ṣuqārī against the Fatimids. This revolt, which
broke out in the Bilad al-Djarid, was led by two
Ibādī-Wahbi sha'yâkhs of the tribe of the Banū
Kaydād and, after his death, Abū Khazar (according to Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., ii, 542:
Abū Dja'far al-Zanātī); it achieved for the Ibādīs
temporary domination of Tripolitania, of southern
Tunisia, of the island of Djarba, of the Zāb and of
the oases of the Rīd and of Wargla (Wargla).
The wilâyat al-djirî was proclaimed, governors were
appointed for all the provinces and it was even
possible to enter into relations with the Umayyads of Spain. Abū Khazar assembled
an enormous army, the tribe of the Maṣāţa alone
providing him with 12,000 horsemen. But this
insurrection also failed, and, after the rout of the
rebels at Bâghāy, the Ibādīyya of North Africa had
to submit to the Fatimids (Masqueray, op. cit., 388-
370; al-Ṣaḥmāhī, op. cit., 346-62; Fournel, op. cit.,
ii, 349).

After this revolt, the Ibādīs of North Africa made
no further attempts to restore an imamate and they
returned to the state of kitmān. Nevertheless, in the
various parts of the Maghrib and Hīrikiya there were
formed small Ibādī-Wahbi political organizations,
independent or semi-independent of the Fatimids
and of the Sunni North African dynasties. There
have been mentioned above the Ibādīs of the
Djibal Nafusa and the Ibādī groups of Tripolitania and of the Fezzān which survived from the
Rustamid rule (which however in the majority of
these provinces came to an end towards the middle
of the 3rd/9th century). The history of the Ibādī
groups in Tunisia at this time has been dealt with in
T. Lewicki, Les Ibādīs en Tunisie au moyen-âge.

The oasis of Wargla was governed, towards the 4th/
10th century, by a council of notables (ṣuqārī,
ṣuqārī, al-djirî; cf. al-Dardjīnī, op. cit., fol. 38v;
al-Ṣaḥmāhī, op. cit., 365). Later, in the 5th/11th century, there appeared among the Ibādīs of
North Africa (alongside the ḥākim, the muḥammad and the raʾs) a new form of government: a theocratic
government formed by councils of recluses (al-
ṭuṣūs) presided over by a sha'yāk who exercised
authority over the entire life of the Ibādī groups (see Haša).

As a result of civil wars and of the defeat of the
rebels by the Fatimids, followed by the repression
of these rebels by the Fatimids and other Sunni rulers of North Africa, there began a decline of North
African Ibādīs which seems to have been accelerated
after the migration of the Banû Hillâl. The North Afri-
can Ibādīs withdrew, from the 6th/12th century
wards, into a few barely accessible regions where
they have continued to exist until the present day.
Thus the Ibādīs escaping from the central Maghrib
at first joined the Ibādī groups of the oasis of Wargla
and the Rīd and thereafter even founded new
colonies in the Mzaib, to which there came later the
remnants of the Ibādīyya of Wargla and of the Rīd.

The Ibādīs of Tripolitania were concentrated towards
the end of the Middle Ages in the Djibal Nafusa.
Today Ibādīs is practised in North Africa only
in Mzaib, in two-thirds of the island of Djarba,
and of the coast of western Tripolitania and
in half of the Djibal Nafusa. They are still
divided there into two main sects: the Wahbis and
the Nukkāris, the last remnants of a once-powerful
population which formerly played a very considerable
role in the history of North Africa.

The Ibādī imāms and doctors of North Africa
maintained fairly active relations with the muqaddâRAFT of Baṣra and Mecca and with the scholars of ʿUman.
There are preserved in the Ibādī chronicles of
the Maghrib several fragments of the letters exchanged
by the North African Ibādīyya and their co-
religionists in the East (cf., e.g., Masqueray, op. cit.,
65-6). Also the Eastern Ibādīs often travelled or sent
embassies to the Maghrib, especially during the rule
of the Banû Rustam, e.g., the journey made to the
Maghrib by the Ḫūrâsâni doctor Abū ʿAlî al-Ṣaḥmāhī (A. de C. Motylinski, Chemins des
Uman, 2, pp. 65-71; Masqueray, op. cit., 53-63, 74-5, 136-41). Conversely, scholars from the Maghrib often
travelled to the East (Masqueray, op. cit., 180-5; A. de C.
Motylinski, op. cit., tr. 112). After the fall of the
Rustamid imāmate, relations between the Ibādīs of
North Africa and those of the East became less close.
Nevertheless, as late as the 7th/13th century, the
muqaddâRAFT of ʿUman sent to the Maghrib several
Ibādī writings in the East, and one of the most
important North African Ibādīs writers, al-Dardjīnī,
was commissioned to write a history of the North
African Ibādīyya for the use of those of ʿUman.

(n) Western and central Sudan. In his important article Sur la diffusion des formes d'archi-
tecture religieuse musulmane à travers le Sahara, in
Travaux de l'Institut de Recherches Sahariennes,
xi (1954), no. 11-27, J. Schacht has demonstrated that it
was the Ibādīs of southern Tunisia, of Wargla and
of the Mzaib who brought the characteristic features
of Muslim religious architecture across the Sahara to the Hausa, the Kanuris and the Fulbe (Peuls). Thus the "staircase minaret" reaching the Sudan from southern Tunisia via Wargla, the rectangular minbar came from the Mzab, and the absence of a minbar among the Fulbe is due to the influence of the Ibāḍīs. According to J. Schacht, it was the Ibāḍīs also who introduced Islam itself into part of "Black Africa". The mediaeval Arabic sources, and especially the North African Ibāḍī sources, provide in fact many interesting and credible proofs of the activity of Ibāḍī missionaries, in western and central Sudan, from the 2nd/8th to the 8th/14th century. The town of Tahert, the capital of the Rustamid state, had in the 8th/14th to the 9th/15th century, the centre of intensive activity of the Ibacli sect of the Nukkaris against the Fatimids. According to al-Bakri, the route from Tāmdemka to al-Kayrawān, which was very important for Saharan trade, went through the (Ibāḍī) oasis of Wargla and through southern Tunisia, which also had a very numerous Ibāḍī population, as is known from other sources. There was also a caravan route which linked Tāmdemka to the town of Tripoli and which passed through Ghadames, a town which still had an Ibāḍī population in the 8th/14th century. The North African Ibāḍī chronicles provide various details particularly on the commercial relations between the oasis of Wargla, the Bilād al-Djarīd and the Djabal Nafūsa on the one side and Tāmdemka on the other.

As for commercial relations between Ibāḍīs and the central Sudan (the environs of Lake Chad) those mainly interested were the merchants of Tripolitania and the Fezzān, particularly those of the Djabal Nafūsa and of the little Fezzān state of Jawila (present-day Zouila), which had an Ibāḍī population as early as 145/762 and which was still Ibāḍī in the time of al-Yaʾṣūb, the second half of the 3rd/9th century. Jawila was considered as the gateway to the central Sudan, and it held a near monopoly of the slave trade in this country. Relations between the Ibāḍīs of the Djabal Nafūsa and the negro populations of the basin of Lake Chad were very close. The governor of the Djabal Nafūsa on behalf of the Rustamid imāms, Abū Ubayda 'Abd al-Hamīd al-Djanawunī (first half of the 3rd/9th century), spoke, in addition to Berber and Arabic, the Kanemī language, probably Kanonī. These commercial relations were in operation along a very ancient route which led across the Fezzān and the Kawkār. According to modern Ibāḍī writers (al-Barūnī, Rīḍā al-Sammā wa l-mubātādi'n, Cairo 1324, 23-4), there were still supporters of Ibāḍīsm in the Sudan towards the end of the 19th century (J. Schacht, op. cit., passim; T. Lewicki, Quelques extraits inédits relatifs aux voyages des commerçants et des missionnaires ibadites nord-africains au pays du Soudan occidental et central au cours des VIIIe-XIIe siècles, in Bibliographie Islamique, ii4 (1964), 513-35; idem, Traité d'histoire du commerce transsaharien, Marchands et missionnaires ibadites en Soudan occidental et central au cours des VIIIe-XIIe siècles, in Etnografia Polska, vii (1964), 291-332).

(o) Spain and Sicily. From the Maghrib, Ibāḍīsm penetrated at a comparatively late date into Spain. Among the six members of the ghūrā of Tāmdemka that had to choose the imām in 168/784-5, after the death of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Rustam, there were two of Spanish origin: Masudd al-Andalusi and 'Ulama b. Marwān al-Andalusi (Masqueray, op. cit., 145). Remnants of the Ibāḍīyya still existed in Spain in the 5th/11th century (Ibn Hazm, Fīṣāl, iv, 170, 192). Similarly, there was an Ibāḍī-Wahhabi colony in Sicily in the 4th and 5th centuries (al-Wisānī, op. cit., 159-60).

**Doctrine**

The Ibāḍīyya, together with another Kharājī sect, the Shīrīyya, form the moderate branch of the Kharājīs. The Shi'ite branch of the Kharājī sects was represented by the Azařīk (see AΖARĪKA), on several
points, the most important of which is the belief that non-Kharidii Muslims are regarded as heretics; this was how the affair of the schism of al-Nukkār came about. The imām could be deposed if he did not observe the dogmas; the judges who had to decide whether he was conforming with the doctrine were probably the most important among those of Basra (Masqueray, op. cit., 144-5, n.). It seems that custom allowed several Ibādī imāms to exist simultaneously in different countries of the Muslim world; indeed, there were at the same time Ibādī imāms at Tāhert, in ʿUmān, the Ḥadramawt, etc. This principle was clearly expressed in the doctrine of the Hamzīyya, a branch of the Khāridji sect of the Adākrida, a group in which the simultaneous existence of several imāms was permitted until the whole world has been finally converted (see al-Shahrastānī, tr. Haarbrieker, i, 145). Nevertheless, there had been a tendency for the Ibādī world to form itself into a universal imāmate, which did in fact succeed towards the end of the 2nd/8th century, though only for a rather short period. We are referring here to the Rustamī imāms, who were recognized for a certain period by all the Ibādī groups of the west and the east, although of course, because of their distance from one another, these groups could neither unite nor achieve uniformity (Masqueray, op. cit., 51, 74-5). From the historical accounts, although they are rather uneven, it can be concluded that in addition to the imāmate there was also practised in certain cases another form of government—a sort of condominium, as in the case of al-Ḥārīth and of ʿAbd al-Djabbar, who were, according to the expression of al-Barrādī (op. cit., 170) muḍtārīḥīn fiʾl-mulk. It is true that this fact, which was a denial of the cardinal principles of Khāridjism, was an embarrassment to the doctors of the sect (see al-Barrādī, op. cit., 170-2).

In general, the dogma and the politico-religious theories of the Ibādīyya resemble on certain main points those of the Sunnis. The Ibādīyya differ from the Mālikīs on only a few points, among which is their theory on the creation of the īrān in the time of the Prophet must be considered as the most important (see Z. Smogorzewski, Un poème abddite sur certains divergences entre les Mālikites et les Abdites, in RO, ii, 260-8). There has also been pointed out the very close affinity between the Ibādī dogma and that of the Muʿtazila (Goldziher, cf. al-Shahrastānī, op. cit., 170); C. Nallino, in RSO, vii, 455-60). Unfortunately the existing sources do not provide a clear outline of the historical process by which the Muʿtazilī elements mingled with the Ibādīyya. It must, however, be mentioned that this Muʿtazī influence on Ibādī doctrine was so considerable that the Arab geographer al-Bakrī refers to the Ibādī sect as al-Wāsliyya-Ibādīyya (op. cit., tr. text, 72). The relations between these two sects even led to the foundation of a number of mixed sects.

It should be added that the Ibādīs were also eminent theologians. The earliest mutakallīm known was an Ibādī of Basra, Bīstam b. Umar b. al-Muslib-al-Dabbī (see above), who worked there between 77 and 81 (see al-Shamīkhī, op. cit., 111; on the Ibādī mutakallīms of the early period, see al-Shahrastānī, op. cit., 82, 83); the Muʿtazī mutakallīms consisted of the MĀliki scholars as the earliest do not appear until the 2nd/8th century (see Goldziher, op. cit., 80). On Ibādī doctrine, see, in addition to the works mentioned in this section: al-Shamīkhī, Kitāb al-Ībād, 1309, i-iv; al-Diyātālī, Kandārī al-bḥkrāyyā, 1307, i-ii; al-Sadrādī, Kitāb al-Dālī ʿal-ī-ibhrūn, 1306; Abī al-ʿAZīz (of the Bnī Īṣqūn), Kitāb al-Nī, 1305, i-ii; Aṭṭīyyaṣṣ, Sāḥib Kitāb al-Nī; Zeyd, Legislation
The religious and political unity of the Ibad sect was broken at a fairly early date by a number of schisms (ifirākh) and heresies (kādār), which resulted in the formation of numerous semi-political, semi-theological subdivisions (jirāḥ). These schisms were at first, during the period of hīman, of a purely dogmatic nature. Later, from the first half of the 2nd/8th century, these and other sects which were the result of political crises, which, in a theological system like that of the Ibadīyya, always appear as schisms. Among the political causes of the Ibadī schisms, two appear to have been of especial importance: the question of the condominium (iftirāk) (khilaf, mukhdāfa), and heresies (jirāḥ). This was concerned with the usurper Ibn Massala (or 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. al-Aswān), referred to by Ibadī authors as al-Hārith. The first half of the 2nd/8th century was purely political in origin, was founded in southern Arabia by 'Abd Allāh b. Ṭarfī, one of the companions of the imām Ṭabīb al-Hādhak, ca. 213/747. Its adherents were found mainly in the East, where Ibn Massala was an innovation (khutba). According to Nafath, the Ibadī sect known as al-Nafathiyya (or al-Naffatiyya), which was pure political in origin, was founded in Tripoli, towards the end of the 2nd/8th century by Khalaf b. al-Samb, a descendant of the imām 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. al-Aswān; it was not until later that it assumed the character of a schism over dogma. This branch had many adherents, especially in north-western Tripolitania. In the 3rd/9th century there took place another political schism among the Ibadīs of the Maghrib. This was concerned with the usurper Ibn Massala, the Ibadīs of the tribe of the Hawwāra, who founded an independent Ibadī state in the neighbourhood of Tāher. The Ibadī sect known as al-'Umarīyya was founded probably in the first half of the 2nd/8th century by ʿAbd Ṭarīq b. Umar (or 'Umayr). The 'Umarīyya differed considerably from the Wahhī Ibadīs and, according to 'Abd Zakariyya al-Wardānī, the doctrines of these two sub-sects differed completely. In matters concerning the Kurān, the 'Umarīs
followed the text of ‘Abd Allâh b. Mas‘ûd. Their adherents were found only in North Africa.

Some of the doctrines of al-‘Umariyya were similar to those of the Ibad branch of al-‘Haşan-iyâ (or al-Husayn-iyâ). The name of this scalar sub-sector, which was widespread only in North Africa, derives from its founder, Ahmad b. al-Husayn (al-‘Haşan) al-‘Aţrâbulusi al-Ibâdi, who appears to have lived in the first part of the 3rd/9th century. His diswâdân was known at Wargla towards the beginning of the 4th/10th century. Adherents of this branch still existed in the 6th/12th century in some districts to the east of the Djabal Nafusa.

In the first half of the 4th/10th century, there was formed the Ibâdi branch of the Fârîhiyya. Its founder, Sulaymân b. Ya‘kûb b. Aflâh, a descendant of the Rustamid imams who lived in the oasis of Wargla, forbade the eating of the large intestines of sheep (fârîh), hence the name of the sect. It may be that Sulaymân’s opinions were also influenced by the diswâdân of Ahmad b. al-Husayn al-‘Aţrâbulusi.

Nothing is known of the period when Sakkakî, the founder of another Ibâdi sect, the Sakkâkiyya, was teaching. This doctor considered that the communal prayer and the call to prayer were innovations; he also rejected the Sunna. The Wahbî Ibâdis described the Sakkâkiyya as mushrikun.

In addition to the works mentioned in the article, see: J. K. All A (I) (A.), a verbal noun meaning originally “belief” and “polytheism” there exists ma‘rîjat Allâh “knowledge of God”.

The adherents of the Ibâdi subdivision of the Hâﬁziyya, founded at an unknown period by Ḥâfîs b. Abî ‘l-Mîdkâm, maintained that between imân “belief” and ǧîrkh “polytheism” there exists ma‘rîjat Allâh “knowledge of God”.

The adherents of the Ibâdi subdivision of the Hâfziyya, founded at an unknown period by Ḥâfîs b. Abî ‘l-Mîdkâm, maintained that between imân “belief” and ǧîrkh “polytheism” there exists ma‘rîjat Allâh “knowledge of God”.

The sub-sector of the Yazidiyya, adherents of Yazid b. Abî Anisa (or Yazid b. Unays), and to be distinguished from another Ibâdi subdivision of the same name which is identical with the Nukkâris, held as one of their principal beliefs that God will reveal a new Kur’ân to a Persian prophet. It can thus be seen that Yazid carried to great lengths the theory of the fâhîrûd, “eminent qualities”, of the Persians and the Berbers in comparison with the Arabs, the gods of which are found also among the Wahbî Ibâdis.

Relations between these various Ibâdi subdivisions were in the main hostile. The Ibâdi historians often mention wars waged by the different branches, particularly the Nukkâris, the Banû Maşšâila and the Khalaﬁs, against the Rustamids. Nevertheless, there can be noticed from time to time, after the collapse of the imâmate of Tâherit, attempts at a reconciliation between several Ibâdi branches. Thus, for example, the population of the district of Zizû on the western coast of Tripolitania, composed of the adherents of the Ibâdi subdivisions of the Wahbiyya, the Nukkâr, the Khalaﬁyya and the Naffâhiyya, lived peacefully together under the direction of a common council, at the head of which in the first half of the 4th/10th century, was a Wahbî who had entrusted juridical decisions to a Nukkâr, the Ramâdân prayers to a Khalaﬁ and the call to prayers to a Naffâhi (T. Lewicki, Les subdivisions de l’Ibâdiyya, in Stud. Isl., ix (1958), 71-82).


**IBâHA (I) (A.), a verbal noun meaning originally “making a thing apparent or manifest”, with the implication that the beholder may take it or leave it, and then “making a thing allowable or free to him who desires it”; it has become a technical term with several connected meanings in the religious law of Islam; istisbaâha, taking a thing as allowed, free, or lawful; muhâb (the contrary of mahûf); “indifferent”, i.e., neither obligatory or recommended, nor forbidden or reprehensible; it is to be distinguished from its near synonym di‘âdha, “unobjectionable, valid, permitted”; the concept ha’âl, i.e., everything that is not forbidden, is wider.

The root does not occur in the Kur’ân. The earliest use of the word as a technical term, from Shâfi’i onwards, seems to have been with regard to those things which every one is permitted to use or appropriate; this meaning of ibâha is expressed, though still without using the term, in a tradition from the Prophet according to which “the Muslims have equal
rights to three things, water and fodder and fire" (Ibn Mādīq and Ahmad b. Ḥanbal; an earlier variant, in Abū Dāwūd, can be dated in the generation of A'māsh, d. 147 or 148/764-5). This has become a general rule of Islamic law, and also an article in the Maǧālila [q.v.]. In a narrower sense, the term may denote the authorization, given by the owner, to consume (part of) the produce of his property; this excludes appropriation and disposal in favour of a third person by the beneficiary; this rule, too, appears in the Maǧālila.

Dāi'ī madhhab, regard to acts is defined as "permission to carry out an act as the agent wishes" (Ḍihrāḏūni) or "a ruling which is not a request but gives the choice of acting or not" (Ṭahānawi); the performance of these acts is not meritorious, nor is their omission reprehensible. The details have been the subject of several controversies which in the works on usūl al-aʃār are often discussed in the sections devoted to the interpretation of the Kurān (an arrangement already apparent in the Kitāb Mafāštāh al-ʿulamāʾ of Khūwārzimān, 2nd and half of the 4th/10th cent.). The earliest of these controversies centred round the question whether the consumption of foodstuffs which had not been explicitly forbidden in the revelation was to be considered lawful or not. A tradition in Abū Dāwūd (415/31, 30) makes the Prophet say: "The pagans used to eat certain things and to refrain from certain things because they considered them unclean; now Allāh has sent His Prophet, has revealed His book, and has declared lawful and unlawful what is to be lawful and unlawful; therefore what He has declared lawful is lawful and what He has declared unlawful is unlawful, and what He has said nothing about is anything forbidden", etc. (Kurān, VI, 145). Also Kurān VII, 31 is taken to imply that all food and drink which has not been explicitly forbidden is lawful. Būkahārī, in the heading of a chapter (ʿīṣām, 27), without directly contesting the principle, makes the point that prohibitions enunciated by the Prophet must be taken to be declarations of unlawfulness unless it can be shown that the act in question is mubāh.

A similar doctrine is supported by the doctrines of the Khārfīḏs, and in particular the followers of Nāṣīda among them (al-ʿAṣhārī, Mākālātā, i, 90, 10-15, 127, 4-6); they were of the opinion that for religious duties to be incumbent, they must have been proclaimed by a Prophet, and that the individual could regard as lawful everything the prohibition of which had not been proved to him, so that he was excused if he was ignorant of the prohibition; the group of the Bayḥayṣyā ī went so far as to say that wine was originally permitted and there was nothing (in the Kurān) to forbid drinking it, even to the point of drunkenness (ibid., 117, 61).

In the controversies raised by the Muṭṭazilā [q.v.], this became a general discussion of the abstract quality of human acts, i.e., whether human acts, before revelation (or in the interval between two revelations), were to be regarded, in principle, as allowed or forbidden. The Muṭṭazilā, starting from their premise that reason decided whether acts were good (useful) or bad (harmful), were divided on the question of how to consider acts in which the qualificati ons of good and bad were evenly balanced, so as not even to lead to a preference for performing or avoiding them; the majority, it seems, regarded them as indifferent (mubāh), others as forbidden (maksūr), and others as left in abeyance (maḥṣūr) until their qualification was settled by revelation; nevertheless, these acts, not being positively bad, might be regarded as belonging to the category of good (in a wider meaning of the term) and such a distinction [q.v., too], together with "all ḥāris and groups among the followers of kiyyāt", concluded on the basis of Kurān X, 59 and XVI, 116 that the qualification must be left in abeyance. The opinions within the orthodox schools of law and theology, which in any case hold that the religious and legal qualities of goodness and badness are known not by reason but by revelation alone, were much firmer. The very basis of the reasoning of the Muṭṭazila, are divided; sūrā V, 1 and 4 are adduced in favour of the opinion that the acts in question are, in principle, forbidden, and sūrās II, 29 and XX, 50 in favour of the opposite opinion; the majority of the Ḥāfīzh class that they are allowed; the prevailing opinion among the Mālikīs and the Shāfiʿīs is that it is meaningless to apply those categories before revelation; the Ḥanbalīs are divided.

All are agreed, however, that in the actual law of Islam, generally speaking, everything which is not forbidden (or reprehensible) and does not, on the face of it, involve causing damage, is mubāh. This general rule has often found expression, from an early period onwards, in sayings of the most highly esteemed authorities, although it does not play a significant part in the doctrine of usūl al-aʃār. But al-Dāi'ī madhhab uses the principle that "everything that is not forbidden in the Kurān or in the sunna of the Prophet is lawful and unrestricted" (mubāh mualk) in an amusing way in order to show as legitimate the entertainment of male companions by singing slave-girls (Risālat al-Kiṣād, ed. Finkel, Cairo 1926, 56; transl., Pellat, in Arabic, i (1963), 125).

Bibliography: Lane, Lexicon, s.v.; Ṭahānawi, Dictionary of technical terms, s.v.; al-Dīhrāḏūni, Taṣrīf, s.v.; Santillana, Istuzzioni, i, 8, 14; J. Schacht, Introduction, 123; ʿṢāḥīf, Risāla, Būlāk 1321, 49; Ibn Rushd, Bidyāyat al-mudīthāhīd, K. al-bayyū ṣ, chap. 5 (transl. A. Lairmèche, Avroröes. Livre des échanges, Algiers 1940, 84); Maǧālila, arts. 836, 875, 1234; al-Kādī ʿAbd al-Dāi'ī madhhab, al-Muwalīn, xvii, Cairo 1963, 144-5; Abu ʿl-Husayn al-Baṣṭī, Kitāb al-Muṭṭamaḍ fi usūl al-hijrah wa l-nafs al-damasceni (with the commentary of al-Mahālī and the gloss of al-Kālām wa l-ḥarq wa l-ḥibbah); Ibn Ḥāzm, al- Ḥākm fi usūl al-ḥaqmah, i, Cairo 1345, 52 ff. (chapter 6); Fakhr al-Īslām al-Pazdawī, Kanz al-uswūl išīf al- Ḥākm fi usūl al-walid (with the commentary of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Buḥṣārī, Istanbul 1938, 85, 95. 128 (Bāb al-maʿwāradā); al-Ghāzālī, al-Muṣṭāfā, Būlāk 1322, i, 63, 75 (al- Ḥākb al-awwal, Fann 1 and 2); Muwaffak al-Dīn Ibn Kudūmā, Rawdat al-nasīr, Cairo 1342, i, 116-23 (section Ḥabībat al-ḥukm, Kism 3); al-Kāfārī, ʿ Ṣarḥ Tānībāt al-ṣufīs fi l-ḥurūf, Tunis 1328/1910, 77 ff. (chapter 1, Faṣl 7), 111 ff. (chapter 4, Faṣl 2); Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, Dīmāt al-đaʿwāmī (with the commentary of al-Maḥālī and the gloss of al- ʿAṭṭār), Cairo 1356/1937, i, 94 ff. (al-Muḥaddidī, ii, 304 (book 5, Muṣīb al-ḥakm al-mandāmil wa l-madārī); al-Ṣāḥīfī, al-Muwaṣṣalāhīd, ed. ʿAbd Allāh Dārārī, i, 109 ff. (K. al- Ḥākim, i, §§ 1-5); al-Suʾūṭī, al-ʿĀghāwī wa l-nafāṣīr, Mecca 1331, 58-63 (book 2, Kādīa 2); Ibn Nūdjaym, al-ʿĀghāwī wa l-nafāṣīr, Cairo 1322, 26 f. (Nawzī i, Kādīa 6); Ibn ʿAbīdīn, Radd al- muḥāt̄ wār (with the commentary of al-Ḥāṣafī, Istanbul 1324-6, iii, 337 (Kībat al- Ḥāṣafī, Bāb ʿisāfī al-huffār); Ibn Badrān, al-Madīthāhīd išīf
Among Sufis, antinomianism seems to have been later in developing; early Sufis were commonly rigorists in the cult and tutorists in points of conscience. But when Islamic spiritual life began to flow largely through Sufi channels, antinomian thinking appeared there too. Sometimes Sufis probably fell heir to the experience and even the language of earlier Shi'i traditions.

For Sufis, as for Shi'is, the texts of Kur'an and Hadith concealed a batin, a secret spiritual meaning; and some Sufis felt that following the batin was dispensed from the literal prescription. But whereas Shi'i antinomianism reflected the historical role of the imam and the elite community of his adherents, Sufi mysticism, like any mysticism, suggested a more personal rejection of literally formulated prescriptions. The batin was not an arbitrarily allegorical meaning of the letter, but rather an inner spirit to which the letter was an approximation, symbolization, or even exemplification, adapted to less spiritual minds. Accordingly, it could be expected that once this inner spirit was entered into, the actual letter was superfluous—the spirit would of itself call forth whatever action was needed.

This point of view took several forms. If God enlightened consciences directly, the scholastic interpretation of rules by shari'a scholars was artificial in comparison; hence, even those Sufis who upheld the norms worked out by the 'ulama' tended to argue on the basis of loyalty and exemplary zeal rather than claim that the shari'a 'ulama' really understood God's will better. Then Sufis believed that the advanced mystical devotee was the friend of God; and just as some Shi'is felt that whoever was devoted to the imam, even though not actually dispensed from shari'a rules, would be forgiven his transgressions, so some Sufis believed that the friend of God was free—that even if he still ought to perform God's commands, he did them out of uncoerced love; and if he slipped, he would be forgiven. Some held that the perfected Sufi saint could by his nature do no sin: whatever action he seemed to do must be understood otherwise.

Sufi discipline itself made for tension with the shari'a. The devotee who had reached high spiritual states might be so wholly in God's hands that he was not responsible for his own actions: if he did perform the ritual worship, it might be unawares—God took care of his enraptured worships. Especially illegal utterances (shakhsiyya') were held blameless under these circumstances. In any case, the novice must agree to obey his pir implicitly; many would add, even in seeming contravention of the shari'a. Moreover, Sufi ways of worship often seemed opposed to the shari'a—music and dance; even, eventually, taking drugs, or gazing at beautiful figures. Sufi apologists claimed that what was for a devotional purpose was exempted from the rules. Some of the Malamatiyya (q.v.), who made a point of concealing their virtues and not their vices, seem to have adopted the same positions on purpose to display them.

In all these cases, it was ordinary Sufi teaching which, however cautiously couched, at the least gave to a Sufi's obedience to shari'a rules a distinctive flavour. But all Sufism was esoteric: only the initiate could understand the real truth behind what was taught. Hence radiantly declared that the shari'a rules did not really apply to initiates at all. Moreover, as Sufis came to see all religions as equally legitimate—if not equally perfect—ways of approaching God, the rules of any one religion could seem little more than transient expedients.) Such radicals ranged from those who asserted antinomianism only as an esoteric principle, not to be actually practised, to those who, alleging some religious pretext, ignored the rules of any one religion could seem little more than transient expedients. But all Sufism was esoteric: only the initiate could understand the real truth behind what was taught. Hence radiantly declared that the shari'a rules did not really apply to initiates at all. Moreover, as Sufis came to see all religions as equally legitimate—if not equally perfect—ways of approaching God, the rules of any one religion could seem little more than transient expedients. (For example, the Nakshbandiyya and the Khadiriyya (q.v.); others, such as the Bektashiyya (q.v.), notably flouted conventional standards. Some jariyas were noted for insisting on the shari'a—for instance, the Naqshbandiyya and the Khadiriyya (q.v.); others, such as the Bektashiyya (q.v.), notably flouted conventional standards. Some jariyas were called in Persian, bid'at.

For some centuries, certain extreme antinomian dervishes were referred to as Kalandars (q.v.). But even within shari'a-observant jariyas, individual shaykhs might take a bid'at position.

Shi'i antinomianism sprang from chiliastic hopes: the hypocritically unjust world was to be transformed
and filled with justice by God's agent; what mattered was to dissociate oneself from the world and its ways and to stand ready to support the new order. Şifî antinomianism sprang rather from a mystical experience and vision, in which an inner ethical responsiveness made all external rules seem trivial or arbitrary. But the two sorts of vision, chiliasm and mystical, were often combined, especially in the later medieval period, when a Şii sect like the Nizâri Ismâ'îlîs took on the aspect of a Şii fârîka, while more than one Şii fârîka was adopting a Şii and more or less chiliasm outlook.

Bibliography: Most Şii writings of this period while upholding the şâ'irâ, have displayed one or more of the tendencies toward ibâda cited; Djiaâl al-Dîn Rûmî's Mathnawi exemplifies most of them. Ghâzâlî's polemic against the Ahl al-ibâda is edited and translated, with a useful introduction, “De Antinomismus der islamischen Mystik”, by Otto Pretzl, Die Streitschrift des Ghazali gegen die Ibadjija, Munich 1933 (SB Bayer. Ak., Phil.-hist. Abt., Jahrgang 1933, Heft 7).

( M. G. S. Hodgson)

IBÂHATIYA, Hindu sect. The Ibhâhtiyâ were, by some writers on Indo-Muslim history, confused with the Ibhâhtiya or Aṣhâb al-İbâha. As the Ismâ'îlîs are included among the latter, the writers have thought that the term Ibhâhtiya applies to them. A closer examination of the evidence, however, leads to the conclusion that the references are to a Hindu Tantric sect, which was also known as Vâma-mûrgî or Vâma-câri (“followers of the left hand path”) and formed a sub-section of the Shâktas. The Tântras form the scriptures of the Vâma-mûrgî. The essential requisites of Tântric worship are the five mûkharas, wine, flesh, fish, mystical gesticulations and sexual intercourse. They worship the female principle. The form of this worship is promiscuous intercourse in the form of communal orgies. The women place their cölîs (bodices) in a jar. The male worshipers pick out a cölî at random and have intercourse with its owner (H. H. Wilson, Religious sects of the Hindus, 245-63). The ceremony is called Bharatî-lahra (S. H. Hoджvlâs, Studies in Indo-Muslim history, 1, 342). The followers of this sect were specially strong in Orissa during the period of Muslim rule.

The Fustâhî-i Firuzshâhi mentions that the Ibhâhtiyâ sect was very strong in Orissa, and it worshiped it. This was probably a symbolical representation of the female sexual organ. The Sûrat-i Firuzshâhi (p. 146) says that the Ibhâhtiya “have an appointed day when they gather at a place fixed for the purpose. They plaster the ground with cowdung and, in accordance with the custom of the idolaters, scatter rice and flour on it. They then ask the person whom they want to turn into a follower to prostitute himself on the ground, and teach him formulas of infidelity to repudiate Islam and to say that he has become their follower. That night they collect their daughters, wives, mothers and sisters and give them pork to eat and wine to drink. Then the lamp is put out and they take off the garments of the women. Every one then pulls out a garment and cohabits with the woman to whom the garment belongs, even though she may be his own daughter, sister or daughter”. This is precisely what the Vâma-mûrgî did. The text clearly says later (p. 59) that the inhabitants of Dîândnagars (Orissa) “all are Ibhâhtis, worship images and have temples in every town, their main place of worship being the temple of Dîjagnâhî”. In those days Vâma-mûrgî Tântrism seems to have been very strong in Orissa.

Bibliography: Firûz Shâh, Futûhâ-i Firuzshâhi, British Museum, MS Or. 2039; Stratî-i Firuzshâhi, MS Bankopole Public Library (page-references in the text are to a copy in Lytton Library, University of Cambridge, Aligarh); H. Wilson, The religious sects of the Hindus, Madras 1904; S. H. Hoджvlâs, Studies in Indo-Muslim history, i, Bombay 1934; I. H. Qureshi, The administration of the Sultanate of Dehli, Karachi 1938. (I. H. Qureshi)

IBÂHIYYA [see IBBA (II)].

IBB, formerly the capital of the bâdî of the same name in the sandâb of Ta'izz in the Yemen; now, since 1946, a separate ibdî, comprising the bâdî of Ibb, `Udeyn, Dîl Sufîl, Kû^tâbâ and Yerim. Besides the pronunciation with i peculiar to the Yemen, we find also Abb (in Niebuhr: Aebb). At an earlier period the walled town, with a population estimated at 4,000, belonged to the territory of Dîl Djibîla. It is situated on the ‘upper road’ leading from ‘Adan to ŞanÂ‘â. According to the proposals of the A. Beneyton mission of 1912 for the construction of a railway from al-Hudaydah to Ta'izz, it was to be a station on this line, as it is now an important station on the motor-road from Ta'izz to ŞanÂ‘â. But this project was never carried out, and the later development of motor-traffic made it superfluous. It lies, 2050 m. above sea level, in a fertile region where cereals and fruit are grown, and also coffee, bâdî, indigo and walnuts. There are about 60 mosques within the town; the water-supply is provided by an aqueduct bringing water down from the mountains, which are about 3200 m. high. In the vicinity there was at one time a silver mine (photographs in the İslâm-Stichung in Leiden).


IBDÂ, absolute creation, primordial innovation.—The term itself is no longer in use, but the Kur'ân calls God Bâdî, Absolute Creator, Innovator. The two verses ii, 117 and vi, 101 assert that God is “Creator (Bâdî) of the heavens and the earth”; we should obviously understand by this, of everything. The commentators emphasize that God is called Bâdî by virtue of His (absolute) creation of the heavens and the earth, and Kâhîl by virtue of His creation (khâlîf) of man (“made of clay”), LV, 14.

There is another distinction founded on the Kur'ân: the text frequently contrasts “the first creation” with “the second”, that of the resurrection of the body. In this case it is never the verb bâdî or its fourth form abâdî that is used, but the expression bâdî al-khâlîs, “He began to create” (e.g., X, 4, 34; XVII, 64, etc.). Every form of the verb bâdî implies, strictly, not a “first time”, but a radical innovation, an absolute bringing into existence.

Taking its meaning from the divine name Bâdî, the maḍâr of the fourth form comes to express, in the elaboration of Muslim thought, the actual act of God. Ibdâ belongs above all to the vocabularies of Şii Islam.
(particularly Isma'īlism) and falsafa: its meanings here depend on the respective world-views. *Ibn al-Kādūm* gives it a further technical meaning consonant with the Sunni can of 'creation'.

References to *Shī* thought — *ibdā* is thought of in connexion with the divine *kun*, the *Be*! of the Word that brings into existence. "The Creator (*Bāḍī*) of the heavens and the earth, when He decrees a thing, He says to it only "Be!", and it is" (Kūrān, II, 117). But "the heavens and the earth" of the verse are subject to interpretation. By *ibdā*, by His "primordial establishing", as H. Corbin translates it, God brings into existence from an existing higher world of the *mubādʿa*, that is to say Intelligences capable of hearing the divine call, and of answering it (cf. the 9th-10th century, Abū Yaḥyā al-Sījdīstānī, Kitāb al-Yandī, § 40, ap. H. Corbin, *Trilogies ismaïliennes*, Teheran-Paris 1961). Such is the "world of the *ibdā*", to be distinguished from the lower "world of the *kalāl*". More precisely still, the divine *ibdā* is addressed to the First Hypostasis, *al-mubādʿa* al-*awwal*, in which the intelligible pleroma is contained. One might even say that, for al-Sījdīstānī, the formulated and active (or *mubādʿī*) *ibdā* is the First Hypostasis. The same line of thought is found in Nāṣīr-i Khusrav.

We later find the Imām Mūsā Ṣadrā Shīratī (10th-11th/16th-17th century) protesting against those who identify the radical Will (*maṣūfa*) with the divine Essence, and make the *ibdā* into the First Emanation. For him, referring to the 5th Imām, *ʿAlī Rīḍa, no distinction exists between radical Will, act of Will (*irḍa*) and *ibdā*; they are three names for divine Activity. Now, divine Activity is God, but as manifested in the First Cause, Essence being God unmanifested. From the First Cause emanates the "Muḥammadan Reality", "the mass of primordial Light ... from which come the fourteen higher archangelical Lights" (cf. H. Corbin, introduction and notes to Kitāb al-maṣūfa, "Book of metaphysical Penetrations", Teheran-Paris 1964, 83, 121, 168, and *passim*). These various nuances of *Shī* interpretation appear to represent various attempts to discern the absolute immediacy of the *ibdā*, the creative Word *kun*, in an emanatist cosmogony where "*Sunna* comes from the One but the One".

_Falsafa._ — Abū Yaḥyā al-Kindī, closer in this to the Muʿtazilis than to other "philosophers", takes *ibdā* in the sense of temporal creation _ex nihilo_ (*Rasāʿīl al-Kindī, ed. Abū Rida, i, Cairo 1360/1950, 207, 270; cf. R. Walzer, _Greek into Arabic_, Oxford 1962, 188-9). For later falsāsifa, Ibn Rusdh as well as Ibn Sīnā or al-Fārābī, *ibdā* denotes the absoluteness of the creative (emanative) act in the production of beings that have no reason for existing in their own essence. Here too we find an emanatist of a neoplatonic kind, and the idea that "nothing can come from the One but the One"; the First Intelligence is the first of the *mubādʿāt* (cf. al-Fārābī, _ʿUyun al-maṣāʿīl_, apud Al-Fārābī’s _Phil. Abhand_.), ed. Dieterici, Leiden 1890, 58). But while *Shī* thought as such puts the accent on the divine imperative *kun* and its immediacy, _falsafa_ whatever *Shī* influences it may have undergone, emphasizes above all the idea of _ibdā_ an absolute production of being. Here, as an example, is a brief analysis of Avicenna's vocabulary.

Two questions are found in Ibn Sīnā: (1) production of being; (2) the method of this production.

(1) _Production of being._ In his explanatory and didactic works, Ibn Sīnā certainly uses _khalā_: "_Khalā_ signifies first of all to make to receive being, whatever it is" (*Rasāʿīl*, Cairo 1326, 101). But in the texts that serve as a prelude to his _Fiḥma maṣūfīyya_, in which he expresses a more personal thought, *ibdā* seems to him best to denote the absolute innovation, considered non-temporally, of a being not necessary in itself, which is really preceded by nothing, not even not-being, and which takes all that it is from the First; thus Iṣḥāq, ed. Forget, Leiden 1892, 153. The First created thing, _al-mubādʿa_ al-*awwal* (*ibdā*, 431), is the first Hypostasis or the Intellect of the All. More clearly still, the "Commentary" (*garh*) on the pseudo-"Theology of Aristotle" (ed. A. Badawi, Cairo 1947, 60) takes *ibdā* as the "creative trance" where "*kun*" and 'creation' (or *gushing out*) when the procession of beings from the first Being is considered, and 'creation' (*ibdā*) when the relationship of the first Being to the other beings is considered". The accent is still laid on radical coming into existence brought about by *ibdā* (*ibdā*, 64).

(2) _The method of production._ (cf. Iṣḥāq, loc. cit.; Ṭisʿ ṛaʿdūl, 101-2, etc.). In a more limited sense *ibdā* denotes the production, without any kind of intermediate pre-existence, of _incorrupible and eternal_ beings, whether above all incorporeal or corporeal (the celestial spheres): here again we find the "world of the *ibdā*" (or _dār al-ibdā_*) of *Shī* thought. _Khalā_ denotes rather the production, with or without an intermediary, of corporeal beings, whether _incurruptible_ or _incorruptible_: _khalā_ denotes the production, with an intermediary, of corruptible beings (in a sense that is quite close to that of _sunn_, another of Avicenna's words). Finally, *ṣūlāth* should be noted; this term emphasizes the non-necessity of the final product; it could thus be applied to any being that is not necessary of itself, although it preferably implies a temporal beginning (cf. A.-M. Golechon, _La distinction de l'existence et de l'existence d'après Ibn Sīnā_, Paris 1937, 241-59). Thus, then, in Avicenna's texts, *ibdā*, _khalā_ and _ṣūlāth_ suggest above all, but in differing degrees, creative emanation proceeding from the first Being; _takwin_ and _sunn_ are reserved for the production ("manufacture") of compound beings from pre-existing elements.

To conclude this brief (and fragmentary) lexicographical study: in _Shī*ism as in _falsafa_, *ibdā* puts the accent on the absolute power of the creative act (or gushing out). The way in which this term is applied to the beings thus produced, the *mubādʿāt*, depends on the particular cosmology or world-view.

*Ibn al-Kādūm._ — It was apparently after the conflicts with _falsafa_ (e.g., al-Shahrastānī, etc.) that *ibdā* was fully accepted into the vocabulary of the _muḥallīmān_. It bears the same fundamentally basic meaning, but its connotations are certainly closer to those it has in al-Kindī than to those it has in Avicenna or the *Shīs*. For the sake of brevity, we shall confine ourselves to referring to the _Ṭaʿrīfāt_ of al-Djurjānī (ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1845, 5-6), which summarize with precision the usage of the school in its conflicts with *falsafa_.

To conclude this brief (and fragmentary) lexicographical study: in _Shī*ism as in _falsafa_, *ibdā* puts the accent on the absolute power of the creative act (or gushing out). The way in which this term is applied to the beings thus produced, the *mubādʿāt*, depends on the particular cosmology or world-view.
thing. Khalk and tahwin are distinguished from one another, in that khalk emphasizes the idea of creating, whereas tahwin emphasizes that of forming or fashioning. Al-Dinwalla emphasizes that onomatopoeic verbs known as "replacement" (ibdal) is used for the formation of the heavens and the earth, and the verb khalka for the creation of man.

**Bibliography:** In the article.

**IBDÁL (a.), "replacement", "mutation", technical term in Arabic grammar indicating on the one hand morphological features involving a mutation of a phonetic character, the grammatical (nahwi) ibdal as in il-taṣāla < it-taṣāla [see HAMZA, NAHW, TAYNIR, etc.] and, on the other hand, in its lexicographical sense, the doubles ibdal, muḍāra, muḍākaba, nāzīr, etc. which are very common in Arabic and which differ from each other only by a single consonant: madāha/madāda "to praise", kaṣṭa'al-kaṣama "to cut", etc. This lexicographical (lughawi) ibdal has intrigued the philologists, who from an early period have studied the phenomenon and especially have drawn up lists of examples, though generally neglecting to indicate their provenance. Two main problems presented themselves: first was the question whether doubles of this type existed in the same dialect with an identical meaning, and the second, whether the quality of the consonants in question played any part in their formation. Not all linguists have seen these problems very clearly and many have limited themselves to listing the examples which may be classified under the same rubric according to the "permutation" in question (I, II, III, etc.). A scholar such as Ibn Fāris (d. 595/1004) has no hesitation in stating that the Arabs have a habit (min sunan) of replacing one phoneme (harf) with another (ṣabi'), ed. Choueini, Beirut 138/1964, 203-4), and Ibn Sidūd (d. 458/1066) admits the existence of muḍāra in the speech of one single tribe (Muḥṣasas, xiv, 19). On the other hand, Abu 'l-Ṭayyib al-Lughawi (d. 421/1030), and who seems to consider that these doubles are not found within one single dialect (K. al-Ibdal, ed. Iṣṣ al-Dīn al-Tanukhi, Damascus 1379/1960, i, 261) and he is even more categorical in his introduction, a passage from which has fortunately been preserved by Suyūṭi (Muṣḥur, i, 273; 2nd ed., i, 460): he does not see the phenomenon of ibdal as intentional, but as consisting of the appearance of variants (lughawi), of paronyms used in different tribes. He does not, however, consider that this paronym necessarily implies that the phonemes in question have adjacent points of articulation, for he cites cases of ibdal which are very far from complying with this condition: ḥij, ḥij, ḥid, etc. Al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898), however, had already considered it essential that they should be adjacent (Kāmi', Cairo 1308, ii, 97); Ibn Dīnār (d. 932/1002) in his Sīr al-sīnā (i, 197) and Ibn Sidūd (Muḥṣasas, xiii, 274) followed him on this point.

The examination of doubles was also to lead to the formation of a more general theory on the origin of language; Ibn Dīnār (Khaṣṣī, i, 46) had already ruled out the fact that onomatopoeic words formed a large part of the vocabulary, but it was Fāris al-Širāḍī (q.e.) in particular who developed this theory in his Sīr al-layḥi fi 'l-kab ṣa wa l-ibdal (Istanbul 1248); he points out that the verbs which imply, for example, an idea of rupture, breaking, etc. offer many examples of doubles, and considers that the onomatopoeic bilateral form with a long second radical (verbs known as "deaf") is the earliest (e.g., baṭa "to cut") and that the Arabs consciously replaced the second element of the doubled consonant in order to express a different shade of meaning (hence baṭa'a, baṭama, etc.); obviously one is led to ask whether a bilateral has become a trilateral, and thus the whole question of biliterality is raised.

We cannot investigate in detail here the rules which the obliques have attempted to isolate. For example, al-Farrā' (d. 207/822) had stated that before kh, ch, c or l, the sibilant s changed to the emphatic s; al-Sid al-Baṭalwāyisi (d. 520/1126) adds to this qayn; and al-Ḥarīrī, in the maḳāma haḥlibiya, delights in collecting doubles in s and g. In addition, the grammarians enumerate very carefully all the phonemes which permute in the type of ibdal known as nahwi, but they do not agree as to their number.

From another point of view, it is perhaps not without interest to mention the idea of the editor of the K. al-Ibdal of Abu l-Ṭayyib, who suggests (Introduction, 41-2) that the use of doubles to enrich modern terminology and proposes, for example, ta'rīth "demarcation" and ta'rif "land survey", or mirdaḵa "walnut-cracker" and mirdaḵa "hazelnut-cracker" which would probably lead to a certain amount of confusion.

After allowances have been made for artifice and error (in particular the ṣabī', misreadings which have led to a fair number of bādais), it would be useful to collect the examples cited in the monographs, to compare them with the roots of the other Semitic languages and submit them to detailed analysis. This would permit, to the extent that they can be localized, the production of maps showing the linguistic geography of ancient Arabia (cf. C. Rabin, Ancien West-Arabian, London 1951).

**Bibliography:** Grammatical works generally contain a paragraph on ibdal, but the most complete synthesis is that of Suyūṭi (Muṣḥur, i, 272-8; 2nd ed., i, 458 ff.) and the most profound study is that of Iṣṣ al-Dīn al-Tanukhi, in his Introduction to K. al-Ibdal of Abu l-Ṭayyib, 5-42; see also B. Bustani, in F. Bustani, Dā'irat, 42-43; and the bibliography cited there. Besides the K. al-Ibdal already mentioned, the other ancient monographs which have been preserved are those of Ibn al-Sikkit, al-Kab wa l-μaḍākaba wa l-nāṣī'ir, ed. Tanukhi (in the press).
the camelus dromedarius, which lives in the area from the Indus valley to the Sahara and the Congo, and for convenience we shall call it "camel".

Early poetry and works of lexicography bear witness to the extraordinarily rich vocabulary which Arabic possessors to describe this animal, which provided the Bedouin with a large part of his food, his clothing and his shelter, and served as a mount and a means of transport (see, e.g., Ibn Silduh, Muhhasas, vii, i-174; F. Hommel, Die Namen der Säugetiere bei den südsemitischen Völkern, Leipzig 1879, notes more than 160 words); there are terms for the camel at different stages of growth (for the modern period, see, e.g., Jaussen, Moab, 270), many descriptions based on physical characteristics, and equally numerous metaphors, but only four terms are really specific: itil (fem.) indicates the species and the group, ba'tir, the individual, regardless of sex, nāba the female and diimal the male (sometimes used equally with itil for the species; see Ch. Pellat, Sur quelques noms d' Animaux domestiques en arabe classique, in GLECS, viii (25 May 1960), 95-9).

There are four terms found in the Kur'ān, in particular appears in the edifying stories of Šālīb, the Thamūd, etc. (see VII, 71, 75, X1, 67, XVII, 61, XXVI, 155, LIV, 27, XCI, 13). Dīnimal seems to come from Hebrew (gimel being a reminiscence of the form of its neck) and to be itself the origin of Greek καμήλος and Latin camelus.

The Kur'ān certainly says (LXXVIII, 17): "What, do they not consider how the camel (itil) was created?" but some interpret this verse as an allusion to the clouds. The popular belief that this animal is descended from demons (ṣayātīn) survived into Islam (cf. al-Djahiz, Hayawān, i, 297, 343; Ibn Kūtayba, Muḥāsibī al-khādījī, 163); moreover, it can happen that dīnīn here forms the title of a camel (E. Westermarck, Pagan survivals, London 1913, 6); according to a current legend, the camel urinates backwards because it was "modified" in order not to soil Abraham (see especially H. Massé, Croisances et coutumes persanes, Paris 1938, i, 187). The early Arabs believed that the descendants of the herds which had belonged to the annihilated peoples of ʿAd, Thamūd, etc. had taken refuge in the country of Moab, where they lived in a wild state (raḥīl); the males then bred with "Arab" female camels and produced the "mēhara" (mahriyya), a species famed for its speed and the slimmness of its limbs and body, as well as other less well-known species; this belief is perhaps a survival from the period when the camel lived wild in Arabia. It is worth noting also that the giraffe is considered either as belonging to the camélidae or as being the result of a cross between a camel and a panther or other animals (see al-Dībāzh, Tarbi', index, s.v. sarāfa).

The camel, unlike the horse, played an important rôle in sacrifices; before Islam, camels were ritually slaughtered at the time of the pilgrimage to Mecca (see J. Chelhod, Le sacrifice chez les Arabes, Paris 1955, index s.v. ēdāy). The recitation of one eye was performed on a stallion as a rule when the herd numbered a thousand, and the second eye suffered the same fate when this number was exceeded (see al-Dībāzh, Hayawān, i, 17); this practice, intended to ward off the evil eye, to avoid distemper, and to protect the herd from the attacks of hostile tribes, may be compared with the uṣūra (q.v.); ignipuncture was practised on a healthy animal to cure animals afflicted with mange (uṭra). The reception of guests by a generous host was always marked by the slaughter of a camel, and the unfortunate beast was also the victim in the game of māsār (q.v.). Closely associated with its Bedouin owner during his lifetime, his camel often followed him in death (see maʿlīyya) to serve him as a mount on the Day of Resurrection. Even recently a camel-owning tribe would make the animals take part in mourning by inducing the female camels and their young to emit cries resembling lamentations (see A. Dhin, Nomadisme, 427-8). The camel is one of the animals endowed with baraša (q.v.), and to eat its flesh amounted to an act of heresy (cf. J. Wellhausen, Restauration, 115, n. 2); in Morocco, the Prophet is made to say: "He who does not eat of my camels does not belong to my people" (Westermarck, Survivals, 105-6). Its flesh is indeed perfectly licit, whilst it is abominated by the Jews because its hoof is not cloven (Lev., XI, 4; Deut., XIV, 7). A camel seen in a dream is usually a good omen, but in Persia, if it falls asleep at the door of a house, the owner will die (H. Massé, Croisances, 1, 193).

Pre-Islamic poetry gives pride of place to the she-camel, the Bedouins' favourite mount, and the rakīl of bāṣīda is the occasion for detailed descriptions accompanied by extremely eulogistic epithets; that of Ṭarafa, in his muṣāllaka, is justly famous (Fr. tr. by Cauvin de Perceval, apud A. Machuel, Auteurs arabes, Paris 1924, 45-7; Eng. tr. A. J. Arberry, The seven odes, London and New York 1957, 85-9), but many other poems contain lyrical passages on the camel, which seems to be so intimately linked with the very structure of the bāṣīda that some modern poets, who have rarely if ever seen riding-camels, feel that they too must conform artificially with the tradition. What the poets most esteem is the smooth gait, the speed, the sobriety and the endurance of the "ship of the desert" (ṣafinat al-barr; Eng. tr. by C. Naim, in DMC, xlv (1890), 165 ff., analysed by G. H. Bouquet, in Arabica, vii/3 (1960), 255-6). During their long journeys across the desert, the Bedouins loaded their water-supplies on camels specially kept for this purpose (rawiya), but they sometimes had to tie up the mouths of some of their animals in order to prevent them from ruminating, and thus be able to find in their stomach, in case of need, water which was still drinkable (Westermarck, Survivals, 357); at other times they cut the throat of a sacrificed animal to collect and drink its blood (madjdābī) (see Arabica, ii/3 (1955), 327). It was also said that camels prevented blood from being spilt, for they were used to pay blood-money (diya [q.v.]); it was in camels also that a bride's dowry was paid; thus the hādīt (?): "Do not speak ill of camels for in them is found a means of avoiding bloodshed (rabib al-dam) and of paying the dowry of a woman of noble birth"; according to another hādīt: "Camels are a source of power for their owner, sheep a blessing, and good is attached to the forelock of horses until the Resurrection".

The character of the camel, its spiteful disposition (cf. H. Massé, op. cit., 187), and its stubbornness have often been stressed; the rutting stallion (cf. Leo Africanus, i, 557) has an extraordinary strength and will let no-one approach the herd of which he is the head; he makes the soft palate (ṣibāṣibā) project from his mouth, belling violently. Of the males, only those selected when young for breeding are kept uncastrated; this avoids fights to the death between stallions. Animals destined as mounts and those to be used as beasts of burden are also selected at an early age. Each tribe branded its herds with a red-hot iron, which gave occasion for ceremonies...
whose significance has somewhat changed in the course of time [see MAWSIM].

The strength of the camel is admired, also the ease with which (thanks to its long neck, which serves as a balance) it can get up from the ground when laden with heavy burdens; in Islamic literary sources it is compared with the elephant, and it is in a sense the symbol of the Arabs just as the elephant is of the Indians.

For transport, the early Arabs used a rudimentary pack-saddle (ibd) or a qadad of the size of the hump, which, when the camel was reared, took the place of the lant (lant, Q.v.). The question of the riding-camel and of the position of the rider in relation to the hump has been studied by W. Dostal (in L’antica societa beduina, t. 15 ff.); according to this writer, the practice of sitting behind the hump is earlier than that of placing the saddle directly on the hump, which dates from the beginning of the Christian era; Leo Africanus (i, 35) mentions the use of a saddle between the hump and the neck, corresponding to the rahla of the present-day “mehrāristes” (troops mounted on fast camels)—a light saddle placed on the withers of the animal. The early Arabs must sometimes have ridden bareback, but generally they used a saddle (rahāl), which was called ribāla when it was adorned with skins; this saddle was made of wooden bows (katad) joined together with leather thongs; it was separated from the hump by cushions and was held in place by girths passing under the breast (ghurda), the belly (hakab) and the loins (rabad) of the animal. A rope threaded through a nose-ring (ḫiṣama) made control of the animal easier than when the simple halter (rasan) was used, and a curved stick (mīgħjan) was used to guide it. Women of a certain rank rode in a palanquin (hawadaj) made of hoops arranged to form a dome and draped with hangings to screen the traveller from prying eyes; one of these palanquins has remained famous in the history of Islam—that in which ‘A‘īsha sat during the Battle of the Camel [see AL-DJAMAL]. Palanquins of this type are still in use nowadays, particularly during marriage ceremonies, and are called ʿajūfī, bāṣqr, etc.; moreover modern descriptions of the harnessing of camels correspond very closely with what we know of those used in earlier times, and the terminology itself has scarcely changed (see, e.g., Jaussen, Mosb, 272-3). Among the Touareg (Tawārīk [q.v.] of the Sahara, apart from the rahla of the “mehrāristes” four kinds of saddle are in use: tarik, with a pommel in the form of a cross; tamak, of the same shape but more luxurious; tahyast, simpler, with a pommel in the form of a rectangular batten; and ʿaggāwi, a woman’s saddle, wider and heavier and provided with semi-circular hoops attached to the side (see Ch. de Foucauld, Dict. touareg-français, Paris 1951, ii, 547, 723, iii, 1273, iv, 1623).

Among tribes which are at least partly settled, the camel is still used for agricultural work—ploughing, threshing, etc. (see G. Boris, Documents, passim, with illustrations and vocabulary), and Leo Africanus (ii, 40) already mentions the custom throughout Numidia of ploughing with a team consisting of a horse and a camel. Nowadays the peasants of Cape Bon (Tunisia) often harness a camel to a two-wheeled cart, and in the streets of Karachi (Pakistan) tall camels may be seen drawing four-wheeled wagons. Yet such work does not make the best use of the camel’s attributes, which are perfectly adapted to the conditions of life in hot deserts and which are pre-eminentely suitable for journeys across long stretches of desert and for forays [see GAZAW] in regions where the climate and the vegetation are unsuitable for the rearing of horses in great numbers. In the early period of Islam, the camel was used as a mount and as a beast of burden for long or short expeditions; during the conquest of Ṣrāk, the Persian commander himself was mounted on a dromedary, but it was on horseback that the warriors were accustomed to face their enemies in single combat; and it was also on horses, which until then had been led, that the mounted fighters formed themselves into line of battle to commence the attack (tandzala: to dismount from a camel and mount a horse in order to fight). The historians relate that the rebels who went to meet ‘Ali at Basra had a certain number of camels [see AL-DJAMAL], but later, as the theatres of operations became more distant, the camel no longer appears except in the baggage-trains, and it is worthy of note that in the characteristic texts assembled by G. Wiet (Grandes traditions musulmanes d’Islam, Paris 1964) the camel is not mentioned after the battle of that name. Even when ‘Ukba b. Nāfi’ [q.v.] set off on the conquest of Fazzān [q.v.], he assembled a light force of 400 horsemen accompanied by 400 camels carrying 800 skins of water (Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, Conquête de l’Afrique du Nord, ed. and tr. A. Gateau, Algiers 1947, 61). Historians and geographers give very large numbers when they speak of the herds of camels of the Nejd (J. R. Mauny, op. cit., 289-91), and Ibn Khalid, for example (Berbères, ii, 70), tells how the Almoravids made off with 50,000 animals belonging to the government of Siddījīmā; such figures do not seem exaggerated when it is recalled that at the beginning of the 20th century there were 180,000 head of camels in the province of Oran alone. The Andalusians alone among the Arabic-speaking peoples were deprived of the familiar sight of riding- and pack-camels (cf. H. Pérès, Poésie andalouse, index). At the beginning of the 10th-16th century, Leo Africanus devoted a substantial chapter to the camel (Description de l’Afrique, ii, 555-8). He rightly remarks that “all the Arabs who own camels are lords who live in freedom, for with these animals they can remain in the deserts”. Some of his statements may be exaggerated, as for example when he says (cf. Anf. i, 717-18) that in Africa can carry their burdens for forty or fifty days without its being necessary to feed them in the evening; they are unloaded and allowed to graze in the surrounding country on a little grass, thorns and a few branches”, or when he gives distances which are patently excessive; he mentions moreover that the camel, after journeying five days without eating, loses the fat of its hump, fat of which the early Arabs were especially fond. He states that the camel drivers urge on the exhausted beasts by singing to them rhythmic chants (ḥiḍāṭ; see GHA’NA’), and relates that in Cairo he saw a camel dance to the sound of a drum. Leo Africanus specifies that an animal in bad physical condition sold for a few dinār, and adds that 1000 ducats represented the value of 100 camels; a more precise figure cannot be expected, for the prices varied according to the condition of the animal: if it belonged to a rich lord, it was worth more, if it was under the control of the government, less; if it was in a large city, there was competition between the buyers. The camels used by the camel-owning tribes of the desert consist of slow and sturdy transport-camels, while the riding-camel, the “mehrā” (mahri), is confined to the desert where, after a fairly simple training, it is used for swift
journeys. The gestation period of the mahríyya is twelve months, and when she has given birth her baby camel is lovingly cared for; for several days a wide belt is put round it to support its intestines and hold in its belly, and it is kept in the tent to accustom it to human company. In spring its hair is cut; only at the end of a year is one of its nostrils pierced—this is later threaded with an iron ring. At the same time a piece of pointed wood is inserted into it so that when it tries to suck, it pricks its mother, is kicked and abandoned the udder for fresh grass. At the age of two years its training begins; it is first taught to stand motionless, not moving from one spot, then it is introduced to the saddle and the nose-ring, through which a guiding-rope is passed; it is taught to run as fast as possible by light whipping, and to kneel at the voice of its master. The conditioning of its reflex actions is made very easy by the sensitivity of its skin to the slightest blow. Its life-span is about 25 years. Its speed varies from 16.1-25 miles an hour, and it can cover 90 miles in 15 or 20 hours, but thereafter it must rest. The pack-camel walks at 14 ft. or 3 miles an hour and covers distances of 15 or 20 miles at a stretch with an average load of 3 or 4 cwt.s. The sobriety and endurance of the "ship of the desert" are legendary; in its five "water buckets", it stores a considerable amount of water, of which it can drink a considerable proportion. In its five "water accounts of the sin of Adam and Eve, Iblis retains his proper name when it is a question of his refusal to bow down before Adam (II, 34-35, 116); but when he is the tempter, he becomes al-ghaylān, "the demon". The revolt of Iblis and the scene in the Garden as described in the Kurʾān may be compared with Christian traditions. In the Life of Adam and Eve, § 15 (Kautzsch, Apokryphen), it is stated that the Archangel Michael had invited the angels to worship Adam. The devil objected that Adam was less than they were, and younger; he and his host refused to worship and were exiled to this Earth. According to the Schatzkiste (ed. Bezdol, 15-6 of the Syro-Arab text), God gave Adam power over all creatures. All the angels therefore bowed before him, with the exception of the devil, who, overcome by jealousy, exclaimed: "It is he who should adore me, who am light and air, whereas he is only earth." He was then driven out from heaven together with his host, and was, from that moment, named Satan, Demon, etc. Thus until the Day of Judgement God will allow Iblis to tempt the angels, the servants of God (Kurʾān, XV, 39-42; cf. XXXIV, 20-1). He is the "sly tempter" who whispers evil thoughts into men's hearts (ibid., CXIV, 4-6). The hādīf [q.v., so well known in Arabic literature, who is heard but never seen, has on several occasions been a manifestation of Iblis. It was in this form that Iblis is said to have warned 'All not to wash the body ofMuhammad; but after this another hādīf recalled the Prophet's son-in-law to the correct course (al-Thalib, Kisās, 44). This produces the problem of the "distinction of the spirits" on which many Sufis meditated. At the end of time Iblis is to be thrown into the fire of hell, with his host and with the damned: "then they (the false gods) shall be pitched into it, they and the perverse and the hosts of Iblis, altogether" (Kurʾān, XXV, 43). This verse is reminiscent of Matthew, XXV, 41: "Then shall He say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." It is only a few Sufis of extreme tendencies who envisage a "pardon of Iblis". There are two questions which are the subjects of thought or meditation among Muslims. 1. The nature of Iblis. Is he an angel or a jinn [q.v.]? We have seen that there are many
Kur'anic texts which seem to count him among the angels: “All the angels bowed together, except Iblis...” 

2. The sin of Iblis. On the other hand, tradition has no hesitation concerning the character of Iblis, his disobedience, the divine curse upon him, and the character of “enemy of God and of mankind”, of perpetual tempter, which will be his until the day of the Last Judgement.

The two sins which are constantly attributed to Iblis are pride and disobedience. The origin of his revolt seems to have been pride: we have seen that he not only declared himself to be superior to Adam and refused to bow down before him, but, according to al-Ta'bari (i, 83), he considered himself superior to the other angels. It is also said (ibid., 79) that he was an angel and as such reigned over the djinns, on earth and in the lower heavens. It was after he had rebelled that he was called by God al-ghayyân al-radîm.

But the question then arises as to how he can have been so blinded by power as to have been confirmed in a perpetual state of disobedience and how he could justify to himself his attitude.

Some mutakallimûn and many Shi'îs meditated on the “disobedience of Iblis”: the reason why he disobeyed God and was thus placed among the unfaithful was that he did not submit to the unconditional Will of God, preferring the general Law which had been given (“to worship God alone”) to the short-term Commandment (“bow down before Adam”). 

Al-Hallâj makes him say: “No, I shall worship only Thee”. Some suggest that he believed God was setting a trap for him and that his duty was to evade it by an affirmation of uncompromising monotheism. Even more: he preferred to risk incurring God’s curse and to be in hell, and to be, even against God so to speak, the mysterious witness of the absolute Divine Unity. By the expedient of such analyses, Iblis is accorded a certain grandeur, and there can sometimes be recognized in some of the Shi'îs a kind of secret sympathy for the one who was “forced to be disobedient”, a victim of the incomprehensible and inscrutable Commandment of God.

But al-Hallâj nevertheless firmly maintains that this disobedience is certainly a pre-sin of pride. He devoted to the drama of Iblis the very beautiful text of the Tā sin al-azâl (Arabic text ed. L. Massig-...)

We shall not enumerate all the “accounts” concerning Iblis, either in the pre-eternity before the creation of man or when he played his part in the Garden of Eden. It can in any case be said that Muslim thought remains undecided as to whether he was an angel or a djinn, and does not pronounce an opinion on the possibility of his being a “fallen angel”!

IBN (A.), son. The Arab grammarians and lexicographers, who tend to trace all words to three root elements, generally attribute ibn to a root *b.n.w.
and consider that it derives from a hypothetical *banawun by loss of the 3rd sonant radical. Others state that the root is b.n.y. and that the word ibn comes from the verb bandā (to set up [a tent] on*), and, by extension, "marry". In reality, we have an ancient semitic biliteral, which is nevertheless triliteralized in the relative adjective banawi and in the abstract noun bunuwaa. The fem. bint, formed with the fem. indicator -t, has a rival in a secondary form ibnat*. In the pl., banān and abnā (the latter, however, being specialized [q.v.]) correspond to ibns and bandat. The word ibn is constantly employed in genealogical series, and then offers some grammatical peculiarities. On the one hand, the prosthetic alif disappears when it is preceded by the name (ism) of the person and followed by the appellative of his father (except at the beginning of a line), while it is maintained after a kunya or a laqab and before an appellative referring to the mother or an ancestor of the person quoted immediately before, that is to say, the name of the person corresponding to a true patronymic name (see below). On the other hand, the presence of the word ibn exerts a regressive effect on the preceding name; the tanuin, where there is one normally, disappears (e.g., Muhammad ibn Ahmad instead of Muhammad ibn Ahmad), as if ibn "defined" this name, while in fact it is in apposition; in the vocative, an analogous regressive effect is optional, in the sense that the first name may be put into the accusative case like itself or remain in the nominative, while a progressive effect is exercised obligatorily on the epithetic adjective, so that the latter need not be in the same case as the noun to which it refers (ya Muhammed [or Muhammad] bn Ahmad [never bahim]).

Ibn enters into the composition of a certain number of names of animals or plants: ibn 'irs, "weasel"; ibn awwar, "sand truffle", etc., the pl. then being bandā (though bandā is sometimes found). Equally, it is used in a sense similar to ābā or to sāhib: ibn 'ishrin sana, "20 years old", ibn sablī, "traveller", etc. In these two uses it appears strongly expressive.

It occurs that certain persons are known by an appellative composed of Ibn and a woman's name; one might see a vestige of matriarchal society in this, but in the Islamic period these designations have a peculiar significance, and are designed, either to humiliate the person so named or to emphasize that his father is unknown (Ibn al-Maragha for Djarlr of al-Maragha, the sultan appointed him to the office which he occupied until his death, in 728/1328). Ibn entered into the composition of a certain number of names of animals or plants: ibn 'irs, "weasel"; ibn awwar, "sand truffle", etc., the pl. then being bandā (though bandā is sometimes found). Equally, it is used in a sense similar to ābā or to sāhib: ibn 'ishrin sana, "20 years old", ibn sablī, "traveller", etc. In these two uses it appears strongly expressive.

It occurs that certain persons are known by an appellative composed of Ibn and a woman's name; one might see a vestige of matriarchal society in this, but in the Islamic period these designations have a peculiar significance, and are designed, either to humiliate the person so named or to emphasize that his father is unknown (Ibn al-Maragha for Djarlr of al-Maragha, the sultan appointed him to the office which he occupied until his death, in 728/1328). Ibn entered into the composition of a certain number of names of animals or plants: ibn 'irs, "weasel"; ibn awwar, "sand truffle", etc., the pl. then being bandā (though bandā is sometimes found). Equally, it is used in a sense similar to ābā or to sāhib: ibn 'ishrin sana, "20 years old", ibn sablī, "traveller", etc. In these two uses it appears strongly expressive.

It occurs that certain persons are known by an appellative composed of Ibn and a woman's name; one might see a vestige of matriarchal society in this, but in the Islamic period these designations have a peculiar significance, and are designed, either to humiliate the person so named or to emphasize that his father is unknown (Ibn al-Maragha for Djarlr of al-Maragha, the sultan appointed him to the office which he occupied until his death, in 728/1328). Ibn entered into the composition of a certain number of names of animals or plants: ibn 'irs, "weasel"; ibn awwar, "sand truffle", etc., the pl. then being bandā (though bandā is sometimes found). Equally, it is used in a sense similar to ābā or to sāhib: ibn 'ishrin sana, "20 years old", ibn sablī, "traveller", etc. In these two uses it appears strongly expressive.
In addition to the commentary on the Ḥikam, Ibn ʿAbbād left some letters containing spiritual directions and collected in Rasāʾīl ʿAbbād, lhr. Fez 1930, 262 pp.) and Rasāʾīl ʿAbbād (ed. P. Nwyia, 1957, 138 pp.) and some unpublished works: Fatḥ al-tufā (a collection of hadīths in the form of an manual of devotion); Duʿāʾ bi l-asmb al-husnā; a collection of Friday sermons; a versification of the ʿHikam. Ibn ʿAbbād’s work marks a return to primitive ʿṢūfīsm (Muḥāṣibī), for he did not like Ibn Sābīn and only rarely cites Ibn al-ʿArabī.

Bibliography: P. Nwyia, Ibn ʿAbbād de Ronda, i (1933), 7-79.

IBN ʿABBĀD, Abu ʿl-Kāsim ʿIsāmīl b. ʿAbbād b. al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbbād B. Ahmad B. ʿIdris, vizier and man of letters of the Bāyād period, known as al-Shaykh al-Amīn (i.e., the honorific title which he may have owed to his relations with Abu l-ʿFaṭḥ Ibn al-Amīd [see Ibn al-ʿAmīd, ii], but more probably to his loyalty to the amīr Muʿayyid al-Dawla [q.v.]; Born probably at Ṣafākh on 16 Dhu l-ʿKhāda 326/14 September 938 (but the sources disagree on his date and place of birth), of a family of high officials (his father at least, known as al-Ṣāhibī al-ʿAmin, had been a ṣāhib and then become vizier to Rukn al-Dawla; see Abu Ḥayyān, Maḥāshībī, index; Ibn al-Djawal, Munlaqīn, vii; Yakūt, Udabī, vi, 170-2), he spent his childhood at Ṭalālān (near Kazwin), and then settled at ʿIṣfāhān. After the death of his father (334 or 335/946 or 947), he attached himself to Abu l-ʿFaṭḥ Ibn al-Amīd, first as his devoted disciple and later as his secretary. In 347/958 he was chosen to accompany the amīr Abū Manṣūr (Muʿayyid al-Dawla) to Baghdad as a clerk, and it was at this period that his friendly relations with the Bāyād prince began. He may even have been at about this time the tutor of another son of Rukn al-Dawla. On the latter’s death (366/976), the governorship of ʿIṣfāhān and its dependencies fell to Muʿayyid al-Dawla who confirmed the kāhib Ibn ʿAbbād and the vizier Abu l-ʿFaṭḥ Ibn al-Amīd, the son of al-Ṣāhibī’s master [see Ibn al-ʿAmīd, ii], in their offices. Abu l-ʿFaṭḥ then began to engage in intrigues and to incite against the vizier the army of Rāy, with the result that Muʿayyid al-Dawla, with the help of ʿAḍud al-Dawla [q.v.], succeeded in getting rid of his vizier and replacing him by Ibn ʿAbbād.

It is not easy to study in detail the vizierate of Ibn ʿAbbād, whose political activity is confused by the chronicles with that of his masters [see B. Al-ʿAbbād, Abū l-Kāsim ʿIsāmīl b. ʿAbbād B. Ahmad B. ʿIdris, al-Dawla, in the sole surviving volume of the Rasāʾīl, which consists exclusively of diplomas of appointment and official letters or of correspondence with the author’s eminent personal friends. The matters with which they deal naturally extend beyond a single vizierate and thus cannot be listed or covered in the manners of the Daylami vassals of the caliph’s secretary Abu Ishak al-Sabi[3]. Among the sources and studies, among which there should be especially mentioned M. Asin Palacios, Un precursor hispano-musulman de San Juan de la Cruz, i (1933), 7-79.

It is not easy to study in detail the vizierate of Ibn ʿAbbād, whose political activity is confused by the chronicles with that of his masters [see B. Al-ʿAbbād, Abū l-Kāsim ʿIsāmīl b. ʿAbbād B. Ahmad B. ʿIdris, al-Dawla, in the sole surviving volume of the Rasāʾīl, which consists exclusively of diplomas of appointment and official letters or of correspondence with the author’s eminent personal friends. The matters with which they deal naturally extend beyond a single vizierate and thus cannot be listed here. But it is interesting to note the way in which precision is combined with style in the administrative communications written by Ibn ʿAbbād. The letters of course concern general politics, and also the policy of ʿAḍud al-Dawla, the ruling head of the Bāyād family, in his struggles against his cousin ʿIzz al-Dawla Bahkhtyar, and against Fakhr al-Dawla, the Sāmānids, the Kurds, etc.; the letters also cover the matter of the Daylami vassals of the dynasty and of its changeable relations with its Adharbayjānī vassals. Above all, the correspondence demonstrates a constant and efficient administration with exactitude in the management of the finances and the maintenance of public order; on the second of these points the vizier appears to have been hostile to the urban futūwawān [q.v.]; on the first he pays attention to the efficient collection of taxes, but also to the orderliness of their administration and, when circumstances allowed, he was not unwilling to have taxes reduced.[4] For this policy of ʿAḍud al-Dawla, who for himself had always refused to have only one vizier with full powers, should yet have encouraged his brother to grant him his favour only to this all-powerful minister, in whom he had absolute confidence. After the death of ʿAḍud, soon followed by that of Muʿayyid, Ibn ʿAbbād acquired more completely autonomous power, his prince, Fakhr al-Dawla, being now the eldest of the family and no longer owing allegiance to anyone; but this prince continued to have full confidence in the vizier, who, after having fought against him while his brothers were alive had, against all expectation, summoned him to succeed the second of them. Ibn ʿAbbād had attempted to make him play the dominant rôle in the dynasty by his interventions first in support of Shams al-Dawla against Bahāʾ al-Dawla, then of the second against the first: this apparent volte-face is explained by the fact that the struggle between the two young princes had resulted in their territorial possessions changing hands and that in ʿAḍud’s view Fakhr al-Dawla should support the master of ʿIrāq against the master of Fārs, who might covet ʿIṣfāhān. Naturally Fakhr al-Dawla, true to tradition, laid hands on the rich heritage of his minister, who had expected this, and no further member of his family is found among the high officials of the dynasty. But Ibn ʿAbbād himself is remembered as one of the great viziers of Muslim history, even by those who were his adversaries in doctrine (see, e.g., Niẓām al-Mulk, Siyāsat-nāma, xi, 33 and xii, 21-6). Like the latter, he belongs to the category of ministers who, in the service of princes who were either not suited to or were indifferent to the tasks of administration, were able to acquire an almost autonomous personal power and to become temporarily the true masters of affairs. Ibn ʿAbbād would not, however, have gained such wide fame if he had not also occupied a foremost place in the history of Arab literature, as much through his own works as through his patronage of scholars and poets. In addition to being apprenticed in his youth to the profession of kāhib, to which he appeared to be destined by his birth, he had the good fortune to have as his mentor Ibn al-ʿAmīd, who
possessed a strong traditional cultural background and no slight knowledge of theology and philosophy. During his stay in Baghdād he was able to frequent the literary circles in which many traditions of which he was later able to make use. Finally, in addition to many chance teachers, he was in contact, at al-Rayy, with the grammarians Ibn Fāris [q.v.], modestly calling himself his pupil. These favourable circumstances allowed him to acquire an extensive knowledge in all the fields of Arabic culture, from exegesis and ḥadīth to history, and including grammar, literary criticism and dogmatic theology. 

His varied works may be classified under the following headings: (I) Dogmatic theology: al-Ibāna ‘an mdhādhab ahl al-qal bi-hudūdī al-Kur‘ān wa-li-sabl, a statement of some points of Mu‘tazīlī doctrine in contrast with other sects and schools (ed. M. H. A. Yāsin, in Nafṣīs, i, Nadjaf 1372, 20 pp.); al-Tadhkīra fi ‘rū‘ al-‘ilm al-dhīma, a short history of the life of the Prophet and of those who were proclaimed to be the Caliph; al-‘Ibāna wa-l-haddār, a short history of the life of the Prophet and of the members of the Mu‘tazīlī school at Baghdad (ed. M. H. A. Yāsin, ii, Nadjaf 1373, 9 pp.); Risāla fī ‘l-hidāya wa-l-dalāla, on predetermination (ed. H. ‘Alī Maḥbob, Tehran 1374/1955). Among works which are not known to have survived, the following would come into this category: K. Muḥtāṣar asma‘ Allāh wa-sifātih, al-Ma’mūna, in which he proclaimed the superiority of Allāh while accepting the imāmat of his predecessors; al-Zaydiyya; al-Khādār wa-l-haddār, al-Nawrūz; al-qulub, a lost work which raises the question which religious school Ibn ‘Abbād adhered to. There is no doubt that he was a good Muslim and an Arabophile, in spite of his non-Arab origin, but his biographers, his friends and his enemies disagree completely when it comes to specifying to which school he belonged. Some Shī‘īs like Ibn Bābūya (‘Uṣūn aḥhār al-Rādī, 3) and others unhistorically claim him as one of them, and the Mu‘tazīlīs bādī‘ Abūl-Dībāb ān al-‘Ism al-Madani, who sang his praises; it is even said that 100,000 poems were attributed to Ibn ‘Abbād, but it is known that he is prejudiced. There is no doubt that he himself, being accustomed to receive praise, had a high opinion of his own worth and that his vanity was agreeably flattered by the “five hundred poets among the employees of the diwāns” who sang his praises; it is even said that 100,000 couplets (some go so far as to say 100,000 poems) were devoted to his praise, but this eulogy was not enough for him, since By also addressed a megaronic poem to him and ordered a poet to recite it in his presence. He did, however, possess a fair amount of kīm [q.v.] and knew how to behave humbly with those whom he regarded as his masters, and, although accused of avarice, he could on occasion show generosity, at least when he considered it opportune to do so.

As a writer, Ibn ‘Abbād shows a marked taste for rhyymed prose, the long sentences in which the figures of bādī‘ above and which are thus very close to poetry, but his prose remains readable and, to a certain extent, light; it is in any case less precious than his poems, in which he makes use of all the ornaments and artificial characteristics of the poetry of the period. With Ibn ‘Abbād, al-Amid, al-Hamadhānī [q.v.], and al-Khuwarizmi [q.v.], Ibn ‘Abbād is one of the main representatives of the school of literature which introduced rhymed prose into the official correspondence and then into all types of writing; a kīthā and poet from Spain, Ibn Shihāy [q.v.], however, omits Ibn ‘Abbād and considers only al-Hamadhānī and Kūbās [q.v.] as really representing the new tendency (apud Ibn Bassām, Dabḵhira, i, 1, 202).
Al-Sahib Ibn 'Abbad died at Rayy on 24 Safar 385/30 March 995.

Biography: Ibn al-Nadim, the contemporary of al-Sahib, devotes to him only a brief mention (Fehrist, Cairo ed., 194), but Tha'alibi gives a good deal more (Yaština, iii) and Yākūt provides a considerable amount of information (Udabī, vi, 168-313; xiv, 206-10; xv, 113-5) partly taken, it is true, from the works of Abū Hayyān al-Tawbī, whose Makhālib al-namāyn are now published (ed. Ibrāhim al-Kaylānī, Damascus, 1979), but see also by the same author, al-Imāl: wa-l-mu'tanās, i, 55; Ibn al-Anbārī, Nuzha, 397-401; Ibn al-Imād, Thāgharāt, i, 113-5; Ibn Khallikān, i, 206-10; Suyūṭī, Buḫyā, 196-7; Tha'alibī, Maḥšad al-anfās, i; Sādī, Anṣāb, 364; Ibn Ḥāḍir, Līṣān al-Miṣām, iii, 413-6; Kūfī, Inbāh al-ruwaḍ, i, 202; Khīrāsārī, Kawa'd al-djamāl, 109; Mez, Renaisance, index; A. Amin, Zuhr al-islām, i, passim; Sartori, i, 686; Brockelmann, i, S, 198; Tha'alibī, Fihrist, iv/4-v/1; Zurkullāh, Ahjad, 451; Ibn, Aṣkr, iii, 307 in which he 176-205; M. H. Al Yāsīn, al-Sahib Ibn 'Abbad haydūt wa-adabhū, Baghdād 1376/1957 (very thorough study of the life and particularly of the works of Ibn 'Abbad). On his activity as vīnir, see especially: Miskawayh, Tāḍārib, vi; Abī Ṣuhdā, Dhāhil Tāḍārib al-unmām, 163-70 and passim; Ibn al-Athīr, vi; Ibn al-Djawzī, Munṭasaṣ, vii; Sīḥ Ibn al-Ḏjwīl, Miḥrāb al-bāqūm (unpublished); Ibn Isfandiyar, Tabaristān, index; Nīẓām al-Mulk, Siyāsāt-nāma, index; see also the Bibli. of the article Būyids. (C. Cahen and Ch. Pellat)

IBN 'ABBĀD [see 'ABBĀDIS; AL-MU'TAMID]}

IBN AL-ABBĀR, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Bakr b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Amīd b. Abī Bakr al-Kūfī, historian, traditionist, litterateur, and poet, belonged to a family which had its origin in Ouda, the patrimony of the Kudāsī of Spain; he was born in Rabi' I 595/February 1199 at Valencia, where he passed his youth studying under the direction of several teachers whom he quotes in his Muṣījam. For more than twenty years he was the disciple of the most learned traditionist in Spain, Abū 'l-Rabī' b. Sālim, who persuaded him to complete the Shī'a of Ibn Baṣhkuwāl. He made several journeys in the Peninsula fi ṣalāb al-'ilm and acted as secretary to the Mu'āmmī governors of Valencia. This town, after being taken by Ibn Mardānshī [q.v.], was besieged in Ramadān 635/April-May 1238 by James I of Aragon; thereupon Ibn al-Abbār was besieged in Ramadan 635/April-May 1238 [q.v.], it was captured by James I on 17 Safar 636/28 September 1238 and acted as secretary to the Mu'mīnīd governors of Valencia. He returned to Valencia, but left it a few days after it was captured by James I on 17 Safar 636/28 September 1238 (Dozy, Notices, 190). Al-Ghubri al-Abbār (an unред, 183) states that he stopped at Bougie before going to Tunis, where, received favourably by Abū Zakariyyā, he was appointed chief of his chancellery, but was ordered to leave a blank in official documents and to fill in; Ibn al-Abbār did not carry out this instruction and was soon dismissed and put under arrest in his own house. However, he was pardoned and re-instated in his office.

When Abū Zakariyyā died, his successor, al-Mu'tanṣir, kept Ibn al-Abbār close to him, but his attitude so much irritated the sovereign and his courtiers that he was ordered to be tortured. His writings were confiscated and a satire against the sovereign was discovered and burnt. The reading of this piece enraged the amīr even more and he ordered Ibn al-Abbār to be killed by lance-thrusts. Ibn al-Abbār died on the morning of 20 Muḥarram 658/January 1260. On the following day his corpse, his books, his poetry, and his diplomas were burnt together on the same pyre.

We possess a certain number of official letters (Maṣāḥif, vi, 211 ff.) and poems (ed. Analecetes, i, 658, 658, ii, 762; ed. Aṣkr, iii, 223 ff.) of Ibn al-Abbār, who is the author of fifteen or so works (forming about 45 volumes) among which the following have been preserved:


Bibliography: Besides the works cited: Ghaib.) al-Abbār, G. R. R. al-Ālīrī, fi mān 'urfūn min al-'ulāma'; fi l-ma'ārif l-sīyāh bi-Bidāgīya, Al-Muṣījam, 1328/1910, 183; Kutubī, Fawā'il, Būlāk 1290/1882-2, ii, 226; Maṣhāri, Analecetes, index; edem, Aṣhrār al-rīyād fi al-ḥabbār Ḫayd, Cairo 1939, index; Ibn Khallud, Berberes, tr. de Slane, i, 307, 347-50; Zarkāšī, Tāriba al-dawlatāyīn, tr. Fagnan, Const. 1895, 36, 38, 48; Pons Boigues, 409; Gayangos, Hist. de la Mon. dynasties in Spain, ii, 528 ff.; R. Brunschvig, Ḫayd, index; F. Bustānī, Dā'ūrat al-muṣījā, ii, 294; Brockelmann, I, 3401, i, 580-1. (M. Ben Cheneb-[Ch. Pellat])

IBN AL-ABBĀR, Abū Daʿīfat Abū Allāh Muḥammad al-Kirmáni, an Andalusian poet who lived among the entourage of the early 'Abbābids [q.v.] of Seville and died in 433/1041-2. Of his Didam only a few poems survive, in particular a panegyric of Isma'il Ibn 'Abbad, some occasional verse and some descriptions; floral poems seem to have occupied a leading part in his work, which drew its inspiration from the life of the Andalusian aristocracy of the time: wine, pleasures, country-walks, women—these for the most part are his favourite subjects, and an element of sensuality is visible in his poems. His
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technique is excellent, metaphors and similes abound, and the basic is applied with assurance and felicity. Ibn al-Abbar, nos. 304, 305, 306 and 307, appears to confuse this Ibn Abbar with the historian who is the subject of the preceding article.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Bassam, Dabbâ, ii; Dabbâ, Bughyā, no. 352; Abu 'I-Walid al-Himyarî, Baddî, index; Ibn Khallîkîn, Cairo 1310, i, 44; Maqâlî, Analectes, index; Pons Boigues, Essays, 697; S. Khalîlî, La vie littéraire à Stavelot au xiie siècle, thesis Sorbonne 1955 (unpublished); H. Pêrs, Pôsecte andalousse, 186; F. Bustânî, Dâ'îr al-ma'ârif, ii, 295. (M. Ben Cheneb*)

**IBN 'ABBâS** [see ABD ALLâH B. (AL-)ABBâS].

**IBN 'ABBâS,** as patronymic of a covert

[see 158].

**IBN ABD AL-BARR AL-NAMâRî** [al-Numârî], apppellative of a family of Cordovan scholars, the principal representative of which is Abû 'Umar Yûsuf b. 'Abd Allâh, born in 368/978. He studied in his native city under masters of repute, engaged in correspondence with scholars of the East and travelled all over Spain "in search of knowledge", but never went to the East. Considered the best traditionist of his time, he was equally distinguished in fikhn and in the science of genealogy. After displaying Zâhrî tendencies at first, in which he resembled his friend Ibn Hazm, he later followed the Mâlikî doctrine, not without some inclination towards Shâfi'î teaching. He held the position of kâdi at Lisbon and Santarem under the Muzaffar b. al-Alâs, and died at Jâ'tiva in 463/1070.

Ibn 'Abd al-Barr is the author of a considerable number of works on all kinds, of which there have been preserved especially:—K. al-Iṣãhâf fi ma'âštî al-Abbâr, biographies of the Companions of the Prophet, ed. Haydârîbâd 1318-9, then on the margin of the Isbâb of al-'Askâlânî, Cairo 1323-5, and finally ed. 'All Muh. al-Badwî, Cairo 1957-60, 4 vols. (for the abridgments of this work, see Brockelmann).—Diwânî baydân al-ṣîm wa-ṣâfî-hî wê mà yawna tâbî fi rsâdî-hî wê-hami-hî, Cairo 1346.—al-Ka'fî fi 'l-ṣîhâ, a manual of Mâlikî law (see Brockelmann, S I, 297, 628-9, foot).—al-Tarsîfâ al-ṣâfî wê wafa'ta min al-ma'ârif wê al-asâsî, on the methodology of hadîth (see Brockelmann, S I, 298, 629).—Kitâb al-isdrûkâr fi gharî madâkhût 'ulumâ' amâsîr, a summary of the preceding (see Brockelmann S I, 297, foot).—al-Iṣdrûkâr li-madâkhût al-a'âsîr fi-mâ tâdâmânama-hu 'l-Muwaçîna min ma'ârîn 'i-râva wa-l-akhir, commentary on the Muwatta'.—Kitâb al-Intîbâh fi faddîl al-ḥalîlîhât al-ṣâmîma al-γâkâhî, on Mâlikî, Abû Hanîfâ and al-Shâfîî, Cairo 1350.—al-Iṣâdîj fi-mâ bayn al-'ulumâ' min al-θâlîlîs, ed. Cairo, in Madâ'âmût al-râsîlî al-mu'nîriyya.—al-Ka'd wa l-amâm fi-l-γârîf bi-γâlî al-'Arab wa-l-'Adîm wa-man awwal mon takallama bi-l-γârîbîya min al-umâm, in genealogies, Cairo 1350; French trans. A. Mahdjoub, in Kâfrîn, xiix (1955-7).—al-İbnâb 'alâ kâhî l-rûwâhî, on the genealogies of transmitters, printed and in the science of genealogy, in official correspondence, including a fiscal rescript clarifying his financial policies (H. A. R. Gibb, in Arabic, ii (1955), 1-6). It exemplifies the deep influence of religio-legal thought upon Muslim historiography, and it is particularly valuable as the oldest preserved representative (apart from the Sîra of the Prophet) of Muslim biographical writing on the large scale in monograph form.

2. 'Abd al-Ḥâkam, the eldest of 'Abd Allâh's sons, died under torture during the misappropriation trial in November 851. Like Sa'd, who appears to have been the youngest of the four brothers, he did not leave much of a permanent mark.

3. Abû Muhammad 'Abd Allâh b. (al-)Abd al-Hakam, was esteemed by his contemporaries as the outstanding member of the family. Born on 15 Dhu 'l-Hijâja 182/27 January 799, he studied with al-Shâfîî but later wrote a "Rebuttal of al-Shâfîî where he was in contradiction to the Kur'an and the Sunna." It was he who was summoned to Baghdad to subscribe to the dogma of the createdness of the Kur'an, but he refused to do so and was sent back to Egypt. His works, none of them preserved, included polemical treatises directed against the 'Irâkîs and against Bishr al-Marisi, as well as studies of special legal questions. In the manuscripts of his father's biography of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz, he is stated to be its transmitter (an addition in his name appears on pp. 121 f. of the edition). The date of his death is variously given as Wednesday, 4 or 15 Dhu 'l-Ka'dî 58/10 June (Thursday) or 6 June (Wednesday) 882, or 269/882-83.

4. Abu 'I-Kasîm Abd al-Rahmân b. 'Abd Allâh (born ca. 382/979-99, died 527/871) is famous for his work on "The Conquest of Egypt and the West" (Futûh Misr), the oldest preserved work on the subject (ed. C. C. Torrey, New Haven 1922; another old manuscript in Manisa, General Library 281, 2,
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cf. A. Ates, in Revue de l'Institut des Manuscrits Arabes, iv (1956), 20 f.) Two long appendices deal with the chief judges of Egypt down to the year 1466/67 and with the companions of the Prophet who came to Egypt, and the hadiths transmitted there on their authority. The main body of the work consists of a history of Egypt that starts out with the legendary early beginnings and ends with the death of 'Amr b. al-Á‡, following throughout the chronological sequence of events. It then continues with the recital of the subsequent conquests of Northwest Africa and Spain. The author includes important information on such matters as the historical topography (khittâd) of Fustat and the problems of financial administration. His point of view (like that of his sources) is that of the legal scholar rather than the historian. Characteristically, he begins with the admonition to respect the original Coptic inhabitants of the country. The section on the Western conquests has been translated into French by A. Gateau (Algiers 1942, 2nd ed. 1947 [1948]; for an analysis of this section as a historical source, cf. R. Brunschvig, in AIEO Alger, vi (1942-47), 108-55.

Bibliography: Al-Kindi, The governors and judges of Egypt, ed. R. Guest, Leiden-London 1912, 199 f., 455, 464 f.; Ibn Abi Hâtim al-Râzî, Dîyâr, ii/1, 92 (Sa'dî), ii/2, 105 f. ('Abd Allâh, 257 ('Abd al-Râhîmân), ii/3, 36 ('Abd al-Á‡âkam), iii/2, 300 f. (Muhammad) (uninformative, brief evaluations of the standing of these men as transmitters); Fîrûz, 211 ('Abd Allâh; 'Abû 'Á‰kim al-'Á‘bbâdî, Tâb. al-fâfarû, ed. G. Viste tam, Leiden 1964, 20 f. (Muhammad); Ibn Khallikân, Wafâyâ', nos. 322, 510 (= Cairo 1948, ii, 239 f. ('Abd Allâh), iii, 333 f. (Muhammad); al-Á‡adrî'i, Dâ'ârî, ed. S. Dederer, iii, 338 f. (Muhammad); Muslim, Dâ'ârî, Tab. al-Á‡ârî 'uyûsî, ii, 223-5 (Muhammad); Ibn Farbûn, Dhâbîhî, Cairo 1351, 134 ('Abd Allâh), 166 ('Abd al-Á‡âkam; 'Abd Allâh), 231 f. (Muhammad) [the most detailed information]; Ibn Hâdjâr, Taikhtâb, ii, 289 f. ('Abd Allâh) vi, 208 ('Abd al-Râhîmân), ix, 260-62 (Muhammad). Cf. also Brockelmann, i, 154, S. 1, 227 f.; the introductions to the editions of al-Kindi, 22-4, of the Fînîkî Miṣr (cf. also Torrey, in EP* s.v.), of A. Gateau's trans.; 'Îbrâhîm A. al-'Á‘addâwî, Ibn 'Abd al-Á‡âkam, rá'îd al-mu'arrîkhîn al-Á‘rab, Cairo 1963.

[F. Rofenthal]

IBN 'ABD AL-MALIK AL-MARRÂKUSHI, his full name being Abû 'Abd Allâh Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Sa'd b. al-Á‘swî al-Á‘nârî al-Marrâkushî, chief kâdî in Marrâkush under the Marinids, and author of a bibliographical dictionary indispensable for a knowledge of the illustrious men of the Muslim West. He was born, probably in Marrâkush, on 14 Dhu 'l-Khâdîda 614/6 July 1237 and died in Tiâmen in 703/1303-4. His work, still in manuscript, comprises several volumes and bears the title al-Dhâlî'î wa l-takmilâh li-khatâbihîn l-mawâ’il wa l-Siâ, that is to say Sequel and Supplement to the Kitâb al-Mawâ’il fi ta'iîrîkh 'ulamâ' al-andalus of Ibn al-Farâidi [q.v.], which died in 403/1012-3, and to the Kitâb al-Siâ fi al-hadîth al-Á‘ndalusi of Ibn al-Bashkûwât [q.v.], which died in 528/1132-3. It is one of the sources habitually used by Ibn al-Khâtîb [q.v.], Ibn al-Kâdî [q.v.], Leo Africanus [q.v.], etc. in the article devoted to him by 'Abâs b. 'Îbrâhîm (see Bibl.) will be found a long list of his teachers and pupils and of his other writings, with numerous references, and even the names of some thirty personages who are of importance for the history of Marrâkush and whose biographies are provided by Ibn 'Abd al-Malik.


IBN 'ABD AL-MUN'IM AL-HIMYARI (or rather al-sâjjî al-sâjî al-'âdî Abû 'Abd Allâh Muhammad b. Abî 'Abd Allâh Muhammad b. Abî Muhammad 'Abd Allâh b. Abî Muhammad 'Abd Allâh b. Abî Muhammad 'Abd Allâh b. Abî Muhammad 'Abd Allâh, author of the important Arabic geographical dictionary entitled Kitâb al-Rawd al-mîdhâr fi khabar al-Á‘dâr. Nothing is known of this writer apart from the facts that he came from the Maghrib and that he was a jurisconsult (jâfîh) and a kâdî's assessor or notary ('âdî). E. Lévi-Provençal was responsible for the discovery and the publication of a large part of his work (La ptimônsule Ibérique au Moyen Age, d'aprés le Kitâb ar-Rawd al-mîdhâr fi khabar al-Á‘dâr d'Ibn 'Abd al-Mun'îm al-Himyari, Leiden 1938). In this edition, Lévi-Provençal used several manuscripts (of Meknès, Fez, Salé and Timbuktu) dating from the 11th/12th and 12th/13th centuries. To these manuscripts should be added two others found after 1936: one copy, preserved in the Nuroumosiyan library in Istanbul, written before the year 1045/1635-6, and another, made in 971/1563-4, and in the library of the Djeddja, Cairo 1635-6, and another, made in 971/1563-4, and in the library of the Djeddja, Cairo 1635-6. Another, made in 971/1563-4, and in the library of the Djeddja, Cairo 1635-6, and another, made in 971/1563-4, and in the library of the Djeddja, Cairo 1635-6, and another, made in 971/1563-4, and in the library of the Djeddja, Cairo 1635-6. The full introduction to Ibn 'Abd al-Mun'îm al-Himyari's geographical dictionary reveals that the author used as his main sources three important Arabic geographical works of the 5th/11th and 6th/ 12th centuries: the Kitâb al-Masâlik wa l-manâlik of al-Bakrî (ca. 460; 967-8); the Nuzhat al-mushtâk fi hadâr'ir al-Á‘dâr (748/1348) and the geographical treatise entitled Kitâb al-Á‘dâr fi 'adjâdîb al-amâr (ca. 587/1194), which is in fact only a rewriting of al-Bakrî's work with the addition of some personal observations by the author. It would seem that the Rawd might be important for any future edition of the Kitâb al-Masâlik wa l-manâlik, since the extracts from the latter work which are dispersed in the dictionary of al-Himyari would, if put in order, give a fuller and at the same time a somewhat different version from that known from the editions of de Slane, Kunik-Rosen and Kowalski. Thus the description of the town of Brâgha (Prague), taken by al-Bakrî from the account of 'Îbrâhîm b. Ya'kûb al-Turâqî (ca. 555/965-6), is completely different in the extract given by al-Himyari from the version published by Kowalski. The extracts from the Nuzhat al-mushtâk, which are very numerous especially in the parts of al-Himyari's dictionary which deal with the Iberian peninsula, could also be used for a complete edition of al-Idirisi.

The Rawd was not entirely unknown before its discovery by E. Lévi-Provençal. In fact it is mentioned, ed. 1067/1657, in the Ka'îf al-zunnûn of Hâdîddî Khalla (ed. Flügel, iii, 490, no. 6597), under the title al-Rawd al-mîdhâr fi khabar al-Á‘dâr, as the work of one Abû 'Abd Allâh Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Himyari, who died in 900/1494. E. Lévi-Provençal had already suggested that this
was the same work as that which he had discovered. This supposition seems to be entirely justified by the fact that the brief description of it given by Hadjidi Khalifa lists (iii, 491), immediately after al-Rauḍ al-miṣfār, as no. 6398, a second work of the same title as that of no. 6597. The name of the writer of this second work—a writer of whom Hadjidi Khalifa tells us nothing as far as we know—was shaykh al-ṣumāda Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad b. Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Munīm al-Himyar. In his attempt to clarify matters, Lévi-Provençal comes to the conclusion that there must have been two redactions of the Kitāb al-Rauḍ al-miṣfār written at different times by two members of the Ibn ʿAbd al-Munīm al-Himyar family. A first redaction, which has now disappeared, dates from the end of the 7th/13th century. This hypothesis is supported by two facts: (1) that among the written sources used by al-Himyar, the great treatises of the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries are lacking; (2) that the majority of the historical events mentioned in this dictionary do not go beyond the end of the 7th/13th century. The second redaction (of 866/1461) is represented by the numerous manuscripts mentioned above. It certainly seems to be the first, hypothetical, redaction to which the citations in al-Kalkashandi (d. 821/1418) refer. It should, however, be stressed that the problem of the writing and of the author of the Kitāb al-Rauḍ still remains open and that it is not likely to be resolved before the publication of a complete critical edition of the work.

It should be mentioned that since 1938, in spite of the continual interest in it since Lévi-Provençal published the passages from it concerning the Iberian Peninsula and southern France (having published also, in 1935, the description of the Pharaohs of Alexandria), only very brief extracts from al-Himyar's dictionary have been published. Thus Ch. Pellat published in 1954 a description of Başra and in 1956 there appeared that of Crete, published by Lévi-Provençal, and that of the Italian islands and Leghorn, in 1959-60, the description of Prague (Brăţa) and of the Polish state of Mieszko I (Migka) and in 1962-3 A. Malecka published that of certain places and coastal regions of East Africa. There should also be added the brief survey given by T. Lewicki in 1960 of all the information on Eastern, Central and Southern Europe scattered throughout the dictionary.

The work acquired a great popularity, albeit almost entirely within the Maghrib. Apart from al-Kalkashandi, who reproduces passages from the earlier redaction, extracts from it are found in al-Makkari (11th/17th century), in Makdsh (12th/18th century) and in al-Nāṣir al-Salāwī (13th/19th century). The Dīwān al-ḥāfīz min al-Rauḍ al-miṣfār of al-Makrī (d. 845/1442), however, considered by some to be a rewritten version of al-Himyar's work, seems, as a result of more recent research, to be rather a résumé of the Nuzhat al-muṣḥabāt of al-Iṣrāʾīl.

**Bibliography:** Brockelmann, art. ʿΑΛ-ΜΑΚΡΙΖΗ, in EI2; W. Kubiak, Some West- and Middle-European geographical names according to the abridgment of Iṣrāʾīl’s Nuzhat al-muṣḥabāt known as Makrīzī’s Gany al-āshār min ar-rawḍ al-miṣfār, in Folia Orientalia, i/2 (1959-60), 198-206; E. Lévi-Provençal, Ar-Rauḍ al-miṣfār, in Actes du XVIII* Congrès des Orientalistes, Leiden 1932; idem, La péninsule Ibérique . . . . . , idem, Une description arabe inédite de la Crète, in Studi . . . . G. Levi Della Vida, ii, Rome 1956, 49-57; T. Lewicki, Brāḏa i Miṣfār aŭd ar-Rauḍ al-miṣfār li-ʿbn <Abd al-Mun*im al-Himyari, as a source of information on the history of Islam, which is of little value and hardly tells anything new, even on Spain. Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih placed this poem at the end of the 15th book of his principal work, in which he had collected a good number of his own productions, al-ʾIḥd “The Necklace”, which copyists have entitled al-ʾIḥd al-farid “The Unique Necklace”. To justify his title he divided the work into 25 books (kiṭāb), of which each is divided into two ʿdzūs’s, and gave to each kiṭāb the name of a precious stone: (1) al-ḥuwaʿ; (2) al-farid; (3) al-sabargāda; etc.; the 13th book is called al-ʾIḥd al-lajdīl al-Thānīya.

Fundamentally the ʾIḥd is a book of adab, for which the materials are drawn from the works of al-Džāhi, Ibn Kutayba, and other authors who had assembled the elements of Arab culture; it may thus be considered as a sort of encyclopedia of the knowledge which is useful to a well-informed man, and as a more or less successful attempt at orderly classification of the notions which constitute general culture: Book I: Government; II: War; III: Generous Men; IV: Delegations; V: How kings should be addressed; VI: Religious Knowledge and the Principles of Good Conduct (adab); VII: Proverbs; VIII: Homilies and Asceticism; IX: Condolences and Funeral Orations; X: Genealogies and Virtues of the Ancient Arabs;

A basic characteristic of this encyclopaedia is that, apart from a portion of the above-mentioned mgūza, it contains absolutely no tradition of Andalusian origin. The author, Ibn Quddama, who had himself studied under al-Bahuti and al-Abd al-Baki, a native of Baclabakk, had himself studied under al-Bahuti. He had little information on his life, and the dates both of his deposed and thrown into exile, there began "an era of the first Arab governors (wall) of Jaen and was thus going first to Mecca, where he found the teaching of al-Maʿmad, had been begun under his father's guidance. He learned the Qurʾān by heart and first studied Hanbali doctrine, which originated in the kūra of Jaen and was descended from al-Samh b. Malik b. Khawlan, one of the first Arab governors (wall) of al-Andalus. Several members of the family, which was very numerous, occupied important administrative posts in the time of the Mutlak al-faḍālī according to Ibn Bassām, who quotes in this connexion some satirical points out some manuscript sources not used in the preparation of this article); Makkari, Analectes, ii, 404-5; H. Péres, Poesie andalouze, index.

(From the Library of Dr. Lucien-Janke)

Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, Hanballi theologian, founder of Wahhabism, was born in 1115/1703, in the centre of the Najd at al-ʿUyayna, an oasis which at the time was enjoying some prosperity. There had already been several representatives of Hanbalism in the Najd, and the young Muhammad belonged to a family which had produced several doctors of the school. His grandfather, Sulaymān b. Muhammad, had been mufti of the Najd. His father ʿAbd al-Wahhāb was kādi at ʿUyayna during the emirate of ʿAbd Allāh b. Muhammad b. Muʿammār; he taught hadith and fikr in the mosques of the town and left several works of Hanball inspiration, which in part survive.

Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb's education was begun under his father's guidance. He learned the ḥurūf by heart and first studied Hanballi doctrine in the works of Shaykh Muwaffaq al-Din b. Kudama (d. 620/1223) and in particular in the ʿUmda, which, according to Shaykh Ibn Bīrī, was regarded in the Najd at that period as the standard authority. In the time of this author and on the ʿUmda see H. Laoust, Le précis de droit dʾIbn Qudama, in the series PIFD, Beirut 1950).

The young theologian soon left ʿUyayna, in what circumstances it is not clear. It may be that he had already begun his teaching against the cult of saints and the paganism which was rife among the Bedouin, and that the amir showed little inclination to follow him in this matter. It is also likely that, as the oasis of ʿUyayna offered relatively few intellectual resources, the young shaykh felt the need to go and complete his education in other centres.

Little is known of the chronology of his journeys "in search of learning". He performed the Pilgrimage, thus going first to Mecca, where he found the teaching disappointing. The stay which he made after this at Medina was decisive in shaping the later direction of his thought. At Medina, he met especially a Hanballi theologian who was to have a decisive influence on him: Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿIbrāhīm al-Najḏī, who had become a supporter of the neo-Hanbalism of Ibn Taymiyya and who had himself been the pupil of Shaykh ʿAbd al-Ṣāliḥ al-Hanbalī (d. 1071/1661); ʿAbd al-Ṣāliḥ, a native of Baḥābakk, had himself studied under al-Bahūtī (q.v.) and al-

avarice of the new masters—the Almoravids, for whom he was now writing panegyrics—and his wanderings in which he encountered no friends (Analectes, loc. cit.). The memory of the fallen al-Muʿtamid's generosity was to stay with him all his life and faithful, like Ibn al-Labbāna (q.v.), to the poet-king, he went shortly after the latter's death (488/1095) to Aqshāt, where he was so daring as to kiss his tomb and to recite, on a feast day, before a large crowd which was moved at the sound of his poetry, a long impassioned elegy in which he called him "King of Kings" and described him "as though he possessed two similar versions (Ibn Khākān, Kālidīdī, Būlāk 1283, 30-1; Ibn al-Khadīth, Amdāl al-ʿalām, Beirut 1956, 165-7, who has preserved more than a hundred lines) has been used by R. Dozy, Hist. Mus. Esp., iii, 175, and by E. García Gómez, in al-Andalus, xviii (1953), 403-4.

Bibliography: In addition to the works already quoted: Ibn Bassām, Dhakīrīa, iii (ms.); Ibn Saʿīd, Muṣīrīb, ii, 203-4 (in which the editor points out some manuscript sources not used in the preparation of this article); Makkari, Analectes, ii, 497; H. Péres, Poesie andalouze, index.

(F. de la Granja)
Marî; he taught for a long period at Medina and then returned to Damascus, where he continued his teaching at the Umayyad mosque. At Medina b. 'Abd al-Wahhab met also, among other 'ulama', Muhammed b. Hayât al-Sindi (d. 1165/1752), a Hanafi, who does not seem to have had a great influence on him, and Muhammed b. Sulaymân al-Kurdi (d. 1194/1780).

Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab went next (it is not known exactly at what date) to Basra, which was still an active centre of Islamic culture, and where he seems to have stayed for a fairly long time. The names are known of several of the teachers whom he met at that period, in particular that of Muhammed al-Madimu't, under whom he studied philology and the sira. Probably also, in a town with such a mixed population as Basra, he had the opportunity of making the acquaintance of a wider circle of spiritual groups than that in which he had been educated, in particular the mystic fraternities and the shî'î sects. The spectacle of popular idolatry such as that in which he had been brought up, seems to have led the young shaykh to embark at this period on his campaign of reform. His departure from Basra, which seems to have occurred in 1152/1739, marks in any case the end of the period of his education and the beginning of his religious and political apostolate.

According to the anonymous author of the Lam' al-qahhâ fî ta'rîkh M. m. 'Abd al-Wahhab (ed. Ahmad A. Abu Hâkîma, Beirut 1967), the legendary character of which seems to evidence on many counts, Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab, after spending four years at Basra, went to Baghdad, where he made a wealthy marriage and remained for five years. He next appeared in Kurdistân, at Hamadân and at Isfahan, where he arrived about 1148/1736 at the beginning of the reign of Nâdîr Shâh and studied philosophy and Sûfism. He next went to Damascus and to Cairo. Similar journeys had already been attributed to Ahmad b. Hanbal.

On leaving Basra, Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab went to Huraymila, where his father (d. 1153/1740) had just settled. It was here that Muhammed composed his first work on the unity of God (tawhîd) and really began his apostolate, gathering round him his first disciples and thus extending his influence not without some difficulties, since the hostility of the Banû Khâlid was still to be feared. In 1157/1744, the amir and the theologian swore an oath of mutual loyalty (bay'a) to strive, by force if necessary, to make the kingdom of God's word prevail. This pact, which was always faithfully adhered to, marked the true beginning of the Wahhabî state, which transformed a small Bedouin principality into a legally constituted empire. Henceforward it was impossible to separate the destiny of the shaykh from that of the Su'ûdi dynasty.

Until his death in 1206/1792, Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab continued his activities in the religious as well as the political field. He taught at the mosque in Darîyya, wrote theological works and sent out numerous letters to win to his cause new supporters in the Nadîd and the neighbouring regions. He also remained the political counsellor of Muhammed b. Su'ûd (d. 1178/1765) and, to a lesser degree it seems, of his successor 'Abd al-'Azîz (1765-1801).

Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab's literary and doctrinal works, which have appeared in many editions for the use of Wahhabî missionary activity, are important. Most of his writings are fairly short, full of quotations from the Qur'an and hadîths; the Kitâb al-Taghî, his main work, often reprinted and of the subject of many commentaries, sets out his teaching in the line of the strictest Hanballi doctrine. His Kitâb al-Uṣûl al-thaqîla, written at the request of the ruler 'Abd al-'Azîz, is a type of official catechism, which is still esteemed. His Kitâb Kâshf al-ghubûhî, more polemical in presentation, condemns Muslims who do not practise the true tawhîd.

The Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab, in his work Kitâb al-qubûs al-nasîhî (Cairo 1346) mentions several other short treatises by the shaykh defining his conception of faith (imân) and of Islam (Uṣûl al-imân; Fadl al-Islâm; al-Kabdîr; Naṣîhat al-Muslimîn).

Several of the sons or the descendants of Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab carried on his work. His son 'Abd Allah, who accompanied Su'ûd b. 'Abd al-'Azîz (1803-14) on his conquest of the Hijaz in 1805-6 and supported his action in 'Irât, wrote an important refutation of the doctrines of the Twelvers and of the Zaydiyya, published in the Madimā'at al-rasâ'il wa'l-masâ'î al-nadîdiyya (iv, 47-222; the greatest part of volume i of this collection consists of his writings). 'Abd al-Wahhab often mentions in his works non-Hanballi Sunni sources (among them Ibn Hazm).

Sulaymân b. 'Abd al-Wahhab, the grandson of the shaykh Muhammad and also greatly devoted to the principle of reform, was hâdi of Darîyya; he was violently hostile to the Ottomans and forbade all relations with them. He was sentenced to death by Ibrâhîm Pâsha after the capture of Darîyya in 1233/1818, while his brother 'Ali was pursued by the Egyptians and killed at Qâdirjî. Sulaymân wrote a work which is interesting for the study of the relations of Uâyyna. The Nadîd was at this time in close relationship with the inhabitants of al-'Absâ, among whom were some Shî'is, who tended to be alarmed by the shaykh's preaching.

Because of their intervention (and also that of the Banû Khâlid), Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab left Uâyyna. He went to Darîyya (near Riyâd, the present capital of Saudi Arabia), where he had acquired powerful protectors in some members of the family of the amir, Muhammed b. Su'ûd. After winning to his cause the amir's two brothers and his son, the future king 'Abd al-'Azîz (d. 1215/1801), he finally gained supremacy. He turned towards his new centre, though not without some difficulties, since the hostility of the Banû Khâlid was still to be feared. In 1157/1744, the amir and the theologian swore an oath of mutual loyalty (bay'a) to strive, by force if necessary, to make the kingdom of God's word prevail. This pact, which was always faithfully adhered to, marked the true beginning of the Wahhabî state, which transformed a small Bedouin principality into a legally constituted empire. Henceforward it was impossible to separate the destiny of the shaykh from that of the Su'ûdi dynasty.

Until his death in 1206/1792, Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab continued his activities in the religious as well as the political field. He taught at the mosque in Darîyya, wrote theological works and sent out numerous letters to win to his cause new supporters in the Nadîd and the neighbouring regions. He also remained the political counsellor of Muhammed b. Su'ûd (d. 1178/1765) and, to a lesser degree it seems, of his successor 'Abd al-'Azîz (1765-1801).

Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab's literary and doctrinal works, which have appeared in many editions for the use of Wahhabî missionary activity, are important. Most of his writings are fairly short, full of quotations from the Qur'an and hadîths; the Kitâb al-Taghî, his main work, often reprinted and of the subject of many commentaries, sets out his teaching in the line of the strictest Hanballi doctrine. His Kitâb al-Uṣûl al-thaqîla, written at the request of the ruler 'Abd al-'Azîz, is a type of official catechism, which is still esteemed. His Kitâb Kâshf al-ghubûhî, more polemical in presentation, condemns Muslims who do not practise the true tawhîd.

The Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab, in his work Kitâb al-qubûs al-nasîhî (Cairo 1346) mentions several other short treatises by the shaykh defining his conception of faith (imân) and of Islam (Uṣûl al-imân; Fadl al-Islâm; al-Kabdîr; Naṣîhat al-Muslimîn).

Several of the sons or the descendants of Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhab carried on his work. His son 'Abd Allah, who accompanied Su'ûd b. 'Abd al-'Azîz (1803-14) on his conquest of the Hijaz in 1805-6 and supported his action in 'Irût, wrote an important refutation of the doctrines of the Twelvers and of the Zaydiyya, published in the Madimâ'at al-rasâ'il wa'l-masâ'î al-nadîdiyya (iv, 47-222; the greatest part of volume i of this collection consists of his writings). 'Abd al-Wahhab often mentions in his works non-Hanballi Sunni sources (among them Ibn Hazm).

Sulaymân b. 'Abd al-Wahhab, the grandson of the shaykh Muhammad and also greatly devoted to the principle of reform, was hâdi of Darîyya; he was violently hostile to the Ottomans and forbade all relations with them. He was sentenced to death by Ibrâhîm Pâsha after the capture of Darîyya in 1233/1818, while his brother 'Ali was pursued by the Egyptians and killed at Kâdirjî. Sulaymân wrote a work which is interesting for the study of the relations of Uâyyna. The Nadîd was at this time in close relationship with the inhabitants of al-'Absâ, among whom were some Shî'is, who tended to be alarmed by the shaykh's preaching. 
of Wahhabism with Trak, the K. al-Tawdifr 'an tawhid al-Khalldk fi gjawwb alhk al-Trak (Cairo 1319).

The doctrine of Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhab was very strongly influenced by that of Ibn Taymiyya (d. 729/1329), to a lesser degree, by that of Ibn Kayyim al-Danjwiyah (d. 751/1350). But, beyond these two writers, it is still more closely linked to the formulation of Hanbalism as found in the works of earlier writers, such as the shaikh 'Abd Allâh (d. 290/903) or Abd Bakr al-Khalilî (d. 311/924). Very hostile to the sects which had always been denounced by the Hanballîs as incom- pact, Kalawun (d. 738/1340) declined and rejected the teachings of al-Pundîl (Jâhâl, etc.). Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhab criticized, even within Sunnism, all the forms of kalâm or of Sûfîsm which tended to introduce into the dogma or the law of Islam innovations (bid'a) considered to be heretical or schismatic. He denounced no less violently the survival, particularly among the Bedouin, of practices going back even to the period of the Bihâbîyya. Although Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhab was not confirmed or rejected by an important section of Muslim opinion, it was nevertheless to make a powerful contribution not only to a more profound Islamization of Arabia, but also to a general renewal of the Islam conscience immediately before the modern period of intrusion from the West.


IBN 'ABD AL-Zahir, Mu'âviya 'l-Dîn Abu 'l-Fadl Abu 'l-Abd Allâh b. Rashîd 'l-Dîn Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-Zahir b. Naṣîwân b. 'Abd al-Zahir b. Naḍîd al-Sâdî al-Rawî, born in Cairo 620/1223, died there 692/1292 (Wiistenfeld, Ktib al-Sirr Sabyb al-Inshâ*, Cairo 1939, 166 ff., and, for the author's place in the general history of Islam, Usur fi sirat al-Malik al-?ahir, ed. Murad Kamil, Cairo 1961, cited above). He compiled books, which were of use to later authors.


IBN 'ABD AL-ZAHIR (B. NADJDA AL-SA'DI) (Tashrif, i, 477; for the place in the general history of Islam, Usur fi sirat al-Malik al-?ahir, ed. Murad Kamil, Cairo 1961, cited above). He compiled books, which were of use to later authors.

It cannot be doubted that Ibn 'Abd al-Zahir engaged in much official activity as secret secretary, and it is difficult to identify the role of Fakhr al-Din in his history. An interesting document is quoted by Ibn al-Furat, a ta'addul drawn up by the sabil al-muhaddara fi akhibdr Misr wa 'l-Kadhira, 333; so too does al-Suyuti, liusn al-muhddara fi akhbdr Misr wa 'l-Kadhira, 65-74; Spanish translation, Pons Boigues, Ensayo, 190-8); reproduced in F. Busfutuwwa xii, 274 f., with German translation, A. Moberg, Urberichte aus der Geschichte der Staatskanzlei im Islamischen Maghreb, v, 318 f.; in Rabi I 695/March 1292 he wrote a decree for the initiation of the Kurd al-Hakkarl as a member of the madrasa Kubba. Nevertheless, Ibn 'Abd al-Zahir continued his activity during these years. In Djumādā II 679/October 1280 he drew up a ta'addul al-sultana for al-Malik al-Salih from Kalāwūn (op. cit., 200 f.; Subh al-aqūda, x, 173 f.; in Rabi I 679/June 1280 he produced a decree about the leadership of the Jews (Tabari, iii, 236); in Rabi I 695/March 1292 he wrote a decree for the king and the government of the city and the enumeration of some great characters and explanations, as was realised by Abu 'l-Kasim Abd al-Malik b. Mu'ādh al-Mawsil, better known as al-Murādī of this city, which sets out to call to mind all the kings killed since the beginning of mankind and is an elegy on the end of the Aftasids, possesses a certain literary merit, yet real lyrical inspiration is missing and it is weighed down by the accumulation of proper names. Nevertheless, it is much admired by Arab critics, who consider it a veritable masterpiece.

In order to be intelligible, the poem needs precise explanations, as was realised by Abu 'l-Kāsim 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Abd Allah al-Hadrami, better known by his ma'rifa or ma'rifat, who wrote a historical commentary on it. All we know of this Ibn Badrūn is that he came originally from Silves and was a contemporary of Ibn 'Abdūn. His work, however, which draws largely on Oriental sources, particularly the Murādī of al-Mas'ūdī, has survived and been published, together with the text of the poem and abundant notes, by R. Dozy, as Commentaire historique sur le poème d'Ibn Abdūn par Ibn Badrūn, Leiden 1863. The Prolegomena and edition of this celebrated Aben Abdūni poematis in hictuosum Aphtasidarum interitum.

Bibliography: The text of Ibn 'Abdūn's poem is to be found also in the Muqaddimāt of Māraḵuṣlī (ed. Dozy, 53-60; Cairo edition 1368/1949, 76-87); French translation, E. Fagnan, Histoire des Almohades, 65-74; Spanish translation, Pons Boigues, Ensayo, 190-8); reproduced in F. Busfutuwwa xii, 274 f.

IBN `ABDŪN, MUHAMMAD B. AHMAD, Spanish author of a treatise of hisba [q.v.] dealing with Seville. All that is known of him is drawn from his own work itself, the two known manuscripts of which give the author’s name in two slightly different forms (Muhammad b. AbdAllah al-Nakha‘i ‘Abdūn, and Muhammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Abdūn al-Tudīlī). He was either a āfīkh or a ḥāḍī or a muḥtaṣib, who was perhaps born, and certainly spent a large part of his life, in Seville, in the second half of the 6th/12th centuries, since on the one hand he refers as a direct witness to the early years of the reign of al-Mu’tamid, and on the other speaks of the Almoravids as being already masters of the town. His source, together with the similar work devoted to Málaga by his contemporary al-Sakātī, is a most valuable source on urban, economic and social life in Muslim Spain at this period. The text edited by E. Lévi-Provençal (JA, ccxvii [1934], 177-229; and ed. in Doc. arabes inédits sur la vie sociale et économique en Occ. mus. au moyen âge, Cairo 1955, 3-65) has been translated into Italian by F. Gabrieli (Il trattato censorio di Ibn ‘Abdūn sul buon governo di Siniglia, in Rend. Mem., 9th series, xi, 1935, 878-935), from French by Lévi-Provençal himself (Seville musulmane au début du XIIe siècle: le traité d’Ibn ‘Abdūn, Paris 1947), and into Spanish by E. Lévi-Provençal-E. Garcia Gómez (Sevilla a comienzos del siglo XII, Madrid 1948). [F. Gabrieli]

IBN `ABDUS [See AL-DAHSHIYYA].

IBN `ABDUS, ABū `ABD ALLAH MUHAMMAD B. IBRĀHĪM (202-60/817-73), faḥīk of Ifriqiya. (Tunis). His life, study and thought can be considered typical for those of the generation that followed Ibn Sahnūn and his followers said that man can be sure of his faith only for the past and present, but not for the future: if he were asked if he were muḥiimin he should say “muḥiimin in shā‘a ‘ārāh” (the satirical insult known as the satirical letter), using the signature of Wallada, and sent it to Ibn ‘Abdūn by the same go-between. The risāla became immediately famous because it was an attack on one of the chiefs of the town. Ibn ‘Abdūn avoided any open contact with Wallāda, whose attitude to Ibn Zaydūn had been cooled by the poet’s audacity; but after the latter left Cordova for Badajoz and then Seville, Ibn ‘Abdūn took over Wallāda completely, and she remained his mistress until her death. He died in 472/1079-80, at the age of 80.


IBN ABI ‘AMIR [See IBN-AL-MANṢŪR].

IBN ABI ‘ASRŪN,Sharaf al-Dīn Abū Sa‘īd Abū ‘AbdAllāh b. Muhammad b. Hibat ‘Allāh b. Mutahhar al-Tamīnī al-Mawṣūlī, later al-Halābī and finally al-Dīmahquī, was the most important ʂāfi‘ī scholar of his time. He was born in Rabī‘I 492 or 493/February 1099 or 1100 at Hadīth, studied at Mawṣul and then at Wāṣīt, with Abū ‘Ali al-‘Afdīlī, and at Baghdad, particularly with As‘ad al-Mayhānī and Ibn Burūnī (see the list of his teachers in al-‘Nu‘aymī, Dāris, 400). From 523/1129, he taught at Mawṣul, then went to settle in the region of Sindjār and was appointed ʂādi‘ of Sindjār, Nishābūn and Harrān, and later of Dīmahquī. He was deeply pious and well versed in ʂī‘a. He was also appointed administrator (muṣīr) of the wa‘fāt. He then returned to Aleppo, where he had had a madrasa built, and became again ʂādi‘ of Sindjār, Harrān and Diyar Bakr. Leaving his son Nadjīm al-Dīn to succeed him at Aleppo, he returned to Damascus in 570/1174 to teach at the Ghazāliyya madrasa, the lectures of which were given in the north-west sector of the Great Mosque. He was also appointed administrator (muṣīr) of the wa‘fāt. He then returned to Aleppo, where he had had a madrasa built, and became again ʂādi‘ of Sindjār, Harrān and Diyar Bakr. Leaving his son Nadjīm al-Dīn to succeed him at Aleppo, he returned to Damascus in 570/1174 to teach at the Ghazāliyya madrasa, and also in his own madrasa. In 573/1183, in the reign of Sa‘īd al-Dīn, he was appointed, after the death of Diya‘ al-Dīn al-Shahrāzurī, to succeed him as the chief ʂādi‘ ʂādi‘, the most important judicial office in Syria. In 575/1179-80 he had to retire, and died at the age of over 93 in Ramadan 585/October-November 1185 and was buried in the madrasa he had built opposite his house in Damascus, to the west of Bāb al-Barid.

Nūr al-Dīn had had built for him six madrasas: at Aleppo, Ba‘labakī, Damascus, Hamāt, Hims and Manbīdji. Ibn Abī ‘Asrūn wrote a number of works, which have been lost, but the titles of seven of them are mentioned by Ibn Kāhir, among them Safarīt
IBN ABI 'ASRŪN — IBN ABI 'L-AWWDJĀ

al-ma'dhab fi nihdyat al-maflab in seven volumes, K. al-Intisāf, and Faw'dād al-ma'dhab. His sons Nadīm al-Din and Muhbīl al-Din taught in the madrasas which he had founded at Aleppo and Damascus, followed by his grandsons and great-grandsons.


IBN ABI 'AṬIK is the usual appellative of the great-grandson of the Caliph Abu Bakr, ʿAbd Allāh b. Mūhammad (= Abū ʿAthīk) b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abū Bakr. All that is known of him is that, after al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, he married, AL-RAHMAN B. ABI BAKR. All that is known of him is that he lived first at Basra, where (although even this is doubtful) he is supposed to have been a disciple of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (q.v.), and seeking the company of wits such as Umayr b. Abī Rabiʿa and al-Thurayya. We may take this personage supplied by Muslim historians and theologians of diverse tendencies depicts him as a man of dangerous heterodoxy, who, on his own admission, invented the calendar and spread Manichaean propaganda by means of insidious questions relating to the problem of free will and determinism. What is more certain is that he frequented a very mixed milieu, rubbing shoulders with Muṭaṭazzīlīs such as ʿAmr b. Ubuyd and Wāṣīl b. ʿAtāʾ (qq.v.), with poets disapproved of by orthodox Muslims, such as Bashshār b. Burd and Sālīḥ b. Abī ʿAlī al-Kudūsī (qq.v.) and with other suspect persons. Expelled from Basra, he went to live at Kīfē, where he was put to death by the governor Muhammad b. Sulaymān, in 1557 or perhaps two years earlier; it is difficult to accept the date 67/783-4 accepted by L. Massignon; it is also doubtful whether one should accept as entirely historical the Ṣāḥīh accounts speaking of discussions carried on over a long period at Mecca between Ibn Abī 'l-Awwdjā and Dīārār al-Sādīk (q.v.). The arguments which, according to L. Massignon, would make him the compiler of the fīṣāḥāt of the iṣmāʿ Dīyar are also far from convincing.

This much, however, is clear: the information on this personage supplied by Muslim historians and theologians of diverse tendencies depicts him as a man of dangerous heterodoxy, who, on his own admission, invented numerous traditions, falsified the calendar and spread Manichaean propaganda by means of insidious questions relating to the problem of free will and determinism, and who was a believer in the eternity of the world and in metempsychosis (tannāsīn). Bibliography: The sources have been gathered together and discussed in G. Vajda's study, Les sīnīds en pays d'islam au début de la période abbasside, in RSO, xxvii (1937-8), 193 (21-26), 223 (51-225 (53); in addition al-Kulaynī, Uṣūl al-Khāf, i, Tehran 1375/1955, 74 ff.; Ch. Pellat, Le milieu basrien et la formation de Gāhīz, 1955, 219; L. Massignon, Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, 1954, 182, 201, 205-6 (index to be corrected). H. Tālīzāda and A. Ašfār Shīrāzī, Mehr ve dīn-i a, Tehran 1355 S./1976, index s.v. Ibn Abī 'l-Awwdjā (p. 540). (G. Vajda)

in criticism over an anecdote in which ʿAṣīha appears, does not hesitate to accuse the Rāfīḍīs (q.v.), in their hostility to the Prophet's widow, of having invented the. Without going that far, we may legitimately suppose that the name of Ibn Abī 'Athīk could well have served to justify the development of the genre of jokes that flourished so much in the early days of Islam [see AL-QIYD WA 'L-HAZL, NĀDIRA].

Bibliography: Muhammad b. Ḥābīb, Muhābbar, 66, 442; Dīāhī, Ḥayāyān, ii, 84; Ps.-Dīāhī, Le Livre de la couronne, transl. Ch. Pellat, Paris 1954, 151-2; Ibn Kitāyba, Maṣūdī, 233; idem, ʿUyūn, index; Masʿūdī, Mūṣādī, v, 285; Fihrist, Cairo ed., 145, 212; Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīh, ʿĪbādī, Cairo 1950-53, ii, 291, vi, 207-8, vii, 22 ff.; Aḥqāfī, index; Ḥūṣiṣ, Zāhr, i, 238, 247, 248, index; Pīdām, 4, 31, 52 ff., 177-8; Muḥābbar al-Zubayrī, Nasr Kurayba, 278; Marzuqānī, Muḥābbarāt, 149; F. Rosenhal, Humour, 12, n. 1; F. Bustānī, Dīārār al-maṣūdī, ii, 317. (Ch. Pellat)

IBN ABI 'L-AWWDJĀ, ʿABD AL-KARĪM, a notorious crypto-Manichean (sīnīdī q.v.), belonging to a great family (he was the maternal uncle of Mān b. Zādīqā (q.v.)). According to the most reliable information, he lived first at Baṣrā, where (although even this is doubtful) he is supposed to have been a disciple of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (q.v.), from whom he parted on account of the latter's doctrinal inconsistency regarding the problem of free will and determinism. What is more certain is that he frequented a very mixed milieu, rubbing shoulders with Muṭaṭazzīlīs such as ʿAmr b. Ubuyd and Wāṣīl b. ʿAtāʾ (qq.v.), with poets disapproved of by orthodox Muslims, such as Bashshār b. Burd and Sālīḥ b. Abī ʿAlī al-Kudūsī (qq.v.) and with other suspect persons. Expelled from Basrā, he went to live at Kīfē, where he was put to death by the governor Muhammad b. Sulaymān, in 1557 or perhaps two years earlier; it is difficult to accept the date 67/783-4 accepted by L. Massignon; it is also doubtful whether one should accept as entirely historical the Ṣāḥīh accounts speaking of discussions carried on over a long period at Mecca between Ibn Abī 'l-Awwdjā and Dīyarīr al-Sādīk (q.v.); the arguments which, according to L. Massignon, would make him the compiler of the fīṣāḥāt of the iṣmāʿ Dīyar are also far from convincing.

This much, however, is clear: the information on this personage supplied by Muslim historians and theologians of diverse tendencies depicts him as a man of dangerous heterodoxy, who, on his own admission, invented numerous traditions, falsified the calendar and spread Manichaean propaganda by means of insidious questions relating to the problem of free will and determinism, and who was a believer in the eternity of the world and in metempsychosis (tannāsīn). Bibliography: The sources have been gathered together and discussed in G. Vajda's study, Les sīnīds en pays d'islam au début de la période abbasside, in RSO, xxvii (1937-8), 193 (21-26), 223 (51-225 (53); in addition al-Kulaynī, Uṣūl al-Khāf, i, Tehran 1375/1955, 74 ff.; Ch. Pellat, Le milieu basrien et la formation de Gāhīz, 1955, 219; L. Massignon, Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, 1954, 182, 201, 205-6 (index to be corrected). H. Tālīzāda and A. Ašfār Shīrāzī, Mehr ve dīn-i a, Tehran 1355 S./1976, index s.v. Ibn Abī 'l-Awwdjā (p. 540). (G. Vajda)
IBN ABI 'AWN, IBRAHIM B. MUHAMMAD B. ABMDABI 'AWN B. HILAL B. 'L-NA'IM, man of letters who flourished in the 3rd/9th century. His bynaya is variously reported as Abū 'Isāḥ, Abū 'Imrān (Baghdādī, Farkh), Abū 'Amr (colophon of the Medina MS of his K. al-Taṣbihātī, no. 4 below). The above genealogy, given by Yaḥyā (Udabd*), is variously reported as Abu Ishak, Abu Lahab, Abu Thīhib as chamberlain and was appointed governor of ṭūṣī in 255/866, during the caliphate of al-Mu'tazz; he too was a poet, and verses of his addressed to Ibn Rūmī (p.v.) are quoted in al-Muwāṣṣadāt, 349.

Ibn Abī 'Awīn, a litterateur of the 2nd/8th century, on the Nahr cūtī; he followed the family profession of secretary, whence his designation as al-Kātib al-Baghdādī, and was for a time chief of the ghurī. He was the friend of al-Muktadir's secretary; his grandfather Ahmad was a scholar and the Medina MS of his K. al-Tashbihītī, (al-'Umdāta, Farkh), father Muhammad served Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Thīhir as chamberlain and was appointed governor of Wāṣṭi in 855/866, during the caliphate of al-Mu'tazz; he too was a poet, and verses of his addressed to Ibn Rūmī (p.v.) are quoted in al-Muwāṣṣadāt, 349.

The above genealogy, given by Yakut (Udabd*), kunya is variously reported as Abu Ishak, Abu Lahab, Abu Thīhib as chamberlain and was appointed governor of ṭūṣī in 255/866, during the caliphate of al-Mu'tazz; he too was a poet, and verses of his addressed to Ibn Rūmī (p.v.) are quoted in al-Muwāṣṣadāt, 349.

Ibn Abī 'Awīn, a litterateur of the 2nd/8th century, on the Nahr cūtī; he followed the family profession of secretary, whence his designation as al-Kātib al-Baghdādī, and was for a time chief of the ghurī. He was the friend of al-Muktadir's secretary; his grandfather Ahmad was a scholar and the Medina MS of his K. al-Tashbihītī, (al-'Umdāta, Farkh), father Muhammad served Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Thīhir as chamberlain and was appointed governor of ṭūṣī in 255/866, during the caliphate of al-Mu'tazz; he too was a poet, and verses of his addressed to Ibn Rūmī (p.v.) are quoted in al-Muwāṣṣadāt, 349.


IBN ABI 'L-DAM, SUHAYR AL-DIN IBRAHIM B. ABU'LLAH AL-HAMWAI, historian and Shāfi'i jurist. Born in Ḥamāt on 21 Dūmād I 583/29 July 1187, he studied in Baghdād, taught in Ḥamāt, Aleppo, and Cairo, and finally was appointed judge in his native city. He went to Baghdād in 621 on an embassy for the ruler of Ḥamāt, al-Malik al-Muẓaffār, and, in the following year, when he was again on his way to Baghdād to announce there the death of al-Malik al-Muẓaffār, he was stricken with dysentery in al-Maʾarrā and returned to Ḥamāt, where he died upon arriving there on 25 Dūmād II 622/20 July 1224. He wrote two histories, one a brief annalistic work starting with the life of the Prophet and continued to the year 628, dedicated to al-Malik al-Muẓaffār, and the other a large biographical work in six volumes, entitled al-Ṭaʾrīkh al-Muẓaffārī. Only the former is preserved in manuscript (Ms. 1292b of the Municipal Library in Alexandria being another copy of it). He also wrote an often cited work on Muslim Sects (cf. H. Kitter, in Is., xvii (1929), 51), as well as legal works on ādāb al-ḥādīt (ḥādīt, ḫudūd), on (it seems) the transmission of traditions Tadākh al-ṭanīya fi taḥkīk al-riwdy waṭawiya, and commentaries on al-Ghazalī's Wasit (Ṣarḥ muḍqīl al-Wasit, obviously identical with the ṭāḥāḥ al-aṭāḥi, mentioned by Brockelmann, S I, 753, no. 49 f) and on the Tābīnī of Abū l-Isbākh (Ṣirākh, quoted by Damir, under zarīf). A legal opinion from these works was still debated by the Subkīs.


IBN ABI 'L-DĀ'ŪD [see al-ṣīdājīnī].

IBN ABI DĪNĀR, ABD ALLĀH MUHAMMAD B. ABI 'L-KĀSHIM AL-RUṢAYNĪ AL-KAYRAWĀNI, historian of Kayrawān. In 1092/1681 or in 1110/ 1698 he wrote a history of Tunisia entitled Kādāb al-Mun'īs fi adḥbār Irīṣiyā wa-Tūnīs, printed Tunis 1286/1621-2; tr. Pelissier and Remusat, Paris 1845. It is a mediocre work. Though of interest for the core of the period up to the date when it was written, it is hardly of interest for any others.

Bibliography: A. Bel, Les Benou Chānā, Paris 1903, Introduction; Roy, Extrait du catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de la Grande
Mosquée de Tunis, Tunis 1900, no. 4960, 50; Brockelmann, II, 457, S II, 682; F. Bustād, DM, i, 205.

**IBN ABI 'L-DIYĀF, ABR 'L-'ABNĀS AHMAD, Tunisian chronicler born at Tunis in 1217/1802-3, died in the same town on 7 Jāhār ban 1291/20 September 1874. As secretary and counsellor to the beys, he was entrusted with the delicate missions to Istanbul in 1246/1830 and 1258/1842, and accompanied Ahmad Bey to Paris in 1262/1846. He played an active part in the drawing up of the Pacte Fondamental and of the Constitution of 1861 {see note 24}. After the date he seems to have fallen into partial disgrace, from which he was rescued only for a short time by Khāyār al-Dīn, who was chief minister from 1873.

The work of Ibn Abī 'l-Diyāf consists essentially of a history of Tunisia from the Arab conquest up to 1260/1846, the Istāfah abī al-samān bi-akhbār mušāk Tūnīs wa-‘l-adhn al-amān. Up to the period of the Husaynis, this chronicle is a summary devoid of originality, but it increases in extent and in interest as it approaches the events which were contemporary with the author.

**Bibliography:** I. Editions: (1) Tunis, Imprimerie Officielle, 1359/1901-2; only the 1st 'ādī; (2) Tunis, Secrétariat d'État aux Affaires Culturelles, 1963-6, 8 volumes published. II. Reference works: Muhammad Bayram (Bayram V), Şafā' sad al-ʃīrī, ii, Cairo 1930; Muhammad al-Nafyar, ʿUnwān al-arbi fi man nāğā bi 'l-mamlak al-Tūnīsyya min 'ālim adīn, Tunis 1351, ii; 130; Muhammad Makhlūf, Şadhījarat al-nār al-ṣākiyya fi ṣababāl al-ʃāmilīyya, 394, no. 1571; H. H. 'Abd al-Wāḥīḥ, al-Munahlākah al-mādrasi min al-adab al-tashī, Cairo 1944, 142; idem, Ḫulūldat ta'rīkh Tūnīs, Tunis 1373, 170; al-Rūdād al-tamisī, 15th year, nos. 25 and 26; Brockelmann, S III, 490; L. Bercher, En marge du pacte fondamental, in RT, n.s. xxxvii (1939), 67, note 3; J. Ganiage, Les origines du protectorat français en Tunisie, Paris 1959, 86, note 38; H. Përs, La littérature arabe et l'Islam par les textes, les XIXe et XXe siècles, Algiers 1938, 18. (A. ABDESELEEM)

**IBN ABI DU'DĀD [see AHMAD B. ABI DU'DĀD].**

**IBN ABI 'L-DUNYĀ, ABŪ BAKR 'ABD ALLĀH B. MUHAMMAD B. 'UBAYD B. SÛFYĀN AL-KURASH AL-BAGHĀDI, Arabic writer, born in 208/823 in Baghādād and died there in 282/894. Although he was a freedman of the Umayyads, he became the tutor of several 'Abbāsid princes and in particular of those who were later to become caliphs as al-Mu'tadid and al-Mu'taḍidī. Ibn Abī 'l-Dunyā was a learned teacher, highly respected for his exemplary way of life; he is counted as a "weak" traditionist only by the Shi'i [Māmākānī, Tanbīḥ al-mādoğ, 7028]. He led a pious and ascetic life (zaḥā), combined with an extensive teaching activity. His writings belong for the most part to the field of edifying literature: he preached patience, humility, penitence, trust in God, hospitality, vigils, silence, frugality, etc., and condemned envy, anger, drunkenness, the use of musical instruments, and "the World" (al-dunyā) in general; he treated also single themes such as the merits of Rāmādān and of 10 Dhu 'l-Hijjah (yawm al-adhāt), or general themes such as the moral characteristics which a man should seek to attain (mahārīm al-ṣabāb), or Joy after Sorrow (al-'afārā ṣabā al-ṣağṣa). The titles of a few historical works are also recorded. Altogether Ibn Abī 'l-Dunyā is said to have written over 100 works some 20 of which have survived. Siyāt al-Diawālī even speaks of more than 130 which were known to him. Indeed more than 100 titles can be traced, partly from Ibn al-Nadīm's Fihrist and Ḥājīd, partly from "reading lists" (fahdrīs al-shuyukh), in which later scholars, recording the works which they have studied, have mentioned also some by Ibn Abī 'l-Dunyā.


**IBN ABI 'L-HADĪD, SCHOLAR OF wide learning in the fields of Arabic language, poetry and adab, rhetoric, kalām [q.v.] and of the early history of Islam; in addition he was an avowed Shi'ī and an eminent writer of prose and poetry. Born at al-Madā'ín on 1 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 586/30 December 1190, he died at Baghādād in 655/1257 or 665/1258, i.e., either immediately before or immediately after the capture of the city by the Mongols (20 Muharram 655/28 January 1258); since Ibn al-Fuwāti states that he was able to escape the massacre by the invaders, it is likely that he spent much time in the desert and also in the house of the mawārī of the nāsās (the archives of the diwan al-sīmām), the second date is the more probable. His full name was 'Īzīz Abī Hindī al-Madā'ī, or Al-Madā'ī, less gifted than 'Īzīz Abī Hindī, was the younger of two brothers mentioned in the sources, one, Muwaffāq al-Dīn Abī 'l-Maṭālī Abī Hindī (or al-Kāsim), less gifted than 'Īzīz Abī Hindī (according to Ibn Ḥajjar), enjoyed a certain fame as a jurist, a man of letters and a poet; the other, Abī 'l-Barakāt Muhammad, kātib of the waqfs of the Nizāmīyya and also a poet, died at the age of thirty-four in 598/1201 (Ibn al-Sā'ī, 88).

'Abd al-Hamīd spent his youth in his native town, studied there the doctrines of kalām and showed a leaning towards Mu'tazilism; it was at al-Madā'īn, where Shi'īsm was predominant, that he composed several kasidas, known as fihrīs al-Awāsīyya, which are strongly Shi'ī in tone
He then went to Baghdad, where he mixed with scholars and moderated his opinions. He there enjoyed the patronage of the Seljuk caliphs, from whom he received gifts, and occupied official positions: kāthib in the dār al-taṣrīḥī (office of protocol), then in the Diwān al-Khiṭṭāt, then nāṣīr in the bimāristān (hospital), and finally director of the libraries of Baghdad (according to Muhammad Abu 'l-Fāḍil, in the introduction to his ed. of the Ṣabr al-Nakī āl-balāgah). Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd himself relates (Cairo ed. 1339, iv, 41) an episode which throws some light on his work as a civil servant, which did not, however, prevent his devoting himself enthusiastically to learning and to poetry. It was the last minister of the 'Abbasids, Ibn al-Kalikānī, who showed him the greatest favour, there being political affiliations (tasāyyūnu) and literary connections between them.

Brockelmann gives information on only five of Ibn Abī 'l-Hadid's scientific works, whose titles are given here with some additional information: (1) a criticism of al-Muṭaḥal al-sāʾir fi ǧābūl wa-l-ğābir by Dīyā' al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr (Brockelmann, I, 297, S I, 521), produced on the orders of the caliph al-Mustanṣīr and having the title al-ʿAlāk al-dāʾir ʿalā l-Muṭaḥal al-sāʾir, which immediately gave rise to refutations (see Ḥādjīlī Khiṭṭāt, ed. Flügel, v, 272); (2) Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd's residence in Baghdad from 1236, this work was completed in fifteen days. (2) A commentary on the theological work Al-qārat al-Dīnayn (Brockelmann, I, 507, S I, 923) by al-Fāhrī al-Dīn al-Rāzī. (3) A commentary on Al-muṣannīfī min Shark Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd (Brockelmann, I, 1, 405, S I, 703). This ʿSharḥ in zo ǧuzaʾ, which may be justly described as a masterly product of the best literary work in the Cairo 1239 ed.), is a mine of information of every sort, each fragment having been used by the author as a peg for explanations and digressions on literary, biographical and other matters (attention should be drawn to the historical excursus, because the author has inserted in his commentary long passages from monographs either earlier than al-Ṭabarī or not used by him); because of its value this work deserves the title of ʿAbd Allah b. al-Hadīd b. Ḥamza (Brockelmann, S II, 242) made an abridged version of the title al-MMāṭuṣrāhādī min ʿSharḥ Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd, which was translated into Persian (Brockelmann, S I, 705). To Brockelmann's list there should be added: (6) al-

Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd was also highly thought of as a poet and sometimes described by antonomasia as al-ṣāḥīf al-Tabarī (i.e., "the Tabarī poet"); since he was inspired by a sense of justice he was known under the name of ʿAbd Allah b. al-Hadīd b. Ḥamza (therefore Shīʿī) (the title of this work is not mentioned by Brockelmann). (7) A commentary on ʿAlī al-Muḥāṣṣib (i.e., al-Muḥāṣṣib; see Brockelmann, I, 424, S I, 754). (8) al-Hażrāwī ʿalā ʿAbd Allah b. al-Hadīd al-Muṣafṣāl fi l-nāʾiḥ (by al-Zamakhshārī, S I, 509). (9) Some very critical glosses (lūṭika) on al-Maḥṣūl fi ʿAlī ʾl-ṣīb by Fāhrī al-Dīn al-Rāzī (Brockelmann, I, 507, S I, 421). (10) A commentary (gharb) on the work Muḥāṣṣab al-abār min muḥāṣṣādat al-muḥāṣṣabīn wa-l-muṭaṭabbābīn, a philosophic text by the same Fāhrī al-Dīn al-Rāzī (Brockelmann, I, 507, S I, 923). (11) A commentary on the Muṣkātāt al-ʿalwār of Abuʾl-Ḥasan (or Abuʾl-Ḥusayn) al-Bāṣrī on the ʿAlī al-Muṣafṣāl (neither the work nor the author is mentioned by Brockelmann). (12) A theological, historical and literary miscellany under the title al-Aḥkār al-ḥāṣanīn, in which the author has introduced also some pieces of his own prose and poetry. (13) A commentary on al-Yābūlī by Abū ʾĪsāḥīr b. Nawbāghīt (Brockelmann, S I, 320). (14) Al-Wīṣāb al-ḥāḥābī fi l-ʿilm al-ʿUṣūl, on which no further details are known.

Al-Shīʿī Abū ʾĪsāḥīr b. Nawbāghīt wrote a number of scholars. There are mentioned the following poems by him: (1) the Diwān containing poetry of all types from panegyric to the ḡazal, but with a predominance of Şīʿī munādāt and muḥāṣāt (several examples are included in the ʿAbd Allah b. Ḥamza bibliography); (2) a philosophical text by the ʿAbd Allah b. al-Hadīd b. Ḥamza; (3) a commentary on the Al-ṣāḥīf al-Tabarī, which on which there exist at least four commentaries (Brockelmann, I, 249 f., S I, 497) and the subjects of which are: (a) the capture of Ḵhaybar; (b) the conquest of Mecca; (c) and (d) praises of the Prophet; (e) and (f) the murder of Ḵusayn b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allah; (g) praises of the Prophet. (3) The Muṣannīfīyāt composed on the orders of the caliph al-Muṣṭanṣīr. Verses by Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd are quoted by al-ʿArṣafādī and by Ibn ʿṢāhir in their biographical notices.

All the above information produces an image of a scholar of wide and complex intellectual interests, but different from many other Muslim scholars. It is the details given by the Rawdāt al-dhannāt and confirmed by the ʿAlī al-Muṣafṣāl which show Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd to be a more interesting personality. These two sources show how difficult it was to class this author in one or other of the great religious and political movements of Islam; various judgements have been formed on him and, as his position was not clear, writers have resorted to making distinctions: Muṭaṭallī for the ʿUṣūl, but ʿṢāḥīhī for the ḡurāʾ (thus decidedly Sunni in this field), but objective in his attitude to the ʿAlī al-Bayt [q.v.] and explicit in his affirmation of the rights of ʿAlī (therefore Shiʿī); or else it has been suggested that, at first a Muṭaṭallī, he later became a Ṣāḥīh; it has also been said that he was between the Ṣāḥīh and the Sunni parties (bāyān al-farāḥ al-ṣāḥīh), since he was inspired by a sense of equity (insāf); his position in relation to the Sunnīs has even been compared with that of ʿUmar b. al-ʿAzīz [q.v.] in relation to the other Umayyad caliphs. Concerning the title al-MMāṭuṣrāhādī min ʿSharḥ Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd, which was translated into Persian (Brockelmann, S I, 705). To Brockelmann's list there should be added: (6) al-
balágha, he often states that he is in agreement with al-Djahiz. A thorough and impartial examination of the many polemical passages in his Šahr Naḫdī al-baldgha will be necessary before his thought can be better understood and a sounder assessment made of him; it may, however, now be taken as certain that he was not an Imāmi. Bibliography: Ibn Kathlīkān, Būlāk 1299, ii, 209, Cairo 1310, ii, 158 (in the biography of Diyyā al-Dīn Ibn al-Aṭhir), tr. de Slane, iii, 547; Ibn al-Sā'rī, al-Dīmāl al-muqāvaṣah, ix, ed. Mustafā Wūdūd, Baghdaḍ 1355/1934, 88 and notes on pages 11 of the intro., 177, 262 of the text; Fakhrī, ed. Denerbūn, 456; Safadī, Wāfi, ms. Bodl., xvi, 586-609. (s.v. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd); Ibn Ṣhākir al-Kutubī, Fawādi, Būlāk 1283, i, 377-9, Cairo 1299, i, 248-50; Ibn Ḥaṭṭār, Bīdāya, Cairo 1346-66, xii, 191; Ibn Ḥannāṣī, Rawḍāt al-dā ḡāmāt, 422-5; Ḥādījī Khālīfa, ed. Flügel, iii, 294, 577, iv, 445, 453, v, 373, 422, 424, vi, 407; Rayḥānaṯ al-maʿṣūr fī ʿl-hunayna wa ʿl-lāḥab, v, 273, 216-8; G. C. Anawati, Textes arabes édités en Œuvre au cours des années 1959 et 1960, in MEDEO, vi (1959-61), 232-5; biography written by Muhammad Ibn ‘l-Fadl Ibrāhīm for his edition of the Šahr Naḫdī al-baldgha, i, Cairo 1378/1958, 13-9, with bibl.; see also Zirkīlī, al-ʿAṣām, iv, 60; Waḥabī, Muṣṭafā al-muqāṣah, v, 106. (L. Vecchia Vaglieri)

IBN ĀBI ḤĀṢIŅA, Aḥmad b. Yāḥyā Shīrāzī al-Dīn al-Ṭīlīmānī, a poet and prose writer. He was born at Tilimsan in 725/1325 in the šarīa of his grandfather, who is said to have been given the nickname Abū Ḥāǧaqla (lit. ‘partridge’s father’) because a partridge laid an egg on his sleeve. Ibn Abī Ḥāṣina left Tilimsan for Cairo, then performed the Pilgrimage, after which he went to Damascus where he studied adab, in which he became proficient. He wrote a number of maḥānūs and many works in poetry and prose, a number of which are extant (see Brockelmann). He became head of a Sūfī monastery outside Cairo, but seems to have been more occupied with general literature than with mystical writing. He wrote kasidas in honour of the Prophet imitating the style of the kasidas of Ibn al-Ḥāǧaqla, whose views he more or less held. He belonged to the Ḥanafī madḥāhīb, but was inclined to the beliefs of the Ḥanafī Ismāʿīlī. Ibn Abī Ḥāṣina says he used to tell the Ṣhāfīʿīs that he was a Ṣhāfīʿī, the Ḥanafī that he was a Ḥanafī, and the traditionists that he was a traditionist. He died during a plague at the end of Dhu l-/Instruction 776/A.H.; Hagūl Khalīfa, ed. Shadḥūr, i, 248-97/1023-85. Ibn al-Ṣadūq, Fawūd, ii, 237; Ibn al-Wardī, Taʿrīḫ, i, 365; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, ed. D. Dāhhān, Damascus 1959 in the published collection.

IBN AḤMAD B. ʿABBĀS AHMAD B. YĀḤYĀ SHĪRĀZĪ AL-DĪN AL-ṬĪLĪMĀNĪ, poet and prince belonging to the great Arab tribe of the Banū Sūlaym, which traces its descent from ʿAdnān. He was born at Maʿṣarr (Syria) in 388/998 and received his early education in his native town (which was at this time an important cultural centre), drawing on the same resources as al-ʿArārī, then completed his education at Aleppo, frequenting the literary circles there.

At the age of barely twenty he met Thīmālī b. Mīrādās at Raḥba and dedicated to him a poem which demonstrated his poetic gifts. When the Mirdādīs became governors of Aleppo (from 414 to 473/1025-83) he enjoyed their special favour and continued throughout his life to celebrate their virtues and their exploits. Sent by Thīmālī b. Mīrādās on a mission to the Fāṭimid calīph al-Mustanṣīr, he visited Egypt in 457/1065 and dedicated to this calīf a first panegyric, then a second one in 459/1068. Al-Mustanṣīr granted him a princely title, which permitted him to lead at Aleppo the life of an amīr. Ibn Abī Ḥāṣina also visited Damascus, where he met its scholars, wrote of the beauties of its situation and composed a fine elegy on the occasion of the death of the bābī of the town, Abū Yaʿṣīr Hamzah b. al-Ḥusayn. Ibn Abī Ḥāṣina, always loyal to the Mirdādīs, died at Sarūd j on 15 Shaʿbān 457/22 July 1065. Ibn al-ʿAdīm (Zubda, ii, 73) attributes to him a poem written in honour of Shāhār al-Dawla Muslim b. Kūrāysh after the taking of Aleppo in 473/1080, but the author of this must be another man of the same name—or perhaps there is confusion with Ibn Ḥāyyūn (s.v.).

He wrote panegyrics, love poetry, descriptive and elegiac poetry, but his main work was in the field of panegyric. He was distinguished by the quality of his language, his themes remaining the traditional ones.

Ibn Ḥāṣina’s đivāna was published in two volumes at Damascus in 1956 by Muḥammad Asʿad Tašāl. The first volume contains the poems, the second a commentary on them by Abu l-ʿAlāʾ al-Maʿṣarī, from which it may be deduced that he sent his poems to Abu l-ʿAlāʾ al-Maʿṣarī for him to comment on them.

This edition is based on a manuscript in Baghdaḍ (Iraqi Museum no. 1261) and on another in the Escorial, no. 275. It is evident that this edition does not contain the whole of the poet’s work, since the commentary by Abu l-ʿAlāʾ al-Maʿṣarī contains some first lines (matla) of poems which are not found in the published collection.

IBN ABDULWALID AL-MADINI (b. 74/693; d. 810/1407).

Ibn Abi Layla was appointed hadīth of Kufa by the recently appointed governor ʿIsa b. Mūsā in 123/741, and he held this office under the Umayyads and the ʿAbbāsids, except for an interval, at his own request, under the Khārījī usurper al-Daḥḥāk b. Kays, until his death. He based his judgments, as was customary in his time, on his own considered opinion (raʾy). A work on the law of inheritance (fuʿāda) went under his name (Fihrist). He was succeeded as ʿālī of Kufa by his nephew, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿIsa, who, however, died soon afterwards. His distinctive function in Kufa still had followers in the time of ʿShāfiʿī (d. 204/820).

A treatise of ʿShāfiʿī (Kitāb al-ʿUmm, vii, 87 ff., surprisingly called Kitāb al-ʿAsmāʾ wa l-ḥabībī in ʿAtīqī Khālīfah, v. 42, No. 938) is concerned with the differences between Ibn Abi Layla and Abī Ḥanīfa concerning technical details of legal doctrine. Ibn Abi Layla represents, generally speaking, an older stage of doctrine than his contemporary Abī Ḥanīfa, that is to say, he is more conservative; he also pays more regard to judicial practice. Ibn Abi Layla’s doctrine, taken as a whole, shows a considerable amount of technical legal thought, but it is generally of a primitive kind, somewhat clumsy and untrained, and therefore shortsighted and often unfortunate in its results. The striving for systematic consistency, the action of general trends and principles pervade his whole doctrine. A rigid formalism is perhaps the most persistent and typical feature of his legal thought. Ibn Abi Layla’s practical, commonsense reasoning often takes material, and particularly Islamic ethical, considerations, into account. There are numerous traces of his activity as a ʿālī in his doctrine, last but not least his conservatism.

Ibn Abi ‘l-Ridjal’s other astrological works include two important scientific works. It is a vast compendium of astrology, which contains references to the works of ancient astronomers and astrologers. The Arabic astronomical and astrological sciences in Latin translation, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1956, 150-4; Hebrew—M. Steinschneider, Die hebräischen astrologischen Texte der Araber in Übersetzung ins Deutsche, Berlin 1851, 233-40. For the various translations of the Arabic text there exists an Old Castilian translation made by E. I. P. de Lippert, 351-3) lists among the witnesses to observations of the summer solstice and the autumn equinox in Baghdad in 378/988; and, though his tombs are said to be beheaded in 379/990 (Ibr. al-Ridjal, vii, 119), he must in fact have lived several years longer, as he mentions the death (in 1037) of the Kabīl amīr of Sicily, Abū b. Mahfūz al-Sawā, in the region of al-Shabat, in the Yemen; he died on the night of Tuesday 5 or Wednesday 6 Rabi‘ I 1092/24-5 or 25-6 March 1618 at the age of 62 years 7 months, and was buried at al-Rawda. The biography composed by his brother Muhammad (MS Ambrosiana nuovo fondo 256, fols. 2-11) contains a wealth of minute details on the curriculum of his studies and provides evidence of the exceptional learning which he acquired, having as his teacher the most learned Zaydis of his day (among them the imām al-Mu‘ayyad bi‘l-llah Muhammad b. al-Kāsim and the shaikh Ibrahim b. Muhammad al-Mu‘ayyadi, Izz al-Dīn b. Durayb, Muhammad b. al-Hasan b. al-Imām b. Kāsim, Abū b. Sa‘d al-Dīn al-Miswārī, Ibrahim b. Yābya al-Suḥṣ, as well as many doctors of various schools. His fame earned him the friendship of the imām al-Mu‘ayyad bi‘l-llah and his son al‘lāh Ismā‘īl bi‘l-llah (d. 1087/1677), who employed him as secretary and court orator (khāṭib wa‘sū).

The work on which is rightly based his claim to fame is an alphabetically arranged collection of about 1300 biographies of famous Zaydis, of military as well as literary importance, of al-‘rāk and the Yemen: (a) the Mālah al-bu‘dār wa-majma‘ al-bubār. This monument of doctrine, which until the beginning of this century was thought to be lost, is an almost unique source of information, and all the more valuable because the Zaydis took especial care to remain silent on everything which concerned themselves; in addition, it contains a number of facts, drawn from sources which now exist only in part, which concern not only the history, but also the geography and the archaeology of the Yemen.

With a few exceptions, of the remainder of his works only the titles remain. They consist of: (a) biographical and genealogical works, such as (2) Taṣūr al-bī’tarādjam tarādjam al-tarāf al-lām (biographies of Kurān commentators); (3) Inbā‘ al-abnā‘ bi-tārīkh halafshīn al-‘ansū, the genealogy
of his own family); (4) Ta'lik (gloss) on al-Mushad-
diar (genealogy of the Zaydi imams) of Ibn al-Djalal
(MS Ambrosiana 681); (b) theological and juridical works: (5) Fudal-al-muwadit bi-khalam
saddathi al-`alam al-mawali (MS Br. Mus. Suppl.
217/2); (6) Taysir (Ta’isir) al-Shari‘a (MS Br. Mus.
Suppl. 217/1); (7) al-Riyad al-nadisyya fi anna
‘l-firka al-nadisyia hum al-Zaydiyya; (8) al-Mawazin
al-radiya li-bi‘arabihin al-sadihi, commentary on al-
`Alida al-sadihi by the imam al-Mutawakkil Isma‘il;
(9) Madzilis al-inhim; (10) al-Wadhi‘ al-audhi‘ fi
bukharu al-wadhi‘ al-audhia dayya; (11) Madzil
man arad al-hadihi min murad al-hadihi; (12) al-
Hadiyya ‘ilay man yuhibb ‘il-hadiyya ‘ilay man
yukabb; (13) al-Djawab al-shafis ‘i’ssadad ‘ilay ‘Abd
al-‘Aziz al-Damadi; (14) Taghkhirat al-bulabb allafi
‘i’ssadud ‘i’shayd al-aqzam allati ‘il-kubur; (15)
Rasa‘idon various subjects; (c) works of Kur‘anic
exegesis, as such as (16) Bughyat al-al‘al wa-salih
fi sabab ‘innad Walisyum Allah wa-Rashidukh
(Kur‘an, V, 60); (d) philological works, such as (17)
Hadiyya ‘ilay laf al-asjar; (e) poetry: (18)
Dawani, consisting of poems of a mainly religious
character, some fragments of which are contained
in his biography, while several others are cited in the
Malla al-budur.

Biography: Mubihib, Khulasaat al-athar, i,
220; Shawkani, al-Badr al-ta‘li‘, Cairo 1348,i,59-61,
n. 36; E. Griffithi, Lista dei manoscritti arabi nuovo
formato della Biblioteca Ambrosiana di Milano, in
KSO, iv, 1946-8. (R. Traini)

IBN ABI ‘L-SADJ [see MUHAMMAD B. ABI
‘L-SADJ].

IBN ABI ‘L-SAKR [see MUHAMMAD B. ‘ALI B.
‘UMAR].

IBN ABI ‘L-SALAT [see UMAYYA B. ABI ‘L-SALAT].

IBN ABI ‘L-SAMHI [see MALIK B. ABI ‘L-SAMHI].

IBN ABI SHANAB (in Algerian dialect BEN-
Shen and officially in French BEN CHENEN) MUHAMMAD B.
AL-Arab, Algerian teacher and Arabist, born at Tahk, near Medea (Algeria) on
10 Rajab 1286/26 October 1869 and died at Algiers on
27 Shawal 1347/5 February 1929.

Some of his ancestors, who were natives of Bursa,
were officers in the Turkish army stationed in Egypt,
and another of them settled in Algeria. His
grandfather, retired from the Turkish army, died at Medea during the siege of this town (May-June
1840) by the amir Abdelkader (‘Abd al-Kadir al-
Djaza‘ri (q.v.)). His father was a small farmer on the
outskirts of Medea and his mother, a Bashahtari, was
also of Turkish descent.

He was educated for a short time at the Kur‘anic
school then at the Ecole Francaise, next at the
College de Medea (now the Lycée Ben Cheneb)
and finally, for a year, at the teacher’s training college at
Bouzaréa near Algiers; in 1888, at the age of 19, he
became a teacher at Témjadré, in the durour of
Wamiri, in the mixed commune of Djeddel, 30
kilometres from Medea. Four years later he was
transferred to the Fatah school at Algiers; there he
achieved it was exceptional, endowed with a robust
nature left vacant by Rene Basset. In July 1928 he
was appointed professor in the Fatah school at Algiers. In 1924, he was appointed professor in the
Faculte des Lettres, while retaining his chair at the
madrasa. It was at this time that he showed his
abilities both as a teacher and in research. His
excellent teaching gained him the attention and the
veneration of an audience which increased daily. He
published books and articles in increasing numbers.
He travelled occasionally, notably to Oran and Constantine and to Tunisia and Morocco, presiding
over boards of examiners, taking part in scientific
congresses and discussions. He was in touch with
many orientalists outside Algeria and corresponded
with Codera and Miguel Aníbal Palacios in Spain,
with E. Griffith in Italy, with Krachkovsky in Russia,
with Ahmad Taymür in Egypt, with Hasan Husni
‘Abd al-Wahhab in Tunisia, with the members of the
Arab Academy at Damascus, and with many
‘ulamā in Morocco and elsewhere.

His scholarship was recognized in 1920 by his
election as a member of the Arab Academy at
Damascus and, in 1922, the award of the degree of
Doctor ès lettres d’État by the University of
Algiers. In 1927, he was appointed to lecture in
the Faculté des Lettres of the University of Algiers,
succeeding to the chair of Arabic language and litera-
ture left vacant by René Basset. In July 1928 he
represented Algiers University at the 17th Inter-
national Congress of Orientalists at Oxford.

Such a career, rare even in France and elsewhere,
was without precedent in Algeria, and even until the
time of his death there has been none to equal it. The man
who achieved it was exceptional, endowed with a robust
constitution and an inflexible will, which made him
tiredless worker and a patient, stubborn and metho-
dical scholar. His association with scholars like
Fagnan and Basset had made him quick to seize the
positive side of modern methods of work, based on
scientific discipline, without leading him to under-
estimate the fine values of his background, to
which he remained faithfully attached, refusing
to change his style of dress or his personal beliefs
and adhering scrupulously to his code of behaviour
as a strict but enlightened Muslim.

His scholarly works are spread over about thirty
years. They were prolific between 1906 and 1913,
ceased for a period during the First World War, and
were resumed between 1918 and 1928. They cover a
very wide field, in many disciplines: pedagogy,
education, Muslim law, hadith, popular poetry, proverbs, lexicography, grammar, poetry, lexicography, grammar, poetry, education, Muslim law, hadith, popular poetry, proverbs, lexicography, grammar, poetry, lexicography, grammar, poetry.

Notions de pedagogy musulmane, in RAfr., 1897, 267-85; (1) Itineraire de Lieux de la Medecine par Ben Msdyeb, poetique populaire tlemcienen du XVIIIe siecle, in the mosque and in... des Hautes Etudes Marocaines, Rabat 1928, published in Abd al-Raliman al-Djilali, op. cit., 50-4; (56) Nazra idimd-
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Ibni Abi Shanab — Ibn Abi ‘l-Shawarib

Ibni Abi Shanab felt himself obliged to conform to the old, but still admired, custom of writing in sazī (rhymed prose).

His work thus consisted on the one hand of the editing of Arabic texts, often with a French translation and notes, and on the other of original studies and the begin-
ing of an official creed. In the history of the "people of the Sunna" at the time when the "Abbasid caliphate with Sunnism, a reconcil-
iation which was itself the prelude to the estab-
lishment of an equilibrium, achieved with diffi-
culty, between the civil and religious powers and the formation of an official creed. In the history of this evolution there appear several persons named Ibn Abi ‘l-Shawarib, at first traditionists and, increasingly, jurists and kālidū. They are:

(1) Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Malik (d. 244/858).
(2) His son, Ḥasan b. Muḥammad, kālidū from 250 to 261/864-74. (3) ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, who succeeded his brother as judge in Baghdad in 272/885-6 according to al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1908, also the year of his death, but Ibn al-ʿAṣir (vii, 334), followed by Massignon, makes him die in 283. Both al-Ṭabarī and al-Khabīr al-Baghḍādi report that he remained in office for only six months. (4) ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Allī, kālidū from 296 to 310/908-13. According to Ibn al-
Djazīrī (Munṣūmaṣ, i, 97, followed by Sourdel, 1964, 142), he was succeeded in 311/922-3 by Ibn Abi Shanab, who is, however, not mentioned by the other historians (cf. ‘Aṣir, 1964, 157, continuité, 39).

The first of these, Muḥammad, was mainly a traditionist, who, well versed in both Kur'ānic exegesis (he was the transmitter of Yazīd b. Zuray'ī) and in mystic kādidū, continued Abū ‘Aṣīm al-
Abbādānī (apud al-Kušayrī, Risāla, ch. Rīdā). He preserved the same strict principles adhered to by the "people of the Sunna" at the time when the latter were no longer in power: he advised his children to hold themselves aloof from public affairs. On the other hand, his activities, devoted almost entirely to kādidū, brought him into contact with men like al-Baghwī, al-Baghanti, Ibn Abī ‘l-Dunjāyā, al-Ṭabarī, i.e., the most eminent transmitters of the second half of the 3rd/9th century. Having contented himself with being an esteemed traditionist, he ended his days in his native town of Baṣra.

Very different was the career of his son Ḥasan, who, with his father, was the most distinguished member of the Banū ‘l-Shawarīb. At first, being the loyal servant of the caliph al-Muṭawakkil, he was sent by this ruler on a mission to the Byzantine frontier. After the assassination of this caliph, he was out of favour under al-Musta’in (245-51/862-6), but deprived of his office as official councillor in 250. With the accession of al-Muṭazz in 251/866, Ḥasan’s fortunes were restored; it was now the turn of the Zaydis, Qāḍīmīs or Rāfīḍīs to be excluded from the judiciary. The subsequent rulers, al-Muṭazz and al-Muṭamīd, retained their confidence in Ḥasan. On his death, his office was entrusted to his brother Allā who, according to the most reliable source, held office for no longer than six months.

From then on the family no longer has a place among the traditionists, but so far as its political fortunes were concerned this was merely a temporary eclipse. Soon ‘Abd Allāh b. Allī was able to play a political rôle. He refused, on the death of al-Muktafi, to let himself be persuaded by the supporters of Ibn al-Muṭazz, who had perhaps thought of him because of the loyalty which his uncle Ḥasan had shown to al-Muṭazz. This prudence was soon rewarded by al-Muktafi, who entrusted him with the judgeship of West Baghdaḍ, a sort of perquisite which reverted at intervals to the family of the Banū ‘l-Shawarīb.
Abd Allah b. 'Ali (unless it was his son Muhammad —see above) seems to have performed his office in a way which was very profitable to his own interests. 

Uncle to Mukhtar, a heavy tax was imposed on him by the vizier Ibn Dhuwa. He seems on this occasion to have had connexions with the al-Madhari family of financiers in Egypt.

His son Husayn, the last of the Banu Abi 'l-Shawari'ib to play a part in history, took up again the traditional office of his family at the end of the reign of al-Mu'tadid. Observing the prudence and impartiality traditional in his family, he witnessed important events in public life, for which when necessary he was competent to draw up documents. He directed the funeral of the caliph al-Mu'tadid, who was killed in battle. It is not certain whether he was kadi after 317. He may have held office at the same time as the famous Malikī kadi Abū 'Amar (H. Bowen, 'Abî b. 'Isa, the good vizier, 119), whose jurisdiction is said to have been limited to the western bank of the Tigris. This may have been the revenge of Abu Malik, whose jurisdiction is said to have been increased from six to ten: al-Baghdālī, Mīlīk, Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasā'ī, al-Bayhaqī, Ibn Abī Shayba, probably by the early Almohads, and in any case before 622/1225, the date at which al-Marraqu'ī (al-Mu'āqib, Cairo 1949, 275) relates that Abu Yusuf Ya'qūb gave orders that there should be extracted from al-Mūsannafāt al-thagāra the hadiths on prayer and everything connected with it, in order to put an end to the supremacy of the Malikī madhhab (cf. I. Goldziher, Muh. St., ii, 265).

Abū Bakr's brother, Abū 'l-Ḥasan Uģumān, was also a traditionist; he compiled a K. al-Sunan fi 'l-fihā, a K. al-Tafsīr, a K. 'l-Ā'yn and a K. al-Musnad. He was born in 1507/773 and died in 237 or 239/851 or 853.

Uğumān's son, Abū Dī'ār Muhamma, died at Baghdad in 297/909, after also compiling a K. al-Sunan fi 'l-fihā and a History of traditionists.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the works mentioned: Ibn Sa'd, vi, 288; Mas'ūdī, Murūdī, vii, 211; Fihrist, 229 (Cairo ed., 320); Tūsī, Fīrist, 185, 185; Khāṭib Baghdādī, Tārīkh Baghdād, x, 66-71; Dhāḥabī, Thaqāfāt al-buḫsī, ii, 19; idem, Mann al-tūdīd, ii, 71; Ibn Kashāshīb, K. al-Khāṣṣ, i, 250; Ibn 'Uṣayr, al-Ma'inī, ii, 85; Ibn Ḥadījar, Tāhābī, vi, 2; al-Andalus, x, i (1954), § 17; Brockelmann, S I, 215, 260; Fustānī, Dī'īrat al-ma'ārifī, ii, 314.

(Ch. Pellat)
is preserved and was edited, together with a German translation, by H. Keller (Leipzig 1908; ed. Izzat al-ʿAtṭār al-Ḥusaynī, Cairo 1368/1949). As far as we can judge, the work is a pioneering and highly successful effort in the field of political local historiography, leaning heavily toward literary and cultural matters. Its importance as a source is assured by its early date, its use of documents and sources now lost, and its author’s sense for the interesting detail. Ibn Abī Tāhir’s treatment agrees widely with that of the later Tahtār. Numerous quotations in his name in the Aḥānī show much agreement with his works, in particular the author of a universal History, Maʿādin al-dhāhib fi taʿrīkh al-mulūk wa-l-khulafa* (where even the Sunnite writers, whether or not they acknowledge the fact, were unable to refrain from utilizing. Important extracts from it are to be found preserved in the History of Ibn al-Furāt [q.v.], and the Rawdatayn of Abū Shāma [q.v.], dealing with the first three-quarters of the 6th/12th century; it was known also to ʿIrāz al-Dīn b. Shaddād [q.v.], among others, but with less certainty to the other great Aleppo historian, the Sunnī Kh̄alal al-Dīn Ibn ʿAddīn [q.v.], Ibn Abī Tayyīr’s continuation of the History with monographs on the reigns of Saladin and his son ʿAlī, Al-ibli, and Macdlim al-umam. He is also the author of numerous poems; ʿAbd al-Qādir wa-ʾl-fawdīd, Hikdāt al-atibbd* fi ḫildidt al-adwa* and Macdlim al-umam. He is also the author of numerous poems; ʿAbd al-Qādir wa-ʾl-fawdīd, Hikdāt al-atibbd* fi ḫildidt al-adwa* and Macdlim al-umam.

His son, Abu ʿl-Husayn Murūdī, continued his History with monographs on the reigns of Saladin and his son ʿZāhir of Aleppo, whom with he seems to have lived on friendly terms. It is more difficult to specify the titles and contents of his other works, several of which are perhaps merely adaptations of works by earlier writers. In any case, none of them attained the importance of the Maʿādin, which is of particular value as a history of northern Syria in the time of the Crusades, in view of the loss of the sources used (though they had also been drawn upon, but differently, by Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-ʿAdīn[ q.v.] and of the Shiʿī point of view of their general content; the Maʿādin also contains useful accounts on the subject of Egypt and, occasionally, even the Maghrib; for ʿIrāk and Persia, Ibn Abī Tayyīr was, broadly speaking, content to borrow from Ḫamīd al-Dīn al-Isfahānī.

**Bibliography:** The only surviving bio-bibliography of Ibn Abī Tayyīr is that of Yākūt, his contemporary, quoted by ʿSaʿdīs (MS. Sūleymaniye 842, fol. 30 v.), but omitted in our version of the Ḫīrādī. Modern studies: Cl. Cahen, Une chronique chīife au temps des Croisades, in Comptes-rendus des Séances de l’Acad. des Insr., 1935; H. A. R. Gibb, The sources for the history of Saladin, in Speculum, xxv (1950); these two articles, in the History and its sources, were corrected and completed by Cl. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord au temps des Croisades, Paris 1950, 55-77. (Cl. Cahen)}
but he owes his fame to his *Uyun al-anba? fi *abak,at al-apibbd*, a collection of 380 biographies which are of inestimable value for the history of Arabic science, in spite of a number of confusions, some long series of verses which have nothing to do with the main theme, and the one-sidedness of the choice of subjects: he provides no mention of persons such as Ibn Nafis, who, like him, was a pupil of Ibn al-Dakhwar (d. circa 628/1230), but whom he disliked. He based his work on the bibliographical productions of his predecessors (Ibn Djüdžil for example), and a compari-
son between their texts and that of Ibn Abi Usaybi'a showed how he either copies them, very often literally, or summarizes them, and how this mass of raw material was amplified by successive additions; the biographies are arranged by country and by generation (*tabakât*). The work appeared in two redactions: a major and a minor. The latter was completed in 640/1242 and, with the addition of new material drawn in part from the *Ta'änkhl al-kulub*, it produced the major recension (667/1268). From the two redactions a not very careful copyist produced a re-written version after the author's death. The literary style of the *Uyun*, which contains some features of a popular style, has been studied by A. Müllcr, who also prepared an edition of the text based on the two original redactions; but this work was so badly printed in Cairo (1299/1882) that he had to include a long list of corrections and to repeat the indices in a third volume which mainly contains the variants (*Ibn abI Usaybi' araIzeIgen von August Müller, Königsberg 1884*). The *Uyun* was later published in several commercial editions and was reprinted in Beirut (Dar al-Fikr, 1955-6) without any significant changes.

The importance of this text has been recognized by orientalists since the middle of the 19th century (Wüstenfeld, Leclerc): a French translation of part of it was published by Sanguineti (in JA, 1854-6) and a German translation by Hamed Waly; recently (Algers 1958), H. Jahier and Abdelkader Noureddine have edited, translated and annotated the chapter on the physicians of the Muslim West.


IBN ABI 'UYAYNA, name of two poets of Baṣra of the 2nd/8th century. (I) Ibn Abi 'UYAYNA the Younger or Abu 'l-Minhāl Abū 'Uyayna b. Muhammad b. Abu 'Uyayna is the better known. He was a great-grandson of al-Muḥallab and the son of a governor of al-Rayy under al-Mansūr. Towards the middle of the 2nd/8th century he became known in Baṣra through his love poems addressed to Dunyā, the distant cousin of Fatimah, the daughter of 'Umar b. Hafs (d. 153/770), who in spite of promises was refused to him and married to an 'Abbāsid prince, Ḥāšhā b. Ḫāšāymān. He was living at Kūfah in 159/775-6, then went to Djūrām, serving under his cousin Ḥāšhā b. Yaẓīm b. Ṣabīn, with whom he very soon quarrelled. He was not released until the accession of al-Muḥādīl in 169/785. He returned to Baṣra and assuaged his unhappy love and his hatred for Ḥāšhā by writing of his native town. He is mentioned under al-Raṣḥīd. According to one tradition he was received by al-Ma'mūn, according to another, al-Ma'mūn banished him for his anti-

Muḍārī opinions and he did not return to Ḥarak until after this caliph's death.

From an output estimated to consist of 4,000 verses there have been collected up to now only 41 frag-
ments totalling 325 verses, forming three groups: *ghasal of Fatimah, hidūf of Khalīd and descriptive poems about Baṣra. His themes are love, liberty and nature. For some time he was considered as one of the four born poets among the muṣālātad.*

(II) Ibn Abi 'UYAYNA the Elder or Abu Ḥajī 'Ar 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Abu 'Uyayna, brother of the above, is heard of shortly before the fall of the Barmakids (187/803) and particularly during the struggle between al-Amin and al-Ma'mūn. He played an important part in rallying Baṣra to the support of al-Ma'mūn in 196/812. In the same year, after the battle of al-Abwāz, he came in contact with the general Tāhir b. al-Husayn. For some time he was governor of Baṣra and of the Yamama, then returned to Baṣra, where he took part in minor political intrigues. Later, falling out of favour with the general Tāhir, he remained faithful to the 'Abbāsids and hostile to the 'Alīids. He is mentioned again in 204/819. He survived his brother and probably also al-Ma'mūn.

From a production as large as that of his brother, 26 fragments have been collected, totalling 206 verses. They consist mainly of *mādh, of ḥāl and of fakhr.* He was more learned but perhaps also less gifted than his brother. A third brother, Dāwūd, a very minor poet, died young before 169/785.


IBN ABI 'UYAYNA [see MUH. B. ABI 'UYAYNA].

IBN ABI ZAMANAY, ABU 'ABBĀD ALLĀH MUHAMMAD B. 'ABBĀD ALLĀH B. 'ĪSĀ AL-MŪRRI, Andalusian poet and particularly jurist, born at Badaya (current Gavina in 52/656), died at Fez in 156/770.

The few verses of his which we have are of a somewhat religious nature and show a rather pessimistic attitude and a leaning to asceticism which is expressed in his *ḥayāl al-kulub*. However, he is principally known as an independent Mālikī jurist and author of several works, in particular a commentary on the *Mawāṣit* of Mālik, a summary of Sahnūn's *Mudawwana*, a book titled *Abūl al-trāmān* and a for-
mury which has been used with others by Abū Muhammad al-Kaysī (see Lévi-Provençal, *Hist. Esp. Mus.*, iii, 242 n.). None of his works seems to have survived.


IBN ABI ZAR', ABU 'L-ABBĀS AHMAD AL-
FĀSÍ, d. between 710 and 720/1310-20 at Fez, where he was imām, composed a history of Morocco ent-
titled *al-Anis al-mutrib bi-ra'ad al-bīrīfā fī aqībah mulūk al-Magrib wa-ārā'īn madinat Fās*, a title often abbreviated to *Ra'ad al-bīrīfā, or Kirīfīs.* The
text of this important work, several times printed and translated, has not yet been the object of a critical edition.

Translations: Dombay, Geschichte der mauritanischen Könige, Agram 1794-7 (German); Moura, Historia dos soberanos mahometanos, Lisbon 1824 (Portuguese); Tornberg (Latin; see above); Barbier, Histoire des souverains du Magreb et Annales de la ville de Fès, Paris 1860 (French); Huici, Madrid 1898 (Spanish).


(See H. R. IDRIS) IBN ABÎ ‘L-ZAWâ’îD [see sulaymân b. yahyâ].

IBN ABÎ ZAYD AL-KAYRAWânî, Abû Muḥâmâd ‘Abd Allâh b. Abî Zayd ‘Abd al-Karîm (310-86/922-965), head of the Mâlikî school of Kayrawân. He came of a family from Nafzawa and studied at Kayrawân, his birthplace, where, according to his knowledge, his literary gifts, his piety and his wealth very soon earned him considerable prestige throughout the Muslim world. He came under the influence of âshî’iism, which had a large following in Kayrawân at that time, and also that of mysticism, against whose excesses, and especially that of miracle-working, he fought. By teaching, delivering innumerable fatwâs and editing numerous works, he set in order, systematized and above all spread Mâlikism among the people, and the triumph of Mâlikism, made final by the rupture between the Zirids and the Fâtîmîds under al-Mu’âzîz b. Bâdis, is due primarily to his activities and to those of his emulators and disciples, the most prominent of whom in continuing his work was al-Kâbîsî. Ibn Abî Zaydî’s many and varied works include numerous epitomes and a number of subjects which have come to be regarded as a summary of Islamic dogma and liturgy, al-‘Abîdât wa djuamî multasara min wâdîb umâr al-diyânà, a biographical dictionary in alphabetical order, and above all the important al-Mudawwana: the publication and study of what remains of this epitome of Mâlikî fikû would be of great interest. His Muḥhallâs of the Mudawwana, which was at first highly esteemed, was, however, soon eclipsed by that of al-Barâdhî. Ibn Abî Zayd, who has been called “Mâlik the Younger”, ranks with al-Abhârî among the chief exponents of Mâlikism. He was buried in his own house and his mausoleum, which very soon became a place of pilgrimage, still exists. His son, Abû Bakr Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allâh, appointed kâdi al-Mudawwana in 435/1043 by al-Mu’âzîz b. Badis, who, as the result of an intrigue, had to revoke this appointment soon afterwards.


IBN ABî ‘DâhîRÎ [see ibn ‘îiqârî].

IBN AL-ADâM, Kamâl al-dîn Abû ‘l-Kásîm ‘Umar b. Ahmad b. Hîbat Allâh, historian of Aleppo, born there in 588/1192, died in Cairo in 660/1262. A wealthy and prominent family of the Arab origin, the Banû ‘l-Adîm acquired property in and around Aleppo and a number of dignities or eminence or office under the successive dynasties that ruled in that city. For five generations they held the office of hâlî; the historian’s father was a chief hâlî under Zangîd and then Ayyûbîd rule. He himself, after studies in Aleppo, Damascus, Jerusalem, Baghdad and the Hidjaz, served in Aleppo as a secretary, as a hâlî and later as wa’ir to the Ayyûbîd rulers al-Mâlik al-‘Azîz and al-Mâlik al-Nâşir. As an official he was again able to travel extensively. In 658/1260, when the Mongols sacked Aleppo, he fled to Palestine, and thence to Egypt. Hîlekiî invited him to return to Syria as chief hâlî, and the Mongol withdrawal enabled him to revisit Aleppo, but, finding it in ruins, he returned to Egypt where he died.

Ibn al-Adîm is credited with a number of writings, some of them extant, of which the most important are his two historical works on Aleppo. The earlier and more extensive is the Buğhîyat al-talab fi tariqât Hâlîb, a biographical dictionary in alphabetical order of men connected with Aleppo. Ten volumes survive in manuscript in Istanbul, additional manuscripts in Paris and Mosul. In these biographies Ibn al-Adîm uses oral information, documents, and a great number of manuscript sources which are meticulously cited and for the most part lost. The
work is thus a major source of historiographical as well as historical information. Some extracts were published and translated by Barbier de Meynard in "RHC. Or., iii (1884), 578-690, and others translated—not very well—by E. Blochet in "ROL, iii-vi (1895-98). A critical edition was finally undertaken by Sami Dahan ("Zubdat al-halab fi ta'rîkh Halab, 1951; ii, 1955; iii-vi (1895-98). A third volume in preparation in 1968.

Bibliography: Brockelman, I, 332; S I 568-9; Yakût, U'dabî, vi, 18-46 (including excerpts from his history of his own family); Sami Dahan, apud B. Lewis and P. M. Holt, "Historians of the Middle East, London 1962, 111-3 and index; idem, introduction (in Arabic) to vol. i of his edition of the "Zubdat al-halab, Damascus 1951; idem, "Bugyat al-talab ilî'mi l-Adîm, in Annale des archéologiques de Syrie, i/2 (1951), 207-25; J. Sauvaget, "Extraits du "Bugyat al-Talab" . . ., in "REI, vii (1933), 393-409; C. Cahen, "Les chroniques arabes . . ., in "REI, xi (1936) 359; M. Canard, "Quelques observations sur l'introduction géographique de la Bugyat at-talab of Kamal ad-din ibn l-Adîm d'Alep, in "âEIO, xv (1957), 41-53; Ali Sevîm, "Bugyât al-talab fi tartîkh-i Hâleb'i gûre Sultan Atîr Aşşu, in Belleten, xxx/xxv (1966), 205-42; B. Lewis, "Three biographies from Kamal ad-Dîn, in "Mêlanges Fuad Khâbir, Istanbul 1954, 7-9- (B. Lewis)."
short metaphysical treatises in which the author propounds, without actually naming it, the theory of the oneness of existence: *wahdat al-wujud*. In the first, he demonstrates how the Divine Essence remains identical to itself before and after it is irradiated—*tajdid*—in existence; in the second, he describes the existential veils behind which the One Essence conceals itself and through which it may be grasped according to three increasingly perfect modes of unity: *taqadd al-af‘āl, taqadd al-sifāt, taqadd al-dhāt*; (3) *Sharh Ta‘siyya* (Ibn ‘Arabi); (32) *Sharh Nasī‘iyah* (Shahristānī); (33) *Mī‘rād al-tashawwuf fi mut‘ād il-hakam al-tasawwuf* (Shahristānī); (34) *Sharh Tā‘yiyya fi ‘l-Khamra* (two commentaries, one short and one long, on a poem by his master Buziyyan); (36) *Sharh al-Mukaddima* (al-Suyūtī); (38) *Sharh ‘Ayniyya al-tashawwuf il-ḥakam al-tasawwuf* (al-Suyūtī); (41) *Tabsīrdt darbīyya*; (43) *Fi ‘l-mawadda*; (45) *Fi l-mawadda*; (47) *Al-tashawwuf il-hakam il-tasawwuf*; a little treatise of a few pages in which he sets out the technical terms of Sūfism; published Damascus 1350/1357 by al-Hāshimī [q.v.; Fr. tr. by J. L. Michon, see Bibl.; (34), (35) *Sharh Tā‘yiyya fi ‘l-Khamra* (two commentaries, one short and one long, on a poem by his master Buziyy); (36) *Sharh al-Mukaddima* (on two levels, grammatical and esoteric, of the treatise on grammar by Ibn Adjurrum; a *tāfriq* giving only the esoteric content of the work has been published, Baghdad 1235/1291; (37) *Hāshiyah ‘ala ‘l-Djami*—al-saghir* (al-Suyūtī); (38) *Dīwān* (4 hasīdas and various ta‘dhībāt, about 200 verses in all). To this list must be added: (38) the *Fahrasa*; (op. cit., i, 361; ibid., iii, 139-40; Mss. Ar. 340) and in particular Buziyyan al-Maskartī (Ṭabākāt darbīyyah). Sporadic references to his works are found in bibliographical compilations (F. Bustānī, *Dh.‘rat al-ma‘ārif*, iii, 358; Sarkīs, *Mu‘jam*, 169-70) and in manuscript catalogues (Allouche and Regragui, *Ms. Ar. Rabat*, 1; *passim*). The contemporary historian Muhammad Dāwūd accords him a prominent place in his *Ṭarīkh Tiwān* (see vol. iii, 1962, *passim* and vol. vi, to appear). These sources and data drawn from the author’s writings have been gathered together in a study by J. L. Michon, Ibn *‘Adība* et son Mī‘rād (thesis, Paris 1966).

**IBN ADJURRUM, Abu ‘Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Dāwūd al-Sanḥādī, Moroccan grammarian born 672/1273-4, died 723/1323 at Fez, where he taught grammar and the art of Kur‘ānic recitation. Ibn Adjurrum is the author of a celebrated *Mukaddima* which bears his name, a little treatise of a few pages in which he sets out the system of the ṭarīb of words. This summary syntax, easy to memorize, has enjoyed to the present day great popularity in all the Arabic-speaking countries, in the west as well as in the east. Because of its extreme conciseness, the *Mukaddima* has provoked about 60 commentaries by subsequent grammarians, which testify to its wide diffusion among teachers. The *Mukaddima* has been known in Europe since the 16th/17th century, being one of the first treatises available to Arabs for the study of the Arabic grammatical system. It has been published a dozen times and translated into most European languages. It is to be remarked that al-Suyūtī (ibid., 102) considers Ibn Adjurrum to represent the Kūfa grammatical school, basing himself on the fact that he uses the term *khāl*, and that he considers the imperative to be *mu‘rab* and the particle *hay’ama* to govern the *djasm*.


His father, ‘Abbās al-Dīn al-Tilimīnānī (see al-Tilimānī), was a mystic who had left Tlemcen and settled in the *khānākh* of Sa‘īd al-Su‘ādā in Cairo, where the poet was born on 10 Di‘umād 1621/1 April 1263. While still young, Ibn al-‘Abbās went with his father to Damascus, where he completed his education under the direction of his father and a number of other scholars. He very soon obtained the post of treasurer, and lived at the foot of Mount Kāsīyūn.

From his youth he had devoted himself to poetry, with the encouragement of his acquaintances. His literary fame spread quickly; he secured access to the important people of his time, presenting his panegyrics to them, and in particular wrote of the merits of al-Manṣūr Muḥammad, the Ayyūbid ruler of Hamāt.

His poetry, relaxed in style, was highly thought of, but his enemies, jealous of his success, conspired against him; for some time he resisted this, then finally decided to retreat from the world and shut himself away in his own house. He died while still very young, at the age of 27, on 14 Rādjd 688/5 August 1289.

Ibn al-‘Abbās led a free and easy existence. His poetic gifts find expression chiefly in poems of love and wine, which reflect the dissolute life of the period; he wrote also *dābāys* and *mu’awṣakbāt*. His skill and facility of expression enabled him to avoid the mannered style in vogue in the poetry of his time. The love poems, generally addressed to men, could be given a Sūfi interpretation, but this is not probable.

The *dīwān* of Ibn al-‘Abbās, although rather short, has enjoyed a lasting fame; it has been published several times in Cairo (1274, 1281, 1308) and in Beirut (1885, 1894, 1907), but these editions are very mediocre (a critical edition is at present (1967) in preparation in Paris; on the manuscripts see Broekelmann, i, 300, S I, 458, adding MS Damascus, Zāhiriyya, no. 5126). There exist also some *Māhānāt* by him (MSS Paris 3176, 3947; Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayi 2402; Berlin 8594), one of which has been published in Damascus, n.d., and two *Mubāhas* (MS Berlin 3953).


Ibn al-‘Abbās al-Ahmār, byname of several poets, including an Arabī (q.v.; Fr. tr. by J. L. Michon, see Bibliography: Kutubi, Fawād, ii, 422; Dhabahl, *Ta‘rīkh al-Islām*, MS British Museum, Or. 53, fol. 62 v.; Ǧaṣfālī, al-Wāfi‘ī, iii, 129-36; Ibn al-‘Imād, Shadrādī, v, 405; Ibn Taqribīrī, vii, 381; Hādījī, Khālīfī, ii, 1786; Ẓirīkī, Allām, vii, 21; Kāhījāl, Mu‘āṣīm al-maʿāṣīfīn, x, 33; Broekelmann, i, 300, S I, 458. (J. Rikārī)

Ibn al-‘Abbās al-Ahmār, byname of several poets, including an Arabī (q.v.; Fr. tr. by J. L. Michon, see Bibliography: Kutubi, Fawād, ii, 422; Dhabahl, *Ta‘rīkh al-Islām*, MS British Museum, Or. 53, fol. 62 v.; Ǧaṣfālī, al-Wāfi‘ī, iii, 129-36; Ibn al-‘Imād, Shadrādī, v, 405; Ibn Taqribīrī, vii, 381; Hādījī, Khālīfī, ii, 1786; Ẓirīkī, Allām, vii, 21; Kāhījāl, Mu‘āṣīm al-maʿāṣīfīn, x, 33; Broekelmann, i, 300, S I, 458. (J. Rikārī)
al-'Amarrad b. Tamīm b. Rabī‘a b. Hīrām b. Farrāṣ b. Ma‘n b. Aṣ’ur al-Bahili. He is included among the muḥāhadranāmān [q.v.], embraced Islam, took part in the conquests in South-west Asia (in the course of which he lost an eye), settled in Syria and died during the caliphate of ‘Uthmān. His poems do not seem to have been collected, but he is often quoted as an authority on the Arabic language, although he is criticized for having invented four words. Ibn Sallām, authority on the Arabic language, although he is appreciated his language, but thinks that he uses too many rare expressions. Numerous anthropophagae appear in his poems, and a description of sand-gr Bour (kaṭāb) has remained famous.

**Bibliography:** Dībīḥ, Hayawān, Bayān, index; Ibn Kutayba, Uyūn, Aunu‘, Abd al-kabī, index; idem, Shīr, 315-8; idem, Ma‘arīf, 587; Būhtūrī, Hamās, 187; Abū Tammān, Hamās, ii, 314; Kālī, Amālī, index; Ibn Sallām, Tababāb, 492-3; Mubarrad, Kāmil, index; Kuraštā, Dījamāra, 158-60; Dījamalīkī, Mubarrad, 104, 142; Aga‘nī, xii, 144; ‘Amīdī, Mu‘alīf, 37; Marzubānī, Mu‘ājam, 214; ‘Askārī, Sind irrigation, 53; Ibn al-Abnārī, A∂ād, index; Baghdādī, Khūsānī, Būlāk ed., iii, 39-9; Ibn ‘Hāḍar, Isbāb, no. 6466; Ibn al-‘Abīrī, vi, 300; Aḥkārūs, 230-1; ‘Amīrī, Shīrān, index; (C. Pellat)

**IBN AL-AHNAF** [see ‘ABBĀS B. AL-AHNAF].

**IBN AL-AHTAM** [see ‘AMR B. AL-AHTAM].

**IBN ‘ĀDĪD,** the author of a work on the raids (magā’hīs) [q.v.], used by such later authors as Ibn Suyyīd al-Nās and al-Dhahabī. His given name was Muḥammad. His kunyā is variously given as Abū ‘Abd Allāh or Abū Ahmad, and his grandfather’s name as Sa‘īd or ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. Born in Damascus in 150/767, he died there on Thursday, 25 Rabi‘ II 233/December 847 (or in Dhu l-Hijāda 232/July-August 847, or in 234/848), having been the tax collector for the Ghūṭa under ‘Alī. As a historian, he stands in the tradition of al-Walīd b. Kub b. a. as the main or exclusive source for later biographers. The Ta‘rikh Dimashq further credits Ibn ‘Ādīd with a work on the Muslim Conquests and the Summer Campaigns and quotes some non-historical statements in his name. Since that name is not infrequent, however, it is not impossible that Ibn ‘Askārī conflated one or more persons. The situation is further complicated by the fact that the Fīhirst, 109, mentions a historian Ibn ‘Abīd (sic) as the author of a history of kings and nations, and this, in turn, obscures the relevance of the reference to a historian of the same name in Ma‘arīf, Murādī, i, 11. If Ibn C‘Ahdī left no mark in the earlier historical literature known to far, this may be due to his having represented a Syrian tradition unpopular at the time. It may be noted that (if we are dealing with one person) he was considered reliable as a transmitter, but he was also described as a Mu’tazilī (kadari).

**Bibliography:** al-Bukhārī, Ta‘rikh, i, 1, 207; Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Dījak, iv, 1, 52; (al-Dawālībī, al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī, Ibn Mākūlā, all the preceding cited in Ta‘rikh Dimashq); al-Safādī, Wādī, iii, 181; al-Dhahabī, Tharī, Kuwait 1960, i, 414 (copied by Ibn al-‘Imād, ‘Abd al-Qadrī, ii, 78); Ibn Ḥāḍar, Tabāḥīb, i, 322-26; al-Sakhītwālī, 174, in F. Rosenthal, A history of Muslim historiography, Leiden 1952, 320, 322, 430, 432, (509).

**IBN ‘ĂISHA,** by-name of several persons, who may be distinguished as follows:

I. Muḥammad b. ‘Ăisha, Abū Da‘far, Medinan singer of unknown father. A pupil of Ma‘bad and of Mālik, he was regarded as the equal if not the superior of his masters, and celebrated for his skill at launching into a performance. He was highly respected at Mecca and at Medina, but, extremely vain, he would become very angry when asked to sing. He was invited to the court of Damascus, probably by al-Walīd b. Yazīd but during the caliphate of Hāšām b. ‘Abd al-Malik (105/274/43), and died accidentally on the way back, at Dhū Khurshub, when loaded with presents. Two monographs at least were devoted to him, one by Isākh al-Mawṣīli (Fīrikī, Cairo ed., 1348, 202), the other by Abū Ayyūb al-Mudnīl (ibid., 274).


II. Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Waḥrāb b. Ibrāhīm b. Māmān, known as Ibn C‘Aishā after his grandfather C‘Aisha bint Sulaymān b. ‘Abbī. Having retained a plot against al-Ma‘mūn, he was put to death in prison by the caliph and his body was hung up in a street of Baghdad in 209/ 824-5.

**Bibliography:** Tabārī, iii, 1022, 1073, 1075; Mas‘ūdī, Murādī, vii, 78-80; Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb, Muḥārāb, 489; F. Bustānī, Dā‘irat al-ma‘arīf, iii, 329.

III. Muḥammad b. Hāfs al-Taymī, Abū Bakr, genealogist, collector of traditions, and wit of Basra, who owes his by-name Ibn ‘A‘isha (al-Akbār) to C‘Aishā bint Ṭāha [q.v.], from whom he was descended.

**Bibliography:** Dībīḥ, Hayawān, i, 12, ii, 155; ibid., Bayān, i, 102, 320, ii, 290; Tabārī, index; Aghānī, index; Mas‘ūdī, Murādī, v, 343.

IV. ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Muḥammad b Hāfs, Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥman, the son of the preceding, from whom he takes his by-name Ibn C‘Aishā (al-Aghār) or C‘Aishā bint al-Ayghal. Also a traditionist, a rāwī and a celebrated orator, he settled in Baghdad in 219/834. He was considered very learned and is often quoted in ṣimāds, and it is generally he who is meant when the name Ibn ‘A‘isha alone is used. He reports very many historical and religious traditions on the authority of his father, and is even said to have been the author of an historical work. He died at Basra in 228/843.

**Bibliography:** Dībīḥ, Bayān, i, 102, 194, 239, 320; ibid., Hayawān, ii, 12; Ibn Kutayba, Ma‘arīf, 453, 523, 598; Mas‘ūdī, Murādī, vii, 288; Sha‘rānī, Ansāb, 379; Ibn Ḥāḍar, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib, vii, 45; F. Bustānī, Dā‘irat al-ma‘arīf, iii, 329-30.

**IBN ‘ĂKIL,** Abū Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Raḥman b. ‘Abd Allāh Bahl b. al-Dīn al-Ḥāshimī, born 694/1294 (or 698 or 700), died 769/1367, an important Shi’ī jurisconsult and grammarian. A native of Bālīs [q.v.] in Syria, he arrived destitute in Cairo, where his ability was recognized by his teacher in grammar, Abū Ḥāyyān al-Gharrānī [q.v.]. His main teachers in šiḥk were, among others, ‘Alī al-Dīn al-Kownī (Breakell, 11, 105; SI, 101) and the Chief Kāfij al-Dīn al-Din al-Kawzī (Subki, Tababāb, v, 238); having held various posts as substitute kāfīd
Ibn 'Aqil, born in 699 (880), he became the substitute of the Chief Kadilz al-Din Ibn Djamaca [q.v.], but was dismissed by him on account of unseemliness in a discussion. Ibn 'Aqil, however, won the favour of the amir Sarghit-minagh, who dismissed the amirs Jilali and put Ibn 'Aqil in his place in 759/1358. But when Sarghit-minagh fell from power immediately afterwards, Ibn Djamaca was reinstalled, and the term of office of Ibn 'Aqil lasted only 80 days. Ibn 'Aqil's short term of office became memorable through his considerable distributions of charity to the poor and the students, including a legacy of 150,000 dirhams which he distributed in sums ranging from 1 to 10 dinars. He also showed concern for the interests of ordinary people in the matter of making valid legacies.

Ibn 'Aqil taught several subjects of religious learning in a number of institutions, including tafsir in the mosque of Ibn tulun; his course took 23 years, and after that he started it again but did not live to complete it. His literary output does not seem to have been very considerable; he wrote a commentary on the hadiths of Ibn Djamaca [q.v.] wrote a gloss, and another commentary on the same author's Tashkil, both of which have been preserved; he also started an extremely detailed work, variously called Taysir al-isti'dad li-rubbat al-idhathad and al-Tas'is li-madhab Ibn Idris, in which he set out the ishihad and the various arguments, deciding in favour of the doctrine which he found best supported by traditions; four parts of it exist.

Ibn 'Aqil was very elegant in his dress, his food and his dwelling, and liked to mix in high society where he was well liked, but he was unreliable in business matters, though generous, and he died in debt. Siraj al-Din al-Bulkini [q.v.] was his son-in-law. 

Bibliography: Ibn Hadjar al-'Askalani, al-Durar al-kaminah, ii, 266 ff. (no. 2157); Ibn al-Kadi, Durrat al-hajij, ii, 347 f.; al-Suyuti, Usun al-mubaddara, Cairo 1321, i, 257 (a short notice among the grammarians); idem, Bughyat al-wu'ad, Cairo 1326, 284 f.; Ibn al-Imad, Shadhari al-dhahab, vi, 214 (year 769); al-Shawkan, al-Badr al-tali, Cairo 1348, i, 386 (no. 171); Khansari, Rawdat al-dimnai, iii, 458; Catalogue Cairo, iii, 212; Brockelmann, ii, 508, § 11 (at the end, read: Cairo ii, 121); S II, 104, § 12 (at the end, read: Ibn 'Aqil)]

Ibn 'Aqil, Abu 'l-Wafa, 'Ali b. 'Aqil b. Muhammad b. 'Aqil b. Ahmad al-Baghdbadi al-Zafari, Hanbali jurist and theologian (431/1040-1119), a great Sunni personality whose life and writings shed light on one of the most important periods in the development of Muslim religious thought, and who stands at the head of a progressive movement within Sunni traditionalism. 

Family origins and early youth. Ibn 'Aqil was born in Baghdad, on the left bank quarter of Bâb al-Tâk (see his Kitâb al-Fumûn, fol. 12b: "... Bâb al-Tâk, the quarter in which I was born"), in Djamâd II 431/February-March 1040. This fact, when added to others cited below, leaves little doubt that he belonged to a Hanafi family, not only on his mother's side (G. Makdisi, Ibn 'Aqil, 357), but also on that of his father. Some of his earliest recollections went back to this quarter where the great Hanafi mosque-college was located, along with the Shrine of Abû Hanifa and the great Hanafi cemetery. Mu'tazilism, during this period, had found a refuge within the Hanafi school of law, which helps to explain the interest Ibn 'Aqil took in Mu'tazilism, the independence of spirit which was never to leave him and which was to endow the Hanbal movement with a new direction and renewed vigour.

Education. This precocious young man had broad interests ranging from Qur'ân and traditions, grammar and prosody and the art of letter-writing, to those subjects in which he particularly excelled, the art of the sermon, dogmatic theology, dialectics and legal studies. Of the twenty-three teachers he himself names as those under whom he studied, only two belonged to the Hanbali School, Abû Ya'âla and Abû Muhammad al-Tamimi (d. 485/1095). The others were Shafi'i, Maliki, Hanbali-Maliki, and Hanbali-Shafi'i. Ibn 'Aqil, however, won the favour of the Sarghit-minagh, who appointed him to a chair in the Cathedral Mosque of al-Manṣur after his teacher Abû Ya'âla died in 488, an appointment made possible by his patron Abû Mansûr, earned him the hostility of a group of Hanballis led by the Sharîf Abû Dja'far (d. 470). The latter, twenty years the senior of Ibn 'Aqil, apparently resented the early distinction conferred upon the young man. After the death of
Abū Mansūr in 460 and the consequent loss of his protection, Ibn 'Aqīl had to go into hiding to escape the wrath of this group. From 460 to 465, he lived in hiding in the house of Būh al-Mārṭūs under the protection of Abū 'l-Ḵāsim b. Ṣawāna, also a wealthy Ḥanbalī merchant, son-in-law of Abū Mansūr.

Public retraction. On Monday 8 Muharram 465/24 September 1072, in the mosque of the Šarīf Abū Dja'far located in the quarter of Nahr al-Muʾalla, on the east side of Baghdād, Ibn 'Aqīl read the text of his retraction in the presence of a numerous gathering. The retraction was then signed by five ḡubūd-notaries, including two sons and two sons-in-law of the late Abū Mansūr. Two days later, in another ceremony in the Caliphal Diwān, Ibn 'Aqīl signed his retraction. In this document, Ibn 'Aqīl retracted writings in favour of Hallādī and of certain Muʿtazīlī doctrines.

There is no doubt that the Ḥanbalī school as a whole was opposed to Muʿtazīlīsm; and there is no reason to doubt Ibn 'Aqīl's sincerity regarding his abjuration of Muʿtazīlīsm. Although his later writings owe much to the spirit of inquiry he may have gained from his Muʿtazīlī professors, he cannot be said to share their theological doctrines. Therefore, in so far as Muʿtazīlīsm is concerned, Ibn 'Aqīl was thoroughly sincere in his retraction and remained afterwards true to Ḥanbalīsm.

However, as regards Hallādī. Ibn 'Aqīl's sincerity in retracting his veneration for him is, one may safely say, open to doubt. He was probably practising ḏikr Allah, invocation of the Divine Name, dhikr Allah. Later he authorized him to resume the lessons. He made him a shuhūd-notaries, by five figures given ranging from two hundred to as many as eight hundred volumes; only one volume is known to be extant. An abridgment in ten volumes (not extant) was made by Ibn al-Djawzi. Sibt Ibn al-Djawzi.

Among his other important works, now lost: 'Aqīl al-Waṭāfī 'ṣūr Allāh, Ibn 'Aqīl written in praise of al-Hallādī, in defence of the tradi-

**Bibliography:** On the public retraction of Ibn 'Aqīl, see I. Goldziher, Zur Geschichte der hanbali-
tischen Beweisungen, in ZDMG, lxix (1908), 20-1;

L. Massignon, La Passion d'al-Hosayn ibn Mansour al-Hallādī, Paris 1914-22, 566, 567; for details of the affair, see G. Mokdisi, Nouveaux détails sur l'affaire d'Ibn 'Aqīl, in Mélanges Louis Massignon, iii, 91-126. For Ibn 'Aqīl in the history of Han-
balīsm, see H. Laoust, Le Ḥanbalīsm sous le Califat de Baghdād, in REI (1959), 104-5. For bibliography and further details on Ibn 'Aqīl, see G. Mokdisi, Ibn 'Aqīl et la resurgence de l'Islam traditionnaliste au XIe siècle, Damascus (PISI) 1963, esp. ch. V, and index s.v. (G. Mokdisi).

**IBN 'ALIWA, SHAYKH ABU 'L-'ABBAS AHMAD B. MUṢtáfā AL-SALAWI AL-MUSTĀQHĀMĪ, Ṣafi and poet, born at Mostaganem in Algeria in 1286/1869 of a distinguished but at that time indigent family. He never went to school and his handwriting remained unproficient all his life, but he was taught to read and given lessons in the Qurʾān by his father, though even these had to be cut short owing to his family's poverty, which forced him, from an early age, to take to cobbling and then later to open a small shop. In his spare time he attended a course of lessons in the Islamic doctrine of Divine Unity (tawḥīd). His father died when he was 16, and not long afterwards he entered the Ḥarawi [q.v.], an important by his father, though even these had to be cut short owing to his family's poverty, which forced him, from an early age, to take to cobbling and then later to open a small shop. In his spare time he attended a course of lessons in the Islamic doctrine of Divine Unity (tawḥīd). His father died when he was 16, and not long afterwards he entered the Ḥarawi [q.v.], an important by his father, though even these had to be cut short owing to his family's poverty, which forced him, from an early age, to take to cobbling and then later to open a small shop. In his spare time he attended a course of lessons in the Islamic doctrine of Divine Unity (tawḥīd). His father died when he was 16, and not long afterwards he entered the Ḥarawi [q.v.], an important by his father, though even these had to be cut short owing to his family's poverty, which forced him, from an early age, to take to cobbling and then later to open a small shop. In his spare time he attended a course of lessons in the Islamic doctrine of Divine Unity (tawḥīd). His father died when he was 16, and not long afterwards he entered the Ḥarawi [q.v.], an important
On the death of the shaykh al-Buzlid, 15 years later, in 1905, the members of the order insisted that Ahmad b. Allwa should be their shaykh. Some five years later he decided to make his sauriya independent of the mother-sauriya of the Darkawiya in Morocco, and the new branch was styled al-Tarita al-Alawiyya al-Darkawiyya al-Shadhiliyya, whence he himself came to be known as the Shaykh al-Alawi. One of the reasons for the "rupture", which seems to have taken place around 1240 AD, is that he felt that his methods were different. As part of his method, the practice of spiritual retreat (khulou [q.v.]) in an isolated cell under his close supervision rather than in the wilds of nature according to the traditional Darkawi-Shadhili practice.

His fame spread over North Africa and a large sauriya overlooking the sea was built at Tidgitt, the purely Arab quarter of Mostaganem. As perhaps the most eminent representative of Sufism in his day, and looked upon by many as the maddadd (renewer) of 'Islam in its 14th century, he inevitably came into conflict with the enemies of Sufism, in particular members of the "reformist" Salafiyya [q.v.].

Partly as an antidote to their paper al-Shakhb, published at Constantine, he started a weekly review at Algiers, al-Baldgh al-Diazdirl, in which, established also other to al-Andalus in 123/741 with the vanguard of the Syrian contingent of Baldj b. Bishr al-Kushayri [q.v.] through his connexion in addition to his vindications of Sufism, he attacked in particular the enemies of Sufism, in particular members of the doctrine, expounding the relationship between the Divine Essence, Divine Being and the Supreme Spirit. The starting point for this treatise appears to be Abd al-Karim al-Djili’s al-Kahf wa ‘l-Rakim, but Ahmad b. Allwa’s treatment is the more subtle. In Lubab al-imr fi Sura‘a Wa’l-Nagim, he explains the nature of the Prophet’s two visions referred to in Qur’an LIII, one with the heart (fu’dad) and the other with the eye (basar). These three works, together with his poems (the third edition of his Divan was published in Damascus in 1963), are perhaps the most profound of his writings. His earliest book in vindication of Sufism, al-Kawi al-mawrf, first published in 1920, was followed up in 1927 by Risalat al-Nadr Ma’rif, an anthology of pronouncements in praise of Sufism by eminent jurists and theologians from the 2nd/8th until the present century. The first part of al-Mawadd al-ghaythiya, his commentary on the aphorisms of Shu’ayb Abū Madyan, was published in 1942, but the second part has not yet been published, neither has his commentary on the Sūrat al-Fātihā and the first 40 verses of the surah al-Kahf, in which each verse is given four different interpretations ranging from the literal to the purely spiritual. The unique manuscripts of these unpublished works are at Mostaganem.


IBN ‘ALIWA — IBN ‘ALKAMA
with Thakif, Tammam b. Alkama was one of the chiefs who supported Abd al-Rahman I, d. 187/803, but is given as 194/809-10 by Abu Bakr al-Razi (cited Ibn al-Abbar). He served as wazlr to the Umayyads Muhammad I (q.v.); Abu Bakr al-Razi, in the latter's successful bid (138/755-6) for independence, contributed to the disastrous defeat of the Caliph's army at Baghiriyya. According to Rashid al-Din he was confirmed in his post as wazir by the Mongols and, when he died on 2 Diunmad II 656/June 1258, was succeeded in that office by his son, Sharaf al-Din Abu l-Kásim 'Ali. On the other hand, Wasi'f speaks of his being passed over in favour in some other Ibn Amran, a man of the people from Bak'dah.


IBN AL-ÂLÂF, Abu Bakr al-Hasan b. Ah-mad b. Bashshar b. Ziyâd Ibn al-Âlâf (so called because his father was a seller of katt) al-Nahrawâni, poet and traditionist who lived to be a hundred (282-318/893-930), becoming blind in his old age. He frequented the court at Bagdad and was an intimate particularly of al-Mu'ta'ziz and Ibn al-Mu'tazz. He knew much poetry and composed a great many verses himself, some of which were collected by his son and accompanied by accounts of his relations with the persons on whom he had written panegyrics, occupied four hundred warâkas, if the Fikrist reading (Cairo ed., 238) is reliable.

IBN al-'Alâ'î's fame however is based almost entirely on a basâ'da of 65 verses (metrical muwaqit, rhyme -â), including here and there gnomic verses in which he laments the death of his cat, killed by the Mongols and accompanied by accounts of his relations with the persons on whom he had written panegyrics, occupied four hundred warâkas, if the Fikrist reading (Cairo ed., 238) is reliable.

IBN AL-'ÂLÂF's fame however is based almost entirely on a basâ'da of 65 verses (metrical muwaqit, rhyme -â), including here and there gnomic verses in which he laments the death of his cat, killed by the Mongols and accompanied by accounts of his relations with the persons on whom he had written panegyrics, occupied four hundred warâkas, if the Fikrist reading (Cairo ed., 238) is reliable.

IBN AL-'ÂLÂF's fame however is based almost entirely on a basâ'da of 65 verses (metrical muwaqit, rhyme -â), including here and there gnomic verses in which he laments the death of his cat, killed by the Mongols and accompanied by accounts of his relations with the persons on whom he had written panegyrics, occupied four hundred warâkas, if the Fikrist reading (Cairo ed., 238) is reliable.

IBN AL-'ÂLÂF's fame however is based almost entirely on a basâ'da of 65 verses (metrical muwaqit, rhyme -â), including here and there gnomic verses in which he laments the death of his cat, killed by the Mongols and accompanied by accounts of his relations with the persons on whom he had written panegyrics, occupied four hundred warâkas, if the Fikrist reading (Cairo ed., 238) is reliable.

IBN AL-'ÂLÂF's fame however is based almost entirely on a basâ'da of 65 verses (metrical muwaqit, rhyme -â), including here and there gnomic verses in which he laments the death of his cat, killed by the Mongols and accompanied by accounts of his relations with the persons on whom he had written panegyrics, occupied four hundred warâkas, if the Fikrist reading (Cairo ed., 238) is reliable.

IBN AL-'ÂLÂF's fame however is based almost entirely on a basâ'da of 65 verses (metrical muwaqit, rhyme -â), including here and there gnomic verses in which he laments the death of his cat, killed by the Mongols and accompanied by accounts of his relations with the persons on whom he had written panegyrics, occupied four hundred warâkas, if the Fikrist reading (Cairo ed., 238) is reliable.

IBN AL-'ÂLÂF's fame however is based almost entirely on a basâ'da of 65 verses (metrical muwaqit, rhyme -â), including here and there gnomic verses in which he laments the death of his cat, killed by the Mongols and accompanied by accounts of his relations with the persons on whom he had written panegyrics, occupied four hundred warâkas, if the Fikrist reading (Cairo ed., 238) is reliable.

IBN AL-'ÂLÂF's fame however is based almost entirely on a basâ'da of 65 verses (metrical muwaqit, rhyme -â), including here and there gnomic verses in which he laments the death of his cat, killed by the Mongols and accompanied by accounts of his relations with the persons on whom he had written panegyrics, occupied four hundred warâkas, if the Fikrist reading (Cairo ed., 238) is reliable.

IBN AL-'ÂLÂF's fame however is based almost entirely on a basâ'da of 65 verses (metrical muwaqit, rhyme -â), including here and there gnomic verses in which he laments the death of his cat, killed by the Mongols and accompanied by accounts of his relations with the persons on whom he had written panegyrics, occupied four hundred warâkas, if the Fikrist reading (Cairo ed., 238) is reliable.

IBN AL-'ÂLÂF's fame however is based almost entirely on a basâ'da of 65 verses (metrical muwaqit, rhyme -â), including here and there gnomic verses in which he laments the death of his cat, killed by the Mongols and accompanied by accounts of his relations with the persons on whom he had written panegyrics, occupied four hundred warâkas, if the Fikrist reading (Cairo ed., 238) is reliable.
family consisted of the father, Abu 'l-Kasim 'Abd Allah b. Amadiur al-Turki and of his son Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali, and also of a freedman of the latter named Muflihi. They worked at Baghdad and at Shiraz between 272/885 and 321/933, making astronomical observations which have been in part preserved by Ibn Yunus. The son devoted much of his attention to the determination of the limits of the latitude of the moon, observing that it reached greater latitudes than those given by Hipparchus (2nd century B.C.) and finding considerable differences between his own various determinations; this implies some gain of the variation of the plane of the moon's orbit, demonstrates how exact was Abu 'l-IJasan's work. The three astronomers collaborated in compiling the tables called al-Badi'i, al-Mamarrat, al-Khaliis, al-Muzannar, and a version of the Sind-Hind, now lost, and some maps for Mars according to Persian chronology. Abu 'l-Kasim 'Abd Allah was the author of two other works: *Risammi akhla al-akba'il (Bibliotheca Nation. 58, 103 and 1170)* and Zad al-musifir (quoted by Ibn al-Kifti).


**IBN AL-'AMID**, the name of two viziers of the early Buyids, the first of them known also as a man of letters:

(1) Abu 'l-Fadl Muhammad b. al-Husayn b. Muhammad was the son of a pedlar or wheat merchant in the Shawabish town of Kumm in central Iran where later became a kāhib in Khurāsān, where he received the title of 'amīd [g.v.] which was in this region usually given to high officials. He appears at Bukhārā (Mathālī, 332-6) at an unknown date, perhaps later than his appearance in 322/933 as vizier of ᪜aghsānih in *Rayy* (quoted by Ibn al-Kifti) in *Fihrist*, and in 323 as vizier of letters at Rayy. In his correspondence, if we are to believe Miskawayh, he possessed a copy of it: this makes it all the more strange that almost nothing of it has been directly preserved and that all that is known of it comes from quotations by Abū Ḥayyān, al-Tha'labī and Yākūt; even al-Kalāshandi, though quoting so widely from his contemporaries and rival Abū Ishāk al-'Ṣabī', seems not to have known of it. So little being known, there should be pointed out ms. no 452, p. 449 of the Bihar Catalogue, a short recently copied collection of some of Ibn al-'Amid's letters, which deserves study and suggests that an earlier manuscript may exist somewhere in India or elsewhere. The critics' opinions on Ibn al-'Amid's literary worth depended however on what the writer considered to be the stylistic ideal and perhaps also on his personal relations with Ibn al-'Amid; while he is praised by Miskawayh, and in the *Yatima* there is found the formula which was later so often repeated according to which style "began with Ibn al-Hamid and ended with Ibn al-'Amid", Abū Ḥayyān considers him as the first corruptor of the language of al-Dhāhib and prefers to him his son Abu 'l-Fath and his rival mentioned above, Abū Ishāk al-'Ṣabī'.

Unfortunately practically nothing is known of his actual administration. Miskawayh, who had been his librarian, praises him, but in general terms only, for having been able to reorganize and maintain a regular system of administration. His father, having been vizier for 32 (lunar) years—a period whose length was to be exceeded later only by Nizām al-Mulk—died at Hamadhan on 5 Safar 360/9 December 970, having been vizier for 32 years—a period which he contracted during it gave his son the opportunity to make demagogic overtures to the troops, disregarding his father's disapproval. He died at Hamadhan on 5 Safar 360/9 December 970, having been vizier for 32 (lunar) years—a period which he contracted during it gave his son the opportunity to make demagogic overtures to the troops, disregarding his father's disapproval. He
the considerable influence exercised by Ibn al-
Amid must have been due primarily to his prodigious
memory in all matters, to his generosity (although
Abū Hayyān accuses him also of avarice on various
occasions), and to his friendly character. In letters,
as in politics, he was the master less of his own son
than of Ibn 'Abbād [q.v.] and of Abūd al-Dawla, who
always referred to him as al-Ustād al-Ra'īs.

**Bibliography:** See ibn yūnids. Apart from the
Tādājir of Miskawayh (to be completed by the
Ta'lima of Ḥamadānī, ed. A. Y. Kānānī, the main sources and references are: Ta'awwuz ed. Abū
Hayyān, Ta'awwuz, ed. ʻIbrāhīm ʻAlī, Kāyānā, Damāsca 1961 (especially 55-6, and from 212 to the
end), to be completed by the K. al-Imtd wa
l-mu'ānasa, ed. Ahmad Amin, especially vol. i
(index); and the Yaḥtaya of Thālibī. ʻĀkūtūs bi-
ography of Ibn al-Amid has not survived; that of
Ibn Ḥallikān (no. 707, de Slane, iii, 256 f.) is
based mainly on the Kālid al-Wuzārā of Ḥilāl al-
Sāhīb, of which this part is lost, and the K. al-
Tādājir of his ancestor mentioned above, Abū
Ishākh al-Sāhīb. The article by Amedroz, Ibn
al-Imtd, in Isl., iii, 323-51, consists essentially of
translations of the passages concerning him in the
Tādājir of Miskawayh, at that time unpublished.

I have not been able to see the brochure of Ḥallāl
Mustard, Ibn al-Imtd, Aleppo 1931.

(2) Abū ʻl-Fath ʻAlī b. Muḥammad ..., born 337/
948-9, son and successor of the above, who
accompanied his father on the Kurdish campaign
during which he died and during which Abū ʻl-Fath
attracted attention, in spite of his father's disapproval, by his
courting of the troops. He had the same intellectual
qualities as Abū ʻl-Fath and some writers even consider him to be a superior stylist, but he had the
rashness and inexperience of youth and made the
princes uneasy when his incautious expenditure in
the jealousy of ʻAbd Allāh b. Abbad and Ibrahim b.
Abbad, wished only for a quiet life, allowed him
to his father's suzerainty, with Abū ʻl-Fath as vizier of
this region. Abū ʻl-Fath, sent to sound the aged ruler
on the matter, had great difficulty in pacifying him,
and of Rukn al-Dawla attaching great importance to family
solidarity and loyalty; nevertheless, ʻAbd Allāh having
left, Abū ʻl-Fath remained behind at Baghādār where
he amused himself, amassed possessions, improved
his relations with Baghāthār and his vizier Ibn Bakīyya
[now], and received from the caliph, without
Rukn al-Dawla's having asked for anything, the
kābab of ʻAbd al-Ra'īs, in short gave the
impression of following his own personal policy against
the interests of Rukn and of ʻAbd Allāh. ʻAbd used him
again in 365/976 to settle with his angry father
questions concerning the succession; but in 366, Rukn
being now dead, ʻAbd Allāh intervened in ʻArāq, while Abū
ʻl-Fath, who remained at Rayy, quarrelled there
with the influential counsellor of Mu'āyyid, Ibn
ʻAbbād [q.v.], whom he feared and tried to get
removed and even killed, and finally, on the orders
of ʻAbd Allāh, Mu'āyyid's suzerain, was arrested,
tortured and put to death. The family, of whom no
other members are known, does not seem to have
played after this any role of importance.

**Bibliography:** See ibn yūnids and the
above article on Abū ʻl-Fath; there is a long biography
on Abū ʻl-Fath in the Irkādāt of Yatīma, v, 347-73,
based on the chronicle or the K. al-Wuzārā
of Ḥilāl al-Sāhīb, a Ta'īrīh of al-ʻĀbī, and an account
by Abū Ḥayyān which I have not been able to
find either in the Mu'āyyid or in the İmdād
both of which include several paragraphs on Abū
ʻl-Fath—see index); the life of Abū ʻl-Fath in Ibn
Khalikīn is also based on the Wuzārā, and on the
Tādājir of Abū Ishākh al-Sāhīb; see also the
following texts: Ta'īrīh of al-Maṭrūkh (Maṭrīf,
Arslan) and J. Chr. Bürgel, Die Hoheitsrepublik
Abūd al-Dawlas, 1969; the İmdād contains
nothing about him.

(̊C. ̊Cahen)

IBN AL-ÅMID [see ibn al-kalānisī; al-makīn].

IBN AL-AMĪN MĀHMŪD KEMAL [see inal].

IBN ʿĀMIR, Abū ʻUmar ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿĀmīr
al-Yaḥṣūbī, "reader" of the Kurān whose
Yaḥṣūbī [q.v.] is counted among the seven canonical
"readings". Of south Arabian origin, he belonged to
the first class of the Tabībīn [q.v.], his guarantors
being ʻUṯmān b. ʻAffān, Abū ʻl-Dardā [q.v.] and other
less famous Companions. He settled in Damascus
where he was appointed ʿaddāl by al-Walīd
b. ʻAbd al-Malik and chief of police by Yazīd
b. al-Walīd and İbrahim b. al-Walīd; his "reading"
was adopted by the inhabitants of Damascus. He
died in 1187/736, having had as direct disciples his
brother ʻAbd al-Rahmān and especially Yabhā b.
al-Ḥārith al-Dhimārī (ed. 145/762), whom Ibn
Kutayba (Maṣrīf, 530) includes among the authors of
canonical "readings", while mentioning Ibn
ʻĀmīr only incidentally. His reading was trans-
mitted indirectly by ʻAbd Allāh b. Ḥaykānīn (d. 241/856) and the ʻaddāl of Damascus,
Hālgām b. Ammar al-Sulami (d. 245/859).

Among others of the same name, the best known is
ʻAbd Allāh b. ʻĀmīr b. Kurayz [q.v.].

**Bibliography:** Fihrist, Cairo 1348, 43-4; Ibn
Dżżarī, Kurā'ī, s.v.; Dānī, Taṣāvīr, s.v.; idem,
Muḥkam, Damascus 1960, 140, 188; Ibn ʻAsūsī, Ta'īrīh Dimāqāt, ed. Munāṣṣīd, ii, 51; Ibn
Khalikīn, s.v.; ʻAskariī, Taḥkīb al-Taḥdhib,
v, 274; Gesch. des Qor, iii; H. Blachère, Introduction
au Coran, 120. (Ed.)

IBN-AL-ÅMIR, Abū 'L-MUTARRIF AMER, b. ʻAbd Allāh al-Makīmī, writer, poet and judge,
who was born in Valencia (Spain) in Rama-
dān 580/December 1184, and died in Tunīs in Dhu
l-Hijjah 656 or 658/December 1258 or November
1260 (his grandfather's name is given as ʻUmār āy in
the Dīdawgīt al-Isbīdāt of Ibn al-Kāḍī, 72). His
family originated in Alcira (Džazālrat Shukr), near
Valencia. He studied with the best Andalusian
scholars and then travelled probably to the East where
he acquired an immense knowledge of fikh, hadith
and literature, and also gained some acquaintance with
certain branches of the speculative sciences (maṣūfīāt),
philosophy, kalām, etc.

On his return, he settled fora time in his native
town, where he became one of the local dignitaries.
It was there that he started a life-long friendship
with Ibn al-Abbhār [q.v.]; shortly afterwards, he
became a judge at Ḥattiva, and he must have held the
same position in Majorca in about 627/1229-30,
for he was present in the island when it was con-
quered by James I of Aragon (Jaime el Conquistador);
he wrote an account of the event in a book,
the title of which is unknown and which is always
referred to as ʻAbd al-Kā'iūn Mayyārka; this is
his most famous work, and al-Maṣkārī (Analectes,
i\. Abbás Ahmad Al-Mangallílát and Abū ʾAbd Allāh Muhammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAll, known nowadays in Algeria by the name of Sidi Ben ʿAll.

In 1166/1752 he decided to perform the hajj, and, six years later, after a stay in Cairo, withdrew to the Hijāz to end his days there as a muḥaddīṣ [q.v.]. According to certain indications, he was still alive in 1204/1799, and his death allegedly occurred in Mecca between this date and 1211/1796. This is all that is known of his life and studies. In Algiers he held the post of Māliki muṣṭaﬁ for a long time and taught kādiyya (an abridgement which omits most of the prose quotations); Ibn al-Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahab al-Rashid, the tenth Almohad caliph (630-40/1232-42), who appointed him secretary in the Chancellery. A little later, he was appointed kādi of the Hārijīn, his tribe, and then transferred to the following reign he appears as a kādi in Meknès. Later, he moved to Ceuta and from there to Ifrīqiya, where he entered the service of the Hāsjīdīn, in Tunis. He was appointed kādi, first of al-Úrbūs, then of Gābba; al-Mustansir bīllah (647-72/1249-76) made him one of his advisers, and he became his favourite courtier until his death, on 20 Dhuʾl-Hijjah 65/26 November 1260.

Ibn ʿAmir was a prolific writer of both prose and verse; the sources named in the bibliography reproduce an abundance of material, mostly in the form of official State letters and letters addressed to friends. Even his book on the fall of Majorca was a risāla addressed to a particular person. His prose is sober, elegant, beautiful and precise, but is surpassed in these qualities by that of his contemporary Ibn al-ʿAbbār. His poetry is better than his prose. The only work to have survived under his name is al-Thābīn fī ʿilm al-kalām (MS Escorial 296), and it seems in fact that this and the work on Majorca are the only books that he wrote, although several others have been attributed to him.

Bibliography:

Ibn al-Abbar, Muḥtadab min Kitāb Ṭuḥṭ al-kādīm, Cairo 1957, 145-50 (an abridgement which omits most of the prose quotations);

Ibn ʿAMMAR, Abū ʾL-ʿABBAS AHMAD, fakīḥ and poet, known at the present time in Algeria under the name of Sidi Ben ʿAmār. It is not known where or when he was born and nothing is known of his childhood, his youth and his early studies. He is said to have learned hadīṯ from Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿUmar b. ʿAkdīl (or ʿUkāyil) al-Yaṣāli (sic) or al-Bāṣalāwī (probably al-Yaṣāli, i.e., of the Banī Yaṣā, a tribe of the lesser Kabylie) al-Makkī, who died in 1270/ 1756; he is said to have studied more particularly the Sahīḥ of al-Bukhārī under masters (?) whose line went back to Abū ʿUṯmān Saʿdī b. ʿAḥmad al-Makkī, a former muftī of Tlemcen (928/1521- 1011/1606). He is said, furthermore, to have been initiated into the mysteries of the fraternity of the Shāhīḥiliyya by Abū ʾAbbās Allāh Muhammad al-Munawwār al-Tīlīmsnā, a disciple of Mḥammad b. Nāṣir al-Ḥarīfī, and to have received his mystical education from a second line of masters going back to the Egyptian Abū ʾAbd al-Wahhāb al-ʿAffīfī.

For his literary education and notably for the composition of muḥaddīsah his masters are said to have been two well-known Algerians, Abū
always linked with the ‘Abbādīdīs. At the court he became the friend of the prince Muḥammad, accompanying him to Silves when the prince was made governor there; but as the prince, desiring to add to his power, invested his friends with disagreeable duties, Ibn ʿAmmār began to circulate about the two young men and al-Muʿtadīd, mistrusting their friendship, recalled his son to Seville in 450/1058 and commanded the poet to leave the kingdom. Ibn ʿAmmār then sought refuge in Saragossa, whence he addressed poems to the ruler of Seville and to his vizier, Ibn Zaydūn [q.v.], in vain attempt to make them relent. He had to wait until the death of al-Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥimād and the succession of his friend Muḥammad (who took the title al-Muʿtadīd) in 461/1069 before being recalled to Seville.

From then on Ibn ʿAmmār gave up poetry to some extent in order to devote himself to politics, in an effort to play a prominent part in Muslim Spain. Soon after his return he was appointed governor of Silves and later became al-Muʿtadīd's chief minister. In 460/1069, he took part in the annexing to the kingdom of Seville of the town of Cordova, which became the seat of the court; the following year he got rid of Ibn Zaydūn, whom he considered as his rival, by sending him back to Seville; he struggled successfully against the favourite ʿĪtimād, who was hostile to him, and succeeded in dominating the ruler completely and practically directing the state. He then advocated a policy of expansion based on the support of the Christians, i.e., of Alfonso VI, with whom he strengthened the relations of Seville to such an extent that he was even considered a traitor. His manoeuvres to take Granada with the help of Alfonso VI failed however, and his first action against Murcia (Tudmīr) had no greater success. This attempt was part of a plan which he had conceived in order to gain possession of the town for himself personally; he therefore set himself up as independent governor of Murcia as soon as he had succeeded in taking possession of it, with the help of Ibn Rāshīl [q.v.], in 471/1078. Taking advantage of this victory, he turned to Toledo, leaving behind in Murcia Ibn Rāshīl, who in turn betrayed him and declared himself independent. Dispossessed of his short-lived conquest, Ibn ʿAmmār took refuge once again with al-Muʿtadīd Ibn Ḥādī [q.v.], in whose name he took part in a number of successful expeditions; he was, however, captured at Segura in 473/1081 by al-Muʿjīb ibn al-Muʿtadīd, and was imprisoned in Córdoba from which he escaped and went to Seville, where he suffered the most degrading humiliations. In spite of interventions on his behalf, Ibn ʿAmmār was brought back to Cordova in chains and paraded on a donkey, then taken to Seville, where he suffered the most degrading humiliations. In spite of interventions on his behalf, al-Muʿtadīd stood firm and did not allow himself to be swayed again by the pleas which Ibn ʿAmmār addressed to him from prison; nevertheless, the poems with which he tried to soften the heart of his former patron, indeed, are said to have had some effect, and certainly such as to touch al-Muʿtadīd’s feelings, to the extent that he seemed at one time to be on the point of yielding and granting pardon, but his prisoner made a blunder which was skillfully exploited by his enemies, in particular by the son of Ibn Zaydūn, who had taken his father’s place, and al-Muʿtadīd in a passion of anger cut off Ibn ʿAmmār’s head with one blow of an axe (479/1086).

As regards his character, Ibn ʿAmmār is accorded in Spain the fame which he deserves; his intelligence and especially his unbounded ambition made him a dangerous and much-feared person, who knew too well how to attract people by charm of manner and conversation. His behaviour towards al-Muʿtadīd is judged with severity but does not prevent the critics from recognizing his poetic talent. His poetry, very personal in inspiration and composed with remarkable technical skill, is indisputably gifted and original, but his satires are bitter and his panegyrics often lacking in dignity.

His Diwān, which he composed in Seville, where it appeared in the two recensions, now lost, of Abu Ṭāhir Mū. b. Yūsuf al-Tamīlī and of Abu ʿKāsim al-Shībīlī; besides, Ibn Bassām included the poems from it which were considered the best in his Nukḥbat al-khittāyīr fī aṣghūr Ibn ʿAmmār (which is also lost). Recently, Ṣaḥāb al-Dīn Ḥaḳīm made an attempt to reconstruct it in a thèse complémentaire presented at the Sorbonne in 1953, also devoting to the poet a long chapter in his thèse principale on La vie littéraire à Séville au XIe siècle; the data thus collected were published in Baghādād in 1957 under the title of Muḥammad b. ʿAmmār al-Andalusī.

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Les Mēmoires de 'Abd Allāh, dernier roi ziride de Grenade, in al-Andalus, iii-iv (1935-6), index; Ibn Bassām, Dhakhīra, ii (MS); Ibn Ḥaḳīm, Kaḥībād, 88-99; Ibn al-Abbār, Ḥusṭa, apud Dozy, Scriptorum arabīm loci de Abbādīdīs (Muḥnis ed., index); Ibn Ḥaḳīkān, iv; Marrakūshī, Muṭjdīb, index; Ibn Sa‘īd, Muṭjrīb, index; Maškārī, Analectes, index; Ibn Dībāya, Muṭjrīb; Ibn al-Imād al-Isfahānī, Kaḥībāt al-ṣaḥīb, MS Paris 3330; Dozy, Hist. Mus. Esp. , ii, 83-117 and references there given; A. González Pailencia, Literatura*, 75-8; A. Ḏayl, Balāghat al-Arab fī 'I’anālas, Cairo 1342/1924, i-ii-20; H. Pērēs, Poesie andalouse, index. (Cn. PELLAT)

 Ibn ʿAmmār [see ʿAmmār, bānū; al-Ḥakīm bi-amr Allāh; Ṭarbūlīs].


Ibn al-ʾAraḫī, Muḥammad b. Ziyād, Abū ʿĀbd Allāh, philologist of the school of Kūfa, who is said to have been the son of a slave from Sind who became a māuida of Abū ʿAbbās b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Ḥāshimi. Born at Kūfa in 150/767, he was the pupil principally of al-Kisāʾī [q.v.], of Abū Muḥāsīva al-Dāris, of al-ʿAskārī b. Maʿṣūn al-Maṣīdi (see Fīrāsī, Cairo, 193), and of al-Mufaḍḍāl al-Dābbī [q.v.], who had married his mother and whose Muṭfaḍḍāliyya he hand over; and he in his turn had many disciples, among them Thaʿlab [q.v.], Ibrāhim al-Ḥarbī and Ibn al-Sīkkit [q.v.], besides Saʿīd b. Saʿīd b. Kūṭayba, whose teacher he was. His biographers praise his learning in grammar, lexicography, genealogies and poetry, and it is said that he have drifted from memory, without having to refer to any book, enough material to have loaded several camels. Al-Dīḥījī, who knew him at Baghādād or at Sāmarrā, quotes him often as a ṭawī, without, it seems, resenting his ill-natured attack on the Bāṣra scholars Abū ʿUbayda and al-ʾAṣmāʾī, who, he maintained, knew nothing. He claims to have received from the mouth of the Bedouins many facts which contradict the affirmations of al-ʾAṣmāʾī, but
IBN AL-AfRABl — IBN AL-<ARABl
he himself indulges in fanciful interpretations and
accepts curious grammatical rules, to the extent
that his critics have easily been able to point out
proofs of his ignorance, even in the domains where
he is considered a master.
Afflicted with both a squint and a limp (Muht.
b. Habib calls him also al-Acradj), he seems not to
have had a very distinguished career, but his learning nevertheless met with some success, since audiences of more than one hundred crowded to his
classes. At Samarra, al-Wathik resorted to him for
the solution of a philological problem, which proves
that he enjoyed quite a wide reputation. In spite of
his hostility towards the MuHazills, it was Ahmad
b. Abi Du'ad [q.v.] himself who led the funeral prayer
at his grave, on 13 Shacban 231/14 April 846 (but the
date of his death varies from 230 to 233), at Samarra.
About twenty works are attributed to him:
K. al-Nawddir, K. al-Anwa*, K. Sifat al-nakhl, K.
Sifat al-zar<, K. al-Khayl, K. Ta'rikh al-kabd>il, K.
Ma'dni 'l-shi'r, K. Tafsir al-amthdl (Fihrist: alKabd*il, but that is an error), K. al-Nabdt, K.
al-Alfdz, K. Nasab al-khayl, K. Nawddir al-Zubayriyyln, K. Nawddir Bani Fafr'as, K. al-Dhubdb
(transmitted by al-Sukkari), K. al-Nabt wa yl-bakl,
and others listed by Brockelmann. Only a few of
these have survived, a K. al-Fddilfi 'l-adab, a collection of elegies published by Wright (Op. ar., 97-122),
a K. al-Bi^r (Cairo, vii, 652) [see BI'R], and the K.
Asmd* khayl al-^Arab wa-fursdnihd, which must
correspond to the K. Nasab al-khayl mentioned
above (ed. G. Levi Delia Vida, Les "Livres des
Chevaux", Leyden 1928); on his recension of alAkhtal's Diwdn, see AL-AKHTAL.
Bibliography: Djahiz, Bukhald*, Baydn and
Hayawdn, index; Muh b. Habib, Muhabbar,
index; Ibn Kutayba, Macdrif, 238; idem, 'Uyun
and Adab al-kdtib, index; Tabari, iii, 972, 1357;
Kali, Amdli, index; Mubarrad, Kdmil, index;
Aghdni, index; Mascudi, Murud[, iv, 117, vii, 162-4;
Fihrist, Cairo, 102-3; Marzubani, Muwashshah,
index; Ibn Khallikan, i; Khatib Baghdad!, Ta'rikh
Baghdad, v, 282-5; Yakut, Udabd*, xviii, 189-96;
Ibn al-Athir, Mathal sd*ir, 490; Nawawi, Tahdhib,
784; Suyuti, Bughya, 42-3; Safadi, Wdfl, Damascus
1953, iii, 79-80 (no. 993); Anbari, Nuzha*, 95-7;
Zubaydi, Tabafydt, Cairo 1373/1954, 213; Fihris
al-mu?dllifin, Tetuan 1952, 248; al-Muktabas, vi,
3-9; Flick, 'Arabiya, 49-51 (Fr. trans., 75-8) and
index; R. Sellheim, Die klassisch-arabischen Sprichwb'rtersammlungen, The Hague 1954, 49 and index;
Brockelmann, S I, 179-80; B. al-Bustani, in
Dd^irat al-ma^drif, ii, 340-4.
(Cn. PELLAT)
IBN AL-CARABI, ABU BAKR MUHAMMAD B.
C
C
ABD ALLAH AL-MA AFIRI, a t r a d i t i o n i s t belonging to Seville; b. 468/1076, d. 543/1148. In 4&5/
1092 he travelled with his father to the East, and
spent periods studying in Damascus and Baghdad.
In 489/1096 he performed the Pilgrimage, after which
he returned to Baghdad and studied under Abu
Hamid al-Ghazali and others. He then went with his
father to Egypt and met traditionists in Cairo and
Alexandria. After his father's death in 493/1100 he
returned to Seville, where he was credited with
encyclopaedic knowledge. He wrote books on a
variety of subjects, including jiadith, fikh, usul,
Kur3an studies, adab, grammar, and history. A long
list of his writings is given by Makkari, Analectes, i,
483 f. Among them is cArida al-Ahwadhi, a commentary on al-Tirmidhi's collection of traditions.
Many of his works are no longer extant. In Seville
he acted as kddt for a time, acquiring a reputation
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for severity towards evildoers and kindness towards
humble people. He later resigned this post and
devoted himself to scholarship, both teaching and
writing. When the Muwafcfoids entered Seville he and
others were taken to Marrakush where he was
imprisoned for about a year. He died while on a
journey from Marrakush to Fez, where he was
buried. Makkari says a ziydra came to be held at his
tomb, which he himself had visited several times.
While Ibn al-cArabi was generally highly commended,
everyone did not accept him as an authority on
fradith. He has been called thika (trustworthy) and
thabat (reliable), but the frddi clyad b. Musa (d. 544;
1149), a contemporary who heard traditions from
him, said people criticized his traditions, and Ibn
Hadjar al-cAskalani (d. 852/1449) has called him
(toc*/(weak).
(Bibl. Arab.-Hisp., x); Ibn Farhun, al-Dlbddi almudhahhab, Cairo 1329, 281-4; Ibn Hadjar,
Lisdn al-mizdn, v, 234; Ibn Khallikan, Wafaydt,
Bulak 1275, i, 697 f., De Slane (Eng. trans.), iii,
12-14; Ibn al-clmad, Shadhardt, 546 A.H.; Hadjdil
Khalifa, ed. Flligel, Index No. 2045; Brockelmann,
I, 525, S I, 632 f., 732 f.
(J. ROBSON)
IBN AL-cARABl, MUHYI 'L-DIN ABU C ABD ALLAH
C
MUHAMMAD B. ALI B. MUHAMMAD B. AL-CARABI ALHATIMI AL-TA3!, known as al-Shaykh al-Akbar
(560/1165-638/1240), was one of the greatest Sufis of
Islam. He is usually referred to—incorrectly—as Ibn
c
Arabi, without the article, to distinguish him from
Ibn al-cArabi, Abu Bakr [q.v.]; in Turkey he is often
referred to as "Muhyi '1-Din cArabi"; whereas some
sources (e.g., al-Kutubi, Fawdt al-wafaydt, Cairo 1951,
ii, 487) give his kunya as Abu Bakr, in autograph notes
he refers to himself only as Abu cAbd Allah.
Life. He was born at Murcia on 27 Ramadan
560/7 August 1165 (see the note by Sadr al-Din alKunawi, reproduced by A. Ates, in TV, n.s. i/i (16)
(1955), PI. XXV), of a family claiming descent from
Hatim al-Ta'i [q.v.]; some Sufi adepts were numbered
among his near relations. When he was eight, his
father moved to Seville, where Ibn al-cArabi began
his formal education; as a young man he is said to
have acted as kdtib to various governors (al-Makkari,
Nafh al-jib, i, 568). At an early age, in the course of
an illness, he enjoyed a vision (Futufydt, iv, 552) which
changed the course of his life, leading him to regard
his earlier years as a period of dj_dhiliyya (Futuhdt, i,
207); the genuineness of this "conversion" much impressed his father's friend the philosopher Ibn Rushd
[q.v.], the fyddi of Seville (Futuhdt, i, 170). Although
Ibn al-cArabi claimed that his macrifa was communicated to him with no intermediary, he notes in his
works the names of many shaykhs whom he served
and whose company he sought, among them: Abu
Djacfar al-cUrayni (Ruh al-kuds [no. 8, below], fol.
41; Futuhdt, iii, 589, 596, etc.); Abu Yackub al-Kaysi,
a disciple of Abu Madyan [q.v.] (Ruh al-kuds, fol. 43);
Salili al-cAdawi, skilled at revealing the future; Abu
'1-Hadjdiadi Yusuf, etc. (Ruh al-kuds, fols. 46-73),
and two women: Fatima bint al-Muthanna and
Shams Umm al-Fukara3. Although he refers to Abu
Madyan (d. 598/1193) as his "shaykh", in fact he
never met him personally (Ruh al-kuds, fol. 66).
Ibn al-cArabi spent some ten years in various
towns of Spain and North Africa with these teachers,
but until 590/1194 Seville remained his home. In
that year, at the age of 30, he went to Tunis to
join a certain cAbd al-cAziz al-Mahdawi (Ruh al-


In the next year he went to Fez, where in 594/1198 he wrote his K. al-Isrā (no. 3, below). In 595/1199 he was in Cordova, where he attended the funeral of Ibn Rusd, and later at Almanzor, where he wrote his Mansāḥt al-nuṣūḥ (no. 7 below) (Naḥf al-fihū, i, 576); in 598/1202 he was back in Tunis and then, travelling via Cairo and Jerusalem, set out to perform the Pilgrimage (Rūḥ al-ḫūds, fol. 63 v.). Deeply moved by the sight of the Ka'ba, for him the point of contact between the worlds of the visible (ḵhawād) and the invisible (ḵhawād), he stayed (shuhūd), with the occasion of the funeral of Ibn Rusd, and later at Almānza—the investigation of which still remains incomplete. Ibn al-ʿArabi himself did not know how many works he had written; at the request of his friends he endeavoured to draw up a list, of which three (conflicting) versions survive: (1) Fihrist (Konya, MS Yusuf Āga 4989, pp. 378-89, on which see A. Ates, in TV, n.s. li (1955), 155-60, written by Sād al-Dīn before 612/1216, is incomplete; (2) a MS of 1337/1918-9 (copied from one of 639/1241-2) by Sadr al-Dīn, who was with him in his last days, spent his life in teaching and commenting on his master's works. Ibn al-ʿArabi died, in the house of the bādī Mūṭḥa li-Dīn Ibn al-Zakī, on 28 Rabīʿ II 638/16 November 1240, and was buried in that family's turba on the slopes of Mount Kāsimūn.

Ibn al-ʿArabi married several wives and presumably had many children, but only two of his sons are known: Sād al-Dīn Muḥammad, b. 618/1221 in Malātīya, d. 656/1258 in Damascus, a poet (al-Kutubī, Faḍīl al-ʿaṣfāyādī, i, 325 (which, however, gives the date of his death as 686); Naḥf al-fihū, i, 572; Brockelmann, i, 583); and ʿĪmād al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh, d. 667/1271 in Damascus (Naḥf al-fihū, loc. cit.).

The Ottoman Sultan Selim I, during his stay in Damascus after his Egyptian campaign (923/1517-8), ordered the rebuilding of the turba where Ibn al-ʿArabi was buried, and the construction nearby of a mosque and a takhiṣṣa (H. Laoust, Les gouverneurs de Damas . . ., Damascus 1952, 148-50; cf. Feridun, Muslkhālī, i, 404, 441, 444; Sād al-Dīn, ii, 379); on this occasion a āfād lauditing Ibn al-ʿArabi was given by Kemāl-Paštahāzād (q.v.) (text in Shāhābārī, v, 195).

Works. Ibn al-ʿArabi was certainly the most prolific of all Sūfī writers; although Brockelmann (i, 571-82, S I, 791-802) lists no less than 239 works (perhaps with some duplication of works with differing titles), he was unable to avail himself fully of the rich resources of the libraries of Istanbul and Anatolia—the investigation of which still remains incomplete. Ibn al-ʿArabi himself did not know how many works he had written; at the request of his friends he endeavoured to draw up a list, of which three (conflicting) versions survive: (1) Fihrist (Konya, MS Yusuf Āga 4989, pp. 378-89, on which see ʿAtes, in TV, n.s. li (1955), 155-60, written by Sād al-Dīn before 612/1216, is incomplete; (2) a MS of 1337/1918-9 (copied from one of 639/1241-2) by Sadr al-Dīn, who was with him in his last days, spent his life in teaching and commenting on his master's works. Ibn al-ʿArabi died, in the house of the bādī Mūṭḥa li-Dīn Ibn al-Zakī, on 28 Rabīʿ II 638/16 November 1240, and was buried in that family's turba on the slopes of Mount Kāsimūn.

Ibn al-ʿArabi married several wives and presumably had many children, but only two of his sons are known: Sād al-Dīn Muḥammad, b. 618/1221 in Malātīya, d. 656/1258 in Damascus, a poet (al-Kutubī, Faḍīl al-ʿaṣfāyādī, i, 325 (which, however, gives the date of his death as 686); Naḥf al-fihū, i, 572; Brockelmann, i, 583); and ʿĪmād al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh, d. 667/1271 in Damascus (Naḥf al-fihū, loc. cit.).

The Ottoman Sultan Selim I, during his stay in Damascus after his Egyptian campaign (923/1517-8), ordered the rebuilding of the turba where Ibn al-ʿArabi was buried, and the construction nearby of a mosque and a takhiṣṣa (H. Laoust, Les gouverneurs de Damas . . ., Damascus 1952, 148-50; cf. Feridun, Muslkhālī, i, 404, 441, 444; Sād al-Dīn, ii, 379); on this occasion a āfād lauditing Ibn al-ʿArabi was given by Kemāl-Paštahāzād (q.v.) (text in Shāhābārī, v, 195).

Works. Ibn al-ʿArabi was certainly the most prolific of all Sūfī writers; although Brockelmann (i, 571-82, S I, 791-802) lists no less than 239 works (perhaps with some duplication of works with differing titles), he was unable to avail himself fully of the rich resources of the libraries of Istanbul and Anatolia—the investigation of which still remains incomplete. Ibn al-ʿArabi himself did not know how many works he had written; at the request of his friends he endeavoured to draw up a list, of which three (conflicting) versions survive: (1) Fihrist (Konya, MS Yusuf Āga 4989, pp. 378-89, on which see ʿAtes, in TV, n.s. li (1955), 155-60, written by Sād al-Dīn before 612/1216, is incomplete; (2) a MS of 1337/1918-9 (copied from one of 639/1241-2) by Sadr al-Dīn, who was with him in his last days, spent his life in teaching and commenting on his master's works. Ibn al-ʿArabi died, in the house of the bādī Mūṭḥa li-Dīn Ibn al-Zakī, on 28 Rabīʿ II 638/16 November 1240, and was buried in that family's turba on the slopes of Mount Kāsimūn.
IBN AL-‘ARABI

graph text of the second recension, in 37 volumes dated 633-7/1235-9, is preserved in Istanbul, MSS Türk-İslâm Eserleri Müzesi 1845-81; several printed ed. 1296, 1294, 1330. The work was begun in Mecca in 598/1201 and finished (according to one tradition) in 629/1231. In six (al-) subdivided into 556 bâb, it contains a full exposition of the author's Sufi doctrine. A commentary on its difficult passages was written by Ibn al-Karîm al-Dînî (d. 825/1908); Brockelmann, S II, 283, and there are abridgements by (Ibn al-Wahâbî) al-Shârâni [q.v.] (d. 973/1566); Lâwîlâlî al-al-‘âmâr ... (Cairo 1312); l-Kîlîbî al-fârîm ... (Cairo 1277); l-Yawdîrî wa l-Dawdîrî ... (Cairo 1277, 1305, 1321).

(2) Fûsûs al-khâm wa hâmîsîl al-kîlâm (Brockelmann, no. 11). MS written by Sdr al-Dîn in 630/1232-3, read to and corrected by the author, in Istanbul, MS Türk-İslâm Eserleri Müzesi 1933. This summary of the teaching of 28 prophets from Adam to Muhammad, dictated to the author by Damascus in the Prophet by a dream, has been frequently printed: Cairo 1252, Istanbul 1387, Cairo 1304, 1309, 1321, 1329, etc. Abridged Eng. tr.: Sâhib Khâja Khan, Wisdom of the Prophets ..., Madras 1929; partial Fr. tr.: T. Burchhardt, La sagesse des prophètes, Paris 1955; Turkish tr. in the series §arkîyat Mecmuasi, ii (1957), 49-130. A work of 55 chapters, composed at Mosul, on the “inner” significance of religious duties.

(9) K. al-Fârîyân; (12) and (14) the commentary on it: Fath (Kashî) al-‘alîkhârîr wa l-‘awdîr ‘ân wâdîh Tahrîm al-‘asîb wa l-‘asîb (Brockelmann, no. 129); Eng. tr. of text and part of comm.: R. A. Nicholson, Fath (Kashj) al-dhâkhîr wa l-‘aldîr (final ed. 1911); printed Bulâk 1271; lith. Bombay n.d.

(3) K. l-Istârâ lâ makâm al-‘asîr (Brockelmann, no. 15). MS Velîyûdîn (Istanbul, Bayezid Public Library) 1628, dated 633/1235-6, was read to the author. Printed: Haydarâbâd 1357/1948. A short work, written in rhyning prose (sâdî) in Fes in 594/1198, it describes Ibn al-‘Arabi’s “mi-râdî” from the world of being to the world of being, with the station (maûfî) in God’s presence. Commentaries by (a) his disciple from the world of being no. 15). MS Veliyuddin (Istanbul, Bayezid Pub-lic Library A 79; lith. Cairo 1281). A letter written from Mecca to his Tunis friend 4 Abd al-‘Azîz al-Mahdawî, with criticisms of the wordly ways of gâtîfs he had met and much information on the shâykhîm whom he had known in Spain (this section discussed with Sp. tr. by M. Âsun Palaci, Vidas de santones en Andalucía, Madrid 1933).

(5) K. l-Isfâr ‘an nâfâ’îdî al-‘asîr (Brockelmann, S no. 152); printed: Haydarâbâd 1367/1948. Perhaps identical with no. 10.

(9) K. al-Dînî (Brockelmann, no. 130). MS written during the author’s lifetime: Konya, Yusuf Ağa 5503, 5502; printed Bulâk 1271; lith. Bombay n.d.

(10) K. al-‘Asîrîn (not in Brockelmann), to the author, dated 588/1240: Konya, Yusuf Ağa 4859, fols. 4-38. On the three “journeys”, to, from and in God.

(11) K. l-Isfâr ‘an nâtâ’îdî al-‘asîr (Brockelmann, S no. 152); printed: Haydarâbâd 1367/1948. Perhaps identical with no. 10.

(12) Dîvân (Brockelmann, no. 130). MS written during the author’s lifetime: Konya, Yusuf Ağa 5503, 5502; printed Bulâk 1271; lith. Bombay n.d.

(8) R. ‘Alîl al-kudî fi munâdâsahî al-nafsi (Brockelmann, no. 56). MS copied in Rabî 1 600/1203, the month of composition: Istanbul University Library A 79; Cairo 1281. A letter written from Mecca to his Tunis friend 4 Abd al-‘Azîz al-Mahdawî, with criticisms of the wordly ways of gâtîfs he had met and much information on the shâykhîm whom he had known in Spain (this section discussed with Sp. tr. by M. Âsun Palaci, Vidas de santones en Andalucía, Madrid 1933).

For further details of MSS in Konya and Manisa, see A. Âtes, Konya kuîîphanelerinde bulunan baz mümîn yazmalar, in Belleten, xvi/51 (1953), 49-130; idem, Anadolu kuîîphanelerinden ..., in TV, n.s. li/4 (1955), 150-7; idem, al-Mahdawî al-arabîyya [q.v.].
Among the spurious works attributed to Ibn al-'Arabi are the so-called Tafsir al-Shaykh al-Akbar (Broeckelmann, no. 3); al-Shadara al-nu'maniyya (Brockelmann, no. 124); and a popular work on the interpretation of dreams (Ta'bir-nama-i Mushfi 'l-Din Arabi terjum, Istanbul 1939, etc.; most lately Rüyâ tâhirārī, Istanbul 1955). 

... to the effect that Ibn al-'Arabi's ideas were bid'a and that every word of the Fusus was kufr were given by, e.g., Ibn Maqallah (al-dawla al-'Uthmaniyya 2, ff.). Among the spurious works attributed to Ibn al-'Arabi is a manuscript, it is as yet impossible to give a complete survey of which has in fact been pronounced Tafsir al-Shaykh al-Akbar (Broeckelmann, no. 3); al-Shadara al-nu'maniyya (Brockelmann, no. 124); and a popular work on the interpretation of dreams (Ta'bir-nama-i Mushfi 'l-Din Arabi terjum, Istanbul 1939 etc.; most lately Rüyâ tâhirārī, Istanbul 1955). 

Ibn al-'Arabi's ideas are examined, it is necessary to consider his epistemological outlook. Like almost all Muslim şâfit, Ibn al-'Arabi regards human reason as severely limited: in the introduction of the Futufydt (i, 33 ff. and cf. iii, 205), he divides the branches of knowledge ('ilm) into three classes: (a) those which may be attained through reason ('qal); (b) the knowledge attained through "states" (hâl), acquired by perception of taste, colour, etc.; (c) knowledge of mysteries: this is the knowledge which the soul "blows" (mañatha) into the heart (râ); it is in part like (though higher than) the knowledge provided by 'âbî and hâl; in part it is knowledge arising from "communications" (ahhâdîr), i.e., the revelations of prophets. This last "knowledge", coming from God, with or without the mediation of an angel, and acquired only after a profound mystic training, is ma'drif. The true branches of knowledge are the ma'ârif; and he who knows these knows everything. The ma'ârif, and particularly those relating to the "way" of God, are not to be acquired by reason, or by reason's most effective instrument kiyya (q.v.), for "every day [Allâh] is upon some labour" (Kur'an, LV, 29). The truth of a statement depends on its source: the prophets recognized truths through inspiration (ihtikār); these truths are to be received by faith and are not open to dispute. Ibn al-'Arabi claimed a similar authority for his own teachings, since the waft (q.v.) is modelled upon and is the heir of the prophet; but he is far from claiming prophet-hood for himself, and hence the Batini, position (summary in al-Ghazali, Kitâb-ut al-Janâba, 1955). 

Ibn al-'Arabi's teaching as far as it has been transmitted to the east: it is baqâl bi'l-ilah. The traveller (sâlit) who is making the third journey performs those precepts of the şari'a which are šari'; externally, he is living with his fellows; but internally he is dwelling with God. Not every man is capable of more than the first journey; only those specially endowed (kiyds (q.v.)) may win to the vision of God, but even for them this depends on certain conditions (şuqûr), some fulfilled by the traveller (sâlit, murid) himself, some provided by the shaykh. Even the Prophet had a şaykh—Gabriel. The şaykhs perform the function which the prophets had performed in their day, except that they do not bring a new şari'a. Ibn al-'Arabi's views on the "travelers" are expounded especially in his Tuhfat al-safa'ra ila hadrat al-barara (Istanbul 1300; Turkish tr. M. Salim, Istanbul 1939) and diyâyat al-abâdî (Turkish tr. Enver, Istanbul 1936). The conditions he must observe are four: (1) silence (samî); (2) withdrawal from men (uzla); (3) hunger (dî'â) and (4) wakefulness (sahar). Through their observance with sincere intention (îkhlas), there will be awakened in his heart a love (mahabbâ), which grows to be a passion (îshk) quite distinct from selfish desires (ghafâ). It is this passion which particularly brings men to God. On the journey the şâlit experiences a series of "states" (ahwâl), some continuing and hence called "resting-places" (ma'âkim, mansul), at each of which he learns various ma'ârif. When the heart is thoroughly purified, the veil (kifâb) of those other things which hide God (md siwâ Allâh) is drawn aside; all things, past, present and future, are known; God grants the manifestation (lajjâll) of Himself; and finally, he is drawn on a "way" of God, are not to be acquired by reason, or by reason's most effective instrument kiyya (q.v.), for "every day [Allâh] is upon some labour" (Kur'an, LV, 29). The truth of a statement depends on its source: the prophets recognized truths through inspiration (ihtikâr); these truths are to be received by faith and are not open to dispute. Ibn al-'Arabi claimed a similar authority for his own teachings, since the waft (q.v.) is modelled upon and is the heir of the prophet; but he is far from claiming prophet-hood for himself, and hence the Batini, position (summary in al-Ghazali, Kitâb-ut al-Janâba, 1955). 

Influence. Thanks to the protection of influential supporters, Ibn al-'Arabi was only once in his lifetime in danger for his opinions; this was in Egypt (Makkari, Nafî al-lib, 1, 580). Neither he in his lifetime nor his followers after his death founded a şurika. The greatest influences in spreading his teaching were the works of his disciple Şadr al-Dîn al-Khnawî (q.v.) and Şadr al-Dîn's conventicle at Konya, where there forgathered learned şâfit who—many of them in flight before the Mongols—had come to Anatolia. The most important of these was the poet İrâki (q.v.); d. 686/1287, author of the Lamad'vit: this abridged paraphrase in Persian of the Fusûs carried Ibn al-'Arabi's teaching as far as eastern Iran (so that the Lamad'vit of Dâmî (q.v.) is written in imitation of it). Others were al-Ma'âyyâd b. Mahir, al-Diwanî, al-Ghazali, al-Sulayman b. Na'sîr al-Dîn al-Farghânî (Broeckelmann, S I, 812; see also A. Atez, in TM, vii-viii/2, 1945), 112 ff.). 

Ibn al-'Arabi's mysticism was widely taught in the Yemen, particularly at Zabîl, where it aroused much hostility; some ūbûhâh and bâdîîs sought the opinions of various doctors, and fatwa to the effect that Ibn al-'Arabi's ideas were bid'â and that every word of the Fusûs was hûf were given by, e.g., Ibn
Taymiyya [q.v.], Ta'bir, Brockelmann, ii, 106 and Badr al-Din b. Djamâ'î (d. 767/1366; Brockelmann, II, 86). Ibn Khalidîn [q.v.], in his Ḥikâyat al-sā'il, mentioned above, examined Ibn al-Arabi's mystical thought, and found it meaningless and heretical. That he had numerous followers, is made clear by the work of such notable works as Ibn al-Abdal's (d. 857/1455) Ḥikîyat al-qâhîrî (Brockelmann, S II, 239) and Badr al-Din b. Diama (d. 767/1366; Brockelmann, II, 86). Ibn Khaldun (Brockelmann, II, 239) and the works of al-Suyutî [q.v., Brockelmann, II, 106] and Taki al-Din al-Subki (d. 745/1344; ibid., 179). It was delivered by Kemal-Pasha-zade (d. 885/1480; Brockelmann, II, 179). It attacked the doctrines of al-Taftazani (fasc. 85, pp. 533-55), where further references are given. (A. ATEŞ)

IBN 'ARABSHAH, AHMAD B. MUHAMMAD B. 'ABD ALLAH B. IBRAHIM SHIHAB AL-DIN ABU 'L-'ARABSHAH AL-DIMASIKI AL-'ANAFI AL-SA'ADI, born in 727/1325 in Damascus, was taken with his family to Samarkand in 803/1400-1, when Timur conquered Damascus and carried off many of its inhabitants (cf. Vita Timuri, ed. Manger, Leeuwaarden 1767-72, ii, 143 ff.; there he studied with al-Djurjani, al-Djazari and others, and learned Persian, Turkish and Mongol. In 811/1408-9 he went to Khâta in Mongolia where he studied kadî with al-Shirâmi, later to Kâfarazm and Dâshî (at Se'ay and Hâjjî-Djâhî Târîkhân), where he still was in 814/1409-10 (Vita Timuri, i, 376). He came through the Crimea to Edirne, where he became a confidant of the Ottoman Sultan Mehemmed b. Bayezid. He translated several books for him into Turkish (al-Awfi, Ta'bir, Fliigel, ii, 510; ibid., 510-51), and a similar work was composed by 'All ibn Kâri (d. 1014/1605; Brockelmann, II, 519). From this time onwards, however, hostile writing ceased, and there appears a continuous stream of commentaries on and translations of Ibn al-Arabi's works, chiefly the Fusûs. A comparable influence in Anatolia was exercised only by Djalal al-Din Rumi; but here too his doctrines were attacked, e.g., with his Lawdîih, Shark al-Fusus, and al-Radd wa 'l-tasnim (Cairo 1951, ii, 336; Ibn Taghribirdi, ed. London 1958; Osman Yahia, Histoire de l'imagination créatrice dans le soufisme... Madrid 1931, and his Keldmdan tasavvufa, ibid., 149-67; Saffet Yetkin, Muhyî'd-dîn Arbî ve IA (fasc. 85, pp. 533-55), where further references are given. (A. ATEŞ)
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1110/1698, Iladjî Khalifa, iv, 190; vi, 544), in which Timur's conquests and the conditions under his successor are described. Timurî is represented as a cruel conqueror and tyrant, but towards the end of his reign (cf. ed. Manger, iii, 785 ff.) his great qualities are appreciated. The book contains valuable descriptions of Samarqand and its learned world (iii, 855 ff.). Latin translation by Golius, Leiden 1636, French translation by Vattier, 1668, English translation by J. H. Sanders, London 1936.
the month of Safar 852/1448 (Hādīdī Khalla, iv, 345) contains a mirror for princes and beast-foes, according to Hādīdī Khalla "like Kāliya wa Dinma and Sulūna al-Mustuq" (see Chauvin, Bibliographie, ii, nos. 140-4), but, as Chauvin has shown (op. cit., ii, no. 145-9), it is actually a version of the Persian Marwānīn-nāma in the recension of Sa’d of Varāvīn (cf. Houtsma in ZDMG, ii, 359 ff.; a selection in Freytag, Loci Muri Fabulae, 72 ff.; complete edition see below). The introductory portion of an edition of his al-Ta‘līf al-fāhīr fi ḥiyām ... Abū Sa‘īd Dhiqabak was published as a posthumous work of S. A. Strong in JRAS, 1907, 395 ff. Ten works are mentioned under his name, among them a work on Arabic, Persian and Turkish, Tarjumān al-murādijm (Hādīdī Khalla, ii, 278). See also Hādīdī Khalla, iii, 158; iv, 190, 232, 270, 311; v, 479, and Freytag’s work mentioned below.

Of his sons the following were authors: (1) Abū ‘Alī, wrote Idāb al-ṣulb wa-baydān fi ‘a‘rīsh al-Nabulúsī al-Khālidī al-Khwāndin, in which is still in manuscript, is now almost forgotten. (2) Abū ‘Alī, which has become a classic and is the object of a considerable interest which extended outside the Muslim West, of the doctrines of al-Ghazzālī, which seemed to infuse fresh, youthful blood into the quiet Spanish esoteric school, imparting to it a new vitality and, above all, a firm resolve to resist the persecutions of the fūbhakī. Men such as Ibn Barradjan of Seville, Abū Bakr al-Mayrūkī of Granada and Ibn Kāsī, who rebelled in the Algarve, owed the greater part of their firmness and intransigence to Ibn ‘Arīf.

His father had once been ‘arīf in Tangier, that is to say he was employed as head of the guard responsible for keeping watch in the town at night. From this circumstance came his surname Ibn al-‘Arīf. Although naturally inclined to a studious life, the young Abū ‘Alī was apprenticed to a weaver. However, his marked vocation for study became ever stronger and could not be resisted, in spite of constraints and threats. In the end, in Almeria, he was able to receive religious and philological instruction and to satisfy his taste for poetry. He earned a reputation as a traditionist, reader of the Kurān and poet. He taught in Saragossa, Valencia and Almeria.

It was in this last town that he achieved his greatest success. His exemplary life and his aptitude for asceticism and meditation enabled him to become a respected Sufi, surrounded by many disciples. Almeria was at that time one of the most vigorous centres of Andalusian Sufism, one of the focal points of opposition to the Almoravīd fūbahakī. It was there that a solemn condemnation was made, in a collective fujad, of the destruction of the books of al-Ghazzālī ordered by the kāfī of Constantine by Djuydīn al-Dīyūnī.

Ibn al-‘Arīf was initiated into Ṣūfism by Abū Bakr Ibn Abī al-Bākī. The complete chain of the succession will be found in the text of his epitaph, published and translated by G. Deverdun. We may note it in particular the name of one of the disciples of Djuynādī (298/910), Abū Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-‘Arīf (d. 312/921-2), whom Ibn Masarra, according to M. Amin Palacios (Abenmasarra y su escuela, Madrid 1914, 35) was later to meet in Mecca. Now, it is known that the teaching of Ibn Masarra (269-319/951-931) exercised a profound and lasting influence on Andalusian Sufi circles until the period of the dissemination, in the Muslim West, of the doctrines of al-Ghazzālī, which seemed to infuse fresh, youthful blood into the quiet Spanish esoteric school, imparting to it a new vitality and, above all, a firm resolve to resist the persecutions of the fūbahakī. Men such as Ibn Barradjan of Seville, Abū Bakr al-Mayrūkī of Granada and Ibn Kāsī, who rebelled in the Algarve, owed the greater part of their firmness and intransigence to Ibn ‘Arīf.

The first-named appeared to the local authorities to be highly dangerous. Did he share his views with Ibn al-‘Arīf? Ibn al-Khaṭīb (Kitāb A‘māl al-a‘lām, ed. Lévi-Provençal, Rabat 1934, 266) writes that he was named ‘Abd al-‘Atī ‘Alā al-Shāhīdī, a distinguished and translated by G. Deverdun. We may note it in particular the name of one of the disciples of Djuynādī (298/910), Abū Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-‘Arīf (d. 312/921-2), whom Ibn Masarra, according to M. Amin Palacios (Abenmasarra y su escuela, Madrid 1914, 35) was later to meet in Mecca. Now, it is known that the teaching of Ibn Masarra (269-319/951-931) exercised a profound and lasting influence on Andalusian Sufi circles until the period of the dissemination, in the Muslim West, of the doctrines of al-Ghazzālī, which seemed to infuse fresh, youthful blood into the quiet Spanish esoteric school, imparting to it a new vitality and, above all, a firm resolve to resist the persecutions of the fūbahakī. Men such as Ibn Barradjan of Seville, Abū Bakr al-Mayrūkī of Granada and Ibn Kāsī, who rebelled in the Algarve, owed the greater part of their firmness and intransigence to Ibn ‘Arīf.
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enjoyed, his unanimously recognized noble reputation and the favourable treatment accorded him by the court show clearly that, although belonging to the opposition, Ibn al-‘Arif was not as fully compromised by political activities as was Abū Bākṛ al-Mayyūrī, who took to flight when summoned to Marrākūsḥ, or again as was Ibn Barraḍān, whose body the prince ordered to be thrown onto the town dunghill.

The only work of Ibn al-‘Arif known today is the short work entitled Māḥāṣiṣīn al-madżalis, studied and translated by M. Asin Palacios. Ibn al-‘Arif’s biographies of Mūsā b. Ḥabīb, al-Ṣa’dī da al-abadīyya, Fāżī 1097, 1101-12; ‘Abbās b. ʿIbrāhīm, Ḥīṣām bi-mān āḥal Marṣugū wa-āḥādī mīn al-lāmīm, Fāżī 1096, 1100 ff. (containing a vast number of quotations from the works of the many biographers of the Šūfī); Ṣa’dīlī, Taqawwufuwa’īda rīḍjīl al-tasawwufuwa, ed. A. Faure, Rabat 1958, 96 (a compilation dating from the 7th/13th century). In Los Almoryvides, Tetuan 1956, 283 ff. J. Bosch Vilà traces the activities of the Andalusian Šūfīs in the historical context of the decline of Almoravid power. For his epitaph, see G. Derverdu, Inscriptions arabes de Marrakech, Rabat 1956, 77; the article by Father Paul Nwyia, Note sur quelques fragments inédits de la correspondance d’Ina al-‘Arif avec Ibn Barraḍān, in Hespériscxliii (1956), 217-21, supplies new information concerning the relations between the two men.

(A. FAURE)

IBN AL-‘ARIF, AL-ḤUSAYN B. AL-IVALI AL-DIMASHKI AL-SHAFI‘I, was born in 499/1077 and died in 590/1195. He was the son of Abū l-Ḥasān al-Dimashki al-Shafi‘i, who died in 511/1115.

Among the most illustrious members of this remarkable family it is fitting to mention al-Ḥasan b. Hibat Allāh, who was born in 507/1112 and was a noted jurist and retainer of the Banū Kurāṣ, which included numerous kādīs and scholars, of whom was the historian Ibn Kathīr. Ibn al-‘Arīf, with references to Ibn al-Muwakkit, translated by M. Asin Palacios may be added:—Ibn al-Muwakkit, al-Sa’dī da al-abadīyya, Fāżī 1097, 1101-12; ‘Abbās b. ʿIbrāhīm, Ḥīṣām bi-mān āḥal Marṣugū wa-āḥādī mīn al-lāmīm, Fāżī 1096, 1100 ff. (containing a vast number of quotations from the works of the many biographers of the Šūfī); Ṣa’dīlī, Taqawwufuwa’īda rīḍjīl al-tasawwufuwa, ed. A. Faure, Rabat 1958, 96 (a compilation dating from the 7th/13th century). In Los Almoryvides, Tetuan 1956, 283 ff. J. Bosch Vilà traces the activities of the Andalusian Šūfīs in the historical context of the decline of Almoravid power. For his epitaph, see G. Derverdu, Inscriptions arabes de Marrakech, Rabat 1956, 77; the article by Father Paul Nwyia, Note sur quelques fragments inédits de la correspondance d’Ina al-‘Arif avec Ibn Barraḍān, in Hespériscxliii (1956), 217-21, supplies new information concerning the relations between the two men.
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his maternal grandfather Yahyā b. Abbād al-Din al-Kurashi (d. 534/1139), then, in about 505/1112, he went to attend the teaching given by his elder brother at the Great Mosque. He learned to recite the Qur'ān and began to learn ḥadīths and their isnād. According to custom, he was permitted to transmit these traditions only after the age of puberty. ʿAllī also had as masters the Shaykh Abū Muḥammad al-Afdān (d. 524/1129) and Dīmāl al-ʿĀlī b. Muslim Abbād al-Ḥasan al-Sulami (d. 533/1139). As a youth he was present at the inaugural lectures of al-Sulami at the Shafiʿī madrasa which ʿAllī attended the lectures at the Niẓāmiyya; he attended the lectures of the Hanbali Saʿd b. Ḥayyār Abbād al-Ḥasan al-Anṣārī, a pupil of al-Ḥazālī, and of the disciples of al-Barmakī, of al-Tanukhī and of Abū Muḥammad al-Djawharī; he attended the lectures on hadīths of Ṣādīq b. Isā b. Abbās al-Sulami b. Ṣāliḥ al-ʿĀlī b. Karamānī and Ibn al-Ḥusayn Abbād al-ʿĀṣimī. ʿAllī visited the region of Mosul and returned to Damascus in 525, the year of the assassination of ʿAbd al-Mulk Būrī. The young man seems to have married towards the end of this period, for his son-Abbās was born in 527/1133. The situation was becoming unsettled in Damascus and so ʿAllī returned to the East in 529/1134; he crossed Kūrārūsān, visited Iṣfahān, travelled in Transoxania and stayed in Marv, where he met Abbās Saʿdī b. ʿAbd al-Karīm b. Saʿdī, with whom he went to Nishāpur and Harāt. In 533/1139, Ibn ʿĀṣikīr again passed through Baghdat, and returned to Damascus two years later. In the course of his journeying through ʿĪrāq, Kūrārūsān, the Dījāzār and the Hidjāz, he collected a considerable number of hadīths and became a ḥāfiz.

From the reign of Muḥīt al-Dīn Anār onwards, ʿAllī Ibn ʿĀṣikīr never left his native town, where he devoted himself for forty years to learning and political activity, without neglecting poetry. Because of the great esteem in which the Banū ʿĀlī made him, the Banū ʿĀlī Ibn ʿĀṣikīr in Damascus society and the personal prestige of Abbās Ibn ʿĀṣikīr as a ḥāfiz and lawyer, Nūr al-Dīn, on his occupation of Damascus in 549/1154, immediately established contact with him; the sovereign found in ʿAllī a valuable ally in successfully implementing his religious policy of Nūr al-Dīn: Arbaʿin fi l-ʿaḍīrīhā fi ʿišāmat al-ghīthā, exalting the virtues of the Holy War; to this period also belongs his Pāḍī ṣakālidīn, mentioned by al-Dīhābī (Taḥkīra, iv, 124); the work exhorted to combat ideas which this period also belongs his Taʾrīkh madinat Dimashq, is a biographical dictionary conceived on the same plan as the dictionary of al-Khāṭib al-Baghdādī. It consists of 80 books (madārijāt) each of 10 sections (dijāzāt) of 20 folios, the whole forming a manuscript in 18 volumes in the Ẓāhirīyya library. This dictionary seems to have been composed in three stages: begun in 599/1193, it consisted in 594/1194 of 57 books on 10 fascicules (dijāzāt); at this time Nūr al-Dīn encouraged the author to continue his work. In 562/1167, when ʿImād al-Dīn came to Damascus, he saw a copy of 70 books on 10 fascicules (khurāsāt) of 20 folios. Finally al-Ḳāsim, the son of the author, speaks of a collection of 800 fascicules divided into 80 books. The work begins with a highly detailed historical topography of the town of Damascus. This section owes much to Aḥmad b. al-Muʿarrād (al-Dīhābī) and to Ibn Ḥumayd b. Abī ʿAbdallāh, who was later used by Ibn Ṣaddādī in his al-ʿĀṣikīrī al-ḥadīthīrā and by Ibn ʿĀṣikīrī al-Kutubī for his ʿUṣān al-taʾrīḵī. The principal part of the work is a collection of biographies, approximating to the genre of tabābāh; after eulogizing the Prophet, the author enumerates in alphabetical order all the important people who dwelt in Damascus permanently or briefly. Widening his horizons, Ibn ʿĀṣikīrī also deals with celebrated persons who lived in Ḥalab, Baṣṭabakī, Raṃla or Ṣaydā. This excellent source for the history of Damascus has so far only been partially published by Bādrān and Ahmad ʿUbayd (7 vols., Damascus 1911-32, as far as part of the letter ṣayyīn). A new edition, promoted by the Arab Academy of Damascus, is in the course of production (2 vols. appeared in 1954, one volume (vol. x) appeared in 1968). It is very probable that this work of Ibn ʿĀṣikīrī inspired Ibn al-ʿAdīmī to write the Bughya.

Besides the two books mentioned, exalting the virtues of ghīthā, we may notice in the abundant production of Abbās Ibn ʿĀṣimī two apologetic works: Manāšib asghārīyya and the Tabyīn kāḥib al-maḥjarī li Ṣādiq Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥasan al-ʿĀṣirī (ed. al-Kawthārī, Damascus 1951). Finally, his poetic gifts caused him to be mentioned among the “scholar-poets” of Damascus by his contemporary ʿImād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī (Kharīdat al-Kasīr, Damascus ed. 1955, 157-174).

His son, al-Ḳāsim Bahāʾ al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad, was born at Damascus in 527/1132. He studied in his native town and in Cairo. He wrote a biography of his father, but this work, which was used by Yākūt and al-Dīhābī, is lost. His most remarkable work is al-Ṣaḥābī al-mustābāt fi ṣaḥābī al-Maḥṣūr al-Aḥsāʾ. He died in 600/1203, and was buried on the slopes of Kasīyun (see Subki, Tabākāt al-Shāfiʿīyya, v, 148; Ibn Kaṭīṛ, Bilādīya, xii, 38; Brockelmann, S I, 507).

Among the six nephews of the historian, it is fitting to mention Fadl al-Dīn and Zayn al-Umānī. Fadl al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan Ibn ʿĀṣikīr Abū Mansūr al-Dīmashqī was born in 350/1165. He was the pupil of Kūrārūsān Nūr al-Dīn before becoming his son-in-law. As Shaykh of the Shāfiʿīyya of Damascus he taught in several madrasas in the town. He died in 620/1223 and was buried in the cemetery of the Ṣūfīs (see Ibn Kaṭīṛ, Bilādīya, xii, 101).

Zayn al-Umānī, Abū ʿUmarat al-Ḥasan b. Ibn ʿĀṣikīr 511
Muhammad Ibn ‘Asakir, the pupil of his uncle the historian, was appointed inspector of the Treasury and of the waqfs in Damascus, then he devoted himself to asceticism and died in 627/1230, at the age of 97. He was buried by the side of his brother Fakhr al-Din (see Ibn Kašīr, Biddāya, xii, 127).

**Biography:** Yākūṭ, Uṣūb, v, 139-146; Ibn al-Jawzī, Mi‘rāt al-mamlūk, Haydarābād 1951, i, 336; Abū Šāma, Rawḍat al-Tawārīkh, Cairo 1287, i, 261, 5062, i, 667; Ibn Khallikān, Cairo 1948, 271, no. 414, trans. de Slane, ii, 252; al-Dhahābī, Taḏkarat al-Haydarābād, iv, 122-7; al-Šubkī, Taḥāfut al-Insān, iv, 273; Ibn Ḥusn, messengers, 9, 94; al-Ṭabarī, ii, 259; Ibn al-Mundīrī, id, 259; Ibn al-Ṭabarī, i, 239; Juynboll, Orientalia, 1846, 161, 163-7; Brockelmann, i, 337; S. i, 566; Ḥaddīd al-Khafīlī, i, 126, 233; ii, 104, 130, 131, 187; vi, 143; S. Dahan, in B. Lewis & P. M. Holt (edd.), *Historians of the Middle East*, London 1962, 112, 144-5. (N. ELISEEFF)

**IBN AL-ASH’ATH, ‘ABD AL-RAHMĀN B. MUHAMMAD B. AL-ASH’ATH,** descendant of a noble Kūfa family. He was a great war hero famous because of his insurrection against al-Ḥaḍīdāyī (q.v.) in 82/699-701 or 83/699-702. He was the grandson of the famous al-ʿAsh’āth (q.v.) (see, further to the references given there, L. Caetani, *Amnāli*, 40 A.H. 501-5 for further information, an assessment of him and a very full bibliography; H. Lammens, *Mo‘awia I*, 131, 150-2), and the son of Muhammad (q.v.), who was less famous than his father that he either himself killed or encouraged his hatred (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 901-10), with instructions to pursue Shāhīb Ibn al-Inbādī that Abd al-Rahman had to deal, and the son of Muḥammad al-Mulḍīrī (q.v.) (but probably to be read as Mulḏīrī, son of one of the borderland, the ruler of which, referred to in the sources as Rutbīl [q.v.], [but probably to be read as Rutbīl, i, 1032-4], it was the task of the local governor to keep in subjection the territory of the Kābulistān borderland, the ruler of which, referred to in the sources as Rutbīl [q.v.], (but probably to be read as Zunbel), offered resistance to the Muslims. A "Rutbīl" having inflicted on the governor appointed by al-Ḥaḍīdāyī, Uṣūb Allāh b. Abī Bakr, a most severe defeat in 79/688-9, al-Ḥaḍīdāyī, anxious to put an end to this, prepared an army which, because of its splendid equipment, was called the Peacock Army (dawāḥid al-mawṣil); to be in command of Kūfa. Henceforward it was with the very difficult al-Ḥaḍīdāyī that ‘Abd al-Rahmān had to deal, since he was his superior. The war against the Ṭa’ārīfīs was not yet over when another group of Khāridjīs, the majority of them belonging to the Banū Shaybān, spread terror in the territories on the borders of Ṭarāk and in Ṭarāk itself. This group, consisting of very few men, had inflicted on the government troops some extremely severe defeats (Périer, op. cit., 109-29), when al-Ḥaḍīdāyī entrusted ‘Abd al-Rahmān with an army of 6,000 horsemen with instructions to pursue Shābīb [q.v.]. Ibn al-ʿAsh’āth, describing the advice of the general al-Dīqāl ‘Uṯmān b. Sadaqī who had al-ʿAsh’āth’s experience of Shābīb’s tactical skill (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 901-10), hastened in pursuit of the Khāridjīs, while taking every precaution to avoid an unexpected attack. As the campaign dragged on, the governor of al-Madīn, ‘Uṯmān b. Kātan, in a letter to al-Ḥaḍīdāyī criticized the way the war was being conducted; invited by al-Ḥaḍīdāyī to take the initiative, he attacked Shābīb, but could not with the result that he was defeated with 1120 (or 720) of his soldiers, and the remnants of the defeated army fled to Kūfa (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 930-7); ‘Abd al-Rahmān, unhorsed during the battle, was helped by a comrade (Ibn Abī Sabra) to escape and, after a number of adventures, also reached Kūfa, where he remained in hiding until al-Ḥaḍīdāyī granted him amān (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 937-9).

Relations between the governor of Ṭarāk and Ibn al-ʿAsh’āth had at first been friendly (al-Ḥaḍīdāyī’s son, Muḥammad, married a sister of Ibn al-ʿAsh’āth), but they soon deteriorated; in explaining Ibn al-ʿAsh’āth’s revolt, all the sources attach great importance to this change of attitude. It appears that Ibn al-ʿAsh’āth, proudly conscious of his noble birth, made it clear that he considered himself to be the most worthy of all the amīrs to rule. According to al-Mas‘ūdī (Tanbih, 407), he gave himself the title of Nāṣir al-mu*mīnīn (the Helper of the Believers, presumably setting himself up as the defender of the true Believers as against the Umayyads and al-Ḥaḍīdāyī, whom he condemned as bad Muslims); he also claimed to be the “Kaḥṭānī”, i.e., the person awaited by the Yemenis as being he who would restore domination to them (G. van Vloten, *Recherches*, 61). Such arrogance annoyed the governor, who vigorously condemned Ibn al-ʿAsh’āth (see, further to the references given there, L. Caetani, *Amnāli*, 40 A.H. 501-5 for further information, an assessment of him and a very full bibliography; H. Lammens, *Mo‘awia I*, 131, 150-2), and the son of Muḥammad (q.v.), who was less famous than his father that he either himself killed or encouraged his hatred (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 901-10), with instructions to pursue Shāhīb Ibn al-Inbādī that Abd al-Rahman had to deal, and the son of Muḥammad al-Mulḍīrī (q.v.) (but probably to be read as Mulḏīrī, son of one of the borderland, the ruler of which, referred to in the sources as Rutbīl [q.v.], [but probably to be read as Rutbīl, i, 1032-4], it was the task of the local governor to keep in subjection the territory of the Kābulistān borderland, the ruler of which, referred to in the sources as Rutbīl [q.v.], (but probably to be read as Zunbel), offered resistance to the Muslims. A "Rutbīl" having inflicted on the governor appointed by al-Ḥaḍīdāyī, Uṣūb Allāh b. Abī Bakr, a most severe defeat in 79/688-9, al-Ḥaḍīdāyī, anxious to put an end to this, prepared an army which, because of its splendid equipment, was called the Peacock Army (dawāḥid al-mawṣil); to be in command of
he appointed two generals in succession, choosing finally 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. 'Alā'ī as his successor. It was this appointment which led to the surprise in Kūfa; a patrician uncle of 'Abd al-Rahmān thought it advisable to warn the governor against the possibility that his nephew might revolt, but al-Hādījīdāī refused to reverse his decision. According to al-Ṭabarī (i, 1042), it is not known where 'Abd al-Rahmān was at this time; according to one tradition (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1046), he had been sent to Kīrman to put down the opposition of a military leader who had refused to serve the governor. He proceeded to Sinūd when necessary, and the number of details given in this tradition point to its being the more reliable, although another passage suggests that he accompanied the Peacock Army (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1044).

In Pērīr's Vie d'al-Hādījīdāī, there is given a very detailed account of the insurrection, with each incident supported by quotations from the sources and with translations of speeches, letters and poems; we give here a summary, emphasizing certain details which help to explain the causes and the development of this event, which came near to overthrowing the Umayyad caliphate. Ibn al-Asʿāḥī was in Sīdījīsīn in 80/699-700 (on the chronology see below). His first action was to force the troops who were garrisoned there to join the Peacock Army. After refusing an offer of peace from Rūṭbīl, he invaded Kābulisīn, using very different tactics from those of Ibn Abī Bākra: as he occupied the villages and the fortresses, he established garrisons in them and linked the places he had captured by a service of couriers. When he had made himself master of the territory bordering on the high mountains, he returned to Bust, postponing any deeper penetration until the spring of 81/700. But when he informed al-Hādījīdāī of this intention, the latter sent him a series of arrogant and offensive messages ordering him to penetrate into the heart of Kābulisīn and there to fight the enemy to the death. The invitation to the troops to plough the land, which appears in his second message, and which might seem to be an acquiescence in delay (Pērīr, 162), should also be interpreted as a threat: he is ironically suggesting that the soldiers may as well start sowing crops since he will not be recalling them until after a total victory. As he occupied Thākafis (it thus gives expression to religious convictions and tribal hatred). On the rebels' arrival in Fārs, a new and important fact emerged: it was suddenly realized that the deposition of al-Hādījīdāī would involve that of the caliph also and they acted accordingly: encouraged by the 'ṣurra' and the zealots, the majority of the rebels swore to reject the "imams of error" and renewed their oath of fidelity to Ibn al-Asʿāḥī, who, in his turn, swore to them the bayʿa. Al-Hādījīdāī, informed of this development in the insurrection, went to Baṣra and asked 'Abd al-Malīk to send Syrian forces; the caliph sent him one detachment after another. Near Tustar, Ibn al-Asʿāḥī's advance guard inflicted on that of al-Hādījīdāī a defeat and serious losses (9 or 10 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 81/24 or 25 January 701), and al-Hādījīdāī withdrew speedily to Baṣra; such prudence was necessary since it is said that Ibn al-Asʿāḥī had with him 33,000 horsemen and 120,000 infantry. As al-Hādījīdāī could not have offered resistance in the town of Baṣra, he entrenched himself at al-Zāwiya. 'Abd al-Raḥmān entered Baṣra on 29 Dhu 'l-Hijjah, and there set up fortifications. After a month of skirmishes of varying severity, in which al-Hādījīdāī's soldiers in general came off worse (they also lacked provisions), a battle was finally joined (end of Muharram 81/early March 701). Ibn al-Asʿāḥī was on the point of winning, but the courage and skill of the Syrian Sūfīyān b. al-Abbrād reversed the situation. Many 'ṣurra' (that is 'ulamāʾ, according to the explanation given by Ibn Kāfīr) were killed (the version of the events given by al-Wāḵīlī and repeated by Ibn Kāfīr (ix, 40) attributes to this battle events which in fact occurred in the following battles of Dayr al-Dījāmādīn). But with the news of his approach, Ibn al-Asʿāḥī went to Kūfa with his Kūfīan soldiers and the elite of the Baṣran cavalry. His lieutenant at Baṣra, the Ḥāshimī 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abbās, made efforts to maintain his position in the town, but the Baṣrans had lost no time in accepting the amān offered by al-Hādījīdāī (an equivocal amān, which did not prevent his killing a large number of opponents, 11,000 it is said), so with a group of Baṣrans he rejoined his leader at Kūfa. On his arrival at Kūfa, Ibn al-Asʿāḥī had been obliged first to drive out from the citadel an officer of al-Madáṭhīn, Ṭāṭar b. Nāḏiyā, who had taken advantage of the troubled situation to seize it; he succeeded in installing himself there only after a full-scale attack with scaling-ladders and other means of assault. At Kūfa, his forces increased, being joined by a large number of men who were discontented with Umayyad rule. Ibn al-Hādījīdāī, leaving Baṣra to his cousin Ayyūb b. al-Ḥakām b. Abī 'Aṣīl, set off towards Kūfa (mid-Safar 83/April 702), being harassed en route by detachments of cavalry under the orders of Ibn al-Asʿāḥī. Reaching a wide plain near Kūfa, he set up his position at Dayr Kūrā (q.v.) and 'Abd al-Raḥmān, leaving the town, encamped at Dayr al-Dījāmādīn (q.v.) with his troops, who now number-
ed nearly 200,000 (100,000 were on the regular pay-roll, the others were mawali). Al-Hadjdjadj's army was smaller and in an awkward situation because provisions reached it only with difficulty; in spite of this, Syrian reinforcements were able to join it. Both the armies dug trenches and for a time they engaged in skirmishes, as at al-Zawiya. Since the dignitaries in Damascus wished to see a peaceful solution of the situation, 'Abd al-Malik let himself be persuaded to open negotiations with the rebels, against the advice of al-Hadjdjadj. Through the agency of his brother Muhammad and his son 'Abd Allah, he proposed to the rebels that he should dismiss al-Hadjdjadj and should give to the 'Irākī soldiers the same pay as the Syrians, and offered to 'Abd al-Rahmān the governorship of any town in 'Irāk he cared to choose. At a meeting of the leaders of the rebels these proposals were refused, in spite of a speech from 'Abd al-Rahmān inviting them to accept. They were convinced that their advantage lay in not having to take a difficult decision; they knew that they were in a difficult situation (in fact there was a famine in al-Hadjdjadj's camp) and that the final victory would be theirs. Hostilities being resumed, the two armies still remained for a long time facing each other—it is said that the trench warfare went on for 100 days or about four months, and that there were forty-eight engagements. Those who were the most bitter opponents of the governor were the 'urra, fanatically convinced that they were fighting to defend the Faith threatened by the impiety of the Umayyads. They had formed themselves into a squadron under the orders of Diabala b. Zabr b. Kays al-Dju'afī, and it was only after the death of this leader that their courage deserted them and they dispersed. Finally in Ša'ībān 82/September 701, a great battle was joined. At first the advantage was with the troops of Ibn al-Ash'ath, but shortly before sunset they scattered, and Ibn al-Ash'ath, after vain attempts to rally them, also took flight accompanied only by a few supporters. After visiting Kūfā to take leave of his family, he travelled in the direction of Basra. Meanwhile, al-Hadjdjadj returned to Kūfā, set up a tribunal there and executed a large number of rebel prisoners.

But Ibn al-Ash'ath was still not defeated. One of his supporters, Muhammad b. Sa'd b. Abī Waqākas, had taken refuge with al-Malik in Maximian. 'Irāk; another, the Kurayshī 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Samuel, had forced al-Hadjdjadj's lieutenant to give up Basra to him. After remaining at Kūfā for a month, al-Hadjdjadj continued his campaign and, at Maskin on the Dudiayl, where there were gathered the still impressive remnants of the rebel army, he inflicted on Ibn al-Ash'ath, after hostilities lasting about a fortnight, the defeat which finally put an end to his insurrection, the events which followed, see also Ibn Kathir, ix, 48 f., which records the version of al-Tabrīzī. But al-Umāra, not only in al-Hadjdjadj, advanced, and the majority of Ibn al-Ash'ath's troops were sent prisoner to al-Hadjdjadj, who had most of them executed. While the ruthless governor was occupied in carrying out reprisals and even executing mass sentences, 'Abd al-Rahmān was living at the court of Rutbīl. But, as it was always feared that he might again give trouble, al-Hadjdjadj sent continually to his protector letters in which threats alternated with tempting promises in an effort to get him extradited. In the end Rutbīl yielded. Different versions exist of the death of 'Abd al-Rahmān: he is said to have been killed by Rutbīl himself or to have died of an illness, his severed head being sent to al-Hadjdjadj, who had asked for it; but the account which is generally accepted by the sources is different: put in chains and confined at 'Umāra in order to be taken to al-Hadjdjadj, he threw himself from the top of a castle at Rutkikhādī, dragging with him in his fall the 2,000 men of his supporters. Ibn Kathir:

Chronology. This is not certain since, although the sources are in agreement on the days and months of some of the outstanding events, for example the battles of Tustar and al-Zawiya, they are less so on the years. Wellhausen (Ar. Reich, 150 f., Eng. tr., 241 f.) has studied the question and given preference to the series of dates given above: 81 for the beginning of the revolt; 82 for the three defeats of Ibn al-Ash'ath; 83 for the troubles in Sidjistān and the fighting in Khurāsān. Al-Wākidī (in al-Tabārī, ii, 1052 and 1101; cf. Ibn Kutayba, Ma'ārif, 181 f.) dates the beginning of the revolt in 82, the battle of Rutbīl in 83, and then inconsistently gives the year 82 as the date of the battle of Dayr al-Damādīm, while adding that according to some it took place in 83 (al-Tabārī, ii, 1070); this chronology does not accord with the facts as well as the previous one. Equally unacceptable is the date 14 Djamād II 83/15 July 703 given solely by a tradition of Abū Miḥnaf (al-Tabārī, i, 1094), since if one accepts the year 83 for the hostilities near Basra, this leaves too brief an interval between them and the final battle of Dayr al-Damādīm; if one dates the hostilities near Basra in the year 82, it leaves an interval of too
great a length to be probable (cf. Périer, 186, n. 3). Ibn Kathir (ix, 42 and 47) lengthens the period of the trench warfare near Kūfah in order that it may fall a little later in the year 83, but transfers some of the skirmishes and the final battle of Dayr al-Dīmarjadīm to the year 83; he was evidently attempting to reconcile the divergent accounts, but his solution is not acceptable because he had to disregard the information which limits to about four months the period during which the two armies remained facing one another at Dayr al-Dīmarjadīm. (See Causes of the revolt. The Arabic sources often have a marked bias in the presentation of incidents relating to persons; in the present case they lay stress, in recounting various episodes, on the mutual hatred of the two protagonists. The facts, however, seem to contradict the suggestion that such a hatred existed: the governor put Ibn al-ʿAṣḥāth in command of an army to fight against the Khaṣāḥid, he is said to have sent him to Kirmān to carry out other tasks, and finally he gave him nothing less than the command of the Peacock Army; the reason for his blindness may have been excessive confidence in the fear which he himself inspired (cf. al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1044), or he may have preferred to keep far from ʿIrāq a person who was an embarrassment to him and perhaps dangerous; but if he, as a plebeian, hated the nobly-born Kindī, as is suggested, it is unlikely that he would have shown him so much favour, and if he had been aware of Ibn al-ʿAṣḥāth’s hostility to him, he would hardly have put into his hands the means of achieving his hostile intentions. It must also be conceded that Ibn al-ʿAṣḥāth faithfully carried out the orders of his superior until the autumn of 81. Thus, contrary to the Arabic sources, it is advisable, if not to ignore personal feelings altogether, at least to attach less importance to them and to seek elsewhere the real reasons for the revolt. Von Kremer, in his Culturgeeschichte des Orients (ii, 172, followed by A. Müller and by van Vloten, 17, 26) links the revolt of Ibn al-ʿAṣḥāth with the mawall movement, and more precisely with the attempt made by those who had embraced Islam in ʿIrāq and Kūfah to obtain the same political rights as the Arabs who had been Muslims from an early date. Wellhausen (Ar. Religion, pp. 194 ff., 279 and 290, ed. 1904), following the view of the mawall, chose as his point of departure the fact that only a few years had passed since the fall of al-Muʾtah, who had been their protector, and that al-Ḥadīḍjādī had put into force measures which had made things very difficult for the new converts, does not accept the idea that the revolt of Ibn ʿAṣḥāth was no more than a continuation of that of al-Muʾtah. He notes that the mawall also fought in large numbers, but side by side with their patrons, according to the custom of the time, and that though they might certainly be hostile to the Syrian government, the supporter of Arabism, yet it was not their claims which lay at the root of the revolt. He considers that the basic cause was a rising of the Arab aristocracy against the impoverished and arrogant representative of governmental authority, the plebeian al-Ḥadīḍjādī. The Arab clans followed their chief in the hope of receiving a share of the spoils, and being in war and the garrisons of distant provinces had caused them great hardship. Since not only the Yemenis of Kūfah, who regarded Ibn al-ʿAṣḥāth as one of their chiefs, but other clans and also those of ʿIrāq did not withhold their support, Wellhausen adds that there must be seen in the rebellion a new attempt by the ʿIrāqīs to throw off the yoke of the Syrians and an uprising against the use of Syrian militia and the privileges which were granted to them. All these arguments of Wellhausen must be taken into consideration, but when he states that the rebellion had no religious motives, he ignores the phenomenon of error, or of defending both the faith and worldly possessions (dinakum wa dunyakum) as might be given by any military leader to soldiers who were in disorder (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1095 f.), whereas they do report violent speeches of ʿkurra2 proclaiming the necessity of fighting against the heterodox, the innovators, who disregard the truth and practise oppression, or of defending both the faith and worldly possessions (dinakum wa dunyakum) because if those people (obviously the Unayyādids) conquered, they would ruin both the one and the other, or proclaiming that there are in the world no people more unjust than they (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1086 f., etc.). It is true that the traditionists may have had a predilection for speeches of this type, but their complete silence about any propaganda activities in support of the cause by the person who had begun the revolt is striking. Whereas the ʿkurra2 swore to die and did die on the field of battle, Ibn al-ʿAṣḥāth was inclined towards a compromise with the caliph and ready to lay down arms; he commanded the troops from behind and did not throw himself into the fray, as did many leaders when the cause was already lost; after the defeat at al-Ẓawīya he withdrew, at Dayr al-Dīmarjadīm and at Maskin he fled; he refused to
continue the struggle in Khorasan. It would seem as though the reason he continued to... Always most anxious to distinguish exactly between what is hard and what is soft, he was particularly careful.

on tens of thousands of mawdli, show that he saw punished severely the Persian... Furthermore he extorted from the captives above all as the most dangerous and most guilty of the seditionists, granted to the Arabs and the punishments inflicted in Futuh, the latter, after the revolt had been extinguished, 286). The pardon of the crusaders who had originally joined the... Kurayshis, all the Syrians, and all those belonging to the clans of the "two arbiters" (named at Siffin); furthermore he extorted from the captives above all a declaration that they had been infidel (kafir), al-Tabari, ii, 1096; cf. Mas'ud, Murūdī, v, 358) and Murward, Kāmil, 154, 155, 176, 654, 655. Ibn Rustān, in who had supported the revolt (al-Balāghurī, Futūh, 373-4; al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, 286). The pardon granted to the Arabs and the punishments inflicted on tens of thousands of mawdli show that he saw the latter, after the revolt had been extinguished, as the most dangerous and most guilty of the seditionists.

Bibliography: The main sources are Tabari (ii, 1023-5, 1042-77, 1085-110, 1121-6 and index), who recorded mainly on Abū Mīhnaft, traditionist and author of a monograph entitled Kiya Dayr al-Asmā'īyya wa khāli' Abū al-Rahmān b. al-Asfā'ī (Fīhris, 93) and the Anonyme arabisch... Vaglieri).
to accept nothing from anybody and to submit himself daily to a strict examination of his own conscience. One of his biographers, al-Khadrami, asserts that the Kütya of al-Ḥāfis was one of the works which he constantly read.

Many Şñefs gathered round Ibn ʿAshir at Salé, which was a place suitable for meditation and appeared at that time to those who, aspiring to the mystic life, were fleeing from Fez as a haven of peace and security. Thus one of them, Ibm ʿAbbād of Ronda [q.v.], came to spend several years there in the company of the saint, of whom he became a famous disciple.

Bibliography: Ahmad Ibn ʿAshir al-Hāfi (d. 1163/1750) wrote a monograph on his namesake entitled Tūḥfat al-waʾir bi-baṣṣa manāḥib sayyidī al-ḥādīdī Ahmad b. ʿAshir, which has not been printed (see I. S. Allouche and A. Regragui, Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de Rabat, ii, Rabat 1958, no. 2303); for the list of the biographers of the saint see Lévi-Provençal, Cherifia, 1954. Ibn Romfūdh, ʿUrdu al-ṣaḥīh wa ʿaṣaṣ al-ṣaḥīr, ed. M. El Fasi and A. Faure, Rabat, 1961, 9-10. See also the excellent pages on Ibn ʿAshir in Paul Nwyia, Ibn ʿAbbad de Ronda, Beirut 1961, 55 ff.

(FAURE)

IBN ʿASHIR, patronymic of a family of Ifrīdī descent and Moorish origin which settled in Muslim Spain. It is said that ʿAshir, fleeing from religious persecution, came to settle in Morocco. His son Muhammad was born at Salé in about 1030/1621 and it was with him that the family's importance in the history of Tunisia began, at first in the field of "mysticism", then in those of fikr, of teaching and of religious offices. Muhammad b. ʿAshir, who was initiated into mysticism in Morocco by the shaykh Muhammad al-Kudayrī, distinguished himself at Tunis as the leader of a religious fraternity. He settled there, on his return from the Pilgrimage, at the age of about thirty, and carried on the trade of tarboosh-maker. At Tunis he came under the influence of the shaykh ʿAli al-Zawawī, and on his death inherited the ʿzdwiya of al-Zawawī. Muhammad b. ʿAshir did not seek power, but rather shunned it, and he led a life of strict poverty. There is attributed to him the following dignified remark: "We are not of those who perform the ḏiyr in expectation of payment" ( ḏhayl, 197). On his death in 1110/1698-9, he was appointed chief ḏaḏi of Tunis, and in 1277/1860-1 he left this office to become mujtīfī. Shortly afterwards he combined this with the duties of sind (nakhī) with the title of ṣafārīf. He died on 21 Dhu 'l-Jaḏīd 1284/14 April 1868 and was buried in the ʿzdwiya of ʿSidī ʿAll al-Zawawī which seems to have become the family burial-place.

The most famous of the three brothers was Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir, who gained renown as an ashīb—there exist numerous examples of his prose and verse—as a grammarian and as a fakhl. He produced a gloss (bikāhiyya) to the commentary on al-Kafīr (which remained the basic work for the second year of teaching at al-Zaytūna until the reform of 1958), and an abridgement of the commentary on the Būda of al-Bisri (q.v.) written by Ibn Marrūk. On 25 Radjab 1267/26 May 1851, he was appointed chief ḏaḏi of Tunis, and in 1277/1860-1 he left this office to become mujtīfī. Shortly afterwards he combined this with the duties of sind (nakhī) with the title of ṣafārīf. He died on 21 Dhu 'l-Hijja 1284/14 April 1868 and was buried in the same ʿzdwiya as his two brothers.

The family tradition was carried on by his grandson, also called Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir (born 1296/1779) and by his great-grandson Muḥammad al-Fāḍīl.


( TALBI)

IBN ʿĀSIM, ʿĀbd BAKR MUḤAMMAD b. MUḤAMMAD b. MUḤAMMAD b. MUḤAMMAD b. MUḤAMMAD b. MUḤAMMAD b. MUḤAMMAD b. ʿĀSIM, a famous Mālikī jurist, grammarian and man of letters. He was born in Granada on 12 Qumādād I 760/21 April 1359 and died there on 11 Shawwāl 829/15 August 1426. He had a brother, who was also called Muḥammad but had the kunya ʿAbū Yaḥyā, and a son who also had the kunya ʿAbū Yaḥyā; this last was the author of a
Memorandum on the members of his family (Abd Allah Muhammad b. Muhammad Askar, Sindbad, 1894, p. 18) was able to establish the fact that they were three brothers instead of two. Then in 1905, from different sources (especially the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris), Mallon (JA, 1905, 509-29) confirmed Rieu's thesis and put forward the name of Askar only a single Awoyd al-Assal by two of the sons of the honey producer or merchant, pre-}

The shaikhs of the Coptic family which came originally from the village of Sadamant in the Province of Beni Suef in Middle Egypt at an unknown date and settled in Cairo, where its members rose to wealth and high station at the Ayyubid court during the 7th/13th century. They owned a residence in the capital and occupied a position of leadership in their own community. Though their history is obscure, they were reckoned among the most learned Copts in mediaval times. Early modern historians of Egypt appear to have vaguely recognized in Ibn al-Assal only a single personality in mediaval Christian Arabic literature, until in 1734 Renaudot (pp. 585-86, work cited below) revealed that two different brothers had written independently under that name. Afterwards, while classifying some of their manuscripts in the British Museum in 1894, Rieu (p. 18) was able to establish the fact that they were three brothers instead of two. Then in 1905, from different sources (especially the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris), Mallon (JA, 1905, 509-29) confirmed Rieu's thesis and put forward the name of Askar only a single Awoyd al-Assal by two of the sons of the honey producer or merchant, presumably the title and vocation of the founder of that family. Coptic historians, however, including Ya'kub Naqsha Rufayla (p. 185) and the Commission of Coptic History (Ladjnat al-Tarikh al-Khitbi, 148-52) increased the number of Awoyd al-Assal to two—more—the father and a fourth brother—who also were high dignitaries in the Ayyubid bureaucracy, though rich literary remains were left only by the other three. In 1943, Higgins (see ref. below) has laboured to establish a new thesis that two sets of Awoyd al-Assal had lived—one at the beginning of the 5th/11th century and another in the 7th/13th century. Since this argument is based on a dubious date (1000 AD) in the epic history of a certain manuscript in the British Museum manuscript (Arab. e 163, f. 288 r.), we must for the present maintain that the 7th/13th century group is the only one convincingly established. The full names of the Awoyd al-Assal are as follows: (a) Abu'l-Fadl b. Abi Iskak Ibrāhim b. Abi Sahil Djarjis b. Abu Al-Yusuf Yūhannā b. al-Assal, the father, known as al-Kātib al-Mārīfi, "the Egyptian scribe" or "secretary", who bore the title Fākhr al-
Dawla; (b) al-Safi Abu'l-Fada'il b. al-Assal, with the title Safi al-Dawla; (c) al-Asad Abül-Farağ Bibi Al-Allah, with the title Al-Asad Bibi Al-Allah; (d) al-Mu'taman Abu Isbak Ahrām b. al-Assal, with the title Mu'taman Bibi Al-Allah, al-Malid b. al-Assal, who was Secretary of the important Diwan of the Army. The last two were step-brothers of the preceding two, who are described as full brothers.

The literary figures in the list were the Sañî, al-Asad and al-Mu'taman. In spite of their apparent importance, our knowledge of their lives will remain meagre until further data are gleaned from their numerous works, the chief source for any study on the Awlad al-Asal. All had lived approximately in the tumultuous first half of the 7th/13th century, when Egypt resisted successive crushing attacks on its shores, culminating in the fall of Damietta (1248) and the ultimate discomfiture and imprisonment of King Louis IX of France at the famous battle of Mansûra in 1250. The firm position of the Awlad al-Asal in the Ayyûbîd administration during those years reveals the extent of the decay of the reigning dynasty and their hostility to the Crusade—a movement which aimed at their humiliation as being schismatic, and thus worse than heretics.

Both al-Safi and al-Asad are known from a citation by their third step-brother to have died before 658/1260. The major works of the three are believed to have been accomplished approximately in the decade 627-37/1230-40. All were men of great learning in both the humanities and science. All were masters of Arabic style and in addition well acquainted with Coptic, Greek and Syriac.

Until Ayyûbîd times, Coptic was still in use as a language throughout Egypt, though it was increasingly felt that Arabic was becoming a serious menace to its survival. Hence arose a new class of scholars who concentrated on writing Coptic grammars in Arabic and compiled Copto-Arabic dictionaries to ensure the preservation of their ancestral tongue. The Awlad al-Asal distinguished themselves in this school, as may be witnessed from the enumeration of their works below. In addition to their excellence in Coptic philology, they made outstanding contributions to Coptic canon law, theology, philosophy, Christian polemics, homiletics, Biblical studies, exegesis and all manner of inquiry into their own religious traditions, grammar and the methodology of law. The Awlad al-Asal's monumental contributions may be appraised from the number and nature of their manuscripts. The Coptic Museum alone has down to modern times, among them Gaytji al-Asad, shaykhi Abu'l-Hasan ibn Allah, principally on mysticism and asceticism, of maxims of a distinct beauty of expression, of the depth and breadth of their endeavour is still in its infancy.


IBN 'ATA' ALLAH, TÂBI' AL-DIN ABU 'L-FAQIL (and Abu 'L-ABBAS, see Ibn Farbûn, Dibâdî, Cairo 1351, 70) AHMAD B. MUHAMMAD b. 'ABD AL-KARIM b. 'ATA' ALLAH ISKANDARI AL-SHÂHÂDI, A ra'ay mystic, follower of the doctrines of the mystic al-Shâhâdi (d. 656/1258) as a disciple of the mystic Abu l-Abbâs al-Ma'sûrî (d. 668/1270). He wrote a biographical work on the life and teachings of both mystics, entitled Lâdî'sî al-minânî fi ma'ndûb il-Shâhâdi Abu l-Abbâs al-Sâhypî al-'Ismî (Tunis 1304/1886-87; Cairo 1322/1904, on the margin of Shârâni's Lâdî'sî al-minânî). Originally from Alexandria, Ibn 'Ata' Allâh lived in Cairo and died there on 16 Dhmâd II 702/21 November 1309 in the madrasa al-Manşûriya. Brockelmann (see Bibl.) lists twenty works by Ibn 'Ata' Allâh, principally on mysticism and asceticism, of which six are in print and the rest in manuscript. By far the most celebrated of his works is a collection of maxims of a distinct beauty of expression, al-Hikam al-'Atdîyya, with numerous commentaries down to modern times, among them Shâykh al-ma'sûbî al-Salî'î (Balâk 1285/1868) by the Spanish mystic Ibn 'Abbâd al-Rundî (d. 796/1394). He is also said to have written in the fields of Kûranic exegesis, traditions, grammar and the methodology of law (see Dibâdî, 70).

Ibn 'Ata' Allâh was one of the foremost adversaries of the renowned Ibn al-Bâli juricconsult and theologian, Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328). When the
latter was arrested in Shawwal 707/March-April 1308, it was Ibn 'Ata'llah who made accusations against him for attacks which he had made against Ibn al-'Arabī (q.v.) and other mystics, but none of the accusations were substantiated (‘ondh al-fā‘il) according to Ibn 'Ata'llah (q.v.) in Ibn Kathīr, xiv, 45). Ibn 'Ata'llah no doubt had reason to oppose Ibn Taymiyya, who wrote on particular kinds of names in the Kitab al-Banin wa-'l-bandt wa 'l-dbd* wa 'l-ummahdt wa 'l-adhwd*.

Thus for instance, in his Madjamun al-rasā'ī wa 'l-masā'ī (5 vols., Cairo 1341-9), v, 86, Ibn Taymiyya condemned as an innovation (bid‘a) the formula of dhikr (q.v.) mentioning the name of God as a single term, either in the form of a noun or a pronoun (al-ism wa-mudmar an). Here, Ibn Taymiyya attributes it to al-Ghazālī (q.v.), but adds that some of his contemporaries were guilty of it (wa-kāhā sa wa-yākbu wa-sa ha man kā man samānīnna). We know that this applies to Ibn 'Ata'llah, among whose works is one entitled al-Kād al-muqarrad fi ma‘rifat al-im al-mufrad (Cairo 1930).

Ibn 'Ata'llah was claimed by the Shāfī‘ī (Subkhī, Tabāhāl al-Shāfī‘yya al-kubrā, v, 176) as well as the Mālikīs (Ibn Farhūn, Dībādī; 70). At his death he was interred in the Karāfā Cemetery in Cairo where his tomb was for long the object of pious visits. It is located in the south-eastern group of tombs (see L. Massinon, La Cité des Morts au Caire, in BIFAO, iv, 67).

Ibn 'Ata'llah, among whose works is one entitled al-Kād al-muqarrad fi ma‘rifat al-im al-mufrad (Cairo 1930).


Ibn al-'Athir, a family name (borne by a number of apparently unrelated families) which was given great and deserved lustre by three brothers, Majd al-Dīn, 'Izz al-Dīn, and Diya al-Dīn, who achieved literary fame in the fields of, respectively, philology and religious studies, historiography, and literary criticism. Their father, Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm, whose life spanned the 6th/12th century, was a high official of the Zangids of Mosul, stationed in Dīzārat Ibn 'Umar (hence the nisba Dīzārī). His three famous sons were born there. The family was, it seems, well-to-do, owning real estate in Dīzārat Ibn 'Umar and Mosul and investing in commercial enterprises.

(1) MAJD AL-DIN ABU 'L-SA‘DAT AL-MUBARAK al-Hasawneh was born in 544/1150. His entire adult life was spent in Mosul, where he worked for the government in the service of Ghāzī b. Mawdūd, Ghāzī’s brother Mas‘ūd, and the latter’s son Arsalān Shāh. For a while, he was attached to Muḥājīd al-Dīn Kaymaz, who, formerly of Irbil, had moved to Mosul and been entrusted there by Ghāzī with the running of affairs. Though he was paralysed in his later years, his administrative services and advice were still very much in demand. However, an anecdote reported by his brother, the historian, depicts him as preferring the contemplative quiet of the invalid to the distractions of politics. He died on Thursday, 29 Dhu al-Hijja 606/24 June 1210.

Of his works, a broad collection entitled Di‘āmāt al-ṣulṭān became a much used standard reference work (autograph copy of the first volume in Istanbul, Feyzallah 299, cf. H. Ritter, in Oriens, vi (1953), 71-7). His dictionary of less common words and meanings occurring in the Prophetic traditions, al-Nihāya fi gharb al-hadīth (Cairo 1322, also 1963-5), gained especially wide currency from the fact that it was incorporated in the Liṣān al-‘Arab. He wrote on particular kinds of names in the Kitāb al-Banin wa-l-bānāt wa l-‘ābiyya wa l-‘ummahāt wa l-‘ādīnāt...
IBN AL-ATHIR

was born on 4 Dijumâd I 555/13 May 1160. Like his elder brother, he spent most of his adult life in Mosul but in the capacity of a private scholar. He repeatedly visited Baghdad as a pilgrim or as an envoy of the ruler of Mosul. On at least one of these occasions, upon returning from the pilgrimage, we find him, together with Maqjd al-Dîn, trying to use the opportunity for studying with a Baghdâdî scholar. At the age of twenty-eight, he was with the armies concentrated under the command of Salâh al-Dîn [q.v.] for the fight against the Crusaders (Kâmîl, sub anno 584), probably in the company of his brother Diya3 al-Dîn. Near the end of his life, in 626-28/1228-31, he spent some time as an honoured guest with the Atbâkât of Aleppo, interrupting his stay for one year to visit Damascus. In Aleppo, Yâkût [q.v.], just before he died, asked him to arrange for the transfer of his books and papers after his death to a foundation in Baghdad. He agreed but, we are told, handled the task ineptly. He himself died soon thereafter, in Shâbîn or Ramâdân 650/May-June 1233.

The circumstances of his life are certainly most imperfectly known as compared to the extent of fame and influence that were his on account of his works, which have been preserved and printed repeatedly. He wrote very successful improved compendia of al-Samâ'nî's Ansâb and of some earlier collections of biographies of the men around Muhammâd, entitled, respectively, al-Luhâb and Usd al-qâhâba. His more noteworthy contribution, however, has been to secular history. On the Zangâl (Atbâkât) dynasty of Mosul, he wrote a comparatively short work, based on the first-hand knowledge of his father and himself. His great compilation entitled al-Kâmîl, an annalistic history from the beginning of the world to the year 628, represents one of the high points of Muslim annalistic historiography. Distinguished by the well-balanced selection of its vast material, by its clear presentation, and by the author's occasional flashes of historical insight, it is somewhat marred, from the modern point of view, by its failure to indicate its sources and the restrictiveness of its annalistic form. A noticeable partiality for the Zangîs, leading to some distortion and confusion, is, however, to be expected and is hardly a reason for belittling the great achievement of the historian.

(3) Diya3 al-Dîn Abu 'l-Fath Nasr Allâh, born on Thursday, 20 Shâbîn 558/Wednesday, 24 July 1163, led the most active life of the three brothers and achieved the greatest prominence in politics, obtaining at some time the title of wâizar, which he retained. He joined Salâh al-Dîn in April 1191 (if not already once before, in 583/1187). Near the end of the year, given the choice, he joined Salâh al-Dîn's son, al-Afdal, becoming his wâizar in Damascus after Salâh al-Dîn's death in 585/1193. In this position, he was said to have accumulated so much ill-will that when al-Afdal had to give up Damascus, he was only with great difficulty able to escape, supposedly to Egypt (according to Ibn Khallîkân). In fact, he took refuge in Mosul, where he found employment with Arslân Shâh. In 595/1199, he rejoined al-Afdal in Syria and Egypt, and in 597/1201 moved with him through Syria to al-Afdal's final destination in Sumaysât. Travelling to Aleppo in 607/1211 with the intention to join al-Malik al-Zâhir Ghâzî, he almost immediately left for Mosul. In 611/1215, he took up residence in Irbil, then in Singîr, and eventually, in 618/1221, settled again in Mosul, where he remained to the end of his life in the service of Mahmûd b. Mas'ûd b. Arslân Shâh and Badr al-Dîn Lu'âb, as kâtib al-insâb. He died on an embassy to Baghdad on Monday, 29 Rabî' II 637/28 November 1239. A son, Sharâf al-Dîn Muhammâd (585-622/1189-1229), had begun to follow in his father's footsteps as a littérature when he died prematurely.

Diya3 al-Dîn's works are all concerned with literary criticism. Those published are al-Wâghy al-marmâm (Beirut 1298); al-Dîmâs' al-bahir (ed. Mustafa Dîwâd and Dîamîl Sa'îd, Baghdad 1357/1956) and the most famous of all, al-Mathal al-adâbi, which caused much attention already when it first appeared (on the editions and on old manuscripts of the work, cf. S. A. Bonebakker, in Orientis, xiii-xiv [1961], 186-94). Further, al-Istidrâkh fi l-'adhâh al-âlma'î al-Mukhtdr fi mandkib al-akhdh, an interpretation, together with grammar and Kur'an, of al-Samâ'nî's compendia of al-Samâ'nî's Ansâb and al-Lubâb, an annalistic history from the al-Kâmîl, based on the first-hand knowledge of his father and himself. His great compilation entitled al-Kâmîl, an annalistic history from the beginning of the world to the year 628, represents one of the high points of Muslim annalistic historiography. Distinguished by the well-balanced selection of its vast material, by its clear presentation, and by the author's occasional flashes of historical insight, it is somewhat marred, from the modern point of view, by its failure to indicate its sources and the restrictiveness of its annalistic form. A noticeable partiality for the Zangîs, leading to some distortion and confusion, is, however, to be expected and is hardly a reason for belittling the great achievement of the historian.

Bibliography: Information about the father (from the works of the historian) is to be found in the introd. to the ed., by 'Abd al-Kâdir A. Tulaymat, of 'Izz al-Dîn, al-Bâhir (Caflor. n.d. [1382/1963]), and the ed. of Diya3 al-Dîn, al-Dîmâs'; about other members of the family, in H. Ritter, Orientis, vi, 71 ff. Mehemed Şerefeşedin (Yaltikaya), Ibn Ethîrî (Istanbul 1322) was not available.

For (i): Knowledge of Maqjd al-Dîn's biography goes back mainly to information furnished by his brothers, 'Izz al-Dîn (Kâmîl, sub anno 586) as reported by Yâkût, Utabî, vi, 238-41, and Diya3 al-Dîn in whom the same information appears in Ibn al-Sâ'î, al-Dîmâs' al-muhbâsas, 199-301 (Baghdad 1353/1934). How much of the probably quite [1201] true but somewhat exaggerated account of the works of other contemporaries such as Ibn Nûkîta Ibn al-Mustawi (History of Irbil), and al-Mundhîrî
is reflected in, for instance, Ibn Khallikan, no. 524, or Ibn al-"Imād, Shadhārā, v, 22 f., can as yet not be determined. Brockelmann, I, 438 f., S I, 305, 609-7.

For (2): 1zz al-Dīn achieved fame too late for inclusion in Yākūt, Udbā.ta, and we are basically restricted to the brief remarks in Ibn Khallikan, no. 453, who, at the age of eighteen, had met him in Aleppo. Later authors apparently had no new worthwhile material to add. For information on his teachers from the Kāmil, cf. the introd. of the ed. of al-Bāhir by 'A. A. Tulaymat (the Bāhir had previously been published under the title of Histoire des Atabeks of Mosul, in vol. ii of the Recueil des historiens des Croisades, hist. or., Paris 1876). For the statement concerning Yākūt, cf. the references given by Muṣṭafā Diwād, in Ibn al-Fuwāṭ, Talḥīk Maḏīma al-dāḥib, iv, 260 f. For the esteem he was held in during the Middle Ages, cf. e.g., al-"Imād al-Dīn, 1stA., in F. Rosenthal, A history of Muslim historiography, Leiden 1952, 332, 413. For some more recent critical judgments, cf. C. Caben, La Syrie du Nord, Paris 1940, 58-60; H. A. R. Gibb, in Speculum, xxv (1950), 58-72; H. L. Gottschalk, al-Maḥīt al-Kāmil, Wiesbaden 1958, 61 f.; M. Milmy Al-Maḥīt and F. Gabriei, in Lewis and Holt (edd.), Historians of the Middle East, London 1962, 88-90, 98 ff.; Brockelmann, I, 402, 422 f., S I, 565, 587 f.


ROSENTHAL

IBN "ATTASH. 2. "Abd al-Malik, an Ismāʿili at the mid-10th century, was in charge of the Daʿwa in ʿIrāq and western Persia. Information about him is scanty. According to the autobiography of Hasan-i Sabbāḥ (q.v.), he went to Rayy in Ramadan 464/1072, and enrolled Hasan in the Daʿwa. He is also said to have won over the Rasul Muṣṭafā of Girdkuh, later one of the most active leaders of the Nīṣārī. Ḵālīr al-Dīn and Rāwandi also allude to his relations with Ḥasan-i Sabbāḥ. According to this version, "Abd al-Malik, a resident of Ḥasanān, was accused of Shiʿism, and fled from that city to Rayy, where he joined Ḥasan-i Sabbāḥ. Ibn al-Dīwād gives a slightly different version, and adds further details: he had been a physician, and had been arrested and threatened with death by Sultan Toghru Bey because of his faith. He made a show of repentance, and was then released, went to Rayy, where he associated with Abū ʿAll al-Nisābūrī, the leading Ismāʿili there. He wrote an Ismāʿili book called al-Šākīḥa, and died in the region of Rayy. Rāwandi and Ibn al-"Āṭir agree that he was a man of letters and a fine calligrapher; Rāwandi adds that there were many books in Ḩasanān written in his hand. His son Ḥasan also played a rôle of some importance. According to Rāwandi he was believed in Ḩasanān not to share his father's religious beliefs, and was left un molested at the time of his father's flight. He was, however, secretly working for the cause. As acting as a schoolteacher for the children of the Daylamī garrison of the fortress called Shāhdiz, he is said to have preached to the fathers and converted them, and thus gained control of the fortress. He held it for several years, and was finally defeated in 500/1107. After the capture of the castle, ʿAbd al-"Āṭir suggests that he was an ignorant man, and that he owed his command to Ḥasan-i Sabbāḥ's respect for his father.


(B. LEWIS)

MORE information on his relations with Ḥasan-i Sabbāḥ may be found in the biographies of al-Dhahābi and al-Safādi, in the ed. of al-Dīmāsī, al-habīr. Brockelmann, I, 357 f., S I, 521.
(b) the Canis lupaster for Egypt (dib, taken to be a wolf); (c) the Thos aureus syriacus for Syria and 'Irāk (wādi, Lebanon ḍjabal); and (e) the Canis aureus indicus for Persia and India (Pahlavi Arabized as ḍaxhar, ḍaxbar, ḍaxghar, ḍaxghar).

The sobriquet Ibn ḍaxar seems to go back to remote antiquity, in the dialects of Arabia which were very prone to make use of the construct form to create compounds of which, from their form, show their characteristic behaviour of the jackal which it emphasizes, may be rather the result of the combination of the root ʿAWW/PAW with the idea of “to seek refuge and company in . . .”; they interpret ibn ḍaxar as meaning "the one who responds to the appeal of his congers to rejoin them". This explanation, valid enough in view of the categorical requirements of triliteralism, attached it, on the pattern afal, to the root ʿAWWM/PAW with the idea of “to seek refuge and company in . . .”; they interpret ibn ḍaxar as meaning "the one who responds to the appeal of his congers to rejoin them". This explanation, valid enough in view of the categorical requirements of triliteralism, attached it, on the pattern of the root ʿAWW/PAW, which does not contain the idea of crying out, and of a Bedouin onomatopoeia waʿwašaʿwaša, a vocal imitation of its bark common to all these peoples. The closely related onomatopoeic root waʿwaš is still very much alive in present-day speech to evoke the wailing yelp of the jackal (see the different local names for the jackal given above and al-Djahiz, Hayawan, v. 288, on waš-waš = dog, in childish language). The excessive cowardice of the jackal, which compels it to leave its lair only at night, its instinct as a "carrion-eater", its natural rebelliousness to training, its utter impurity in the eyes of Kur'anic Law and the consequent ban upon the eating of its flesh have condemned it, if not to scorn, at least to total indifference on the part of those who might have been expected to give it their attention, such as huntsmen, naturalists and poets. Although recognizing it to possess the cunning of the fox, they usually refer to it only pro memoria, and, by way of archaisms denoting it, philologists can put forward only the figative shawt bardh which can be interpreted as "luminous rays of the desert" (the expression, in fact, of a phrase heard by them which does not signify at the same time "long course made up of a single stage", "long journey", and "rays of light filtering through a sky-light"), and as the vestige of the Himyaritic language, under its triple Arabic form of ʿilla waššaʿilla waššaʿ. In the Maghrib, in particular, so little attention is paid to the proximity of the jackal that many so-called "dooar dogs", of very variable and sometimes indefinable types, are considered to be mongrels of jackals (barhūḫ) and reveal their essential characteristics.

In this instinctive shunning of the jackal by the Muslim peoples, an exception must be made in the case of the Touareg, who include it among their game and hunt it, either by driving it with beaters or by gin-traps or poison; being far from strict in their observance of Islamic precepts, they sometimes cook the flesh, but for the most part they use the fur for making saddle-bags. Among this people, as in pre-Islamic Arabia, different organs of the jackal are used in the local medicines. In general, in Barbary where it is still regarded with fear as the transmitter of rabies and devastator of hen-houses and sheep-folds, the jackal has become the principal hero of animal tales, in which it takes the part which otherwise falls to the fox (see H. Basset, Essai sur la littérature des Berbères, Algiers 1920, 306-31). In conclusion, it seems that in the mediaval West the jackal was the basis of an import trade from the Maghrib, through Muslim Spain and that, mixed and confused with the fennec [see FANAK] and the fox under the name adīn (from adīn), it was esteemed in furrery. The adīn, with its corruptions adīl, adīr, adīl, adīs, and ardīt, is mentioned in some very ancient chronicles, and in particular we can read in the Mémoires (ed. Paris 1924-6) of Philippe de Conty (in the 16th century) that: "King Louis XI sent to search for . . . strange beasts in all directions, as in Barbary, a species of small lions which are no larger than small foxes and called them adīts". Finally, it will be noted that it is under the name adīn that Buffon (Hist. Nat., v. 214) speaks of the jackal.

The jackal therefore is no longer anything more than a pariah in the Islamic countries, whilst the Egyptians of the age of the Pharaohs dedicated a divine cult to it, as Amunis.

Of his life and character we know next to nothing; but of his birth an entertaining legend is preserved, according to which Šadiq was born as a result of a prayerful request to the Hidden Imām, and the most traditionist used to pride himself on the fact that he was begotten by order of the Imām (Fyzee, 9–10; Nafisi, 5). His father ʿAli was a rich merchant and had three sons, the eldest Hasan, the second ʿUmar and the youngest Muhammad al-Šawājih al-Šadiq (Nafisi, 6, whose opinion is preferable to mine, see Šiite creed, 10). Muhammad was apparently the son of a slave-girl, probably from Daylam. The eldest son Hasan was a theologian of a retiring disposition; ʿUmar was a well-known jurist and theologian; Muhammad, known simply as Ibn Bābāwayhi, or Šawājih-Šadiq among the Šīʿī ulama, was undoubtedly the most famous of all.

Šadiq taught at Baghdād and was a contemporary of the Buwayhid Prince Rukn al-Dawla, and entered into controversies on his behalf. He was pre-eminent in knowledge, memory, "justice", intelligence and reliability, and is universally recognized as a pillar of the Šīʿī faith. Although some have doubted his authority, the Rawdāt al-джннāt declares him to be one of the greatest authorities (iv, 558). Šadiq came of a very illustrious family of learned men, fifteen of whom have been discussed by Saʿdī Nafisi (Musāʿabat al-ḵābār, Instr., 4–17).

Works: Šadiq was a prolific author; of the earliest authorities, Tūsī mentions 43 works and Nāḏajshī, 193; later authorities like the Ǧiṣṣān al-ṭalāmāʾ mention 189 and the Rawdāt al-джннāt, after naming 17 works, says that the rest have not survived. A full list of his works will be found in the Šiite creed, 12 ff.; Nafisi, 6–13, mentions 214 works.

His most important extant books are: (1) Man ī yahdūru-hu l-šafātī, one of the "four books" (often printed; lith. Tehran 1326 A.H.); (2) Risālat al-iḥsādāt (see Fyzee, Šiite creed, containing an English translation and full notes); (3) Ḥmad al-dīn, ed. E. Möller, Heidelberg 1901; (4) Kūlt āl-amālī; (5) Kīdāt al-Taʿṣīlāt; and (6) "Uyān akhābār al-Riḍā (for a full list and particulars see my Šiite creed, 12–17, and Saʿdī Nafisi in his Intr. to Ibn Bābāwayhi’s Musāʿabat al-ḵābār, 11–13.

Bibliography: for his life, Saʿdī Nafisi, Islamic Research Association series, no. 9, Oxford 1943, 111. Sources: al-Nāḏajshī, Fiḥšt, 196; al-Tūsī, Līst, ed. Sprenger, nos. 661 and 471; Nāḏajshī, Ṣīla, Bombay 1317/1900; al-Ḵawāsārī, Rawdāt al-джннāt, iv, 557–60. There are numerous other references in books of riḍā; space does not permit their mention here.


(A. A. A. Fyzee)

IBN BĀDĪS (dialectal pron.: Ben Badis), ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd b. al-Мuṣṭafā b. Ṭamrī, founder of the orthodox reformist movement in Algeria, born at Constantine in 1889. After studying at the Islamic university of Tunis (al-Ẓayṭaḥīna), he devoted himself to private teaching in a mosque in his native town and led an unspectacular life until 1925, when he turned to journalism. He founded a newspaper, al-Muṣtaḥfīd ("The Critic"), which went out of circulation after a few months. Immediately afterwards he founded a new newspaper, al-Shīḥāb ("The Meteor"), which soon took the form of a monthly review and appeared regularly, with some success, until the end of 1939. Ibn Bādīs gave of his best to this publication, which he used as a platform for his reformist propaganda (social questions) and for his religious teaching (šafār, ḍīḥāt).

At first essentially reformist, al-Shīḥāb tried to spread in Algeria the doctrine of the Salafīyya (g.v.), obviously taking its inspiration from al-Manār of Ṭaḥā Ridā (g.v.). But, from 1930 onwards, it dealt more and more with Algerian political questions (this being connected, apparently, with the official celebrations of the centenary of the French settlement in Algeria). From that time onwards the review based its propaganda on two issues—reform (iṣṣāḥ and nationalism, strongly tinged with Arabism. This policy led it to attack: (1) Marabout societies, accused of maintaining certain blameworthy forms of religious life, of favouring obscurantism, of profiting from popular credulity and even of being in collusion with the colonial administration; (2) Gallicization (naturalization and, as a necessary corollary, the abandoning of Islamic personal status, the exclusive adoption of French customs and culture, etc.). Moreover, in this review, Ibn Bādīs showed himself to be a passionate defender of the Algerian personality, which he considered to be inalienable from Islam and Arab culture.

Ibn Bādīs became president of the Association of Algerian Muslim ʿUlamāʾ (constituted in May 1931) and soon confirmed his position as one of the most representative members of the Algerian Muslim community. A tireless worker for his cause, he began the publication of al-Shīḥāb, and directed the organization for the free teaching of Arabic and the religious education of adults in the numerous religious centres of his Association. He played an important political rôle alongside the other representatives of Muslim opinion, particularly after the formation of the Popular Front in France, the meeting of the Algerian Muslim Congress in Algiers (June 1935) and the discussion of the "Viollette project" (end of December 1936). During the last years of his life he was engaged in the exhausting work of political leader and of missionary of iṣṣāḥ in Algeria. He died prematurely on 26 April 1940.

ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd b. Bādīs is remembered with veneration as a master by many followers. His name is already wrapped in legend. Through his activities at the head of the Association of ʿUlamāʾ he was one of the most effective workers in the Arab-Islamic cultural renewal in Algeria between 1930 and 1940. His intellectual brilliance and his religious influence (chiefly his Kurʾānic exegesis published in al-Shīḥāb) make him incontestably the dominant figure of Algerian Islam in the first half of the 20th century. His ardent faith, devoid of all hatred and fanaticism, his disinterestedness and his extreme simplicity, which enabled him to be in collusion with the colonial authorities, regarded him as a saint. It suffices to quote of Ibn Bādīs these words which summarize his life's work: "I am a sower of love, but on a foundation of justice, equity and respect towards everyone of whatever race or religion" (al-Shīḥāb, August 1939, 346).

Bibliography: J. Desparmet, Un réformateur contemporain en Algérie, in L'Afrique Française, March 1933, 149–56; A. Merad, Le réformiste
IBN BADIS — IBN BADJDA


IBN BADJDA (Latinized as Avevements, Abu Bakr Muhammad b. Yahya b. al-Saghîb al-Tudfî al-Andalusî al-Sarakustî, a celebrated philosopher and wasîr in 6th/12th century Spain, and according to Ibn Khalûdîn, who ranked him with Ibn Rushd (Averroes) [q.v.] in the West and al-Fârâbî [q.v.] and Ibn Sinâ (Avicenna) [q.v.] in the East, one of the greatest philosophers of Islam. Ibn Badjda was also well known as a poet, musician and composer of popular songs. Examples of his verses showing a real lyrical gift are to be found in the mediaeval Arabic accounts of the philosopher (see also in the Bibliography the work of Nykl).

Details of his life are obscure. There is an unconfirmed statement in Leo Africanus [q.v.] that the ancestors of Ibn Badjda were Jewish. Since he is said to have died young in 533/1139, it must have been born towards the end of the 5th/nth century (not later, for he was politically active in the first decade or so of the 6th/12th century), at or near Sarakust (Saragossa) [q.v.], where apparently also he spent his youth. We have no reliable information about his education. When in 503/1110 Sarakust was taken by the Almoravids (see al-MurâbiTûn), or earlier, Ibn Badjda for reasons which can only be surmised took service with the new rulers, and became wasîr, apparently while still in his twenties, to the Berber governor Abu Bakr b. Ibrâhim al-Sahrâwî, known as Ibn Tolfâwî. During this viceroyalty he undertook an embassy for Ibn Tolfâwî to 'Imâd al-Dawla b. Hûd, the former ruler of Sarakust [see fûrms], who still maintained his independence at Rûtâ (Rueda de Jalón). Ibn Badjda was thrown into prison, presumably as a traitor, and remained a prisoner for some months. On his release he seems not to have returned to Sarakust, and was at Balânis (Balanis) when news reached him of the death of Ibn Tolfâwî (510/1117). Shortly after this the Christians finally captured Sarakust (Ramadân 514/Decembre 1118). Ibn Badjda may have reached Seville. A second viceroyalty of twenty years to Yaḥyâ b. Yûsûf b. Tâshûfîn (Yaḥyâ b. Abl Bakr b. Yûsûf b. Tâshûfîn), credited to him by several writers, perhaps began about this time. We find Ibn Badjda also at unspecified times at Granada and Wahrân (Oran), and at Ishbîliyya (Seville) in 530/1135 in the company of his friend Abu'l-Hasan 'All b. 'Abd al-'Azîz b. al-Imâm. He died at Fâs (Fes) in Ramadân 533/May 1139, it is said (somewhat improbably) from the effects of eating a poisoned fruit provided by a servant of Abu'l-'Alâ'î b. Zuhr (father of the famous Ibn Zuhr or Avenzoar [q.v.]).

Ibn Badjda's works survive in their original Arabic in a few manuscripts and in Hebrew translations. The late Miguel Asin Palacios considered it possible that there were fragmentary translations into Latin, but no early Latin version of any work of Ibn Badjda has come to light, though he is occasionally quoted in the Latin Avveroes and (differently) in Albertus Magnus. The most important Arabic MSS are:


2. Berlin MS 5060, apparently lost since the second World War. For the contents see W. Ahwardt, Verzeichniss der arabischen Hs. der konigl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, iv (1892), 396-99.


4. Another MS of collected works of Ibn Badjda was signalized by Dr. 'Umar Farîrîk, but has meantime passed out of the hands of its former owner, al-Sayyid 'Abd al-Razzâk al-Hasânî of Baghdad.

The Risdlat Ittisâl al-'Alî (Letter of Farewell) and the later Risdlat Ittisâl al-'Alî bi-l-Insân (Treatise on the Union of the Intellect with Man) have been given good editions by Asin. Ibn Badjda's most celebrated work, the Tadbir al-mutawâhid (Rule of the Solitary), hitherto known only from Munk's French rendering of a Hebrew translation (in Mélanges de philosophie juive et arabe, Paris 1859), was also edited as Asin from the unique Bodleian MS and published posthumously with a Spanish translation. In these three works, as in many passages of his Kitâb fi l-Nafs (Book on the Soul), Ibn Badjda's interest is centred on the possibility of the union of the soul with the Divine, which he takes as man's highest activity and the ultimate felicity, as well as the final end of human existence. Instead of representing this union in a religious sense, to be attained by moral purity and acts of devotion, and as fully realizable only in the after-life, Ibn Badjda considers it as the last stage of an intellectual ascent, by means of a continuous process of abstraction from the impressions caused by sensible objects consisting of matter and form, through a hierarchy of 'spiritual forms' (suwar râhîniyyâ) containing progressively less and less matter, which are intellected by the mind, till finally the Active Intellect is reached. This is devoid of matter and is the same in all men (hence Ibn Badjda's physical doctrine has been described as panpsychism). The Active Intellect is the highest conception which man can fully comprehend and then only in exceptional circumstances, and is represented not indeed as God, the One, the First Mover, or any aspect of Deity, but as an emanation of Deity, ranking immediately below the Separate Inteligences which move the spheres. These higher Forms are entirely beyond the comprehension of man in the sublunary sphere. Ibn Badjda is therefore necessarily concerned with the lower stages of the hierarchy of existence in its metaphysical aspect, but also with the psychological and ethical characteristics of the mind which makes the ascent, which derive according to him from the metaphysical characteristics of the successive stages. The Neoplatonic character of this schema is plain, and Ibn Badjda's 'spiritual forms' are immediately deduced from a treatise of Alexander of Aphrodisias dealing specifically with them, which was available in Arabic.

Apart from the exposition in the Risdlat Ittisâl al-'Alî bi-l-Insân (cf. ed. Asin, § 23), Ibn Badjda made his most sustained effort to explain his thought in the Tadbir al-mutawâhid, which, however, was left incomplete at his death (Ibn Tufayl). Within Arabic
philosophy, the Tadbir was evidently influenced by al-Farabi, who in al-Siydsa (Siydsdt) al-madaniyya, speaks, like Ibn Badija, of the solitary 'plants', i.e., philosophers in the unfavourable environment of existing imperfect cities, and in the Fusul al-madani states that it is the duty of the virtuous man or true philosopher to emigrate to the ideal cities if such exist in fact in his time, adding that if they do not exist, the virtuous man is a stranger in life and to die is preferable for him than to live (ed. Dunlop, § 88). Ibn Badija, who also envisages emigration for his sage, evidently faces the same situation and suggests the solution of withdrawing to a life of speculation viz. Tadbir al-mutawahhid.

In addition to the fields which have been mentioned, Ibn Badija studied mathematics, astronomy, botany, etc.

### Bibliography:
- Ibn Abi Usaybi'a, 'Uyun al-anbiyâ fi tahâihat al-kitâb, ed. A. Müller, ii, 62-64;

### IBN BADJDJA — IBN BAKI

**ABO BAKR YAHYA B. AHMAD (in some sources: Yabîb b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmân), Andalusian poet born at the end of the 5th/11th century. Although he is considered by Arab biographers and in some modern works to be from Cordova (al-Kurtubi), Ibn al-Abbâr, Ibn Sallâ (whose grandfather knew him personally) and Ibn Bassâm refer to him as al-Tulaytuli, and the latter states that the disturbances at Toledo (jînâd 'ulaytulâ) forced him to leave this town. At this time, probably about 477/1085, the year during which Alfonso VI conquered the town, Ibn Bâkî was still young. Soon afterwards the poet began the journeys across Spain and Morocco which were to continue throughout his life. Always seeking a means of livelihood and unlucky in his fortune, he spent some time in Seville—complaining bitterly of it in his poetry as he was to do of all al-Andalus—then in Cordova. The times, the period of the Almoravids, were not propitious for men of letters who were 'fighting against poverty and ignorance' as has been said by E. García Gómez, who has made a study of the period (al-Andalus, x (1945), 285-340). Ibn Bâkî was the friend of al-Âmî al-Tûlîlî and, in a poetry contest at Seville, after al-Âmî had recited his poem and gained the audience's admiration, Ibn Bâkî had not the courage to read his and tore up the paper on which he had written it. The two poets are rightly classed at the head of their contemporaries and it is surprising to find verses of one attributed to the other. Ibn Bâkî finally found refuge with the Banû 'Agâhara, kâdîs of Salé, some of whom he praises in his poems.

Of Ibn Bâkî's work there survive various court poems on classical themes which clearly demonstrate his greatness as a poet, which was recognized by his contemporaries and by the later critics. But it is principally in the genre of muwâshâhâ: that his brilliance is apparent. His various muwâshâhâ which end in a Românate kharda (q.v.) have recently aroused particular interest.

This 'charmant poète, l'un des meilleurs que l'Andalousie ait eus', in the words of Dozy (Hist. Mus. Esp., iii, 256), died in 545/1150-1 according to Ibn al-Abbâr (Tâhâmi, no. 2042). Yâkîb and Ibn Khallîkân, less reliable as being Eastern writers, give the date as 540/1145-6.

### Bibliography:

---

*Note: The text appears to be a fragment of a longer document, possibly a historical or philosophical treatise. The content includes references to various topics such as philosophy, poetry, and historical figures.*

---

*Note: The text appears to be a fragment of a longer document, possibly a historical or philosophical treatise. The content includes references to various topics such as philosophy, poetry, and historical figures.*

IBN AL-BAKILLÁN [see IBN AL-BAKILLÁN].

IBN BAKIYYA, ABDU TAIKH MUHAMMAD, vizier to the Buyid Muizz al-Dawla Bakhtiyar [q.v.], whose history is perhaps difficult to relate objectively since the chroniclers, who wrote from the point of view of the military or bureaucratic aristocracy, were a priori hostile to a parvenu such as he. Coming from a peasant family of Awana (Upper 'Irāk), he had taken advantage of the disturbances during the first half of the 4th/10th century to organize a force which had seized control of the towns on the Tigris at Takrit.

At the time of the conquest of 'Irāk by the Buyid Muizz al-Dawla, when he was in fact in charge of provisioning the prince's kitchens in Baghdad, he had succeeded in holding his privileges as tax-farmer to the new government. A certain charm in conversation, combined with skill in intrigue between civil and military rivals bidding for power and in the adroit placing of gifts, finally secured him the favour of the vizier, Abu l-Faḍl al- 'Abbās al-Širāzī, and then of Bakhtiyar at the beginning of his reign; finally, in 362/972, he received the succession from al-Širāzī himself, probably without desiring it, and contrary to the customary practice whereby, for more than a century, viziers had been recruited from among the bureaucratic profession. Good fortune did not make him unmindful of his former companions, and it is one of the complaints brought against him by the chroniclers that he appointed men of low rank to numerous positions. It seems, however, that Ibn Bakīyya was a clever manipulator rather than a true politician and he failed to compensate for his own inadequate administrative training by winning over the chief officials in the administration. He was unlucky enough to serve a fickle prince, and his final ruin was to result from the latter's overthrow.

Though bound up with the fortunes of Bakhtiyār, Ibn Bakīyya, at the time of the first 'Irākī campaign of his prince's cousin, 'Adud al-Dawla [q.v.], nevertheless perceived the usefulness of enjoying the favour of the latter (a man who today was the protector and tomorrow, it seemed only too clear, would be the redoubtable adversary of Bakhtiyār) and the favour too of the vizier to Rukn al-Dawla (father of 'Adud al-Dawla), Abu l-Fath Ibn al-'Amīd [q.v.], who was lingering in 'Irāk. From them, besides the vizierate, he received also the town of Wāsīt, as an iktā' [q.v.]. In the end, however, the policy he had adopted of trying by means of gifts to win the attachment of certain forces, the 'ayyārn (q.v.) of Baghdad, the autonomous head of the Banī Ḥāshim b. ʿAbd Allāh, who was always in semi-revolt against Baghdad, and others, aroused the suspicions of 'Adud al-Dawla, while at the same time Bakhtiyār continued to fear that Ibn Bakīyya might utterly betray him for the sake of his powerful cousin. When the latter, now successor to Rukn al-Dawla, invaded 'Irāk for the second time, Bakhtiyār attributed the responsibility for the defeat to his vizier and in the end had him arrested and blinded; then 'Adud al-Dawla occupied Baghdad, Ibn Bakīyya fell into his power, and he had him trampled on by his elephants and impaled; the corpse had to await the death of the formidable Būyīd before receiving burial (Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī, Ḳamār, i, 42).

Bibliography: See BUYIDS, 'ADUD AL-DAWLA, BAKHTIYAR and IBN AL-'AMĪD (Abu l-Fath). The principal source is of course Ibn Miskawayh; several letters of Abū Ḥaykāl al-Šābī (particularly in the Leiden MS) are addressed to Ibn Bakīyya or concern him. These are devoted by Y. Heger (in the Irshād (vi) is in reality mainly concerned with the relations of Ibn al-'Amīd (Abu l-Fath) with him; Ibn Khallīkān, no. 709 (de Slane, iii, 272 f.); F. Bustānī, Dīārat al-maʿārif, ii, 375–6; J. Chr. Bürgel, Die Hofkorrespondenz 'Adud al-dawlaus, 1965 (Index). (C. CAHEN)

IBN AL-BALADĪ, SHARAIF AL-DIN ABD AL-DAR'U AMĪD B. MUHAMMAD B. SA'Dī, vizier of al-Mustandīd. In 563/1167–8 Ibn al-Baladī, who at that time was Nāẓir in Wāsīt, was appointed vizier. There was an old feud between him and the ustād-dār 'Adud al-Din Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh. After the murder of the caliph in Rabi 2/1167/November 1710 by 'Adud al-Din and the amīr Kūṭ al-Din, they forced his successor al-Mustandīd to appoint 'Adud al-Din vizier, whereupon Ibn al-Baladī was executed.


(K. V. ZETTERSTEEN)

IBN BĀNA, ʿAMR, famous singer, poet and musician of Baghdad, mawla of the Thaʿlab, died in 278/891 at Sāmarrā. His father was a famous secretary and a high official. His mother, Bāna, whose name he bears, was the daughter of Rawḥ, secretary of Salmā al-Waṣīf. Ibn Bāna was a very cultured, yet a very proud man. He was the supporter and protégé of ʿĪbrāhīm b. al-Maḥdī and among the most bitter enemies of ʿIṣāk al-Waṣīfī, whom he accused of regarding music merely as a profession, whereas for him it was a source of delight. A mediocre musician, he did not play any instrument; nevertheless he excelled in the arts of singing, of improvisation, and of imitation and in teaching music. He wrote a work on music: Kiāb Muṣḥarad al-aghānī. He was an intimate companion of al-Mutawakkil.


IBN AL-BANNA3, ABD AL-HASAN B. AHMAD B. ʿABD AL-MUḤammad B. MAṢʿUD B. MUḤAMMAD B. IBN AL-BANNA, noted Nasīrī scholar, traditionalist and jurisconsult of the Hanbali School in Baghdad; he studied law under the direction of the kādī Abū Ḥassan Abī Mūsā al-Hāshimi (d. 428/1037), and later under the kādī Abū Yašlä b. al-Farrā (d. 458/1066). The available sources tell us nothing of his family origins; he apparently lived all his life in Baghdad, where he died on 5 Radjab 471/1 January 1079. His scholarship was the subject of criticism as well as praise by Shāhīfītes, beginning with al-Muṭṭaman al-Saḏīl (d. 507/1113) and carried on as late as the 9th/15th century with Ibn Ḥadījar al-ʾAskālānī (d. 852/1448). His teaching career began in the lifetime of his master, the kādī Abū Yašlä, on the east side of Baghdad, where he had two study circles, one in the Palace Cathedral Mosque (Djami al-Kasr) and another in the Cathedral Mosque of al-Mansūr. He was commissioned by the wealthy Hanbali merchant, Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Diyāra, to teach in a mosque-college built by the latter and known by his name, Masqīd Ibn Diyarada. He was also a special tutor of this merchant's family.

Ibn al-Bananna3 is said to have written as many as one hundred and fifty works (some say five hundred,
but this number appears to be a copyist's error). He wrote in the fields of history and biography, fikih, asceticism, hadith, theology, philology, pedagogy and the interpretation of dreams. In his biography Ibn Radjab gives a list of his works wherein twenty-eight titles are cited. Four of his works are preserved in manuscript in the Zahiriyya library in Damascus (one of which is not cited in Ibn Radjab's list).

Of great importance for the socio-religious history of Baghdad in the 5th/11th century is Ibn al-Banna's diaries cited in Ibn Radjab's list as al-Ta'iyyih, the History; or, Chronicle. This work is in fact a diary, in which the author recorded his personal observations of day-to-day socio-religious life in the 'Abbāsīd city. Unfortunately, only a small part of the diary has been preserved, a fragment dating from 1 Shawwāl 460/3 August 1068 and ending on 14 Dhu 'l-Ka'ada 461/4 September 1069. There is evidence that the author kept his diary until the year 470/1077-8, just one year before his death. We have no way of telling at present how early he began to keep it. In the history of Muslim historiography, Ibn al-Banna's diary is significant, in that regularly kept diaries were not generally thought to have existed at this early date (cf. F. Rosenthal, A history of Muslim historiography, Ibn al-Banna's eight titles are cited. Four of his works are preserved in the West; indeed, although he made some advances in mathematics toward purposes of divination, astronomy, astrology and occult sciences. Born in the village of Jāhla in his native town, where he was initiated into asceticism, figures [see HISAB AL-GHUBAR].

In all probability, he died on Friday 5 Radjab 721/31 July 1031 in Marraksh and soon became a legendary figure; he was regarded as a sort of magician, with the power to perform miracles by means of his scientific knowledge applied to divination and magic. Nevertheless, his biographers praise his piety, his noble character and irreproachable conduct.

The list of works attributed to Ibn al-Banna is considerable and includes over 80 titles, belonging to the most disparate branches of learning—Arabic grammar and language, rhetoric, exegesis, wā'il al-din fi al-fikih and fikih, the division of inheritances, logic, magic, divination, mathematics, astronomy, meteorology. Unfortunately, they even include a rā'mū of the Iḥyā' of al-Ghazālī. Only a few of his writings have survived however (see Brockelmann), and only one has been published in its entirety. The only Rā've fī 'l-anwā' (ed. and tr. H. P. J. Renaud, Le calendrier d'Ibn al-Banna de Marrakech, Paris 1948). The best known is, beyond question, the Ta'āfi's fī 'l-ḥidā' an 'ilm al-ḥisāb (MSS. Tunis 1030, 206 R., 184 R.; more detailed than the Ta'āfi's, the Masā'id fī 'l-ḥadām wa 'l-nāḥīq (MS Tunis 2840), the Rūmun li-faṣā fīzā fīzā al-dhimm al-bārā'ī wa-l-nayf al-bārā'ī wa-l-nāḥār (MS Escolar, 788/16) and some astronomical tables, Minhāj al-lātīb li-ta'ādīl al-kawākib (MS Escolar, 909/1; Algiers 1454/1). It is to be hoped that further work, in addition to the existing fragmentary works, will be done on this scholar who is an eminent figure of the Maghrib and whose knowledge compelled the high esteem of Ibn Kuldūn.

The exact dates of his life are unknown. However, an Ibn Kuldūn, Professor en el estudio de la labor astronómica de Ibn al-Banna, Petrus Vernet, Contribución al estudio de la labor astronómica de Ibn al-Banna, Tetuán 1952; M. al-Fasi, Ibn al-Banna al-adaddi 'l-Marrakushi, in RIEL Madrid, vi/1-2 (1958), 1-10. (H. Suter-M. Ben Cheneb*)

In probability, he died on Friday 5 Radjab 721/31 July 1031 in Marraksh and soon became a legendary figure; he was regarded as a sort of magician, with the power to perform miracles by means of his scientific knowledge applied to divination and magic. Nevertheless, his biographers praise his piety, his noble character and irreproachable conduct.

The list of works attributed to Ibn al-Banna is considerable and includes over 80 titles, belonging to the most disparate branches of learning—Arabic grammar and language, rhetoric, exegesis, wā'il al-din fi al-fikih and fikih, the division of inheritances, logic, magic, divination, mathematics, astronomy, meteorology. Unfortunately, they even include a rā'mū of the Iḥyā' of al-Ghazālī. Only a few of his writings have survived however (see Brockelmann), and only one has been published in its entirety. The only Rā've fī 'l-anwā' (ed. and tr. H. P. J. Renaud, Le calendrier d'Ibn al-Banna de Marrakech, Paris 1948). The best known is, beyond question, the Ta'āfi's fī 'l-ḥidā' an 'ilm al-ḥisāb (MSS. Tunis 1030, 206 R., 184 R.; more detailed than the Ta'āfi's, the Masā'id fī 'l-ḥadām wa 'l-nāḥīq (MS Tunis 2840), the Rūmun li-faṣā fīzā fīzā al-dhimm al-bārā'ī wa-l-nayf al-bārā'ī wa-l-nāḥār (MS Escolar, 788/16) and some astronomical tables, Minhāj al-lātīb li-ta'ādīl al-kawākib (MS Escolar, 909/1; Algiers 1454/1). It is to be hoped that further work, in addition to the existing fragmentary works, will be done on this scholar who is an eminent figure of the Maghrib and whose knowledge compelled the high esteem of Ibn Kuldūn.

The exact dates of his life are unknown. However, an Ibn Kuldūn, Professor en el estudio de la labor astronómica de Ibn al-Banna, Petrus Vernet, Contribución al estudio de la labor astronómica de Ibn al-Banna, Tetuán 1952; M. al-Fasi, Ibn al-Banna al-adaddi 'l-Marrakushi, in RIEL Madrid, vi/1-2 (1958), 1-10. (H. Suter-M. Ben Cheneb*)
the imām al-Ṣalt b. Malik; in addition, it discusses certain questions of principles and their juridical solutions; (2) K. al-Tā'āruf; (7) K. al-Sharḥ al-Dīmām. Ibn Dīfā'far, no doubt a commentary on al-Dīmām, the work of Abū Dīfābir Muhammad b. Dīfā'far al-Azkawi of Ḫūm dealing with questions of the application of principles.

Bibliography: Šālimūn, Tobjat al-asrān fī strat ahī 'Umān, i, Cairo 1332, 153, 166, 179; idem, al-Lajmān (in Arabic), al-Andalus, an Andalusian mystic theologian, born in North Africa, who taught in Seville during the first half of the 15th century.

His name is often associated with that of the celebrated Şīff Ibn al-ʿArif (q.v.), head of the Almeria school. With Ibn ʿAsīr and Abū Bakr al-Mayūrī, these two men were indeed the leaders of the resistance movement directed against the Almoravids by the mystics and traditionalists and, in general, by those men of religion who, under the influence of the master al-Ḡāzālī, were then inclining towards tasawwuf. But it is tempting to think that, far more than Ibn al-ʿArif, it was Ibn Barrada who was the most ardent and active inspiration of this Şīff opposition to the inquisition of the Almoravid sūkhād. Ibn al-ʿAbbār, his principal biographer, states that he was outstanding among his colleagues in merit and abilities, and that he was known as the Ḡāzālī of al-Andalus. This pre-eminence seems to emerge clearly from the fragments of correspondence between himself and Ibn al-ʿArif that have been discovered. Finally, Ibn Barrada appears to have been more involved in events than his companion and friend. He aspired to the imāmīma. According to al-Ṭahbārī (Tabakht, i, 15), he was recognized as imāmī in 130 villages.

This advancement and the agitation which probably accompanied it aroused the suspicions of the government's local agents. Alerted by them, the Almoravid prince summoned Ibn Barrada, Ibn al-ʿArif and Abu Bakr al-Mayūrī to Marrākūsh. This advancement and the agitation which probably accompanied it aroused the suspicions of the government's local agents. Alerted by them, the Almoravid prince summoned Ibn Barrada, Ibn al-ʿArif and Abu Bakr al-Mayūrī to Marrākūsh. The last-named managed to escape and took refuge in Bigjya, travelling from there to the East where previously he had lived for a time. The other two both died in 536/1141, the year of their arrival in Morocco. This date is more generally accepted than the year 537/1142 given by Ibn al-Khaṭib.

The two men were accorded very different treatment. To Ibn al-ʿArif, the prince offered his belated but certainly sincere regrets. As for the unfortunate Ibn Barrada, ʿAllī b. ʿYūsuf gave orders that his body should be thrown onto the town dunghill, without any prayers for the dead. The intervention of ʿAllī b. Ḥirzīmih, a courageous Şīff from Fās who was then passing through Marrākūsh, saved him from such a disgrace. Ibn Barrada was buried in the corn-market square (rabbat al-hinā). In the very year that followed his death, Ibn ʿAsīr came out into open rebellion against the Almoravids in the Algarve.

Ibn Barrada was versed in the science of hirzī, Tradition and kālim. As a Şīff, he led an exemplary life of austerity, dedicated to worship. He wrote a commentary on the Kurʾān conceived in the spirit of his esoteric doctrine, and also a commentary on the names of Allāh. Among other miracles with which he was credited, he was said to have predicted in 520, with mathematical accuracy, the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin, as well as the actual year in which that event took place, that is to say Ṣadāb 583/1187.

This aspect of his learning implies that Ibn Barrada had a reputation for divination, of evident appeal to the popular imagination. When summoned to Marrākūsh, he had foreseen ʿAllī b. ʿYūsuf too would die soon afterwards. In fact the prince's death occurred one year after his own.

Ibn Barrada belongs to the great Şīff tradition of the school of Ibn Masarra, but like the other Andalusian mystics of his time, he felt the influence of al-Ǧāzālī. Ibn Khaldūn places him in the category of men of the ṭadījīl (revelation, divine irradiation), whom he contrasts with the category of the theorists of monism (waḥda), for whom God is the totality of the manifested and non-manifested world, the sole reality. (Ibn Khaldūn, Šīfah al-ṣā.flatten li-tahdhib al-masdūd, ed. Khalīfī, Beirut 1959, 51-2).

The memory of Ibn Barrada seems to have remained alive for a long time among the populace. In Marrākūsh, he is still known by the name Šīdī Barrada (Ṣīdī Abu l-Rīḍājī).

Bibliography: Ibn al-Abbār, Taḥmīla, no. 1797; i Goldzimer, Ibn Barrada, ZDMG, lviii (1914), 544. M. Asīn Palacios, Abūnasrās y su escuela, Madrid 1914, chapter VIII, gives particulars regarding the Şīff movement resulting from the teaching of Ibn Masarra, after the 5th/11th century; Ibn al-Muwākkīt, in his al-Sāʿīdī al-abādiyya, Fās 1528, i, 106, records the main points of his biography and lists some of the many authors who have devoted a notice to him, such as Ibn Khallikān, Wāṣafyāt, ʿĀbād Bābā, Nāyī al-abīshādī, Nāṣīrī, Istibdā, Nahbānī, Dīmārī karmāt al-nuliyā, Ibn ʿAbd al-Malik al-Marrākūshī, al-Dhāyī wa l-takmilat. It will be found rewarding to read the first pages of the biography of Ibn al-ʿArif, written by M. Asīn Palacios as a preface to the translated and annotated Arabic text of the Maḥāsin al-madālīl, Paris 1933; on the relations between Ibn al-ʿArif and Ibn Barrada, interesting details are given by Fāther Paul Nywia, Note sur quelques fragments inédits de la correspondance d'Ibn al-ʿArif avec Ibn Barrada, in Hespèris, xl1ii (1956), 217-21.

(FAURe)

Ibn Barrada, Abu l-Ḥaṣan ʿAllī b. Muḥ. b. ʿAllī b. Muḥ. b. al-Husayn al-Ribāṭī, Moroccan scholar born in Ṭaza in about 660/1262-6, died in the same town in about 731/1331. Deeply versed in the Islamic sciences, Ibn Barrada owes his renown to an urjīsātā of 242 verses, al-Durār al-lāmmātī fī ʿasa nabbrā fī al-imān Nāfī, completed in 657/1260 and dealing with the "reading" of Nāfī [q.v.]; this work, published several times in Cairo and Tunis in collections of treatises of Kūrānī orthoepy and orthography, enjoyed a very great vogue in North Africa. From the same author has survived another urjīsātā of 30 verses, fī maṣāḥidī l-kurā, on the points of articulation of phonemes (MS Berlin 548). See also the next article, beginning of final paragraph.

Of his life, all that is known is that after having been an ʿašl (a kind of notary) he was entrusted with the official correspondence of the government at Ṭaza, and retained this post until his death.
IBN BARRI, ABU MUHAMMAD AL-MUKHADSM, ABD AL-QASIM IBN AL-BARRI B. ABU AL-MAQBAR, AL-MADHIDI (so called after his father's place of origin) AL-MAFIDAL AL-SHAFI', ARAB GRAMMARIAN BORN AT CAIRO ON 5 RAJDAB 499/13 January 1187. He studied under the masters of that period (see Ibn Khalilkan, ii, 293); when he himself was a master, among his disciples was AbuMusa al-Dhali (d. 582). During the whole of Ibn Barri's life the Crusades were in progress (capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, 1099; disastrous defeat of the Crusaders at Hattin, in the year of his death, 1187); but he himself was an absent-minded scholar, untidily dressed, who seems to have had no interest beyond his passionate interest in pure 'arabiyya, although he himself made mistakes in 'arab while speaking, mistakes of which he was unaware. He held the reputation of having the greatest knowledge in his generation of the language, the grammar, and the vocabulary of Arabic and, like Ibn Bahaishah, was the literary reviser of official correspondence with the Diwan al-Idhan. The author of the Liban quotes him continually, e.g.: six times under k r n (see his Preface, i, 3, line 10, i, 7, line 3 from the bottom).

This scholar showed his learning in writing on the works of other authors: by making annotations (corrections or additions): (1) to the Muwarab and to the K. al-Takmila fi ma yaah h fi l-A'mma (MS Damascus, Zahiriyat) of al-Djwali (g.v.); (2) to the Siah al-Djwali. These copious hawdshi, his chief work (in manuscript; see Brockelmann, i, 134), were collected into an independent work: the K. al-Tanbih wa l-Idhan 'amma waKhama min al-qahim fi K. al-Siah (the title given in Hadijji Khalifa, iv, 93, 9-10); according to Hadijji Khalifa, however, ibid., i, 10, these annotations were begun by his master 'All b. al-Kajfa, of Brockelmann, i, 540 bottom, and, according to al-Safadi (al-Baghdadii, Kitabatu al-adab, ii, 529, lines 8-9), Ibn Barri continued them as far as w g, a quarter of the work, and the rest were written over by Allah b. Hassam al-Bazi; (3) to the Durr al-ghawdwi fi awakh al-ghawdwi of al-Hariri, according to Ibn Khalilkan, ii, 293, line 17, Ibn Kadi Shuhba, 324, line 5-6; by his defence of the Mab'am of al-Hariri against the criticisms of Ibn al-Khashshab (g.v.), printed under the title: al-Istdrakat 'alai Mab'am al-Hariri wa 'nisah Ibn Barri (Istanbul 1328) and as an appendix to the Mab'am (Cairo 1326)—as well as by his Sharh shahid al-Iddh of Abu'l-Farisi; in manuscript, Cairo, ii, 128. Of the personal writings of Ibn Barri only two small works are known: the K. Chuhat al-du'af'a min al-fudhla, a criticism of the incorrect terms of the jurists, published by C. C. Torrey in Orient. Studen Th. Noldeke gewidmet, i, Giessen 1906, 211-24; and al-Masu'd al-'aghir an ma'fra li l-hariri, on some grammatical and local difficulties, in manuscript, Paris 1266 (no. 3), fols. 181-218.

It should be noted (1) that no. 6 of Brockelmann (S I, 340) is wrongly attributed: this Sharh 'ihsan (and not 'ihsan) al-'arid, S. 282 (and not 252) is, as is indicated in the catalogue of the Arabic manuscripts of the Escorial (H. Dersenburg, i, 1884, no. 410, 3), to be attributed to Abu'l-Hasan 'All b. 'All b. al-Husayn Ibn Barri, the Ibn al-Barri of Brockelmann, II, 248 and S I, 350. (2) No. 2 of Brockelmann, i, 302, the 13 verses on the meaning of the word al-khis which L.A. attributes to Ibn Barri (xiii, 240-7 xi, 232-3) are already cited by Abu Hilal al-Askari (d. 956/1505) in his K. Sina'atayn (Istanbul 1320), 335-7. (3) On the question of the glosses or criticisms of Ibn Barri to the Durrat al-ghawdwi and of his refutation of the criticisms of Ibn al-Khashshab to this Durrat, see C. C. Torrey's introduction to his edition of the K. Chuhat al-du'af'a (Orient. St., i, 212-3).

Bibliography: Brockelmann, i, 301-2, S I, 529-30; Subki, Tabaqdt al-Shaf'iyya al-kubrd, iv, 233-4; Suyuti, Bughya, 278-9; Ibn Khalilkan, ii, 292-4 (no. 326); Ibn Kadi Shuhba, Tabaqdt al-nu'dh wa l-ghawdwiyyin, MS Damascus Zahiriyat 438 al-'arabiyya, 323-5; Kifit, Ibn Barri al-radwi, ii, 110-1, see iio, ii, 2, where other references are given. (H. Flesich)

IBN BASHKUWAL, ABU 'L-KASIM KHALAF B. ABD AL-MALIK B. MA'SUD b. MUSA, B. BASHKUWAL, ABU BUKR b. ABU 'L-ARABI, and other celebrated scholars. Well-equipped with learning acquired from some 400 books, he became, according to his biographer Ibn al-Abbâr, the doyen of the traditionists of Cordova and a scholar without peer in the literary history of al-Andalus. At first he became a member of the judiciary as a subordinate of the chief 'alid of Seville, Ibn al-Abbâr, and worked as a 'adl in Cordova, but soon gave up this administrative career and devoted himself to his chosen vocation of teaching and research, and proposed to follow in the footsteps of Ibn al-Farâd, the great pioneer in biographical studies, which had had so great a success. Ibn al-Farâd, with his Ta'fikh 'ulamâ al-Andalus, had laid the foundations for a knowledge of literary and biographical history of Spanish Muslims. Ibn Bashkuwal, two centuries later, decided to continue so interesting a work and called his work al-Šîla "the continuation". In it he was able to gather 1400 biographies of men of letters who had flourished in the 5th/9th and 6th/12th centuries. Although the information which he gives is above all literary and is excessively and frequently detailed in the lists of masters and disciples, he provides a great deal of new data for history, administration, and the toponymy of numerous towns and localities of Muslim Spain.

He is said to have composed 50 works, but of them, apart from the Šîla (Kubd al-Šîla fi al-Šîla al-mammat al-Andalus), finished on 3 Qumdatâ 1354/2 December, 1539, ed. F. Codera in BAH, vii Madrid 1883, we know only the Kith al-Ghuwadwi wa l-mubamâr min al-asma, a dictionary of traditionists whose names are difficult to spell or easily confused with others (Berlin, Verzeichn., no. 1673).

Bibliography: Ibn Khalilkan, Wafayat, Cairo 1310/1929, i, 172; Dhanbâh, Hussâf, iv, 132 ff.; Ibn Farûn, Dibârî, Fez 1316/1905, 116 = Cairo 1312/1923, 113; Ibn al-Abbâr, Takmiha, no. 179; idem, Mawdâm, no. 70; Suyûtî, Tabaqdt al-Abbâs,
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ed. Wüstenfeld, xvii, no. 1; Wüstenfeld, Geschichts-
schreiber, no. 200; Brockel-
mann, I, 340, S I, 580.

[6. BEN CHERRI [A. HUICI MIRANDA]]

IBN BASSÀL [see filaha, ii.]

IBN BASSÁM, ABU 'L-HASAN 'ALI b. BASSÁM AL-
SHANTARINÍ, Andalusian poet and antholo-
gist, a native of Santarem. Forced to flee from his
native town when it was taken by Alfonso V of Castle
(485/1092-3), he went to Cordova for the first time
in 493/1100 and, during the following years, under-
took at Seville the compiling of his Diwáñ and the
collecting of the diwáns of some great poets of the
5th/11th century: al-Mu'tamid, Ibn Wáhbon, Ibn
'Ammar; he also collected the correspondence of the
prince of Murcia, Ibn Táhir, and collected in one
volume his own satirical poems, which, however,
refrained from circulating. Although in order to
support himself he had to accept a reward from
those to whom he devoted an entry in his Diwáñ,
he behaved more honestly than his contemporary
al-Fath Ibn Kháqán [q.v.].

The only one of his works which has survived is
the Diwáñ fi makásin alí al-Diástrá, which is,
however, enough to earn him enduring fame and the
gratitude of all who are interested in the Arabic
literature of Spain. Planning his anthology as a
continuation of the Kitáb al-Háda'ík of Ibn Farádí
al-Diástrá [q.v.], Ibn Bassám (d. 544/1149) is
reputed to have been concerned only with writers
and poets who were his contemporaries or nearly so,
but on many occasions he goes back as far as the
beginning of the 5th/11th century and even to the
end of the preceding century. He was so widely read
that he could immediately detect the least obvious
plagiarism, and was irritated by the inlution of
his fellow countrymen for everything from the
East—"if a crow croaked in that part of the world
or if a fly buzzed on the far borders of Syria or of
'Irák, they would prostitute themselves as if before
an idol", he writes in his preface; hence he was
anxious to collect and preserve the verse and the
prose works written in Spain, which he with his
sound judgement was able to evaluate and to offer
to posterity. He himself admitted that the compiling
of his anthology had caused him immense
pain and suffering, and he had in general no possibility of
verifying the authenticity of the texts which it
contains. The work, which (according to Yákút)
consisted of seven volumes, is divided into four
sections: I. Men of letters and poets of Cordova and
its surrounding district; edition of 1st part, Cairo 1939,
of 2nd part, Cairo 1942; II. the western part
of al-Andalus (Seville, Portugal); III. the eastern
part of al-Andalus: IV. foreign poets and men of
letters living in al-Andalus; ed. 1st part, Cairo
1945. (An edition of the whole work is being
prepared (1968) at Paris.) For the manuscripts of
the unpublished sections see Brockelmann.

The notices are of varying length; they contain
in general some biographical data, in an ornate
and intelligible prose, citations of earlier authors
and historians, notably Ibn Hayyán [q.v.], and
selected extracts in prose or verse; Ibn Bassám
refrains, however, from including the more shocking
satirical pieces, probably because of the rigorism
which prevailed in his time. A shortened version
of the Diwáñ was made by Ibn Mammáti (542-
606/1147-1209) under the title Lá'ilíyãt al-Diwháñ
wa-jaríyãt al-Diástrá (ms. in the Veliúddin Library,
Istanbul).

Bibliography: Yákút, Uda'áh, xii, 275; Ibn
Khallikán, tr. de Slane, ii, 304, iii, 184, 198;
Hádílí al-Khalífã, iii, 337; Ibn Khalífã, Múhtadáhá,
i, 337 (tr. de Slane, i, 353, Enn. tr. F. Renzenthal,
i, 350); Makkáñ, Andáctas, ii, 123 and index:
Dozy, Abbáddís . . ., i, 189, 220, ii, 258, 33 ff.;
M. G. de Slane, Note sur les historiens arabes
espagnols Ibn Haiysán et Ibn Bassám, in JA, 1861,
259-68; Pons Boigues, Ensayo, 208-16; González
Palencia, Literatura, 199-206; Brockelmann,
S I, 578.

IBN BASSÁM, ABU 'L-HASAN 'ALI b. BASSÁM
AL-'ABARTÁ'I, poet
and writer of Baghdad. His grandfather, Nasr, had
held high office during the caliphate of al-Mu'tási
(see Sourdel, Visirat, 252), and he himself was at one
time employed in the service of the barid [q.v.]; he
probably carried out other administrative duties,
since his biographers attribute to him a collection of
letters (rasul) which are unlikely to have been of a
private nature. However, his fame rests on his epi-
grams, very brief, for he was short-winded, but
effective; many stories are told about his relations
with the great men of his time, with whom he treated
with scant regard, attacking the caliphs and
their ministers as well as his own family, so that
Yákút counts him among the unifilí (‘alabáh); he
also managed to write verses on the most highly
placed of his contemporaries and to attribute to
them other poems for example to K. al-Mu'áiyín;
certain eulogies of Ibn al-Furát or of Ibn Múkála [q.v.]
seem out of place in an almost exclusively epigrammatic
output.

Ibn Bassám is besides the author of several works:
K. Abád b. Abu Rabí'a, which Ibn al-Nadim
considers this poet's best monograph and for which
Yákút gives the many sources; K. Abád b. al-Khuwá
Mundfridd al-shu'ardi, K. al-Mukhání. Certain
coincidences with Ibn al-Furát or of Ibn Múkála [q.v.]
seem out of place in an almost exclusively epigrammatic
output.

Ibn Bassám is besides the author of several works:
K. Abád b. Abu Rabí'a, which Ibn al-Nadim
considers this poet's best monograph and for which
Yákút gives the many sources; K. Abád b. al-Khuwá
Mundfridd al-shu'ardi, K. al-Mukhání. Certain
eulogies of Ibn al-Furát or of Ibn Múkála [q.v.]
seem out of place in an almost exclusively epigrammatic
output.

Ibn Bassám is besides the author of several works:
K. Abád b. Abu Rabí'a, which Ibn al-Nadim
considers this poet's best monograph and for which
Yákút gives the many sources; K. Abád b. al-Khuwá
Mundfridd al-shu'ardi, K. al-Mukhání. Certain
eulogies of Ibn al-Furát or of Ibn Múkála [q.v.]
seem out of place in an almost exclusively epigrammatic
output.

Ibn Bassám is besides the author of several works:
K. Abád b. Abu Rabí'a, which Ibn al-Nadim
considers this poet's best monograph and for which
Yákút gives the many sources; K. Abád b. al-Khuwá
Mundfridd al-shu'ardi, K. al-Mukhání. Certain
eulogies of Ibn al-Furát or of Ibn Múkála [q.v.]
seem out of place in an almost exclusively epigrammatic
output.

Ibn Bassám is besides the author of several works:
K. Abád b. Abu Rabí'a, which Ibn al-Nadim
considers this poet's best monograph and for which
Yákút gives the many sources; K. Abád b. al-Khuwá
Mundfridd al-shu'ardi, K. al-Mukhání. Certain
eulogies of Ibn al-Furát or of Ibn Múkála [q.v.]
seem out of place in an almost exclusively epigrammatic
output.

Ibn Bassám is besides the author of several works:
K. Abád b. Abu Rabí'a, which Ibn al-Nadim
considers this poet's best monograph and for which
Yákút gives the many sources; K. Abád b. al-Khuwá
Mundfridd al-shu'ardi, K. al-Mukhání. Certain
eulogies of Ibn al-Furát or of Ibn Múkála [q.v.]
seem out of place in an almost exclusively epigrammatic
output.

Ibn Bassám is besides the author of several works:
K. Abád b. Abu Rabí'a, which Ibn al-Nadim
considers this poet's best monograph and for which
Yákút gives the many sources; K. Abád b. al-Khuwá
Mundfridd al-shu'ardi, K. al-Mukhání. Certain
eulogies of Ibn al-Furát or of Ibn Múkála [q.v.]
seem out of place in an almost exclusively epigrammatic
output.

Ibn Bassám is besides the author of several works:
K. Abád b. Abu Rabí'a, which Ibn al-Nadim
considers this poet's best monograph and for which
Yákút gives the many sources; K. Abád b. al-Khuwá
Mundfridd al-shu'ardi, K. al-Mukhání. Certain
eulogies of Ibn al-Furát or of Ibn Múkála [q.v.]
seem out of place in an almost exclusively epigrammatic
output.

Ibn Bassám is besides the author of several works:
K. Abád b. Abu Rabí'a, which Ibn al-Nadim
considers this poet's best monograph and for which
Yákút gives the many sources; K. Abád b. al-Khuwá
Mundfridd al-shu'ardi, K. al-Mukhání. Certain
eulogies of Ibn al-Furát or of Ibn Múkála [q.v.]
seem out of place in an almost exclusively epigrammatic
output.

Ibn Bassám is besides the author of several works:
K. Abád b. Abu Rabí'a, which Ibn al-Nadim
considers this poet's best monograph and for which
Yákút gives the many sources; K. Abád b. al-Khuwá
Mundfridd al-shu'ardi, K. al-Mukhání. Certain
eulogies of Ibn al-Furát or of Ibn Múkála [q.v.]
seem out of place in an almost exclusively epigrammatic
output.
IBN BATTA — IBN BAT'TÔTA
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became the friend of Abu Bakr al-AdJuri (d. s6o/
970), the author of the famous Kitab al-Shari'a
(Cairo 1369/1950), and went on several other
journeys in 12th (in particular in Bastra), in the border regions between
the Islamic countries and the Byzantine Empire, and
also in Damascus, where he was anxious to meditate
at the tomb of Abû Sâlih (d. 330/942), the founder of
a mosque situated outside the Bâb Sha'riq (cf.
Biday'a, xi, 204-5). When he was about forty—thus
about ten years after the arrival of the Buyids in
Baghdad (334/945)—Ibn Battûta returned to his
native town, where, until his death on 10 Muharram
387/23 January 997, he led a secluded life, devoted,
it is said, to fasting, meditation and study.
Ibn Battûta wrote several works, listed by the bâdi'
Abû l-Husayn (d. 526/1132) in his Tabâkât (ii, 152).
The two most important, which were to have the
greatest influence, were his two professions of faith:
his ta'âhid in the shorter version, the Ibâna saghi'a,
which has survived, and the Ibâna, the text
of which appears to be lost, but of which much use
was made by the bâdi' Abû Ya'âqîb al-Farrâ'î (d. 458/
1066) and Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328). Apart from
these two professions of faith, of salafi type, Ibn
Battûta's other works deal mainly with jihâd
and the great tradition of Hanbali polemic
which was practised, during the century
following the death of the founder of the school, by
the shaykh 'Abd Allâh Muhammad B. Muhammad
B. Muhammad B. Ibrahim B. Yûsuf al-Lâwati al-Tâjî,
Mohriş traveller born at Tangier on 17 Radjab 720/
February 1326, died in Morocco in 779/1375-6;
many lengthy journeys which make him one of the
world's most famous travellers (giâwûdula) and
authors of travel-books (rikûa).

The chronology of his journeys may, in spite of
some uncertainties of detail, be set out as follows:
(1) Departure from Tangiers 2 Radjab 725/13 June
1325; North Africa; Egypt; Upper Egypt; Syria;
departure from Damascus for Mecca in Shawwal
726/September 1326. (2) Departure from Mecca
20 Dhul-Hijjah 726/November 1326; 'Irâk,
Khuzistân, Fârs and Dîjabîr; Tabriz; Baghâd, Sâmarrâ,
Mosul, return to Baghâd; a stay in Arabia
(with three Pilgrimages) from 727/1327 to 730/1330.
(3) Red Sea, Yemen, Aden, Zayla', Mogadishu
and the trading ports of East Africa; return by
'Umân and the Persian Gulf; a further Pilgrimage in 732/
1332. (4) Egypt, Syria; Asia Minor and the terri-
itories of the Golden Horde; visit to Constantinopole
and return to the territories of the Golden Horde;
Transoxania and Afghanistan; arrival in the valley
of the Indus on 1 Muharram 734/12 September 1333;
stay at Delhi until Safar 743/July 1342. (5) Stay of
a year and a half in the Maldives; Ceylon and a second
visit to the Maldives, Bengal, Assâm, Sumatra;
arrival at the Chinese port of Zaytun: Ts'ui-an-chou
(it is not certain if he noted this on his return from
Peking). (6) Return by Sumatra and Malabar
(Mubarram 748/April-May 1347); the Persian Gulf,
Baghâd, Syria, Egypt; a further Pilgrimage. (7)
Egypt, Alexandria; embarked in Safar 750/April-
May 1349 for Tunis; thence reached Sardinia in a
Catalan ship; return by Algeria; arrival at Fez at
the end of Sha'ban 750/November 1349; visit to
the kingdom of Granada and return to Morocco.
(8) Departure from Sidjilmasa at the beginning
of Mubarram 753/February 1352; journey across the
Sahara; the country of the Niger; return to Sidjil-
masa in Dhul-1-Ka'da 754/December 1353.

This chronology suffices to demonstrate the new
dimensions which Ibn Bat'tûta gave to the genre
of rikûa. Originating from the West, among Spaniards
or Maghribis who were curious to take note, while
making the Pilgrimage, of the countries and the
customs of the East (which had for long been regarded
as the source of knowledge and the model of civiliza-
tion), the traditional rikûa was centred round the
visit to the Holy Places of Arabia. Although Ibn
Bat'tûta, especially in the beginnings of his work,
conforms to this usage, by degrees the extent of
his journeys finally blurs the initial object and raises
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the _Rīḥa_ to become in fact a description of the known world.

The documentary value of the _Rīḥa_ is closely linked to the history of its text, which was written down not by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa himself, but by a scholar, Ibn Dūzayy (q.v.), commissioned by the Marinid ruler of the time, Abū ʾIbnān. The writing of it, from Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's dictation, was completed on 3 Dhū ʿl-Ḥijja 726/9 December 1327, and the definitive text appeared a few months afterwards, under the title of _Tuhfah al-musūr fi qawādīl al-umār wa-ṣallīl al-asfār_. So far as can be judged, the literary formation of the _Rīḥa_ proceeded, with Ibn Dūzayy's guidance, from a threefold source.

Ibn Dūzayy's editing inevitably altered in some degree the original aspect of the work; in it are found descriptions which are pertinent, sober and sometimes succinct to the point of dryness, side by side with high-flown passages whose aim is less to give objective information than to produce stylistic exercises on "marvels" such as were then in favour with the educated public. The predilection for unusual details, characteristic of the 'iydn, is here viscerally expressed. The account on his own travels, around which he builds his professional and even his family life, he goes further than Ibn Djubayr, and, in a general way, by his famous predecessor, the vizier Ibn Mukla (Cambridge [Hakluyt Society] 1958-62, vols. 2, in progress).

One outstanding example of his work surviving), a calligrapher of the Buwayhid period who died in 413/1022 (this date is more probable than 423/1031). He frequented the governmental circles of the period, as he was closely attached to the vizier Fakhr al-Mulk Abu Ghalib Muhammad b. Khafid, Tehran 1958; German translations, cf. Brockelmann (cited below in Bibli.).


IBN AL-BAWWĀB, Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Ḥillāl, known also under the name of Ibn al-Sitrī, famous calligrapher of the Buwayhid period who died in Baghdād in 413/1022 (this date is more probable than 423/1031). He frequented the governmental circles of the period, as he was closely attached to the vizier Fakhr al-Mulk Abu Ḥablā Muḥammad b. Ḥilāl at Baghdād and was for some time in charge of the library of the Buwayhid Bahāʾ al-Dawla at Ṣhirāz. He was also an illuminator (at least one outstanding example of his work surviving), a devout man who knew the Qurʾān by heart and is said to have reproduced sixty-four copies of it, and a man of letters who was well versed in the law and who wrote a treatise and a didactic poem on the art of writing. His real title to fame, however, according to the early Arab authors, was to have perfected the style of writing invented, about a century earlier, by his famous predecessor, the vizier Ibn Mukla (q.v.) and to have brought it to a degree of well-balanced elegance which was to be surpassed later only by the efforts of Yāḥyā al-Mustasʿāmī (q.v.). The "well-proportioned script" (al-khāṭṭ al-mansūb)
which he thus made famous in such a remarkable way, and whose basic geometric outlines R. Robertson and N. Abbott have tried to reconstitute by means of a system of theoretical measurement of the letters described in later treatises on calligraphy, has given rise to many different interpretations—particularly since its title itself means perhaps nothing more than "five script". It nevertheless seems likely that we are today in a position to evaluate the calligraphy of Ibn Bawwāb through the unique example of it in a Kur'ān in the Chester Beatty Library (MS K. 16), signed by Ibn Bawwāb and dated 591/1208, whose calligraphy is as splendid as its illuminations. The type of naskhī used in this work, as well as the style of its geometric and floral decorations, form the subject of a long study by D. S. Rice, The unique Ibn al-Bawwāb manuscript in the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin 1955. On his school, see C. Huart, Les calligraphes et les miniaturistes de l’Orient musulman, Paris 1906, 80-4. (J. SOURDEL-THEMINE)

IBN AL-BAYTAR, ABU MUHAMMAD ‘ABD ALLAH B. AHMAD AL-DIN B. AL-BAYTAR AL-MALAKI, botanist and pharmacologist, born in Malaga at the end of the 6th/12th century. He probably belonged to the family of the same name whose existence in Malaga is attested by Ibn al-‘Abbār (Ma‘lūm, nos. 35, 165, 241). He studied in Seville and collected plants in the districts round the town with his teachers Abu ‘l-‘Abbās al-Nabātī, ‘Abī ‘Abbār b. Sāliḥ and Abu ‘l-Hādījī. In about 617/1220 he emigrated to the East: after crossing North Africa (Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia), he visited Asia Minor and Syria and, on his arrival in Egypt, he was appointed by the Ayyūbīd al-Malik al-Kāmil as head of the herbalists (rūṭs ʿālāt al-qahāḥīn). From Cairo he carried out several scientific expeditions; he next settled in Damascus, where his pupil was Ibn al-‘Abbārīfī, with whom he collected plants. He died there in 646/1248.

His main works are: (a) al-Maṣbūhī fī ‘l-ṣaḥīfa al-muṣafada, dedicated to the Malikī al-Sāliḥ Nāṣir al-Din Ayyūbī, in which he gives the appropriate simples for each illness. (b) al-Dījāmī fī muṣafādat al-ṣaḥīha wa ‘l-qahāḥīa, with the same dedication (printed Cairo 1351/1874; good Fr. tr. by L. Ledec in Notices et extraits, xxiii, xviii and xvi (1877-8); German tr. by J. von Söntgen, Stuttgart 1840-2). In this work the author lists in alphabetical order some 1400 simples, animal, vegetable and mineral, basing it on his own observations and also on over 250 authorities including al-Rāzī, Ibn Sinā, al-Ǧāfīkī and al-Ǧāḥfikī. Meyendorf and Sobhy (The abridged version of the book of simple drugs of... al-Ǧāfīqī by Gregorius Abu-Farag [Barhebræus], Cairo, fasc. I (1931), 52-3) consider that the Dījāmī of Ibn al-Baytār is merely plagiarized from the pharmacopoeia of al-Ǧāḥfikī with the addition of material obtained from the works of his teachers. Apart from this doubtful statement (particularly since the mediaeval idea of intellectual honesty was different from that of today), it should be mentioned that, of the total number of simples studied, about a thousand were already known to Greek authors. This work had considerable influence both outside and within the Islamic world, for example on the Armenian Amir Dowlat (3) Maṭla al-tabībī (4) Risāla fī ‘l-aghāḥīya wa ‘l-ṣaḥīha by Maṭla al-Tabībī (5) Maṭla fī ‘l-ṣaḥīha. In commentary on Dioscorides, of which a manuscript has been found and which contains a list of 550 drugs which appear in the first four books of Dioscorides; the technical terms are frequently accompanied by their Latin and Berber equivalents (see MĀMA, iii2 (1957), 120-12).

Bibliography: Ibn Abī Usayfīfī, ed. Müller, ii, 133; the other Arabic sources are listed by Zirīkī, Maqāma, iv, 192; Brockelmann, I, 492, S 1, 896; Sarton, Introduction, ii, 683; Wustenfeld, Arab. Aerzte, no. 231; Fr. R. Dietz, Analecta medica..., i: Elencus materiae medicae Ibn Batikarīs... pars prima (Leipzig 1883); L. Leclerc, Études historiques et philologiques sur Ébu Bekthar, in JàA, 1862, 433-59; idem, Histo. de la médecine arabe, ii, 255; or the translation by Southeimer, see R. Dozy in ZDMG, xxiii, 183-200; R. Basset, Les noms berbères des plantes dans le traité des simples d’Ébu Bekthar, in Génralle Sci. As. It., xi (1891), 53-66; E. Sickenberger, Les plantes médicinales d’Ébu Bekthar, in BIE, 2nd series, x (1890); A. Dietrich, Medicinae arabicae, no. 61, p. 147; Meyendorf, in al-Andalus, iii (1935), 31; C. Dubler, I. B. en armenio, in al-Andalus, xvi (1956), 125-30. (J. VERNEY)

IBN BIBI, AL-HUSAYN B. MUHAMMAD B. ‘ALI AL-DJAFARI AL-RUGHADJI, known by the name of Ibn al-Bibi al-Munaḍjīma (son of the "lady", the astrologer) or simply Ibn Bībī, is the author of al-Awāmir al-Ḏalīliyya fī ‘l-ulumi al-Ḏalīliyya, written in Persian, which was completed early in 680 A.H. (beg. 22 April 1281); it deals with the period from 582/1192 to 670/1210 and is an extremely important work for the history of the Seljūqs of Rūm in whose domains it was written. This work is neither a chronicle nor a pragmatic literary history in the usual sense. The author’s intention was, as he himself states in the introduction (cf. MS Aya Sofya 2985 [henceforward referred to as AS p. 11]), to hand down what he himself had heard and seen, in the literary style of the time. As a general part of Ibn Bībī’s work may therefore be classed as memoirs, which gain especial value from the facts that Ibn Bībī was Mālikī Dinān al-Taṭbāq at the court of the Rūm-Seljūqs, and in effect head of the chancellorry of the Secretariat of State (cf. Muhāṣṣar [see below], 2 and 196), and that his father, Maḏjī al-Dīn Muhammad Taḏǧūm (Ṣūṭṭān Walad in a ḍarīda refers to him as Maḏjī al-Dīn al-Ṣāliḥ b. Maḏjī, see Dinān Sulaym Viel), ed. F. Nal’s Ushak, Ankara 1947, 144, no. 240), was for a long time at the court of Djelal al-Dīn Khurramshāh as Mawṣūl, from 631/1233-4 worked as Secretary in the Seljūq chancellery at Konya and was sent on a number of diplomatic missions (see AS, 485, 485, 487). Practically all that is known of Ibn Bībī’s life is what he himself relates about it in his work (cf. AS, 20, 442-3, Muḥāṣṣar, vii B. and 196-9). The exact date of his death is not known, yet it seems certain that he must have been still alive in the months between Shāb ‘Alān 68/November 1284 and Shāshwalī 68b/ December 1285 (cf. H. W. Duda, Zur Geschichtsforschung über die Rūm-Seldschuken, in ZDMG, lxxxix (1935) p. 29 sq. 1). Ibn Bībī’s mother, who
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belonged to a distinguished family from Nişapur, was highly skilled in astrology and a considerable authority on this subject. She was no longer alive in the last months of 679/early 681. His father, who came of a prominent family of Diyarbakr, died in Sha'bân 679/March 1282 at an advanced age. In 682/1283, when Djalâl ad-Dîn Khâzânî's power was waning, Ibn Bibî's parents had moved to the court of the Ayyûbîd Malik al-Asghar Muşaffar ad-Dîn Mûsâ at Damascus, whence they were invited to Konya by the Rûm-Seldûk sultan 'Alâ ad-Dîn Kaykûbât I, who had heard of the exceptional ability of Ibn Bibî's mother.

Ibn Bibî's work is preserved in three forms:

1. The above-mentioned original work—the Aya Sefîya manuscript as written for the Seldûk sultan Ghûthây ad-Dîn Kaykûhwarî 111. For details of the facsimile edition of this manuscript and of the first volume of a printed edition, see Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Sous Pernas 1356, apparently of the 9th/10th century) by M. Th. Houtsmans as Recueil, iv, 1902 [see Bibliog.]

2. A paraphrase into Turkish, with occasional omissions and interpolations, of the original work al-Anwâr u's-Sâlihât by Yaţ difícî. Allî in the third section of his Otgûnênâmeh, often called also Selûchêmâmeh, which he composed for the Ottoman sultan Murad II in 857/1453-4 or 858/1454-5 (for the date see H. W. Duda, Ziertenschildiche islamische Quellen und das Ogûnênâmeh des Jasîbî. Allî zur angeblichen türkischen Besiedelung der Dobrudja im 13. Jhdt. n. Chr., in the Spässische of the Bulgarian Academy, 12/2 (Sozda 1943), xx, 253-260). For a modern translation of this manuscript, see P. Wittke, Miscellanea, in T. M. xiv (1965), 263 ff. There are a number of more or less complete manuscripts of this Otgûnênâmeh of Yaţ difícî. Allî in the libraries of Ankara, Berlin, Istanbul, Leiden, Leiningrad, Moscow and Paris (cf. Adnan S. Ersat in his introduction to the manuscript of P. Wittke in Igl. xx, 1932), 202. An edition by M. Th. Houtsmans (Recueil, iii, see Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Natural sciences, see 61a) of Yaţ difícî. Allî's translation. This contains only about half of the section devoted to the Selûchêmâmeh of Asia Minor. There is also an epitome of the Otgûnênâmeh as by Seyyid Lîûmîn, see Lîûmîn in 1900; the unique manuscript is in the Austrian National Library. It is a complete German translation, with commentary, of Ibn Bibî's Muşaffar ad-Dîn Kaykûbât I, 1887, 1888. (The manuscript has been supplemented on the basis of Ms. Aya Sefîya 2955 and the Otgûnênâmeh (Houtsmans, Recueil, iii, controlled by the manuscript of the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, Orient Quart 1823).

3. A translation into Persian, by an anonymous epigrapher while Ibn Bibî was still alive, between Sha'bân 683/October 1284 and Shawwâl 684/December 1285, which omits a great part of the rhetorical padding of the original work and leaves out mention of Jîwânî. This epitome was edited from the manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Sous Pernas 1356, apparently of the 9th/10th century) by M. Th. Houtsmans as Recueil, iv, 1902 [see Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris].

The sources, which mention no work by Ibn Bibî, are unanimous in attributing to him three merits: (1) the transmission of the famous dictionary al-Sîbîl of al-Dîwânî (which he received from his master İsmîl b. Muhammed b. Nişâbûrî) to his pupil Ibn al-Keştâ (1920), who is said to have helped to circulate the work in Egypt; (2) the translation, to the survival of the poetic tradition of al-Mutanabbi (in which he had been initiated by his master Şâhî b. Rûshdîn) in Sicily, where the name of the panegyrist of Sâyf al-Dâwî dated from the immigration into the island in (579/1184) of 418 b. Hâmza al-Başîr, râdî al-Mutanabbi; (3) the revision of the Talbîb al-lisan wa-talbîb al-làsîn, a work of Sičo-Maghribi dialectology compiled by his pupil Abû aţâf Umar b. Makki [see Ibn Makki].

Bibliography: To the sources indicated in U. Rizzolino, Notizie bio-bibliografiche su Ibn al-Qâṭûf il "siciliano", in Rend. Lin., 18/5-6 (1954), 260-70 and 282-1; and, Un commento di Ibn al-Qâṭûf il "siciliano" ad alcuni versi di al-Mutanabbi, in RSO, xxx (1955), 208-9; idem, Il talbîb al-lisan wa-talbîb al-làsîn di Abû Hâfîs Umar b. Makki, in Studia Orientalia (of the Centro di Studi Orientali della Custodia Francescana di Terra Santa), Cairo, l (1956), 194-207, should be added the information, particularly from the Takmîla of Ibn Abbâr,
which is found in Ihsan Al-Abbâs, Al-’Arab fi Sihhâya, Cairo 1595, 599-600.

IBN AL-BIRZALI [see IBN AL-BIRZALI].

IBN BISHR, [see UQUMAN B. ABD ALLAH].

IBN AL-BITRÎ [see IBN-AL-BITRIS].

IBN BULHUL, AHMAD B. ISM'Â B. AL-BULHUL AL-TAMÂCUL, born in 252/866 and died at Baghdad in 318/930, was primarily a Hanafi fakî. Trained in the doctrines of his master, Muhammad b. his father and Ibrahim b. Sa'id al-Djawhari, he received also a very careful education in the fields of philosophy and of belles-lettres. He followed, in grammar, the school of Kufa and had the reputation of being a judicious critic of poetry and of adaab. Appointed in 276/889 by the regent al-Muwaffak, during the caliphate of al-Mutamid (275/889-902), and on the advice of Ismâ'îl al-Bulbuli, fakî of Anbar, Hit and of the districts of the Euphrates, Ibn Bulhul then remained in the service of al-Mutâdil (279-85/892-902), the son of the Muwaffak. Al-Mutâdi (289/95-902-8) appointed him, in 292/904-5, kâtîb of the Djihâl. At the beginning of this period, which the reign of al-Muktadir (295-299/908-32), Ibn Bulhul, who had not yet taken up his new post, would have nothing to do with the plot of Ibn Mu'tazz's supporters against the new caliph in 296/909. 'Abû b. al-Furat, who then succeeded to the vizierate (296-909-12), appointed him kâtîb at Madinat al-Mansûr and, in 298/912, entrusted him in addition with the kadât of al-Ahwâz. Without the help of the kadât 'Ihâmî, Ibn Bulhul seems to have enjoyed all the prestige and the prerogatives of this post. The latter retained his offices throughout the reign of al-Muktadir, until 327/940.

Ibn Bulhul, who thus in the service of several caliphs and viziers, appears as a man of great independence of character. He refused to annul, at the request of the mother of al-Muktadir, a marriage to which she had been inclined; he was also, while having served Ibh Al-Furat, to survive his disgrace and to defend him under Hâmid b. Al-Abbâs (306-11/918-23), and later to defend also 'Abî b. Isâ during the third vizierate of Ibn al-Furat (312-23/923-4), when the Karmaî policy of the "good viziers" was called into question.


[HA. LAUZ].

IBN BUKAYLA, 'ABD AL-MASIH B. 'AMR B. KAYN B. HAYVÂN B. BUKAYLA AL-GRASÂNÎ, legendary character who is supposed to have lived for 350 years (only 320 according to al-Ishbîlî, Mustatrâ, ii, 44 and 45) and thus place among the mu'ammarân [q.v.]. The name of his ancestor, who is credited with the construction of al-Kasar al-abdî al-Hira, is often corrupted to Nufayla, but the correct reading is furnished by the tradition according to which this Bukayla owed his surname to a great silk garment, which was the reason for his nickname of "little cabbage".

It is possible that Ibn Bukayla was an historical person; no historian has cast doubt on this, and some Banû Bukayla are mentioned at al-Hira by al-Ya'qûbi. However, the traditions relating to him have, in addition to his longevity, many legendary characteristics. The strangest tradition is that which associates 'Abd al-Masîh b. Bukayla with the Durhum [q.v.] and according to which 'Abd Allah b. Dur'dân [q.v.] discovered his body in a catacomb near Mecca. This tradition is related by al-Hamdânî (384, vii, 163 ff.), who states elsewhere (231) on the authority of Ibn al-Kâbi that the body of Ibn Bukayla was discovered lying on a marble plinth in a catacomb reported this time as being close to al-Hira. Elsewhere this character plays a part in two other traditions of Islamic origin. According to the first, he was sent by Parvis II (Arabian War) to the soothsayer Satîr [q.v.], who was related to him in the female line (†), to question him on the meaning of certain supernatural phenomena (dream of the grand mubâk, shock to the Iwân etc.), which were interpreted as announcing the imminent coming of a prophet (see R. Basset, Le Bordel du Cherikh al-Bouari, Paris 1894, 59-62). The second of these traditions relates that when Khalîl b. al-Walid [q.v.] was besieging al-Hira, he was attacked with projectiles of burning material and then asked the townspeople to send him a mature and experienced man for him to question on their situation. 'Abd al-Masîh was therefore sent before Khalîl, whose questions, however, he took in a different sense from that intended by the general. Ibn Bukayla's answers are similar to those found in folk-stories (see M. Tarnayon and Raynau, Recueil des fabliaux, Paris 1877-88, ii, 52). For example, the question, "The son of how many are you?", meaning, "How old are you?", was answered by "The son of only one man." Afterwards he made as if to poison himself, but Khalîl took the poison from his hands and swallowed it without suffering the least inconvenience. This caused Ibn Bukayla to advise his countrymen not to resist the Arab general any further. In one of his replies the old man declared that at one time the sea reached as far as the outskirts of al-Hira, and al-Masîdî uses this to support his thesis on the movement of seas and continents, apparently convinced of the truth of such a tradition.

Finally, although 'Abd al-Masîh was not converted to Islam, it is he at least who is said to have pointed out to Sa'd b. Abî Wâkîs [q.v.] a suitable site for the foundation of Kufa.

Biography: Abu Hâtim al-Sijistânî, K. al-Mu'ammarî, ed. I. Goldzieher, in Abhandl. zur arab. Philologie, ii, 38; Tabari, i, 981-4; Balâdhûrî, Futûh, 243, 276; Ya'qûbî, Historie, ii, 6; idem, Bâdî, trans. Wiet, 87; Dahîb, Tarbî, index; idem, Baydân, ii, 57; al-Masîdî, Muhammad, i, 217-9, ii, 228; idem, Tabrî, ed. Sâlihi, 310; Ibn 'Abd Rabîbî, 'Ibîd, index; Murtadâ, Annals, i, 188; Ibn Durayd, Fihrist, 285; Makdisî, Cehûr, v, 176; Zakî, B. Hamdânî, Hâdîth, viii, ed. N. A. Fâris, 153, 163, 165; Ibn Khalîlûn, Fâlûmovèmes, i, 224, ii, 207; Tr. Rosenbuhl, 129, ii, 202; Maçrî, ed. Wiet, ii, 55-7; Barbier de Meynard, Surnoms, 56; Caietani, Annals, ii, 935, iv, 657; R. Basset, Tibetan Codex, ii, 213-6 (G. Pellat).

IBN BULHUL [see ISM'Â B. BULHUL].

IBN BURD [see BAHSARI B. BURD].

IBN BURD, name of the members of an Andalusian family (the Banû Burd), of which two representatives in particular enjoy some fame.

I.-IBN BURD AL-QARAB, Abû Hašîb Ahmâd, was head of the Chancellery (dawân al-tâbît) under al-Mu'âzrafter the arrest and execution of Abû Marwan al-Mašîk b. Idrîs al-Djarîlî in 394/1004: with the chief kâtîb Ibn Dhukranî [q.v.], he paved the way for the recognition of Sancholelo in 395/1005. Ibn al-Akrâm ibn al-Arîm [q.v.] was heir presumptive to the caliphate, and it was he who drew up the act of investiture dated Rabî' 1 399 (November 1008); along with other dignitaries, he provided a deputy for Sancholelo during the latter's absence, then, having
taken up office once again during the reign of al-Musta'in, he was appointed khitab during the caliphate of Yalây b. 'Ali, became a minister in the cabinet formed by al-Mustaghfir (441/1052), retired to Saragossa shortly before 417/1026 and died there in 418/1027, more than 80 years of age. Thanks to his perfect mastery of the office of khitab and to his political prudence he was able to live through a troubled period in the history of Andalusia without mishap. According to Ibn Bassâm (Dhakhira, i/1, 84 ff.), there existed a diwân containing all his correspondence, with which the author of the Dhakhira has given some well chosen extracts; other specimens of his writing can be found in nearly all the sources dealing with this period. Not only do they show the characteristics of his prose and his talents as head of the Chancellery, but they are also indispensable documents for the study of the history and politics of the time. Unlike the majority of the khitâb of his day, Ibn Burd al-Akbar is strikingly clear, precise and always to the point. His style is elegant, sober and flowing; he never uses out-of-the-way words and avoids the pedantic expressions so dear to his contemporaries; sa'dî is even used with such skill that it hardly attracts one's attention. It should be observed that, in spite of the troubled times in which he worked, he was anxious to maintain the technical tradition of the Chancellery of the caliphs, insisting on the perfection with which official documents should be written and assigning great importance to paper, ink, writing, the address and its position, etc. In this respect he was the last Andalusian master of the Chancellery to keep up the great traditions of the Spanish Umayyads.


**IBN BURD AL-ASGHAR**  
Ahmad b. Muhammad, grandson of the above, Andalusian author and poet of the first half of the 10th/11th century. Born about 395/1005 at Cordova, he died at Almeria in 445/1054. His father, Abu l-†-`Abbâs Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Burd, had remained almost unknown, and it was the grandson who revived the tradition of Ibn Burd al-Akbar. It is highly probable that he left Cordova for Saragossa with his grandfather, shortly before 417/1026; after the death of the latter he went to Denia where he was employed in the chancellery of Muğhâlîd (q.v.), but cannot have remained there for long, for he was at Cordova again in 426/1035, pronounced the funeral prayer at the grave of Ibn 'Shuhayd (the Banû Burd were masâdîl of the Banû 'Shuhayd). The following year, 427/1036, his name is quoted by Ibn 'Ishârî as the author of a document proclaiming the reappearance of Highâm II al-†-Mû'ayyad brought about by the astute Muḥammad b. Ismâ'il al-'Abbâd b. ‘Abdul-Qadir al-Afûsî in the service of Ma'n b. Šumâdîb whose reign began in 433/1041, and he remained there till his death in 445/1054.  
Ahmad Ibn Burd al-Asghar was a prolific poet and writer whose art is known to us thanks once again to Ibn Bassâm. His poetry is like that of most of his contemporaries, but his prose is different, for it follows the example, on the one hand, of his grand- 
father, and on the other, of Ibn 'Shuhayd. Ibn Bassâm quotes long passages from his works: Sirr al-adâb wa-ka'b ibn 'Abdul–Qadir (i/2, 41 ff.); Risâlât Ibn Burd, wa-l-†-kalam (i/2, 435 ff.); and al-Risâlât al-bâdîs fi tafsîl wkab al-†-šâd 'allad mân yu'farasâh min al-†-wâdp (i/2, 446 ff.), besides a brief essay on the palm tree, Risâlât fi 'l-nâjâh (i/2, 441 ff.). The first of these texts is an unsuccessful imitation of the Kitâb al-†-kâlîk wa l-†-stîyar of Ibn Hazm, in which Ibn Burd tries to give specimens of his writings on different subjects; the second is a dialogue between the sword and the pen, the two adversaries which he handles in giving the debate a faintly dramatic aspect; but he does not carry the comparison beyond the external merits of the two antagonists; the last two are ordinary essays with dialogues interspersed. Yàkût attributes two books to him: al-Tâfiî al-tâfîrî entered al-†-Kurâ'dîn and al-Tâfiî al-tâfîrî entered al-†-Kurâ'dîn, but we know nothing of what these were like.


**IBN BULTÁN**  
AL-MUKHTÀR (or Yuwânîs = Johannes) b. al-Ḥasan b. Abdûn b. Sa'dûn b. Bulán, a Christian physician and theologian of Bagdad. He was the foremost disciple of the Christian priest, physician and physician, Ibn al-Tâsyîb (q.v.), and Ibn Bultan himself was certainly a Nestorian cleric and probably a priest. He was a master of Greek medicine and philosophy, "Ibn Burdûn was the more gracious in style, more spirited and more distinguished in literature and subjects connected with it" (Ibn Aby Ūsayîbî). After a stay in Cairo of three or four years, he went to Constantinople where he arrived in the summer of 446/1054; his arrival there coincided with the crisis which led to the schism between the Greek and the Latin Church, and the Patriarch, Michael Cerularius, asked Ibn
Butlan to compose for him a treatise on the doctrine of the Eucharist, and in particular on the controversial point of the use of unleavened bread. Ibn Butlan stayed in Constantinople for one year Ibn Butlan then returned to Syria, alternating between Aleppo and Antioch; he was for some time in the service of Abu 'l-Mutawwadi Mu'addal b. Nasr b. Munkidh (d. 450/1059), the great-grandfather of Usama b. Munkidh [q.v.]; in 455/1063 we find him supervising the building of a hospital in Antioch and at the same time engaged in literary work. Finally he became a monk and retired to a monastery in Antioch; he died on 8 Šawwal 458/September 1066 and was buried in the church of the monastery. The literary production of Ibn Butlan is distinguished by its originality. (1) His main work is the Tahsin al-sikha, a synopsis of hygiene and macrobiotics in the form of tables, an arrangement borrowed from works of astronomy, al-Qaṣzáli in the preface of his Ihyā' refers to it as his precedent for using another arrangement familiar to the readers from another branch of learning, and it served as a model for the Sāliḥ al-malāḥī fī tadārīr al-mamālīk, a "mirror for princes" by Ibn Abī l-Rabi'ī (wrote 655/1256; cf. G. Richter, Fürstenspiegel, 3, 1937, 206, n. 3; Brockelmann, I, 230; S I, 372; M. Plessner, Ökonomikos, 30-55). It was translated into Latin with the title I hustiunum sanitatis Elucidem Einleitend, Mediz in baldath, (Ibn Butlan), 56-62, ed. H. Richter, 1891, and into German, by Michael Herr, with the title Schachtafel der Gesundheit, Strassburg 1533; see E. Wickersheimer, Les Taucini sanitatis et leur traduction allemande par Michel Herr, in Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance, xii (1950), 85-97.

Facsimile editions of MSS of the Latin translation: I hustuiniunum Sanitatis, by Elena Berti Tosca, Paris 1937, and Theatrum Sanitatis, by L. Serra and S. Baglioni, 2 vols., 1940; see also Unity and Variety in Muslim Civilization, ed. G. E. von Grunebaum, Chicago 1955, 363 f. Another Latin treatise of hygiene is based on this work (see Brockelmann). (2) Add to the manuscripts mentioned by Brockelmann: Brit. Museum, Add. 3676; London, Royal College of Physicians, see Triton in JRAFS, 1957, 385, No. 24. On the title, see Thomä, Zeitgesch. Mittelalter, iii, 294-315; Ibn Abī Usaybi'ā and by Brockelmann. (The title Tahsin al-sikha, "The Medical Dinner Party", was dedicated to Nasr al-Dawla Ahmad b. Marwān, the Marwānid ruler of Mayyafārīkīn (401/1010-453/1060; Zambaur, p. 136), a witty skit on quacks, their ignorance and arrogance, with remarks on the ethics of the medical profession. A commentary by a Christian author of Baghdad dates from the 6th/12th century. Edition of the text, by Dr. Bīghāra zalal, Alexandria 1901; study with summary in French, by Dr. Mahmoud Sedaky Bey, Un banquet de médecins, Cairo 1928; on the miniatures in an illuminated manuscript of the Ambrosiana, dated 672/1273, (not mentioned by Brockelmann), see Dr. Djamal al-Din Muḥrīz, Min al-taṣāwir al-mamālīk: mushka min Da'wat al-attrb il-Butlan, in MIMA, vii (1961), 75-80, and R. Eitinghausen, Arab painting, 1962, 143 f. (Ibn Butlan's Da'wat al-husūs, "The Priests' Dinner Party", which was a counterpart to the Da'wat al-attrbā, has unfortunately not been preserved.) (3) Tadbīr al-amrād al-fāriḍa 'ala l-akhtār bi-l-igāz bīn al-māla'īs wa-l-adwiyah al-mamālīk yantaṣṣ fī biḥā ruḥbān al-adwiyah wa-man bā'da min al-madhima, a treatise on homely remedies, particularly for the benefit of monks, (4) Da'wat al-attrbā il-l-akhtār wa-l-adwiyah al-mamālīk, on how to buy slaves and how to detect bodily defects; extracts from the contents in Mez, Renaissance, 156-8; Spanish tr. by S. Vill, El Renacimiento del Islam, Madrid 1936, 204-7; Eng. tr., 160-2. (5) Two treatises directed against Khwāja Ahmad Qādīn [q.v.], dating from 441/1049-50, edited and translated by Schacht-Meyerhof, below; a third and final treatise, written after Ibn Butlan had left Cairo, and called Waq'at al-arjūbā, has not been preserved. (6) A report of Ibn Butlan, addressed at his request to the man of letters and minister, Hilāl al-Sābī [q.v.], on his journey from Baghdad to Cairo; it was incorporated in Muhammad b. Hilabī's Kitāb al-arjūbā, and considerable extracts have been preserved in the biography of Ibn al-Kīfīl and the Geographisches Wörterbuch of Yāḳūṭ. These were translated into English by G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Muslims, London 1890, 370-5, and from English into German by R. Röhrich, Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges, Innsbruck 1901, 242-6. This report contains most valuable descriptions of Aleppo, Antioch, Laodicea and other cities at the time of Ibn Butlan's visit. The treatise, together with other indications, shows the kind of society in which Ibn Butlan moved. (7) Ibn Butlan's "Treatise on the Eucharist", Maḥāl fi'l burkān al-mukaddas, hastily written in the summer of 466/1074; extracts in text and translation by G. Graf, Oriens Christianus, xxxv (1938), 46-70. (8) Quotations from his notes for an autobiography, Kitāb al-ikhtāṣār fī dhikr al-maṣābīh, are preserved in the manuscripts mentioned by Brockelmann: Ibn Butlan's last recorded work, on which he worked in 455/1063, is a Discourse, Maḥāla, "on the reason why the skilled physicians have changed the treatment of most diseases which were formerly treated with hot remedies, advising in their place a cooling treatment, e.g. for plegia, facial paralysis, paresis and others, and why they disagree with the rules laid down by the Ancients in compendiums (kunāmīq) and pharmacopoeias (ābrāqākhānā), and how this new system has gradually gained ground in 'Irāk and the neighbouring countries from the beginning of the year 377/988 down to the year 455"; Ibn Butlan refers to changes in climate and subsequent changes in vegetation; extracts have been preserved in the biographies of Ibn Uṣaybi'ā and of al-Ṭabbākh, who quotes Abū Dhārr al-Halabī. Ibn Butlan's refusal to follow slavishly the doctrines of the Ancients, notwithstanding his deep knowledge of them, also appears from his controversy with Ibn Rijwān. Further writings are mentioned by Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ā and by Brockelmann. (The 'Umud al-ikhtāṣār fī maṣābīh al-nahdā l-ḥa'il labīb, attributed to Ibn Butlan in one of the two known manuscripts [the other is anonymous], is in reality the work of an Andalusian botanist and pharmacologist of the 5th/11th or 6th/12th century; see M. Asin Palacios, Glosario de voces romances, Madrid and Granada 1943.)


(John Schacht)

**IBN DÂ'B, ABU 'L-WALÎD 'ISÂ B. YAZÎD B. BAKR B. DÂ'B AL-LÂYHY AL-MADÂNÎ, traditionist, poet, physician, and politician of Medina, who, after having been a schoolmaster, lived for a time at the court of al-Mahdi and later at that of al-Hâdî, from whom he received unusual favour, and died in 171/787. He owed his fame mainly to the anecdotes, which, albeit presented differently by his contemporaries, make him an ideal companion for important persons, in spite of his pride and his sometimes rather offhand attitude to the caliph, who seems to have overlooked all this impertinence. There is an anecdote which, albeit presented differently by various authors (see D. Sourdel, *Vitrât*, 123), shows that al-Hâdî had no hesitation in offering him considerable sums for a few well-chosen verses; in the field of the transmission of hadîths, of the historical traditions and of the works of the poets of the Hidjaz, Ibn Dabî was not very highly thought of; indeed, although such writers as al-Dâbîjî (though he does express doubts in *Bighdl*, § 14), Ibn Kutayba or Ibn Sallâm see no harm in reproducing traditions on his authority, Khalîf al-Ahmâr and other transmitters accuse him of inventing hadîths; furthermore, Abâ 'Amr ibn al-'Alî points out numerous mistakes in the poems which he transmitted, while others consider that he invented âhkâm concerning the Arabs. These accusations may be due in part to jealousy, but they may not have been entirely unfounded.

The name of Ibn Dabî usually refers to 'Isâ b. Yazîd, but many other members of his family are cited as transmitters of historical and genealogical traditions: his great-uncle Hujayyâ (Dabî, his father Yazîd b. Bakr, his brother Yahyâ b. Yazîd and his cousin Muḥammad b. Hujayyâ.


(John Schacht)

**IBN AL-DÂBABHI [see IBN AL-DUBAYTHI]**

**IBN DÂBBA [see YAZîD B. MIṣSAM]**

**IBN DÂNIYÂL, SHAMS AL-DÎN MUHAMMAD B. DÂNIYÂL B. YUSUF AL-KHUBA'î AL-MAWSILÎ, b. ca. 649/1252, d. 710/1310, Arab writer in Egypt. Born in Mawsil; from the age of 19, he lived in Cairo, studying and practising ophthalmology. In literary and colloquial Arabic poetry and versified prose, he wrote some of the earliest shadow-plays in mediaeval Egypt. He apparently composed some Arabic poems too, but he is mainly memorable for the keen observation reflected in his dramatic works. All three plays were actually intended for production, and the manuscripts were most probably intended to serve as guides rather than as binding texts; the producer could, and did, depart from them.

The three plays are: (1) *Tâyîf al-khâ'yâl* (The shadow of imagination) relates the story of Wâgil, an erstwhile soldier, ensnared by the wiles of a matchmaker. The comic element is provided by his frustration, when he lifts the bride's veil after the wedding-ceremony, and discovers that she is a monster, in everything the opposite of the matchmaker's promises; (2) *'Adîjî wa-Ghârib* ('Adîjî and Ghârib) lacks a plot and is a parade of characters, common in the market-place, plying their odd or debased trade—money-lenders, quacks, reapers, animal-gamers, and performers; the play is named after two quick-witted rogues who appear at its start; (3) *Al-Mutayyâm* (The Enamoured) presents a succession of prizefights of cocks, rams and bulls, accompanied by comments and music, and loosely connected by a thin plot: al-Mutayyâm and his rival-in-love initiate these prize-fights; and, at the play's end, a party is thrown open to all sorts of pathological characters, who come to feast on a slain bull.

While Ibn Dâniyâl's first play is a farce, the other two are comedies of manners. Ridicule is achieved by contrast, slapstick and obscenity. Lip-service to morals is paid to a limited extent in the second play (in a special ending), and more so in the epilogues of the first (the disappointed bridegroom decides on a pilgrimage to the Hîdâl, to atone for his sins) and of the third (the Angel of Death makes an appearance). However, the plays' main asset lies not in their plot or literary quality, but rather in their reflection of the times. They are a realist's description of mores in late 7th/13th century Egypt. Most mediaeval shadow-plays in Arabic were composed by the producers or their circle; Ibn Dâniyâl, however, was a physician by training and occupation, and it is an open question whether or not he incorporated into his plays earlier materials (owned by shadow-play producers), of which hardly anything is known today.


**IBN DARRÂDÎ AL-KÂSTALLÎ [see YAMÂN B. DâRRÂDÎ]**

**IBN DARRÂDÎ AL-KÂSTALLÎ, ANQIMAR AHMAD B. MUHAMMAD B. AL-'ÅŠÂ B. AHMAD B. SULAYMÂN, b. ca. 645/1248, b. in Egypt, a poet whose nisba derives from Kastallât Dârrâdî, a place which R. Blachère wishes to identify with Cazallâ or Castellar de Sanitsebán, in the province of Jaén. Born in Mâharrân 347/126
958, he belonged to a noble family of Sanhadja origin which had settled in Spain at the time of the Arab conquest. He seems to have had a daughter eight years old, was completely comfortable, a poem (no. 57) revealing to whom the third part of his Diwdn is dedicated.

In material matters his life appears to have been not appear to have found at the Hammudid court of the first Alid regime in Spain. Ibn Darradi, with Amirids, and serving as court poet to al-Mundhir c. i sympathies. However, he does time governed by Ali b. Hammud, the future founder of the chancellery which he had held at the court of the 'Amirids and to have become acquainted with literary circles in Cordova. Apart from this, nothing at all is known of his early life.

At the age of 35, he appeared as an already accomplished poet at the court of al-Mansûr Ibn Abí 'Amir in 382/992. The poem with which he introduced himself (see Diwn, no. 3), and which contains some details on his family life (for example that he had a daughter eight years old), was considered by the critics at the court to be too perfect to be by an inexperienced poet and some of them accused him of plagiarism. In order to test him, al-Mansûr summoned him during the night of Thursday 3 Shawwāl 382/1 December 992 and invited him to improvise a description of a tray of apples surrounded by jonquils; the poet then wrote (see Diwn, no. 140) and recited a poem (no. 150) in which he refuted the charges of plagiarism and claimed qualities as a poet and a prose-writer that entitled him to a position in the court. After this test Ibn Darradj's fortunes began to rise. Al-Mansûr rewarded him generously, had his name inscribed in the register of his official poets, and appointed him to a post in the Diwdn al-mu'jadā. For sixteen years he remained in the service of al-Mansûr and of his son 'Abd al-Malik al-Mu'azzama, this period corresponds to the zenith of the splendour of Muslim Spain and to a period of military and political power such as it was never to know again. Under the 'Amirid dictatorship, Ibn Darradj became the celebrator of the 'Amirids and their victories, the chronicler of their exploits and the most highly esteemed panegyrist of their court.

The assassination of 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abi 'Amir (q.v.) in 399/1008 and the beginning of the fitna inaugurated a new phase in his life. During the first four years he lived at Cordova; he foresaw the dramatic change of régime which was to take place, but, unhampered by excessive moral scruples, he addressed his panegyrics to all those who followed one another on the throne: Muḥammad b. Highām al-Mahdī, Sulaymān al-Mustā'in, al-Kāsim b. Hammūd, etc. Finally, despairing of seeing the situation return to normal, he decided to leave the capital. His first and only journey outside the Peninsula began in 404/1014, to Ceuta, at that time governed by 'Ali b. Hammūd, the future founder of the 3rd régime in Spain. Ibn Darradj, with his opportunism as a court poet, addressed to him a poem feigning Shī'ī sympathies. However, he does not appear to have found at the Hammūdīd court the serenity which he was seeking, since he was obliged to undertake, during four years, many journeys to various minor courts. Until 408/1018 he travelled through the kingdoms of Almeria, Valencia, Játiva and Tortosa, addressing his poems, without much success, to the Slavonic princlings. Finally he arrived, in 408/1018, in Saragossa, where he attached himself to the court of al-Munṣīrī b. Yahyā al-Tuğjībī; for about ten years Ibn Darradj lived a relatively tranquil life, once again holding the positions of chief official poet and secretary of the chancellery which he had held at the court of the 'Amirids, and serving as court poet to al-Munṣīrī (408-12/1018-22) and his son Yahyā (412-27/1022-36), to whom the third part of his Diwdn is dedicated.

In material matters his life appears to have been completely comfortable, a poem (no. 57) revealing that he had acquired land and orchards. However, for reasons unknown, his relations with Yahyā b. al-Munṣīrī deteriorated considerably, and Ibn Darradj found himself obliged to emigrate. In 415/1028 he appeared at the court of Denia, addressing his poems to Mulāhīd al-Śāminī (q.v.), and seems to have passed the final years of his life in this eastern town, since this is where al-Fadl, his only known son, spent his life. Ibn Darradj died on 16 Dīumādā II 421/22 June 1030.

Ibn Darradj is considered as one of the greatest poets of Muslim Spain and the main representative of the golden age of Arabo-Andalusian poetry at the dawn of the thirteenth century. Although he lived until the time of the Mulāhīd al-Ṭawāsīf, he was a product of the Spain of the caliphates. Like Ibn Ṣūyūḥayd, Ibn Ḥazm and al-Ramādī, this poet represents the period during which the character of al-Andalus itself was stamped on its literary production and on all the other manifestations of its culture.

Ibn Darradj was not, however, a revolutionary poet as, to a certain extent, were those who cultivated muwaṣṣfah and sadjād; he was, on the contrary, a neo-classic poet of the type of Abū Tammām and al-Mutanabbi—and in fact he is referred to by the critics as "the Mutanabbi of al-Andalus". Like these other poets, Ibn Darradj adheres scrupulously to what the critics call 'amīd al-ṣ̱īr, the canons of classical poetry. His technique is very polished and he devotes much attention to the correct use of language and the choice of words. His poetry reflects a wide knowledge of Arabic literature and a complete mastery of its vocabulary. He may not achieve the intellectual level and the profundity of thought of Mutanabbi, his favourite model, but some of his compositions (see e.g., nos. 32, 39, 44) are definitely superior to those of his master. The poems in which he describes the battles of al-Mansūr are full of realism and life and reflect the people's sincere admiration for the leader whom they considered as the champion of Spanish Islam against Christianity; in this respect his poems have much in common with those which al-Mutanabbi dedicated to Sayf al-Dawla.

In the genre of floral poetry (nawrīyyāt), Ibn Darradj wrote various poems containing original imagery; in this he appears as the forerunner of such poets as Ibn Khāfādīa, Ibn al-Zaqākī and al-Ruṣāfī, who were to devote almost all of their poems to the description of flowers, fruits and herbs.

A large part of his poetry, and this the most sincere and moving part, is devoted to the description of the horrors of the civil war which followed the overthrow of the 'Amirid dictatorship. These poems form an elegy for the Muslim Spain which the poet knew during the period of its greatest splendour. The lines in which he refers to his sad personal experience during this war, when he wandered continually from place to place with his large family of twelve, mainly females, deserve especial mention. Some of these poems (for example the description of a stormy voyage in a ship, poem no. 33) are particularly successful.

Because of the great care with which he wrote his poems, as much in their basic inspiration as in their form, without adopting the mannerism and the conventionalism of the oriental poets of his time who had a liking for rhetorical ornaments (badāfī), Ibn Darradj may be considered as the initiator, in the Arabic poetry of Spain, of a sort of "cultisme" similar to that which was to characterize, six centuries later, another Cordovan, Luis de Góngora y Argote (1561-1627).

His poetry, apart from its purely literary and
IBN DARRADJ AL-KASTALLI — IBN DAWUD

aesthetic value, is a very valuable documentary source on contemporary events in Spain and particularly on the relations of Andalus with the neighbouring Christian kings (on this aspect, see M. Makki, La España cristiana en el diwan de Ibn Darrād, in Bol. de la Real Acad. de Buenas Letras de Barcelona, xxx (1963-64), 63-104).

Ibn Darrād’s prose is almost completely lost. It is known that he wrote some very famous official communications, such as that which he wrote in the name of al-Mansur on the occasion of the capture of Santiago de Compostella (387/992). But the fragments of this prose which are preserved in the Diwan or in the Dhakhrāta of Ibn Basam are much inferior in quality to his poetry.


IBN DARRADJ AL-TUFAYLI [see TUFAYLI].

IBN AL-DAWĀDĀRĪ, Abū Bakkā r. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. ‘Abd al-Muṭahhar al-Dawḍdrī, was a poet and historian. His father, Djamāl al-Dīn ‘Abd Allāh, was in the service of the Amir Sayf al-Dīn Balabān al-Rūmī al-Zāhīrī, the Dawādar of Baybars, whence the by-name Dawdr. His grandfather, lord of Şarāb, was tentatively identified by S. Munaddidī as ‘Īzz al-Dīn Aybak al-Ustād al-Mu‘āẓamī (d. 645/1247-8), the patron of the medical biographer Ibn Abī Usaybi‘a (q.v.). The family is described, somewhat improbably, as of Saldjukid descent.

The author’s family lived in Cairo, in the Hārat al-Bāṭiliyya. His father served for 11 years, until 710/1310, as mutanawwili of Sāhkiyya province, the wilāyāt al-Urbān, and adjoining areas. Released from this post, he moved to Damascus, where he was appointed mihmāndār, and, later, mihmānd al-dawādār. He lost the latter post through a disagreement, but remained in the city until his death in 773/1373, in a riding accident at ‘Adhīrī. He was buried at Adhīrī, near the graves of his parents.

The dates of the author’s birth and death are unknown. In his writings, he speaks of having lived in Cairo and moved with his father to Damascus, presumably as a child. He held some official post, which he does not specify. It seems to have been in Egypt, and an incident in 723/1323 (Chronik, ix, 320) suggests that it may have been connected with the Barid. He wrote several works, of which two, an extensive universal chronicle (Durar al-tidāt) and an abridgment of it, Kitāb al-durar, survive. An autograph of the former, in 9 parts, exists in Istanbul. Parts 6 (on the Fātimids) and 9 (on the reign of Mūhammad b. Kālāwūn) have been published. The author tells us that he began to make notes and drafts for his work in 705/1305, started his final autograph copy in 732/1331-2, and completed it in 736/1335.


IBN DAWUD, MUHAMMAD B. DAWUD B. ‘ALI B. KHALAF, famous Zahirī jurist and first codifier of Arabic “courtly love”, died in 294/909; nothing else is known of his life. Little is known of his Zahirism: Ibn Dāwūd was the leader of a school, who took over the direction of the Zahirī movement of Baghdad on the death of his father [see DAWUD b. ‘ALI]. It is not clear in which direction he led it. It may have been in one less harsh and less uncompromising than that of Ibn Ḥāzim [q.v.], under whom Zahirī insinuagere was to reach its peak (in the Mūhaltā of Ibn Ḥāzim the Zahirīs as a whole are described by the term aṣhabūndā), and it is not clear whether Ibn Dāwūd is included in this designation). There gathered around Ibn Dāwūd not only Zahirī jurists but also an eclectic group of scholars and grammarians (Muhammad b. al-Husayn al-Zāhīrī, the Kāshīf ibn Suraydī, Ahmad b. ‘Imrān, an impassioned admirer of the mystic Djuymad, the Malamātī mystic Ruywan, the traditionists Ahmad b. Ubayd b. Nāṣib, the principal informer of al-Washaṣba, and Ahmad b. Naṣr b. Dhārī, the grammarians Thālabī and Nīfawwāy, both of them converts to Ḥanbalism, the second later becoming the historian of the Zahirīs, a work which at an early date is much to be regretted). But Ibn Dāwūd was to give more serious contributions to Zahirīsm: he wrote or transmitted an important number of Zahirī works, a list of which is given in the Führist. (Among them is a refutation of Ibn Shāhrīr, which may well have been a dialectical exposition of Zahirism, the loss of which at an early date is much to be regretted). But Ibn Dāwūd’s chief claim to fame is the Kitāb al-Zahār, his anthology of courtly love (translated variously as “Book of the flower” or “Book of Venus”). The Kitāb al-Zahār, which purports to be an anthology, is however a precursor of the “Trbarcus” of the West: it is difficult fully to comprehend its composition, its deeper purposes, and its guiding inspiration. It is possible that the Kitāb al-Zahār conceals the personal secret of Ibn Dāwūd. The following is as much as can be said with certainty about a work which must be read between the lines, if one is to achieve any insight into the extremely complex personality of its author. The Zahār is made up of two parts: the first is a collection of love poetry, the second (MS Turin) is an anthology proper (different parts: panegyric, satiric, drinking poetry, versification). The two parts together make up about fifty chapters, each containing a fairly
free selection of one hundred verses. Each chapter illustrates a maxim; these maxims are not of equal importance: they concern fine points of literary style as well as more urgent matters and, perhaps, the most intimate details of the "secret" of love. The maxims in rhyming prose—the elegant style of the jurist who had succeeded in delivering fatwas in this form. The logical arrangement of the first part is as follows: the first ten chapters are a kind of treatise on the hadith of love (the hadith of love gives the advice to put one's trust in the physician rather than in the beloved). They give the advice of the various consequences of passion and the misfortunes which befall lovers (calumniators, slanderers and "exiles"). Next, in the following ten chapters, are enumerated the obstacles of a deeper or more permanent nature which beset passion (sulawm, "consolation"—a sort of interior movement which follows the "triumph" of the lover, separation with all its consequences). A further ten chapters (30 to 40) are devoted to situations which are reminiscent of the nasib: the lover and the lightning, the lover on the day of separation, the lover haunted by the memory of the beloved, etc. At the very end of the first part, the ethical values return to the foreground, in particular that of the secret. The death of love is also dealt with. It will be obvious that everything in this work is problematical: it seems innocuous and soothing and yet it gave rise to passion and polemic. Its greatest originality was to have attempted to define a code of courtly behaviour independent of both religion and mysticism. This code seems to be based entirely on the principle: "He who loves, remains chaste, does not tell his love, and dies (or dies of it), dies as a martyr". This hadith, transmitted on the authority of Dâwûd the father, sets up two problems which long disturbed or annoyed Muslim moralists: al-nasib, al-mudâh (the lawfulness of glancing at young people or a "strange" woman) and himân, the obligation to refrain from speaking of one's love, even to the beloved himself. It was particularly among the Hanbalis that the reactions were strongest and opposition to Ibn Dâwûd's ideas most bitter: a work like the Dhâmm al-sawâb of Ibn Dâwûd contains a list of later re-wordings which have been preserved for the famous hadith. Hayyim al-Hajjâmyya (q.v.) also reproached Ibn Dâwûd for doing his utmost to discredit him. On the other hand, the Hanbalis, from al-Khârîjî (Broekelmann, S I, 250, the author of an Istidd al-khalâl, Bursa, Ulu Camî 1535), attribute to the passions a sort of therapeutic action, based both on Islam and on common sense. It is true that, in his description of "courtly" love, Ibn Dâwûd did not admit that it could possess a providential therapeutic quality, and indulged neither in excessive systematization nor misplaced idealism. (He always refrained from confusing human passion and divine love; he attributed to love, and even to the memory of love, a theme dear to the nasib, causes which are preponderantly physical: the interaction of the "humours" on the thought and vice-versa). It is possible that he was influenced by the Zahirism which fused both mysticism and human wisdom, in order to preserve intact the unpaired character of "courtly" love. Whether this attitude was dictated by his Zahirism, with its tendency to dispute the capabilities of the human reason, or by a negative mysticism based on mamlûmatiya, Ibn Dâwûd is regarded by such scholars as L. Massignon, A. R. Nykl and H. Ritter as one of the initiators of the doctrine of "courtly love", both in its Western and in its Oriental manifestations.


IBN AL-ÂLî, AHMAD B. YÚSÚF B. IBRÃHIM, Tûrûnî, Fatimian. His father Yusuf was a foster-brother of the caliph al-Mu'tasim and an administrative assistant to Ibrâhîm b. al-Mahdî. As such, Yusuf moved in the centre of intellectual life in Bagdad and Sâmarrâ and counted among his acquaintances many litterateurs and physicians. After the death of Ibn al-Mahdî in 224/839 (and, presumably, in consequence of it), he left Sâmarrâ for Damascus and, it seems, moved from there to Egypt where he therefrom had his residence. Having connections with the 'Abbâsid government and with Ibn al-Mudabbir, Yusuf was under the suspicion of Ahmad b. Tûlîn, who imprisoned him but soon released him as the result of an intervention by his numerous friends. When Yusuf died, Ahmad b. Tûlîn had his son Ahmad and the latter's brother arrested, and his files confiscated and searched for evidence of espionage, but nothing incriminating was revealed and the two brothers were released immediately. Yusuf wrote a book of stories about his patron Ibrâhîm b. al-Mahdî, which is certainly the source of the material on the subject transmitted in his name in the Aghâni (for instance, Aghâni, i, 253, 268, ii, 353, iii, 29, iv, 337, 361, vi, 22, ix, 148, 173, xvi, 6, 249, etc.). Like his patron, he also wrote a book on cookery, and he seems to be meant by the Yusuf b. al-Dâyi mentioned in the Fihrist, 180, who published a collection of stories about Abu Nuwas together with an anthology of his poetry. He probably provided much material for the works of his son Ahmad. His Aḥkâār al-atibba, cited by Ibn Hawkal, i, 124 (cf. F. Gabrieli, in RSO, xxxvi (1901), 246), and, presumably, the source for al-Kifî and Ibn Abî Usayyiba when they quote Yusuf b. Ibrâhimus, seems to be a work in this line. Ahmad b. Yusuf, kohl by preference as Ibn al-Dâyi "son of the wet nurse" (although this nickname would seem to have been originally that of his father), belonged like his father to the class of government officials. A reasonable guess for the date of his birth would seem to be between 245-250/859-864, and he is said to have died between 330-340/941-951. Accurate details are lacking. He wrote a Biography of Ahmad b. Tûlîn, known from an abridgment in Ibn Sa'd's Maqârib (ed. K. Volland, Berlin 1894, Semitistische Studien, i). It was also used in a similar biography of Ahmad b. Tûlîn, written in the 4th/5th century by a certain 'Abî Allâh b. Muhammad al-Balawi (ed. M. Kurd 'All, Damascus 1358), who nevertheless criticized Ibn al-Dâyi's work as confused and incomplete and not the work of a professional historian. Biographies of Khurâsânâwî and Hârûn, including those of Tûrûnîlieutenants, are listed by 'Alî, Uddâbî, ii, 157-60, as separate works, but they very likely belonged together with the biography of Ahmad b. Tûlîn, in the same way as Ibn al-Dâyi's Husn al-tubbâ is listed and cited as a work distinct from his Kitâb al-Mukhâfa'â, although it forms part of it. The Mukhâfa'â (ed. Cairo 1914, 1940, 1941) consists of three sections containing, respectively, stories about rewards for good deeds,
punishments for evil deeds, and timely escapes from difficult situations. The preserved text may not be complete (cf. F. Savyid, in his edition of Ibn Dūjūj, 746, 22, n. 43). Two other biographical works, on physicians and on astronomers/astrologers, are not preserved. In the field of science, he wrote a commentary on the Pseudo-

Ptolemaic Celestiorum (al-Tfmar), which, in addition to the Arabic original, is also preserved (partially?) in Greek translation (Cat. Codicum Astrol., ii, 74, iii, 11), as well as a lost Compendium of Logic, dedicated to the waris 'Ali b. 845. The preserved text is based upon Ibn al-Zālīk and Ibn 'Asikir (presumably, under Yusuf b. Ibrāhim); Brockelmann, i, 155, S i, 229; A. Schade, in ZDMG., Nxxvi (1934), 267-72; B. Lewis, in Byzantion, xiv (1939), 383-6; A. Badawi, al-Usul al-Yundihya, Cairo 1954, 24-9.

Bibliography: Vakīt, loc. cit., is based upon Ibn Zulāk and Ibn 'Asikir (presumably, under Yusuf b. Ibrāhim); Brockelmann, i, 155, S i, 229; A. Schade, in ZDMG., Nxxvi (1934), 267-72; B. Lewis, in Byzantion, xiv (1939), 383-6; A. Badawi, al-Usul al-Yundihya, Cairo 1954, 24-9. (F. Rosenthal)

IBN AL-DAYBA', 846 'Abd Allah al-Rahmān b. 'Ali Wahdān al-Din al-Shāhri al-Zabīdī al-Shāfi'i, Arab historian and religious scholar, was born in 866/1461 in Zabid and died there in 944/1537. Older biographers call him Ibn al-Dayba', but al-Dājirī refers to him simply as al-Kādī al-Nafis 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Dayba'. Dayba', said to mean "white" in Nubian, was the šābāb of his remote ancestor 'Ali b. Yusuf. Ibn al-Dayba', whose father died in India without having seen him, was brought up by his maternal grandfather in Zabid [q.v.], the centre of Shafī'i learning in Tihamat al-Yaman. He studied a little under this grandfather but more under his maternal grandfather in Zabid [q.v.], the centre of Shafī'i hadith, which he would recite at the feet of his grandfather in Zabid [q.v.], the centre of Shafī'i hadith, which he would recite at the feet of his grandfather in Zabid [q.v.], the centre of Shafī'i hadith, which he would recite at the feet of his grandfather in Zabid [q.v.], the centre of Shafī'i hadith, which he would recite at the feet of his grandfather [q.v.], the fourth and last Umawi who, in 570/981, was appointed chief kādī of Fahs al-Ballut, kādī of Zabid, which brings the story of the city down to 992/1583, the second of which ends with 992/1583, the year after the Murabitids of Zabid, and at least two books of Fahs al-Ballut, kādī of Zabid, which proves of benefit to students. Al-

Shawkání (d. 1295/1878) found his fame still widespread in the Yaman. (F. Rosenthal)

IBN AL-DAYBA', 846 'Abd Allah al-Rahmān b. 'Ali Wahdān al-Din al-Shāhri al-Zabīdī al-Shāfi'i, Arab historian and religious scholar, was born in 866/1461 in Zabid and died there in 944/1537. Older biographers call him Ibn al-Dayba', but al-Dājirī refers to him simply as al-Kādī al-Nafis 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Dayba'. Dayba', said to mean "white" in Nubian, was the šābāb of his remote ancestor 'Ali b. Yusuf. Ibn al-Dayba', whose father died in India without having seen him, was brought up by his maternal grandfather in Zabid [q.v.], the centre of Shafī'i learning in Tihamat al-Yaman. He studied a little under this grandfather but more under his maternal grandfather in Zabid [q.v.], the centre of Shafī'i hadith, which he would recite at the feet of his grandfather in Zabid [q.v.], the centre of Shafī'i hadith, which he would recite at the feet of his grandfather in Zabid [q.v.], the centre of Shafī'i hadith, which he would recite at the feet of his grandfather [q.v.], the fourth and last Umawi who, in 570/981, was appointed chief kādī of Fahs al-Ballut, kādī of Zabid, which brings the story of the city down to 992/1583, the second of which ends with 992/1583, the year after the Murabitids of Zabid, and at least two books of Fahs al-Ballut, kādī of Zabid, which proves of benefit to students. Al-

Shawkání (d. 1295/1878) found his fame still widespread in the Yaman. (C. van Arendonk-[G. Rentz])

IBN DHAKWAN, name of the members of a family of Cordova, the Banū Dhakwān, which produced several kādīs.

(1) The first was 847 'Abd Allah b. Harthama b. Dhakwān b. 'Abd Allah b. Dājirī al-Umdān who, in 370/981, was appointed jāhīl al-radd (that is, his duty was to pronounce judgements on matters on which the ordinary kādīs were in doubt); see Ibn al-Farāḍī, no. 722; E. Levi-Provencal, Hist. Esp. Mus., ii, 145.

(2) The most famous member of the family was the son of the above, Abu 'l-'Abbās Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah, who, after having been kādī of Fāṣ waṭ al-Shāhī, succeeded his father in the same post, and was appointed chief kādī of Cordova in 922/1518. Possessing excellent diplomatic qualities, and popular among both the Cordovans and the Berbers, he played an important political rôle under al-

Mansūr, whose close confidant and trusted adviser he was. After the death of the kādī (923/1518), he retained his post until 934/1524, then regained it from 935 to 940/1530-10. In 939/1530, he gave his sanction to the document drawn up by Ibn Burd [q.v.] to make 'Abd al-Rahmān Sanchuelo [q.v.] the successor of Hishām II on the throne of the Umayyads. He also supported the succession to the caliphate of al-Mahdī (399/1009). Exiled for a time to Almeria and to Oran, he soon regained his office under Hishām II, who returned to the throne in 400/1010. It was he who, in 403/1013, asked for amūn from the Berbers who were investing the capital. He died in 22 Radjab 1323/21 October 1022, and his funeral eulogy was made by Ibn Shuwayd [q.v.].

Bibliography: Ibn Bassām, Dāhīsh, i, 224; Ibn Khākān, Māmah, 19-20; Ibn Bashkwīlī, 8īla, no. 63; Dabīb, Bughyā, 174; Ibn Sa'dīd, Mughīb, 210-1; Nubāḥī, Mūkhāb, 84-7 and index; Ibn al-Kāfībī, A'māl, index; Maḵfārī, A'nālecī, index; E. Levi-Provencal, Hist. Esp.
The judgements of his contemporaries on Ibn Dhiyya's character and work are contradictory. Whereas the Andalusians in general praise him highly and refer to his great learning, the Eastern critics regard him as a charlatan because of his false claim to an illustrious genealogy, as a plagiarist (Ibn Khallīkān states that the poem dedicated to Muṣṣafar al-Dīn was written by Ibn Mammātī), or as a liar (which various sources consider to have been the reason for his expulsion from the Dār al-hadith al-Kdimīyya). The titles are known of about twenty of his works, of various types, the majority of which, however, have survived. The above recently appeared two editions of the work for which he is chiefly known, al-Muṣrif fi ashtar abī al-Maghrib, a vast anthology of Arabic poets of the West, compiled in Egypt and dedicated to his royal patron al-Malik al-Kāmil. The remainder of his surviving work is so far unpublished.  

Bibliography: In addition to that given in Brockelmann, I, 310-2, § I, 544-5, see the study by M. Gād, Ibn Dhiyya fi l-Muṣrif, in RIE M., 1 (1953). Sp. tr., ibid., 125-35; cf. also the long introduction to the Egyptian edition of the Muṣrif published by I. al-Ibyārī, H. Ḥab al-Maqdīj, and A. Abū al-Maḍāwī, Cairo 1954. Another edition of the same work was published in the same year, at Khartoum, by Muṣṭafā ʿAwāq. (F. de la Granja)
he had taken no part in politics (Ibn Sa'id, Mughrib, i, 342-3; al-Ma‘kṣarī, Analekta, ii, 468; al-Suyūṭī, Bugyān, 275).

IV.—The fourth and last representative of the family to be mentioned is Abū Bakr Mub, b. Abā Allāh b. Yahyā b. al-Faraḥ b. Abū al-Djid, the most famous in the history of the family. Ibn al-Abbār dedicates a long article to him in the Tahmīla (no. 823). Born at Niebla in Rabī‘ I 496/December 102, he studied under the best teachers of the time, such as Ibn Rūghd and Abū Bakr Ibn al-Arabi. The former advised him not to limit himself to the study of grammar, literature and fikh, but to study fikh and wudū; he showed a special aptitude for these subjects and was not long in becoming the favourite pupil of Ibn Rūghd. About 521/1127 he became a juristconsult in Seville, and continued in this high office for 65 years, till his death in Shāwval 586/Nov. 1190, at the age of ninety. Abū Yūsūf Ya‘qūb al-Manṣūr (380-95/1184-98) had a profound veneration for him, perhaps because he had undergone a certain amount of suffering himself, and appointed, as his successor, Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsūf (558-60/1162/84). During the troubled years which preceded the unfortunate campaign against Santarem (580/1184), he was among the Niebla dignitaries who were arrested and imprisoned (cf. A. Huici Miranda, Hist. pol. del imperio almohade, i, 255-309). He spent his whole life as a fāḥish and teacher. He has left no written work, but his position allowed him to increase his fortune; he was in fact the head of his native town of Niebla.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources quoted in the article: Ibn Sa‘īd, Mughrib, i, 243; Ibn Farhūn, Dībāǧī, 302; Ibn al-‘Imād, Shāhārāt, Cairo 1350, iv, 286; Sa‘īdī, Wafī, photography and fikh, iii, 51; al-Kutub, Cairo, no. 431. He had literary ability, but his passion for wine and his frivolity prevented him from reaching the heights he deserved. For some time he was a secretary (kābīr), in the service of Ibn ‘Amār (q.v.), during the brief period in which the latter reigned in Murcia.

II.—Of greater importance was his cousin and contemporary Abu l-Kāsim Muḥammad b. Abā Allāh Ibn al-Djad. He was one of the best representatives of the family and one of the authorities of his time on hādhī, fikh, literature and genealogy. Ya‘qūb al-Rāḍī, the son of al-Murtāmid Ibn Abābīd, made him his wāṣir when he was appointed governor of the Andalus, and took him with him when he went to govern Ronda; Ibn al-Djad remained with Ya‘qūb till the latter’s death at the hands of the Almoravids, in 484/1091 (Ibn al-Abbār, al-Hulā, apud De Abbaddis, ii, 75; ed. Mones, ii, 71). He retired to Seville; the inhabitants of Niebla then offered him the office of juristconsult (ṣufṭat al-ṣarā) of the town, which he accepted without enthusiasm, keeping his position till Ya‘qūb b. Taqīṣī made him kābīr in the chancellery. He was still holding this office when he died at Marrākush in 515/1121 (Ibn Baqṣhwawl, Sīla, no. 1149; Ibn Khākān, Kawadī, Cairo 1283, 109 ff.; Ibn Sa‘īd, Mughrib, i, 341-2; al-Marrākushī, Muṣliḥī, Cairo 1940, 173; Ibn Dībāyā, Mughrib, Cairo 1940, 150-2; Ibn Bassām, Dīghī, ms. Baghdad, ii, fols. 185-213). Abu l-Kāsim Ibn al-Djad was in excellence in the style being on a level with that of the eminent kuttāb of the time (Muḥ. b. Abī ‘Ikhṣāṣ and his brother Abū Marwān, Abū Bakr Ibn al-Kabtārun, etc.), which marks the apogee of prose writing in Muslim Spain.

III.—A third member of the family is Abū ‘Amīr Abūmad b. Abā Allāh Ibn al-Djad, who was a grammarian of repute. He was arrested and executed by the agents of the Almohads in 550/1155, although

Originally from Ḥamāṭ, in northern Syria, the
Genealogical Table of the Banū Diama'a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Hamāt Branch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abu Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishāk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Abd al-Rahmān (d. 741)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jerusalem Branch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm (596-675)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cairo Branch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badr al-Din Muḥammad (639-733)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Abd al-Rahmān (d. 739)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Jerusalem Branch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abū Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;All (d. 802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm (d. 764)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (ed. and German trans)
| ʿĪzz al-Dīn "Abd al-ʿAzīz (694-767) |
| Ibrāhīm (d. 872) |
| (ed. and German trans) |
| Mūsā (845-916) |
| Ibrāhīm (d. 897) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Cairo Branch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badr al-Din Muḥammad (639-733)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Abd al-Rahmān (d. 739)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārā (d. 855)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cairo Branch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad (b. 833)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhān al-Dīn Ibrāhīm (755-790)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İbrāhīm (d. 897)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Hamāt Branch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad (d. 897)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Banū Diama'a traced their descent to the North Arab tribe of Kinān. The first member of the family to gain a modest reputation for Islamic learning was Burhān al-Dīn Abū Isḥāk Ibrāhīm b. Saʿd Allāh (596-675/1200-1277), who studied jurisprudence (fikih) and tradition (hadith) in Damascus, lectured in his native Hamāt and elsewhere, and died in Jerusalem shortly after he had gone to settle there. The distinguished career of his son Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad, who rose to become three times Shāfiʿī chief (kādi) of Egypt, and twice of Damascus, made the fortunes of the family and established it among the leading religio-judicial "dynasties" of the Mamlūk empire. Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad was the author of numerous works, of which the most important is a book on constitutional law: Tahrīr al-akhām fi tādāb arḥah al-Islām (ed. and German trans by H. Koeller in Islamica, vi (1934), vii (1935), Schlussheft (1938)). The position of Khaqāb of the Aḵṣā mosque in Jerusalem, which he held before becoming chief (kādi) of Egypt in 690/1291, remained in the family until certainly the early 10th/16th century; it continued as the preserve of the descendants of Muḥammad's brother "Abd al-Rahmān Ibn Diama'a, who formed the Jerusalem branch of the Banū Diama'a. As for the descendants of Muḥammad they came to form the Cairo branch of the family, which produced the distinguished ʿĪzz al-Dīn "Abd al-ʿAzīz and Burhān al-Dīn Ibrāhīm. The former, after holding the position of intendant of the treasury (wakīl bayt al-mdāl) of Egypt for twelve years, was appointed Shāfiʿī chief (kādi) of Egypt in 738/1340, and remained in this position, with one brief interruption, for twenty-five years, retiring shortly before his death. His nephew Ibrāhīm, after him, was twice chief (kādi) of Egypt, and died as chief (kādi) of Damascus. Between 690-784/1291-1383, the three Ibn Diama'a mentioned held the office of chief (kādi) of Egypt—the chief judicial position in the realm—for a total of sixty-one years. The fortunes of the Banū Diama'a declined after the death of Burhān al-Dīn Ibrāhīm b. "Abd al-Rahmān, the family nevertheless maintaining a traditional importance in Jerusalem. After the Ottoman conquest the name of the family appears to have been forgotten.

**Bibliography:**


**IBN DIAMI'**

- Abu 'l-Kāsim İsmā'îl, famous singer and musician of Mecca. Of noble origin, he belonged to the clan of Sahn, one of the principal branches of the tribe of Kurayš. A handsome man, well-versed in jurisprudence, (hadith and the Kur'ān, he had won the admiration of the (kādi) Abū Yūsuf until the latter discovered that he was a singer. He was the pupil of Yāḥyā al-Makkī and of his father-in-law Sīyāṣ, with whom he went to Baghdād. Some time afterwards, he was expelled from there by al-Mahdī in order to separate him from his sons Hārūn and al-Hādī. He returned to Mecca, where he squandered his fortune on his two passions: gaming and dogs. After al-Mahdī's death, he returned to Baghdād and became, during the reign of al-Raṣīd, the leader of a rival group to that of his former friend, Ibrāhīm al-Mawṣilli. With his tender, sensitive, stirring and expressive character, possessing a voice vibrant with emotion, Ibn Diami' embodied the typical image of a romantic musician of the period. The flautist Barsawma said: "Ibrāhīm al-Mawṣilli is like an orchard in which the sweet and the sour grow side by side..." Ibn Diami' is like a pot of honey all side by side... Ibn Diama'a mentioned held the office of chief (kādi) of Egypt—the chief judicial position in the realm—for a total of forty-two years.


**IBN DJAMI'**

- Abu 'l-Makārim (Abu 'l-'Ashār) Ḥabīt Allāh (Nathaniel) b. Ḥāsan b. Ibrāhīm b. Ya’qūb b. Ismā'īl, Jewish physician who received the honorific titles of Shams al-rū'ās and Ustadī zamānī, Born at Fustāṭ, he was the disciple of Ibn al-'Aynzarbī (d. 548/1153), entered the service of Saladin, and died in 594/1198. One of his pupils was Ibn Abī 'l-Bayān al-Ibrāhīmī (d. ca. 634/1236) and he became famous for having prevented a person in a cataleptic fit from being buried alive. He was the author of several works: (1) al-Irṣād li-m waṣīlah
al-anjus wa 'l-asdidd, a compendium of medicine which he dedicated to al-Baysanl, the vizier of Saladin, and which was completed by his son Abū Tahir Ismā'īl; it consists of four parts and deals with simple and compound medicines, dietetics, hygiene, therapeutics, etc. (for manuscripts see Brockelmann). (2) al-Maknun fi tankih al-Kdnun, a commentary on Avicenna. He wrote also a certain number of risālas of minor importance, on the description of Alexandria, on what to do when no physician is available, on the lemon and its sorbets, on rhubarb, etc. One of his treatises was used by Ibn al-Baytar [g.v.] and was translated into Latin by Alpagus.

Bibliography: Ibn Abī Usaybi'ā, i, 112; Brockelmann, I, 489, S.1, 892; Sarton, Introduction, ii, 432; Wüstenfeld, Arabische Arznei, 183; Leclerc, Médécine arabe, iii, 53-5; Steinschneider, Arabeische Literatur der Juden, 178-81; Meyerhof, Notes, in Isis, xii (1929), 123. (J. VERNET)

IBN DJANAH, ABU 'L-WALID MARWAN (Hebrew name Yōnāh, Latin name Marbinus [?]). Jewish physician and philologist, born at Cordova circa 380/990, died at Saragossa about fifty years later. His very important works, written in Arabic, as a grammarian and lexicographer of the Hebrew language do not concern us here. Šāʾīd b. Abī Ahmad Ibn Sāʾīd al-Andalusi (whose notice was reproduced by Ibn Abī Usaybi'ā), however, praises him as a logician and the author of an epitome of pharmacology, which is mentioned also by Ibn al-Baytar.


IBN DJARRAH, ABU 'ABD ALLAH MUSHAYHIB, secretary of state of the 'Abbāsid caliphs and uncle of the famous vizier 'Ali b. 'Isā [g.v.]. He belonged to a family of Iranian origin which had formerly been converted to Christianity and then embraced Islam. His father Dāwūd had been secretary under al-Mutawakkil and he himself began his career in government service during the caliphate of al-Mutawakkil and was vizirate of 'Ubayd Allāh b. Sulaymān, whose son-in-law he became. He was director of taxes for the eastern provinces and accompanied the vizier to the Dījbāl in 285/898; on his return from this expedition, he succeeded in getting his section (which until then had been attached to the office of the Palace directed by Abū 'Abd Allāh Ibn al-Furāt) formed into an independent department. This promotion enabled him, during the last years of the caliphate, to defend physicians against degrees of success, born of the fiercely Shi'ī brothers the Banū 'l-Furāt, the Sunni secretaries or governors whose accounts had been submitted to strict inspection.

He retained this office under al-Muktatf, then became secretary of the army, occupying this post when, in 294/906, the Pilgrim caravan was attacked by the Karmajāts.

Muhammad b. Dāwūd, who on the death of al-Muktatf had supported the succession of Ibn al-Mu'taz [g.v.], was some months afterwards one of the promoters of the conspiracy to depose the young al-Muktadīr; soon he became vizier at a time to avoid the pursuit of his old enemy, Ibn al-Furāt [g.v.], who had become vizier when al-Muktadiir returned to the throne, Muhammad b. Dāwūd was finally captured and executed in 296/908.

An administrator whose competence was universally recognized, he was also a highly esteemed man of letters, the author of a poetic anthology, the K. al-Waraka (published in Cairo in 1953), as well as a Book of visiers, of which only a few fragments survive.

Bibliography: D. Sourdrel, Vizirat, index (bibli., at p. 372, n. 3). (D. SOURDREL)

IBN DJARRAH [see DJARRAHIDS].

IBN AL-DJASSAS, "the plasterer's son", the by-name of at least two persons who should be distinguished:

I.—ABU YAHKŪB ISHĀR B. 'AMMĀR AL-KUṬ, who handed down poetry and was very closely connected with the 'Abbāsid prince 'Īsā b. Mūsā [g.v.].

Bibliography: Yākūt, Udadāb, vi, 74-6 (= Irshād, ii, 232).

II.—ABU 'ABD ALLĀH ḤUSAYN (or Ḥasan) B. 'ABBĀD B. AL-DJASSAS AL-DJAWHARI, a celebrated jeweller and financier of the 'Abbāsid period. Originally a broker in attendance on the harem of the Tūlūnī Khumārawy [g.v.], he seems to have owed the start of his fortune to a necklace; when he was ordered to reduce the bulk of the pearls in it, he merely replaced them by smaller ones, and the difference in value won him a considerable profit. When instructed by his master to negotiate the marriage of his daughter Kāt al-nādā to Mu'tadīd's son, he himself brought the girl to Baghdad in 280/893—incidentally she became the caliph's wife—and settled in the 'Abbāsid capital. Having taken Kāt al-nādā's jewels into his keeping, he retained them after her death, which occurred a few years later, and his fortune was correspondingly augmented. In 296/908 he was arrested and fined for giving refuge to Ibn al-Mu'taz [g.v.], but the financial difficulties of al-Muktadiir soon involved him in more serious straits; in 302/914-5, he was again arrested, his palace, situated in the Suk Yahya, and his other possessions, which had reached a fabulous total value (several million dinārs), were confiscated, but he managed to safeguard part of his fortune and lived the rest of his life in comfort. He died in 315/927-8.

However, it was not his vast wealth and the unusual luxury in which he lived that have primarily brought this man to the notice of posterity; his fame in fact rests mainly on a series of anecdotes of which he is the hero and which present him as a feeble-witted fellow given to absurd and ridiculous observations; such characteristics certainly do not tally with his real personality and, insofar as these repartees are authentic, they were probably dictated by the desire of Ibn al-Djassas, a particularly witty individual, to protect his fortune by passing himself off as an insubordinate creature. Certain anecdotes connected with his name are also attributed to other personalities, but the essential point is to note this curious occurrence of his name among a class of jesters, in which financiers would hardly seem to belong.
Bibliography: Tabari, iii, 2133 ff.; Miskawayh, in Amedroz and Margoliouth, Eclipse, i, 8; Hiläl al-Säbäʿ ed. Amderoz, 235; 'Arib, Tāb. cont., 28-9; 46; Süli, Aḥḥār al-Rāḍi...trans. M. Canard, 64 and index; Ḥusri, Dīmāʾ, 240 ff.; Masʿūdī, Murādī, viii, 117-9, 283; Tanbūkhi, Nīghwār, i, 18-32; Ibn al-Djawzi, Hambāh, 30-41; idem, Munṭazām, vi, 211-4; D. Sourdel, Vizāris, index; F. Rosenthal, Humor, 13; F. Bustānī, Daʿīrāt al-maʿārif, ii, 409-10.

IBN AL-DJAWZI

ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAlī b. Mūṣafār al-Djawzī, jurist, consultant, traditionist, historian and preacher, was one of the most famous Hanbalis of Baghdaḍ, where he was born in 510/1126 and died in 597/1200 after a life of great intellectual, religious and political activity. He belonged to a fairly wealthy family and received a very thorough education.

Among his chief teachers (cf. Dīyāʾ, i, 401) were some of the most famous 'ulamāʾ of his time: Ibn al-Zahārāʿ (d. 532/1142), Abū Bakr al-Djawzī (d. 532/1137-8), Abū Maṣūr al-Djawzī (d. 539/1144-5), who introduced him to adab, Abu ʿl-Fadl b. al-Nāṣir (d. 550/1155), Abū Ḥakīm al-Nahrawānī (d. 556/1162) and Abū Yaʿṣāʾ the younger (d. 558/1163; grandson of the kāfī, Abū Yaʿṣāʾ b. al-Farrāʾ).

In addition to his direct teachers, Ibn al-Djawzī was much influenced by three men whom he did not know personally but whose work he admired and often made use of: the Shafiʿīs Aḥšāʿī Abū Nuʿaym al-Isfahānī (d. 430/1038-9), the author of the Hilyat al-aʿlāyī, the historian and traditionist al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1070-1), a Hanbali who had changed to Shafiʿism, and the Hanbali Ibn ʿAklī (d. 513/1121-20), whom he followed in the majority of his works while at the same time criticizing or refuting his ideas (Dīyāʾ, i, 414). Ibn al-Djawzī had only a slight knowledge of kalām, of which he was a severe critic.

Ibn al-Djawzī began his career in the reign of the caliph al-Muṭṭafī (530-555/1136-60), mainly thanks to the patronage of the Hanbali vizier Ibn Hubayra, whom the caliph al-Mustangīd (555-665/1160-70) retained in office until his death in 560/1165.

He began his teaching career as assistant to his teacher Abū Ḥakīm al-Nahrawānī, who taught him in his house. Abū ʿl-Fardāʾ al-Djawzī, jurist and the jurist of his death, in madrasa built for him at the Māḥmūnīya. On Nahrawānī's death, in 556/1162, soon after the accession of al-Mustangīd, Ibn al-Djawzī succeeded him as master of these two colleges (Dīyāʾ, i, 404).

It was during the reign of the Muṭṭafī, however, with the encouragement of Ibn Hubayra, whose policy for the preservation of the caliphate and for a Sunni revival he supported, that Ibn al-Djawzī began his career as a preacher (waʿīz), holding each Friday a session of waʿīz in Ibn Hubayra's own house (Dīyāʾ, i, 402). The caliph al-Mustandjid, during whose reign there occurred Nūr al-Dīn's [q.v.] three interventions against the Fātimids of Egypt, in 559, 562 and 564, authorized Ibn al-Djawzī to preach sermons in the Palace mosque—sermons in which the following year he defended the Sunna and criticized, not only all those whom he considered to be schismatics, but also the fubakāʾ who were too blindly attached to their own magḥhabs.

It was during the reign of al-Mustandi (566-74/1171-9), who moreover did a great deal for the development of Hanbalism, that Ibn al-Djawzī, as much through his activity in the university as through his preaching, became one of the most influential persons in Baghdaḍ. At the beginning of 567/1171-2, when Sālāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī (d. 585/1193) re-established the 'Abbāsīd Muḥṣīl in Cairo, Ibn al-Djawzī celebrated this event by a work which he presented to the caliph: the Kūṭāb al-Ṣaʿā al-Misrī (Dīyāʾ, i, 404). He wrote also, at a date which is not known, another work to the glory of this caliph: al-Misḥāb al-muḍīrī fi dawlat al-Mustaḍī (Dīyāʾ, i, 420).

On 10 Muharram 568/1 September 1172—the day of al-ʿashūrā—he preached a popular sermon of exhortation to a very large crowd; in the same year he was arrested by the caliph, a series of sermons at the Badr gate (Dīyāʾ, i, 405). The year 569 was also one in which he preached many sermons, and in 570 both his teaching and his sermons continued to be received enthusiastically; he taught in two new madrasas and the caliph had a daix (dakka) constructed for him in the Palace mosque. In 571, the caliph conferred on him virtually inquisitorial powers: Ibn al-Djawzī then encouraged his hearers to denounce to him all those who, by their words or their attitude, impugned the reputation of the Companions—a measure aimed directly at the Shiʿism which still flourished in Baghdaḍ (Dīyāʾ, i, 407). In 572, during Ramadān, he preached in addition sermons in the mosque of al-Maṣūr and, in the caliph's presence, in the house of Zahir al-Dīn, the sābī al-maḥkāmīn (Dīyāʾ, i, 407-8). Again in 573 he preached many sermons.

The year 574/1178-9 marked the zeuth of Ibn al-Djawzī's career at Baghdaḍ. He was then directing five madrasas and had already written more than one hundred and fifty works; he enjoyed excellent relations with al-Mustandi, and with the vizier, the ṣāḥib al-maḥkāmīn and the chief 'ulama'. Under his influence, Hanbalism enjoyed great popular prestige in Baghdaḍ; in 574 the caliph had an inscription engraved on the tomb of Ibn Hanbal, on whom he bestowed the title of imām (Bidāya, xii, 300), and erected a dakka for the Hanbali juristconsultus Ibn al-Munā in the mosque of al-Maṣūr (Dīyāʾ, i, 409). But the supporters of the other madhābis complained, seeing this act as the result of Ibn al-Djawzī's influence over the caliph and the latter's growing sympathy with Hanbalism. In addition troubles broke out between Sunnis and Shiʿis (Bidāya, xiii, 300-1). During this year (575/1179-80), a session of al-Mudāṣirī (d. 1224), who gave a new turn to the policy of the caliph but who had many Hanbalīs in his entourage or in his service, Ibn al-Djawzī, though by now old and less active, did not disappear from the political scene. He had, in particular, the support of the Hanbalī vizier Abū l-Muṣafār b. Yūnūs (d. 595/1197), who also had been a pupil of Abū Ḥakīm al-Nahrawānī. He seems to have taken an active part in the condemnation of the shaykh Rukn al-Dīn b. Abū ʿl-Kādir al-Dīlī (d. 561/1160), who was accused of harbouring in his madrasa suspect books of philosophy and of sandāba, in particular the Rasāʿīl of the Ikhwan al-safa (Dīyāʾ, i, 425-6). The Diliyya madrasa was taken away from Rukn al-Dīn and given to Ibn al-Djawzī.

The dismissal and arrest of the vizier Ibn Yūnūs and the appointment to the vizierate of the Shiʿī Ibn al-Kassābī in 590/1194 marked the beginning of disgrace for Ibn al-Djawzī, who had written, it is not known precisely when, a refutation of al-Nāṣir's al-Tāhīr (Dīyāʾ, i, 409).
IBN AL-DJAWZI — IBN AL-DJAWZI, SIBT

until he was set free in 955/1158-9 on the intervention of the caliph’s mother, a very devout woman whose sympathy had been gained by one of the preacher’s sons, the ḥakīm Muḥyī l-Dīn Yūsūf, who took to making his career in the service of the caliphate. But soon after his triumphant return to Baghhdād Ibn al-Djawzī died, in 597/1200.

Ibn al-Djawzī was one of the most prolific writers of Arabic literature. Ibn Radjab, in his Dhayl (1, 415-20), lists more than 200 works (cf. Brockelmann, I, 659-66 and S I, 914-20). Ibn Taymiyya, moreover, when he was still in Cairo, had counted and been acquainted with more than 1,000 works, varying greatly in length, and later learned of still more. All the great Islamic disciplines are represented in this prodigious output, which includes some major works.

His Munāṣaṣam, part of which has survived (ed. Krenkow, Haydarārābd 1357-9/1938-40, 6 vols.), is an exceptionally rich source for the history of the caliphate from 257/875 to 574/1189. His Siyāṣat al-ṣaṣāfe (Haydarārābd 1355-6/1936-7), which makes great use of the work of Abu Naṣr al-Isfahānī, is a well-documented history of ʿṢifism if his aims to demonstrate that the true ʿṢifs in Islam were primarily in fact those who set themselves to follow faithfully the teaching of the great Companions.

But his best historical work, inseparable from his sermons, is found, as Ibn Taymiyya emphasized, in his laudatory biographies (mandāfīb); even the choice of subject is in itself instructive: the first four caliphs and the Umayyad ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz; al-Ṣāḥibī and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (with some Ḥanbalī jāhāds); also several ʿshābūd or ʿṣakhbūd such as al-Ḥasan al-ʿAṣṣrī, Fudayl b. Ṭiyād, Ibrāhīm b. ʿAdham, Sufyān al-Ṭawwārī, Ḥishr b. Ḥālīf, Maʿṣūf al-Karchī and Rabīʿa al-ʾAdawīyya.

His zeal as a catalogue of heresies and as a polemicist, which appears throughout his work and prompted him to write refutations of al-Hallādī and of ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Dīlī, appears with particular intensity in one of the major works of Ḥanbali polemic, Taḥlīls al-Bis (Cairo 1365/1936; Eng. tr. by D. S. Margoliouth, The Devil’s Handmaid, in IC V1, xxi-xlii (1935)-xii (1938)), in which he attacks not only the various sects more or less outside Sunnism (khawāridj, rawāfīd, muṣlaṣṣa, faḍlsafa, bāṣmīyya, etc.), but also, within Sunnism, all those whom he considered responsible for having introduced into the dogma or the law of Islam innovations which were to be condemned (bidaʾa): ḥabādī, traditionists, statesmen and, above all, ṣafyīyya, among whom men such as ʿAbū Tālīb al-Makki, al-Kuḥayri and al-Ghazzālī, with many others, are vigorously attacked. Ibn al-Djawzī left, together with an excellent manual of Ḥanbali ḥikāh, several collections of sermons.

Ibn al-Djawzī had very many disciples and his influence on the Hanbalism of the Ayyūbid period was considerable. The traditionist ʿAbd al-Ḥanī al-Makdisī (d. 600/1203-4) and the juristconsult Muwaffak al-Dīn b. Kuḍāmā (d. 620/1223) went to Baghhdād to study under him or his disciples. Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) also had a profound knowledge of his works.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Radjab, Dhayl al-ʿalā Tabākāt al-anbāba, Cairo 1372/1953, i, 399-434; Ibn Ṭabīḥ, Bidaṣṣa, Cairo 1351-8/1932-9, xii, 28-30; Ibn al-ʿImād, Ṣahāḥara, iv, 329-30; Brockelmann, I, 656-66 and S I, 914-20; ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-ʿAllāghī, Muṣalāfāt Ibn al-Djawzī, Baghhdād 1385/1965. (H. LAOUST)
and it is still on this one alone that the printed edition of Haydarabad is based (1952); in the Recueil des historiens des Croisades a manuscript of the al-Yünini group was used, but the part published (and translated) covered only about forty years, from the First Crusade onwards. The part based on Ghars al-Nīma is still unpublished and little known, although an edition of it is planned by G. Makdisi and Cl. Cahen.

The Mirāṭ al-zaman is the basic source for all the wealth of the later historiography of Damascus as well as of various other historical works. It was the source in particular already of the two parts of the Two Gardens by the contemporaries of Sibt, ʿAbū Shāma. Much used by al-Dhabài, it was almost the sole source of Ibn ʿAṣir and of very large sections of the Nūdūj of Ibn Ṭabarī. The Mirāṭ and the Muṣāfārīḍ of Ibn Wāsĩl alone between them provide nine-tenths of the information known to later writers on the Ayyubids.

There are attributed to Sibt Ibn al-Dżawzǐ a “Mirror for princes” written for al-Muẓārī: ed. Bergstrasser Cawnpore 1288/1871, 392; Brockelmann, II, 201-3, S II, 274-8; F. Bustani, Dārīr al-muṣāfārīḍ, ii, 405-6. (M. BEN CHENEB*)
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in 774/1373, from Diya al-ʿald al-Mawlid al-kabīr, a biography of the conversion; Muhammad ibn al-Dżawzǐ, on the subject of his parents’ works on the Prophet: the orthodoxy of Ibn al-Dżawzǐ, a treatise on pronunciation, in the margin of Ibn ʿAṣir, ed. Bergstrasser Cawnpore 1288/1871, 392; Brockelmann, II, 201-3, S II, 274-8; F. Bustani, Dārīr al-muṣāfārīḍ, ii, 405-6. (M. BEN CHENEB*)
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IBN DJAZLA, Abu 'Ali Yahya b. Isä, Arab physician of Baghdad, known in the West under the names of Ben Guela, Bungaasha, Buhaaisha, etc. Of Christian origin, he embraced Islam under the influence of his teacher, the Mu'tazili Abu 'Ali ibn al-Walid, on 11 Djamada II 466/11 February 784. He was secretary to the Harafi käf of Baghdaad and studied medicine with Şüfi'd b. Hihat Alläh, court physician to al-Muktadi. He lived in the al-Karkh quarter, where he attended his neighbours and his friends without payment and even obtained the necessary medicines for them. He died in Şa'bân 493/June 1100. Ibn Djazla is the author of: (1) Ta'kwim al-abdân fi ta'dib al-insân (printed in Damascus in 3333/1944), which was translated into Latin by the Sicilian Jewish physician, Faradj b. Salim (Magister Farachi) in 1074. He was secretary to the Hanafi of Baghdad which was translated into Latin by the Sicilian Jewish physician, Faradj b. Salim (Magister Farachi) in 1074 (M. D.). (2) Fadâ'il al-jirb (a) al-Radd us'a l-'Naṣârâ', a work in praise of Islam and criticizing Christianity and, in passing, also Judaism; it is apparent from the author's attitude that the basic reason for his conversion to Islam was his identification of Muham- mad with the prophet announced in the books of the Pentateuch and the Gospels. (5) al-Ishâra fi tâlqib al-Ýibâra. (6) Mukhâr Mukhâlasa Tarîkh Baghdaad, a work of the author of al-Khatîb al-Baghdâdi.

Bibliography: Ibn Abî Usaybi'a, ed. Müller, i, 255; Ibn al-Kifî, 356; Ibn al-Khâlikîn, no. 822; Zirikî, A'dâm, ix, 203; Brockelmann, i, 485, S 1, 888; Leclerc, Histoire de la médecine, ii, 1, 493; Stein- scheider, nos. 40 and 41; J. von Sontheimer, Schriften, nos. 40 and 4f. (on succedanea) and, especially, his famous Zâd al-musâfîr ("Viaticum"). The latter was introduced into Spain by his pupil 'Umar b. Hafs b. Bariik, became known in Italy, and was translated into Greek during the author's lifetime. Later it was translated also into Latin and Hebrew. Several philosophical works of his are also cited. He composed three historical works: Kitâb Maqâsir Irsîbya (on the Arab conquest), K. Aḥbâr al-dawla (on the Fatimid dynasty), and K. al-Tarîkh bi-bâbak al-târîkh (collection of biographies), consulted by Yakût; probably also a K. Ta'labâ al-budûd ("classes" of kädîs); and a geographical work: K. Aḥdâjîb al-bulîdân. These books have not survived, but were used by the anonymous author of the Kitâb al-Qiyân, al-Bakri, Ibn Hâyân, Abû Bakr al-Mâlikî, and al-Safadî.


IBN DJILIKI (see 'ABD AL-RAHMAN B. MARWAN).

IBN DJINNI, Abu 'L-Fath 'Uthmân, was born in Mosul before 300/913 (Pröster, p. x, ca. 320), the son of a Greek slave belonging to Sulaymân b. Fahd b. Ahmad al-Asdi. His teacher was the Basran Abu 'Ali al-Farisi, with whom he was associated for forty years till the latter's death, partly at the court of Sayl al-Dawla at Aleppo and partly at the court of 'Adud al-Dawla in Fârs; according to Yakût, he held the post of Kâtib al-ínhâq at the court of the latter and of Şamsâm al-Dawla. In both places he was on friendly terms with al-Mutanabbi, with whom he discussed grammatical questions and on whose Du'ân he wrote two commentaries; as they were merely grammatical, it was criticized by Abû Hayyân al-Tawhidi. He also sought other teachers (Rescher, 5 f.). He succeeded al-Farisi in Baghdad and died in 392/1002. He devoted himself especially to grammar and is celebrated as the most learned authority on tarsîf; he occupied a position midway between the Kûfa and the Þarsha schools. He founded the science of etymology (al-tâbîjib al-askâb), see J. Goldzehir, in ZDMG, xxxi (1877), 546. His most important works are K. ūlûm al-lugâa (on classical rules (quotation from Khashâ'is, in al-Suyûtî, Mu'ṣirî, ii, 494). Besides other philological works he also wrote poems.


(J. PEDERSEN)
IBN DJUBAYR, ABU 'L-HUSAYN MUHAMMAD B. AHMAD B. DJUBAYR AL-KINANI, Andalusian traveller and writer, born at Valencia 540/1145, into a family which had settled in Spain in 1233/740.

He studied at Játiva, where his father was a civil servant, and received the traditional instruction of young men of his class, that is to say he learnt the rudiments of the religious sciences and of belles-lettres at the same time, but not without learning how to exercise his poetical skill. His talents won for him the post of secretary to the governor of Granada, Abu Sa'd Uthman b. 'Abd al-Mu'min, but having been induced to drink wine on a certain occasion, he repented bitterly, and to expiate this sin decided to make the pilgrimage to Mecca. His fame rests on his account of this fairly eventful journey, the Rihla.

Leaving Granada on 19 Shawwal 578/3 February 1183 in the company of his friend Ahmad b. Hassân, he proceeded to Ceuta via Tarif and there embarked for Alexandria on a Genoese ship, which took a month to reach its destination by way of Sardinia, Sicily, and Crete. At Alexandria Ibn Djubayr had to endure vexations at the hands of the Egyptian customs of which he gives a highly lively picture. To reach Mecca he then had to pass through Cairo, Kus, and 'Aydhab, and then cross the Red Sea to Djudda. After staying for nine months in the holy city and performing the pilgrimage, he visited Medina and continued his journey across the desert as far as Kufa; from there he went to Baghdad and Mosul, crossed the Djafrat to Aleppo, came down to Damascus, and went thence to Acre to wait for a ship to take him back to his native land. He embarked there, again in a Genoese vessel, on 10 Rajab 580/18 October 1184, bound for Italy; he narrowly escaped with his life in a dramatic shipwreck in the straits of Messina. Re-embarking at Venice, he arrived at Cartagena on 15 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 580/15 March 1185 and returned to Granada on 22 Muharram 581/25 April 1185.

Four years later he undertook a second voyage to the east, which lasted from 585/1185 to 587/1187, but he has left no account of this journey. In 614/1217 he set off once more and stopped at Alexandria in order to teach there; it is there that he died on 27 Shawwâl 614/29 November 1217.

Ibn Djubayr's Rihla is the first and one of the best of the kinds of books which have been as model to many other pilgrims, and many later authors have borrowed from it shamelessly, beginning with Ibn Djuzayy [q.v.], the editor of the Rihla of Ibn Batûta [q.v.], who had no scruples in copying from it, especially in expressing the sentiments and in giving generalities on a country, desert towns, and also in expressing the sentiments which storms inspire in this poet; on the other hand, he is skilful at seizing the characteristic and picturesque traits of an animated crowd, and on these occasions his colourful and simple style gives an entirely modern air to his narrative. The verses which have been preserved are of traditional type and of generally sententious character, this dedicated traveller sighing for homesickness for his native land and advising his contemporaries never to go abroad.

The Rihla became known in Europe in the middle of the 19th century. A fragment was published and translated in Les Historiens orientaux des Croisades, iii, and M. Amari also edited and translated an extract under the title of Voyage en Sicule sous le règne de Guillaume le Bon, 1846; the whole was published in full by M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, 3 vols., Paris 1949-56.


(Ch. Pellat)

IBN DJULDJUN, ABU DAWUD SULAYMAN B. HASSAN AL-ANDALUSI, Arab physician, perhaps of Spanish extraction, born in Cordova 332/944, died after 384/994. He began the study of grammar and tradition in Cordova in 349/954, but already at the age of 15 turned to medicine, in which field ten years later he was acknowledged as the personal physician of al-Mu'ayyad bi'llâh Hishâm (336-99/977-1009). It was during this period that he wrote most of his works, such as the Tafsir anwâr al-adâwya al-muwfrada min kitâb Dizwahûrûd, composed in 372/982 (of which only extracts survive, in Ms Madrid 233) and the Tabakkat al-âdîbbîn wa 'l-ibhamâm, composed in 377/987 (ed. Fu'âd Sâyyid, Les générations des médecins et des sages, Cairo 1955). Further works are: Maðâla fi al-âdîwya allâtî lam yadhkurû Dizwahûrûd (perhaps extant in the manuscript of mixed contents Bodl. 573); Maðâla fi al-adâwya al-tîrîdâk (in Bodl. 573); Risâlât al-tâbûbîn fi mî lâklâl fîhi bâm al-mu'atlabûbûn (lost). Among these works the History of Physicians (Tabakkat al-âdîbbûn) can claim especial interest; firstly, it is, after the Ta'rikh al-âdîbbîn of Ishâk b. Hunayn (ed. F. Rosenthal, in Orientis, vii (1954), 55-80), probably the oldest collection of biographies of physicians in Arabic, and secondly it is the earliest example of the use of Arabic translations from Latin (Orosius, Chronicle of Hieronymus, Eutychiologiae of Isidorus of Seville).

Bibliography (in addition to works mentioned above): Ibn Abî Usaybiya, 'Uyûn al-anbâ, ii, 46-8; Ibn al-Qâfi, Ta'rikh, ed Lippert, 190; Sà'id al-

IBN DIJUJYIL [see IBN DIHYA].

IBN DJUZAY, Abû 'Abd Allâh Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Kalbi, Arab writer, born in 721/1321 at Granada of a literary family. His father, Abû 'l-Kâsim Muhammad b. Ahmad, was known also as a poet and as a sâhib; born in 693/1294-5, he was one of the teachers of Liân al-Dîn Ibn al-Khatîb and died at the battle of Rio Salado in 741/1340 (cf. al-Makâri, *Nafr al-jib*, ed. M. M. 'Abd Allâh Muhammad b. Ahmad, Cairo 1367-9, 10 vols., viii, 28-31; Brockelmann, ii, 342, S II, 377; U. R. Khabbâla, *Mu'jam al-muwâllâfîn*, Damascus 1376-81/1956-71, 13 vols., i-xi). His three sons, Ahmad, Muhammad and 'Abd Allâh, carried on the family's literary and juristic traditions (cf. Makâri, ibid., 31 f.; Liân al-Dîn Ibn al-Khatîb, *al-Îdâ' fi 'ashbâr Khûrânâ*, ed. by M. A. 'Inân, i, Cairo 1375/1955, 163-48, 411). Of the three, it was Muhammad (Abû 'Abd Allâh) whose fame chiefly survived. Having served as sâhib during the reign of the Nasir Abû 'l-Hâjîdîdî Yûsûf (723-35/1323-54), he then went to Fez, where the Marinid Abû 'l-'Inân (750-9/1349-58) commanded him to take down in writing the text of the *Râf'îla* of Ibn al-Abbar (q.v.). Besides his redaction of this work, Abû 'Abd Allâh wrote poems and various other works, particularly on history, law and philology. He died circa 756/1355-7.


IBN DUKMÂK, Șârîm al-Dîn Ibrahim b. Muhammad b. Aydâmur al-‘âlî al-mîşrî (the name is derived from the Turkish șâkim “hammer”, cf. Hâdidî Khallîa, ed. Flûgè, i, 102), b. about 750/1350, was a zealous Hanafi and wrote a work on the *Taba'kat* of the Hanafis, *Nafr al-dîmmân*, in three volumes, the first of which deals with Abû Hânîfa (Hâdidî Khallîa, i, 136; vi, 377); on account of his depreciatory references to al-Shâfî'î he was haggled and thrown into prison. His history of Egypt, *Nuzhât al-anâm*, in about 12 vols. to the year 779, was of great importance (Hâdidî Khallîa, i, 102; vi, 323). By command of the Sultan al-Malîk al-Zâhir Barqûk he wrote a history of the rulers of Egypt to the year 805; he further wrote a separate history of this Sultan, *'îbâl al-dîwâhir*; he started al-Malîk al-Zâhir Barqûk, abbreviated under the title Yânbâ' al-masákîsh (Hâdidî Khallîa, ii, 102; iv, 230; vi, 514). According to Hâdidî Khallîa, his historical works were largely utilized by al-'Aynî and al-Askalâni (i, 447; ii, 118). He wrote a large work on ten cities of Islam, *Kisâb al-inâshir il-wââsîf 'ibâl l-amârs*, devoting one volume to each city; of these volumes the 4th and 5th describing Cairo and Alexandria are preserved in Cairo and have been published by Vollets (Cairo 1314/1893). According to Vollets (p. 5) he used better authorities than al-Mâşrî. The latter, for a time his pupil, seems not to have used his work. Ibn Dukmâk also wrote a work on Sûfi biographies, *Câmî al-makfûsîyya fi 'i'tânî al-Sâfîyya* (Vollers, 4), also a book on the organization of the army, *Târîkh al-sâmân* (Hâdidî Khallîa, ii, 277), and a book on the interpretation of dreams, *Fârâkîl* (op. cit., 392). According to al-Suyûtî, *Husn al-muhâdara* fi 'îbâl Mîr wa l-Khûrânâ, Cairo 1321/1903, i, 266, he died in 790/1388, aged over 80; so also Hâdidî Khallîa, i, 447; ii, 102, 277; but in any case he was still alive in 793 (see Vollers, *Introduction*) and Hâdidî Khallîa elsewhere gives the date of his death at 809/1406 (ii, 149; iv, 350; 192; vi, 353, 357, 514).


IBN AL-DUMAYNA, one of the lesser poets of the late Umayyad and the early 'Abbâsid.
periods. His name was Abu 'l-Sari 'Abd Allah b. 'Ubayd Allah b. Ahmad. He belonged to the Banu 'Amir b. Taym Allah, a clan of the Kharijite tribe. His mottled way of Dumayna bist Budhaya al-Saliliyya. His notoriety rests on the story of how he murdered the seducer of his wife, killed her and her little daughter, and was finally slain in the ensuing blood-feud. This story is told with many differences in the details and embellished with spurious poems in Aghâni, xv, 151-4.

In his verses he deals mainly with love and its sorrows, with personal and picturesque writing reminiscent of poetry. Owing to this affinity in style and sentiment, some of his verses and even whole poems are attributed to other authors, whilst he is reported to have usurped one basida from his contemporary Ibn al-Taghriyya (see Bakrî, Simt al-la‘dî, 490; cf. also ibîd., 49). Some verses of his (often interpolated) became popular love-songs (Aghâni, x, 161; xv, 155; xix, 82 f.; xxi, 252, 17). Al-Zubayr b. Bakkar collected 100 difficult couplets together with their exegesis in his Kasida (see J. Kraemer in ZDMG, ex, 259-73) to al-Maksur wa’l-Mamdûd (see Fihrist, 49). Some verses of his (often interpolated) were collected in the Kitâb al-Mudânt (without introduction)—The other work of the same title was written by Ibn Abi Tahir (Fihrist, 147). His diwan was published in Cairo in 1337/1918 (see Mackriq, 1920 49) on the basis of two manuscripts of the Dâr al-Kutub but the oldest known manuscript (Istanbul Asir Ef. 950, cf. Ö. Rescher in MFOB, v, 515), containing the recension of Tha‘lab and Muh. b. ‘Abd Allah, has been used as basis for a good edition by A. R. al-Naffakh, Cairo 1379/1960.


IBN DURAYD, ABU BAKR MUHAMMAD B. AL-HASÂN AL-AZDÎ, Arab philologist and lexicographer, born at Basra in 225/847 as son of a nafs of some standing and wealth. He was a pure Arab belonging to the Azd (q.v.) of Umân and tracing his pedigree back to Kahtag (Ta‘rîkh Baţhâdâd, ii, 195). He was educated by his uncle al-Husayn b. Durayd who engaged for him as tutor the philologist Abu ‘Uthman al-Ushnandani of the Banu ‘Umara (reigned 237-273; Zambaur, 202). Ibn Durayd went back to ‘Irak and settled in Baghdad. Al-Muqtadir granted him a monthly stipend of 50 dinar so that he could carry on his studies and his teaching. His profound know-ledge of the language and poetry of the Arabs attracted many students. Among the more famous of his pupils are: Abû Sa‘îd al-Shâfî (284-368), al-Marzbân, Fârîq al-Askari (q.v.) (284-356), Abû ‘Ali al-Baţhâdî al-Khalî [q.v.] (288-356), who made Ibn Durayd’s works known in Spain (see Ibn Khayr, Fahrasa, 348 f., 366, 398, 400), al-Zâdîdî[; (d. 337), Ibn Khâlawayh [q.v.], Abû Ahmad al-A’askarî [q.v.].

Ibn Durayd’s chief work is his monumental dictionary al-Dajmahara (Haydarâbâd 1344), which contains some materials not to be found in our dictionaries; in it Ibn Durayd made use of the Kitâb al-‘Ayn of Khallî—which gave his enemies a pretext for their slander—but in selecting and arranging the words he followed his own judgement. He included a large number of loanwords, tracing as far as possible their origins. His Kitâb al-Ishbâhî (ed. Wustenfeld, Göttingen 1854) was prompted by the assertion of some (non-Arabs) that the names of the Arabs had on the whole no meaning; therefore, Ibn Durayd gives in this book the etymology of their proper names, arranging them according to the genealogical system.—His Kitâb al-Malakânî (Cairo 1347) contains about 400 ambiguous words for the benefit of such persons who, when unjustly forced to take an oath, want to take refuge in mental reservation.—The Kitâb al-Mujtânî (ed. Krenkow, Haydarâbâd 1342) is a miscellany of remarkable sayings of the Prophet and his successors. There are also some apoplectic fits, he died at the age of 98 in Baghdad. Al-Muqtadir was courageous, generous and kind. He was also a cultured man, enjoying good books (see Yakût, Udadâb, vi, 493) as well as singing and music. After two apoplectic fits, he died at the age of 98 in Baghdad on Wednesday, 17 Shawâb 352/2 August 931 on the same day as Abû ‘Uthman al-Dujûbâb, the leading Mu’tazili.

Bibliography: given in the article; see also Fihrist, 61 f.; Marzbânî, Mu‘âjam al-‘uwarâ’î, 461 f.; Ta‘rîkh Baţhâdâd, ii, 155 f.; Anbârî, Nuska, 322-6; Yakût, Udadâb, vi, 483-94; Ibn al-Khîfî, Inbâî, iii, 92-100; Ibn Khallîkân, no. 648; Ibn Ibn
IBN DURAYD — IBN FADL ALLĀH AL-'UMARI


J. W. Fock

IBN DURUSTAWAYH, important grammarian born in 258/871, died at Baghdad in 346/957, all of whose works are lost, with the exception of a Kūtub al-Kutūb (referred to in the works of the Sons of Mekhā and also of his contemporary, the famous al-Darākūtmi). These compilations still existed in the time of al-Khālid al-Baghdādī (5th/11th century). Ibn Durustawayh was also an exegetist of the Korān, in which he was a transmitter of the ancient masters 'Abbās b. Dūrī and Ya'qūb b. Sufyān al-Nasawl, and also of his contemporary, the famous al-Dārākūtmi. His learning was very extensive; it embraced hadīth, and also of his father al-Adham, who was appointed to replace him as head of chancery in Cairo. As for Aḥmad, it was not long before he was thrown in prison, having further incurred the displeasure of the Sultan.

Released from prison in the early months of 749/1349, Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad was soon after appointed head of chancery in Damascus, taking charge at the start of the next year. He remained in that office until 743/1342, when he was dismissed and replaced by his brother Ḍar al-Dīn Muḥammad. Aḥmad remained out of office until his death, of a fever, on 9 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 749/1 March 1349. His principal works may well have been the product of the leisure of his last years, while he was living in retirement in Damascus.

Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad, as a government official, was not as successful as his father or his two brothers. Obstinate and outspoken, he was not the sort of man to win easy favour with a sovereign, and he was quick to make enemies of people with whom he dealt. It was the frequent complaints against him that finally brought about his dismissal from the chancery of Damascus. However, he outlived other members of his family by his brilliance as a writer and expert on a wide variety of subjects related to politics and administration. It is with these subjects that his principal works deal. The compendium al-Ta'rif bi 'l-muṣaḥtāb al-ṣaḥīf (ed. Cairo 1312 A.H.) is a manual of administration which describes the organization of the Mamluk empire in its various provinces and explains the manner of correspondence between the central chancery in Cairo and the other central and provincial offices. The book also explains the manner of correspondence with tribal chiefs, heads of Muslim and dhimmī sects, and foreign rulers. The encyclopaedic Masālik al-abṣār fi mamdlik al-ṣaḥār (vol. i, ed. Cairo 1924) touches on many subjects (literature, history, geography, religion and law, politics and administration), and is designed to serve the same purpose as al-Ta'rif. The two works continued to be regarded as authoritative on the subject of administration during the Mamluk period, and were imitated with due reference by al-Kalākshandi (q.v.) in his well-known Ṣubh al-ṣābīfi ikhbāt al-inṣāb. Apart from al-Ta'rif and Masālik, Aḥmad Ibn Fadl Allah left a history of his family (whose ancestry he traced to the Ḍar al-Dīn Muḥammad, whence the nisba al-'Umari), a number of other essays and letters, and some verse of little importance. His over-ornate Arabic prose style was highly esteemed by writers of the Mamluk period.


IBN FAḌL ALLĀH AL-'UMARI, distinguished author and administrator of the Mamluk period, who served al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Kālāwūn (q.v.) in the chancery of Cairo and Damascus and left important works on the organization and administration of the Mamluk state.

Shihāb al-Dīn Abu ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā Ibn Fadl Allah al-Kurābādī al-'Umārī, a distinguished author and official of the Mamluk period, was born in Damascus on 3 Sha'wwal 779/12 June 1301, of a Shīfī family already distinguished in the Mamluk civil service [see Faḍl Allāh]. His father, Muḥyī al-Dīn Yaḥyā Ibn Fadl Allah, was head of chancery (ḥālib al-sirr) first in Damascus, and after 729/1329 in Cairo, and Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad began his public career as an assistant in Cairo as his father's personal secretary and replacement by his brother ʿAlī al-Dīn ʿAlī. When Muḥyī al-Dīn Yaḥyā died in 738/1337 it was ʿAlī who was appointed to replace him as head of chancery in Cairo. As for Aḥmad, it was not long before he was thrown in prison, having further incurred the displeasure of the Sultan.

Released from prison in the early months of 749/1349, Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad was soon after appointed head of chancery in Damascus, taking charge at the start of the next year. He remained in that office until 743/1342, when he was dismissed and replaced by his brother ʿAlī al-Dīn ʿAlī. When Muḥyī al-Dīn Yaḥyā died in 738/1337 it was ʿAlī who was appointed to replace him as head of chancery in Cairo. As for Aḥmad, it was not long before he was thrown in prison, having further incurred the displeasure of the Sultan.

IBN FA_DL ALL_Á_I-IBN FAHD


IBN FAHD, an important Meccan family whose activities during a period of two hundred years in the 8th-10th/14th-16th centuries are known in quite considerable detail. The family claimed Alid descent through Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya. Its members were all well trained in the traditional subjects and learned mainly in Shi'í but also in Hanafi law. Through four successive generations, they boasted of productive historians whose chief interest lay in local history and biography. Through marriage, the Banu Fahd were closely allied to many other influential Meccan families as well as to scholars from other countries who had come to settle in Mecca. Many of them made their living as merchants. Travel on business took them on frequent trips not only all over Arabia, Syria, and Egypt, but also as far as India and the Red Sea port of Suakin.

"Ibn Fadlan's Reisebericht, Leipzig 1939; Quatremère, Notices de l'ouvrage ... to teach the Bulghars the laws of Islam. The embassy left Baghdad on 11 Safar 309/21 June 921, eunuch Susan al-Rassl, a client of Nadhir al-Harami (s.vv. Itil, Bashgard, Bulghur, Khazar, Khwarazm, Rūz), in whose time several copies of it had been in circulation. Since the discovery of a manuscript at Mashhad which was perhaps an official report addressed to the chancellery at Baghdad, nor a complete text, since it lacks the account of the return journey, and although the quotations from it by Persian writers do not correspond to this text but to an abridged version thought to be the work of a Sāmānid vizier, the account, even so, is of great historical, geographical and ethnographic interest and shows that Ibn Fadlan possessed extraordinary powers of observation and an enquiring mind, which led him to bring back a mass of extremely important information on the peoples, including the Rūz and the Khazars, whom he had been able to see himself or of whom he had heard accounts during his journey.

The judge Muhammad b. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad (ca. 735/736-812/856), and his grandson 'Abd al-Rahman b. Yusuf (767/843-1350), a Shafi'i scholar from Asfūn in Upper Egypt, who had taken up residence in Mecca (Ibn Hajjar, Durar, ii, 350; Ibn al-'Imād, Shahrā'ī, vi, 168; Brockelmann, S II, 227). His son 'Abd al-Rahman had a son Yahyā (789-843/1387-1439), who engaged in the Indian trade (al-Sakhwī, Daww, v, 233); he married the daughter of a Meccan merchant, al-Dūkā (Daww, v, 240 f.), and had a son 'Abd al-Kāfi (909-988/1500-1569), a rather unsuccessful merchant, who died in Sūakin on a business trip (Daww, iv, 299). Another son of the judge Muhammad, also named Muhammad (ca. 760-812/1358(9)-1408) (Daww, ii, 211), had a son 'Atiyah (804-874/1402-1469) (Daww, v, 148 f.), who married Fatīmah, the daughter of a man of Indian ancestry (Daww, ii, 167, no. 477). They had two sons, Hasan (843-922/1443-1516) (Daww, iii, 105; Ibn al-'Imād, Shahrā'ī, vii, 98 f.) and al-Hāfiz, who died as an infant in 849/1445 (Daww, iii, 148).

'Atiyah's elder brother,

1. TAKI 'L-DIN MUHAMMAD, born in Asfūn on Tuesday, 5 Rabī' 1 II 787/16 May 1385, collected a very large library in Mecca and was a prolific author. He wrote on Muhammad's biography, the stories of the prophets, the glyphs of the Kurayshī, the history of local scholars and the history of various places in and around Mecca, and many other subjects. A list of his works is said to be contained in his 'Umādash al-muntahābi (preserved in Cairo). Among his surviving works deals with Dībalā Thawr near Mecca (Brockelmann, S II, 538, where the work is listed), and writing on his great-grandson Djar Allah. His Labīs al-āhās, a continuation of al-Dhahabi's Tabāhāti al-bu'fās, has been published in Damascus (Daww, ii, 347 [pp. 69-94]), it consists of a number of biographies, interspersed with repeated brief notices of the dates of death of scholars in various regions of the Muslim world, and was transmitted by his great-grandson Djar Allah through his grandson 'Abd al-'Azīz and al-Sakhwī. Taki 'l-Dīn died on Saturday, 7 Rābī' 1 II 817/15 January 1406 (Daww, ix, 281-83; Brockelmann, II, 225, S II, 225, III, 1267, 1387-1439), who engaged in the Indian trade (al-Sakhwī, Daww, xi, 93), served, ostensibly in his own handwriting, in Yale University Library L-235 (Nemoy 1292, 1592) and the MS L-234 in Yale University Library. He died in 885/10 November 1480 (Daww, vi, 126).—

2. NADJM AL-DIN C. ABU 'L-KASIM 'AZIZ, born on Saturday, 26 Shawwāl 850/14 January 1447. He closely followed his father in collecting a Muḏjam, making an index to al-Dhahabi's Tabāhāti al-bu'fās, and writing on the history of Mecca. He also compiled a history of Egypt as well as an annalistic history starting with the year 872/1467. Among manuscripts written by him is the Muǧjam of his father in Bankiroke (xii, no. 727) and the MS L-234 in Yale University Library. He died in 921/1415 (Daww, iv, 224-6; al-Ghazalī, al-Kawākib al-sawāra, ed. J. S. Jabbar, i, 238 f.; Ibn al-'Imād, Shahrā'ī, viii, 100-102; Brockelmann, II, 224, S II, 224). Of his children from his marriage to his cousin Kamīliyya bint Abī Bakr, Yahyā died as an infant (Daww, x, 234). His successor as the family scholar, Ibn al-'Imād, Djar Allah, owned after him the manuscript written by 'Abd al-'Azīz (no. 3) preserved in the Yale Library L-234 (fol. 13, 128a, 1655).—

A certain Taki 'l-Dīn Abū Bakr b. Fahd, who died in 946/1340-91, also seems wrongly, under his great-grandson Djar Allah. His Tāhklk al-radjb li-^uluww al-makarr Karādāğ, a work on the history of the sanctuary in Mecca, a Kasāh al-Kird fi awwiyat Umm al-Kurā (incomplete) and on the ribāb of al-'Abbās in Mecca (related to the work mentioned above? ) are preserved, ostensibly in his own handwriting, in Yale University Library L-235 (Nemoy 1292, 1592) (Daww, iii, 52; al-Aydarūsī, al-Nār al-safīr, 241 f.; al-Ghazalī, Kawākib, ii, 131; Ibn al-'Imād, Shahrā'ī, vii, 302; Brockelmann, II, 516, S II, 538, 1295). A son of Djar Allah, Muḥammad, owned after him the manuscript written by 'Abd al-'Azīz (no. 3) preserved in the Yale Library L-234 (fol. 13, 128a, 1655).—

Bibliography: In the article, which is based mainly on al-Sakhwī, Daww (cf. also Daww, xi, 265). More manuscripts of works by members of the family than are hitherto known will no doubt be identified in the future.

(F. ROSENTHAL)

IBN AL-FAHĀM, ABU 'L-KASIM 'AHD AL-
RAHMÁN B. ‘ATÍB b. KHÁLAF AL-ṢÍLÍLLI (422-516/1030-1122), mufrí*, was probably born in Sicily but soon emigrated to Egypt, where we find him in 438/1046-7, that is, in the time of al-Mustansir (427/1036-94) ‘Alā al-bīrādī, say the sources, the traditional science for which he was able to follow the lectures of such scholars as Ahmad b. ‘Alī b. Hāshim, Ibn Nafis, ‘Abd al-Bākī b. Fāris and Abu ‘l-Ḥusayn al-Ṣāfīrī al-Shirāzī. His master in grammar was the famous ‘Aṭhir b. Aḥmad b. Bābāshād (q.v.) and Ibn al-Faḥhām had the distinction of transmitting to his own country the two redactions of the commentaries of the celebrated Muḥaddās, which the pupil had taken down at the master’s dictation (the other commentary is connected with the name of Khaṭāb al-Ibrāhīm, d. 511/1121).

We know scarcely anything of his life in Sicily and nothing of the main phases of his long stay in Egypt, which he left in 504/1110-11 for an unknown destination. The biographers merely tell us that his fame in Alexandria as a master of ḥurūf was so great that he acquired the title of shaykh al-Isbrandaryya. Among his disciples in that town, two may be mentioned: ‘Aṭār ‘Aṭār al-Silāfī (q.v.) and another scholar of Sicilian origin, ‘Uṯmān b. ‘Alī b. ‘Umar al-Sarāqūši al-Ṣūlīlī, philologist and grammarian who lived in the 5th/9th-11th/12th centuries.

Ibn al-Faḥhām is best known by his work on the science of ḥurūf, which is entitled al-Taḍ̄rīḍ fi bughṭat al-murid, while his Muṣraḍḍat Yaḥḥāb have been almost forgotten in the literature of the traditional Muslim sciences.

*Biography:* For the biographical sources, the MSS, commentaries, versifications etc., of the work of Bābāshād, as well as for the argument and a summary of the chapters of the Taḍ̄rīḍ, see U. Rizzitano, Ibn al-Fakih muqri* “siciliano”, in Studi Or. in onore di G. Levi Della Vida, Rome 1956, II, 403-24. (U. Rizzitano)

**IBN AL-FAKIH**, Iranian author of a geography written in Arabic, who lived in the 3rd/9th century. Nothing is known of his life and only one of his works survives, in an abridged form. De Goeje introduced his edition of this work with an authoritative preface in which he reproduced the information, of varying reliability, which Ibn al-Nadim and the geographer al-Muṣaddadī provide on Ibn al-Fakih, and the biographies of al-Mukaddasi (Aṣbah al-taḥāsūm, ed. De Goeje, 4-5) attributes to him a work in five books, that is, in the time of his native country, the digressions are: the “passing from the serious to the sweet, from the jesting to the serious” (41), a debate between the Syrians and the people of Baṣra, and the superiority of the palm tree over the date palm (118), praise of building (151), the duties of an author and the virtues of a good book—a digression which could serve as an introduction to the whole work (153), al-Maqṣūdī’s donation (520-1), which gives to each country a gift, to the exclusion of others (251).

According to al-Muṣaddadī, Ibn al-Fakih borrowed a great deal from al-Dījbiz (whom he mentions only three times: 116, 165, 253). But these digressions lead to the conclusion that, without borrowing directly from al-Dījbiz, he was influenced by him.

The general content of the work may be described here in the assessment by De Goeje, who made a
IBN AL-FAKIH — IBN FARADJ AL-DJAYYANI

The profound study of it: "... I thought that some extracts would suffice, but a more detailed inspection makes me change my mind: this work provides a very important contribution to the history of culture in the second part of the 3rd/9th century..." To this may be added the opinion of the works towards the world of Islam.

"Chronologically, Ibn al-Fakih occupies an essential place in the history of Arabic geography: appearing after the first, basically technical, works, ... on the one hand he reinforced the trend of technical geography towards an inclusion of the themes of adab, and on the other he helped to direct the interest of writers towards the world of Islam."

IBN AL-FAKIH, Compendium libri Kitab al-boldan, ed. M. J. De Goeje (= BGA, v), Leiden 1885; Breckenmann, I, 121, no. 4, S. 1, 405 no. 4—406 (= a new edition is in preparation by E. Bräunlich); R. Blachère, Extraits des principaux geographes arabes du moyen-âge, 70 ff. ("Ibn-al-Fakih has reproduced a large number of the legends, beliefs and ideas concerning the geographical folklore of his time")


"A French translation based on the four manuscripts is now (1967) in the course of revision."

(H. MASSÉ)

IBN AL-FARADJ, ABU 'L-WALID 'ABD ALLAH B. MUHAMMAD B. YUSUF B. NAŠR AL-ĂZdí R. B. AL-FARADJ, Andalusian scholar, was born at Cordova on the night of Monday-Tuesday 22-3 Dhu 'il-Ka'b 351/22-3 December 962. He studied law, Tradition, literature, and history; in the course of his travels he had gathered together a rich library. Of his works we possess only the Ta'rikh al-Andalús, ed. Coder, BAH, vii-viii, Madrid 1897. The scrupulous exactitude of this work and the abundant information which it provides made Ibn al-Faradji the initiator of a series of geographical works embracing the whole of the Iberian peninsula. This success, being continued and amplified in the course of the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries by Ibn Baghkwil (q.v.) with his Silâ, Ibn al-Abbâr (q.v.) in his turn supplemented this Silâ with his Takmilat al-Sîla down to the middle of the 7th/13th century and finally this series of supplements to Ibn al-Faradji's 'Arâf received a final revision in the 8th/14th century by Ibn al-Zubâr, of which the incomplete manuscript belonging to the library of the famous bibliophile Sîdî Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Hayy al-Kattânî was edited by Lévi-Provençal in a partial edition beginning with the letter 'ayn, Rabat 1937.

Bibliography: Ibn Khallikân, Wafayât, Cairo 1310/1892, i, 268; Dhahâbil, 'Ulfâs, ii, 277; Mâkânî, Nahf al-fib, Cairo 1302, i, 383; Ibn Baghkwil, Silâ, no. 567; Ibn Farhun, Dâhid, Fez 1356/1898, 149 = Cairo 1351/1932, 143; Ibn Khâkân, Majmâ' al-anfus, Istanbul 1302/1884, 57; Dâbî, no. 888; Sûyûtî, Tabâbût al-buṣfâs, xiii, 51; Wüstenfeld, Geschichtsschreiber, no. 165; P. Boigues, no. 71; Brockelmann, 133, 757-138; Ibn Bassâm, Dâhidhâ, 1/2, 130-2.

(M. BEN CHENEB-[A. HUICI MIRANDA])

IBN FARADJ AL-DJAYYANI, ABU UMAR AHMAD B. MUHAMMAD, poet, anthologist and historian of Muslim Spain. The only information we have on his life is provided by the few lines inserted by al-Ḥumaydî in his Diwânhâl al-mu'takabis and reproduced by the other sources; all that is known is that he was among the poets attached to the court of al-Ḥakam II al-Mustanṣîr (350-669/961-70). Either his misfortune or his irascible nature led him to compose so wounding a satire on al-Ḥakam that the latter consigned him to prison for the rest of his life, where he continued to write poems and books. He had two brothers, also poets: Abu Saʿîd ʿUhmân and Abu Muhammad ʿAbd Allâh, of whom we know only the names and a few verses.

Ibn al-Faradjî al-Djâyânî owes his fame to a remarkable anthology of Andalusian poetry entitled Kitâb al-Haddâk (the Gardens) and quoted by all subsequent authors; a library by the self-awareness it had acquired and of the bitterness Ibn Faradjî felt towards the caliph. Written in prison, and it probably expressed the self-awareness it had acquired and of the bitterness Ibn Faradjî felt towards the caliph. Written in prison, and it probably expressed the self-awareness it had acquired and of the bitterness Ibn Faradjî felt towards the caliph. Written in prison, and it probably expressed the self-awareness it had acquired and of the bitterness Ibn Faradjî felt towards the caliph. Written in prison, and it probably expressed the self-awareness it had acquired and of the bitterness Ibn Faradjî felt towards the caliph. Written in prison, and it probably expressed the self-awareness it had acquired and of the bitterness Ibn Faradjî felt towards the caliph. Written in prison, and it probably expressed the self-awareness it had acquired and of the bitterness Ibn Faradjî felt towards the caliph. Written in prison, and it probably expressed the self-awareness it had acquired and of the bitterness Ibn Faradjî felt towards the caliph. Written in prison, and it probably expressed the self-awareness it had acquired and of the bitterness Ibn Faradjî felt towards the caliph. Written in prison, and it probably expressed the self-awareness it had acquired and of the bitterness Ibn Faradjî felt towards the caliph.
IBN FARADJ AL-DJAYYAN — IBN AL-FARID

Cairo 1955, 56-7; idem, Rđdt, Madrid 1942, 231;
English translation by A. J. Arberry, ...

1. **Traditions, **Shāh al-arba‘in hadīth**

2. **Bibliography:** In: The...
Progress", a poem containing 760 verses, which is often called al-Ta'iyya al-kubrd to distinguish it from a much shorter one rhyming in the same letter, t. In this famous kašda, nearly equal in length to all the rest of the Disan together, Ibn al-Paris sets forth a penetrating psychological description of the whole series of mystical experiences, a unique masterpiece and an instructive work, in which the mystic's experiences are seen as a realization of Muslim orthodoxy. Among Sufis the Tā'īyya occupies the position of a classic, and many commentators have been written on it since the time of its composition. Ibn Paris endeavoured to present the vocabulary in a clear and

**Bibliography**

Brockelmann, I, 262 and S I, 462 ff. A life of the poet by his grandson 'All, the first editor of the Disan, has been published as an introduction to the edition of Ruşhayid b. Qalib ibn Dašdāb, Marseilles 1853. See also Ibn Khallikān, n. 517; Ibn ibn-'Imād, Shafa'ūrdi al-dhahab, v, Cairo 1351/1932, 149 ff.; Suyutī, Ḥusn al-muḥdhara, Cairo 1521/1903, i, 246; and the references given by Di Matteo (see below) and Nallino, loc. cit., p. 8. Other editions: Cairo 1319 (with two commentaries) and 1353 (with short notes). Translations of the Tā'īyya al-kubrā: Von Hammer, Das arabische hohe Lied der Liebe, Vienna 1854 (Arabic text and German verse translation; the latter is worthless); Di Matteo (Rome 1917); Nicholson, Studies in Islamic mysticism, Cambridge 1921, ch. iii, "The odes of Ibn al-Parish"; ibid, pp. 199-266 (with explanatory notes).—Tr. of the Khannāyya: Eng, by A. Sefi, in BSOIS, i (1922), 235-48; Fr., by E. Demenghemi, L'eloge du vin, Paris 1931 (with tr. of al-Nabulusi's commentary); Danish, in J. Pedersen, Mukammel dansk Mystik, Copenhagen 1952, 54-133.—The critical final study of Ibn al-Paris is by Nallino in his review of Di Matteo's version, in RSO, VIII (1929-30), 1-106 and 501-62. See also, Pearson, nos. 23631, 23634.

(R. A. Nicholson [J. Pedersen])

**IBN FĀRĪS, ABU 'L-HUSAYN ABDAR B. FĀRĪS B. ZAKARIYYA** b. MūH. b. RAKIB, al-S̱afi, later (in Rayy) al-Mālik, al-Lugāwī, Arab philologist.

The date of his birth in unknown and the place uncertain: on the one hand, according to one of his poems (Nallino, op. cit., 91), the place was a village of Kursūf, in the district of al-Zahrāw, and in an early nisba, al-Zahrāwī, is derived; in any case he was certainly of peasant origin (according to Yākūt, op. cit., 92, lines 12-3); on the other hand, Ibn Fāris himself, in his sources for the Makhāyor (his Mūhadimān, 1, 5) names Fāris b. Zarkariyyā as his father] as the person who transmitted to him the nisba, al-lugāwī. He wrote some forty works, which have been published, 2 of these in part only, 7 are both long and short; the most carefully prepared list of his works is by the editor of the Ḵalīf in his review of Di Matteo's version, in RSO, VIII (1929-30), 1-106 and 501-62. See also, Pearson, nos. 23631, 23634.

Ibn Fāris pursued his activities in many fields—grammar, poetry, fāṣīḥ, tafsīr—but lexicography was his favourite domain and to the Arab world he remained al-lugāwī. He wrote some forty works, both long and short: the most carefully prepared list is by the editor of the Makhāyor (i, 25-37): 11 works have been published, 2 of these in part only, 7 are still in manuscript; there are 24 of which only the title is known at present. We may particularly regret the Ḵif̱āf̱ay al-muhādhimān, which has been published in the Ḵalīf and the Ḵalīf of the Makhāyor and the Ḵalīf of the Makhāyor, referred to above and mentioned by the Fihrīṣ (80). Published works: (I) Ḵalīf al-Muḏjam fi l-lugāwī, published in part, Cairo, i vol., 1331 (according to the editor of the Makhāyor, i, 35), 1332/1914, 119 pp. (according to Sarkis, 200), numerous MSS, see Brockelmann, I 136, r 256, S I, 198. Ibn Fāris endeavoured to present the vocabulary in a clear and
authentic fashion (al-wāḏib, al-safray), by means of brief definitions, illustrated with numerous poetic literals; al-Fīruzābādī, who loved and praised Ibn Paris (Type 122), then first radical consonant and begins with 'hamza', frequently of the triliteral, then the quadriliteral and quinquiliteral (see Fihrist, i, 407) and he must evidently have incorporated a certain amount of it into the Kīmās. The work is certainly of great value and deserves a scholarly edition. (2) K. Mafrūūs al-lugha, published by Abd al-Salām Muh. Harūi, 6 vols., Cairo 1366-71; like the latter, it is arranged according to the Djīlām; an etymological study of this word which may serve as proverbs in relevant situations; published by the editor of the Makāyīs, in Nāwdār al-makhtūdī, i, 137-61 (2nd series, Cairo 1371/1951). Not mentioned in the historical sources under this title, it is perhaps the same as the K. Dḥakkār al-halaimāt of Yākūt, Udbādī, iv, 84 (according to the editor, i, 138). (10) K. al-Nayrās, an etymological study of this muṣ̱rūr word which has a large area of use which may serve as proverbs in relevant situations; published by the editor of the Makāyīs, in Nāwdār al-makhtūdī, i, 137-61 (2nd series, Cairo 1371/1951). Not mentioned in the historical sources under this title, it is perhaps the same as the K. Dḥakkār al-halaimāt of Yākūt, Udbādī, iv, 84 (according to the editor, i, 138). 

For the works of Ibn Fāris in MS, see Brockelmann, i, 130, 1, 135-6, S I, 197-8; J. Kraemer, Studien zur arabischen Lexikographie, in Oriens, vi (1953), 215-26; Zakl Mubarak, La prose arabe au IV* siècle de l'Hégire (Xe siècle), Paris 1931, 203-9, unreliable, should be checked; bibliographical notice at the beginning of the ed. of al-Sāhibī and in the Mukaddima of the Makāyīs, i, 3-47; Yākūt, Muṣ̱rūr al-udbādī, iv, 90-98 = Ḥibdā, ii, 6-15; Suyūtī, Buzhya, 153; Ibn Khallākīn, Cairo 1367/1946, i, 100-1 (no. 49); Ibn al-Anbārī, Nuzhat al-awdād, Bagdād 1959 (1960), 219-21; Ibn al-Imād, Shkhdhār al-jīhāb, Cairo 1350, i, 132-3; Kifīt, Inbīl al-ruwāt, Cairo 1369/1950, i, 92-5, other references in note at p. 92.—On the Mukaddima, see J. Kraemer, op. cit.; Makāyīs, i, 21; Husayn Naṣṣār, al-Muṣ̱rūr al-udbādī, Cairo 1375/1956, ii, 432-43. On the Makāyīs: the Mukaddima, i, 39-45; H. Naṣṣār, op. cit., ii, 401-31. On al-Sāhibī: J. Kraemer, 215, and the references given. The Arabic philological dictionary has been made by M. Chouémī (Bibliotheca Philologica Arabica, i, Beirut 1383/1964. References in this article are to this edition but its Mukaddima was not available.

(2) K. al-Limālī, the use of la-, li- in grammar, published by G. Bergsträsser, in Islamica, i (1925), 77-99; a short ch. in al-Sāhibī, 112-6 (see the discussion of the two texts by Bergsträsser, ibid., 97-9). (5) Makhlālī kālā wa-mā dāmā minhā fi Kīlāū al-lāh (mentioned in al-Sāhibī, 162, l. 16), published by Abd al-'Azīz al-Maymānī (A. Memon) al-Rašīdkūtī, in Thulīt rasā'il, Cairo 1344. (6) K. al-līlīa wa-l-māsadwajja, a collection of words of the same pattern always used in pairs, published by R. Brünnow, in Oriens. Stud. Th. Noldeke... gewidmet, i, Giessen 1906, 225-48. See the study by Ch. Pellat, in Arabicca, iv (1957), 131-49 and ch. 28 of the Musīr of al-Suyūtī. (7) K. Sirat al-Nābi, a short sira, published under the title Awdās al-siyar ishār al-bāshār, Algiers 1301, Bombay 1311. According to the editor of the Makāyīs (i, 31), the K. al-lāhār al-Nābi is a different work. (8) K. Fūṣā jāfīl al-lāhār, a collection of questions, juridical riddles so to speak, based on a rare meaning of a word (a genre imitated by al-Hārī in his 32nd Maḥāma, cf. al-Suyūtī, Mushīr, i, 622-37); published by Husayn 'Alī Maḥfūz, Damascus 1373/1956, 52 pp. in 8°. (9) K. Abīyād al-īshīqād, a collection of verses of a genre which may serve as proverbs in relevant situations; published by the editor of the Makāyīs, in Nāwdār al-makhtūdī, i, 137-61 (2nd series, Cairo 1371/1951). Not mentioned in the historical sources under this title, it is perhaps the same as the K. Dḥakkār al-halaimāt of Yākūt, Udbādī, iv, 84 (according to the editor, i, 138). (10) K. al-Nayrās, an etymological study of this muṣ̱rūr word which has a large area of use which may serve as proverbs in relevant situations; published by the editor of the Makāyīs, in Nāwdār al-makhtūdī, i, 137-61 (2nd series, Cairo 1371/1951). Not mentioned in the historical sources under this title, it is perhaps the same as the K. Dḥakkār al-halaimāt of Yākūt, Udbādī, iv, 84 (according to the editor, i, 138).
he refused the post of shahid to the Janafi Chief Kadi Abu 'Abd Allah b. Makula (d. 430/1039). In 430/1039 he finally accepted this post, however, some years later, probably in 428/1037, as a result of the intervention of the great patrons of Hanbalism Abu Mansur b. Yusuf (d. 400/1010) and Abu 'Abd Allah b. Djarada (d. 470/1077). In 429/1038 he was fiercely attacked by a group of Ash'ari theologians, who accused him of having supported, according to other sources, in 433/1041, he formed part of a large audience, which included the famous Shahid Abu 'l-Hasan al-Kazwini (d. 442/1050), at the solemn reading of the Kadiiriya in the caliph's palace. He is also mentioned as being present, in 445/1053, at the meeting which was held in the Dar al-Khilafa under the presidency of Ibn al-Mushtari, who remained in office until his death, also a member of the entourage of the vizier Ibn al-Mushtari.

It was in fact at the suggestion of Ibn al-Mushtari and through the good offices of Abu Mansur b. Yusuf that Ibn al-Farrak, in 447/1055, after the death of Ibn Makal, agreed to become ka'idi of the Harim, a section of the caliph's palace, but stipulating his own conditions: that he should not be expected to take part in official processions or to meet the important persons received by the caliph, and should be excused from attending in person at the palace; that he should be allowed to spend one day each month at Nahr al-Mu'd and another at Bab al-Hajar, nominating during his absence a deputy (kadi) at the Harim. To his duties there, was later added responsibility for Harran and Hulwan. Ibn al-Farrak, who remained in office until his death, also taught kadidh each Friday in the al-Mansur mosque.

Ibn al-Farrak produced many works. The principal ones are listed in the Tabakdt al-Handbila (ii, 205; cf. Brockelmann, I, 502 and S I, 686) by his son, the amir i, who remained in office until his death, also the al-Isbahani. From Iraq he went to Rayy, then to Nishapur, where a redaction of unequal length (the shorter is preserved under the title of al-kadidh, the traditionist Abu 'l-Fath al-Ijarani (d. 476/1083), who was one of the most obstinate opponents of the nascent Ash'arism; Abu 'l-Fath al-Harrani (d. 476/1083), who was ka'didh of Harran and was killed, with his two sons, in his struggle against the Shii amir Muslim b. Kuraysih; Abu 'l-Faradj al-Shirazi (d. 486/1094), who worked actively in spreading Hanbalism in Palestine and Syria, with the support of the amir Tutush. Abu Muhammad al-Tamini (d. 486/1095), Abu 'l-Fath al-Hulwani (d. 505/1112) and Abu 'l-Khattab al-Kalwadhani (d. 510/1116), together with many others, are also often considered as followers of Ibn al-Farrak.

Ibn al-Farrak left three sons who are mentioned in the history of his madhhab. The most famous of them was the gawiy Abu 'l-Husayn (d. 525/1131; Dhahih, i, 212-4; Brockelmann, S I, 557), the author of Tabakht al-Handbila.

A brother of Ibn al-Farrak, the traditionist Abu Khazim Ibn al-Farrak (d. 430/1041; Munirsam, vii, 102), is sometimes mentioned as being a Mu'tazili. He should not be confused with his nephew, Abu Khazim Ibn Abu Ya'la (d. 527/1133), known as a jurisconsult and traditionist.

Ibn al-Farrak's prestige, within his school, was such that for three centuries, until the middle of the 8th/14th century, he was referred to by all the Hanbalis simply as "al-ka'didh"; afterwards, however, Muhammad al-Din b. Kudama (d. 620/1222) grew in importance with his Maghani, and the Hanbalis of the end of the 9th/15th century tended to give the title of al-ka'didh to al-Mardawi (d. 885/1480; Brockelmann, S I, 130).

Bibliography:
Khatib Baghdadi, Ta'rikh Bagdadi, ii, 256 (no. 730); Abu 'l-Husayn, Tabakht al-Handbila, ii, 193-231 (with a list of works, 205); Ibn al-Djawzi, Munirsam, viii, 243-4; Ibn Kathir, Bidaya, ii, 94-5; Nabilus, Kitab al-Ihtiisar, Damascus 1350/1932, 380-415; Ibn al-Imad, Sadaqatir, iii, 306-7; Brockelmann, I, 502 and S I, 686. See also: H. Laoust, La profession de foi d'Ibn Buttha, Damascus (PIFD) 1958; idem, Le babilisme sous le califat de Ba'adh, in REI, 1959, 96-8; G. Makdisi, Ibn 'Asqi et la résurgence de l'islam traditionnaliste au XIe siècle (Ve siècle de l'hégire), Damascus (PIFD) 1963, index. (H. Laoust)

IBN FIRISHTHE [see FIRISHTHE-OGHLU].

IBN FORAK, Abu Bakr Muhammad b. al-Hasan b. FORAK al-ANASHIRI AL-ISHBAHANI, Ash'arite theologian and traditionist, was born about 330/941, perhaps in Isfahan. In Iraq, both at Basra and at Baghdad, he studied Ash'arite kalim under Abu 'l-Hasan al-Bakili along with al-Bakili (q.v.) and al-Istarafini (q.v.), and also traditions under 'Abd Allah b. Dja'far al-Ishbahani. From Iraq he went to Rayy, then to Nishapur, where a madrasa was built for him beside the khansakh of the sii al-Bashandhi. He was in Nishapur before the death of the sii Abu 'Ugman al-Maghribi in 373/983, and probably remained there until shortly before his
own death in 406/1015, when he was summoned to Ghazna by the sultan Mahmūd. This was probably at the instance of members of the Karrāmīyya sect, against whom he had been fighting at Nishāpur. They tried to persuade the sultan Mahmūd that he was a heretic, but he seems to have defended himself successfully, and to have been poisoned by the Karrāmīs on his way back to Nishāpur. The version, according to which Mahmūd was responsible for poisoning him, is improbable.

Writings. His main work in the eyes of later generations was Kūtūb Muḥṣīlūl-baḍīḥ wa-bayānišīnī (with many variants of the title). This attempt is to explain difficult phrases in such a way as to avoid both anthropomorphism and a Muḥtāzīlī view (extracts with German translation, Raimund Robert, Analecta Orientalia 22, Rome 1941; full Arabic text, Hyderabad 1362/1943; cf. R. Arnoldes, Grammaire et théologie chez Ibn Hanem de Cordoue, Paris 1956, 30 f.). The titles of other extant works and stray references in heresiographers (Ibn ʿĀṣīm, Pīṣāl, iv, 209, 214, 215, 224; Abu ʿl-Ḥāmid, Ḥaḍīrāt, 281; Ibn Ṭabāṭabāʾī, al-Rawda al-bahiyya, 14, 44) show that he took a part in contemporary theological discussions on such questions as: the use of the istiḥāḍ in respect of one’s faith; whether a saint may know he is a saint (cf. also Ḥujwi ʾrī, Kāhjī fī al-mahdījūb, tr. R. A. Nicholson, 214); the application of atomistic conceptions to man; the sinlessness of prophets; the relation of God’s attributes and names to human attributes. Much of his disputation was against Karrāmīs in Nishāpur and Ghazna; but his views differed slightly at certain points from other Aḥṣārīs. He was a Šīʿī, but wrote a book on liawfi fī ḥikm, and on the strength of this receives a brief notice (no. 185) in Ibn ʿArifūbūgī Ḥaʾī’s Tāḍī al-ṭarāḍīṣīm.

Influence. It seems improbable that al-Aṣḥārī was a mere eponym (as suggested by J. Schacht, in Stud. Isl., i, 33-5), but the early development of Aḥṣārī theology is obscure. A lost work by Ibn ʿFurak entitled Ṭabāṭabāʾī al-mutakallimin is the main source for our knowledge of al-Aṣḥārī and his writings, and was extensively used by Ibn ʿAṣīkīr in his Ṭabāṭabāʾī al-muṣtaflatī (esp. 123; cf. also R. J. McCarthy, The theology of al-ʿAshīrī, Beirut 1953, index). Since Ibn ʿFurak’s master al-Bāhili was a pupil of al-Aṣḥārī, and since Ibn ʿAṣīkīr has other early sources which could seem to indicate Ibn ʿFurak’s material can be relied on. At Nishāpur Ibn ʿFurak seems to have played a part in securing the adoption of Aḥṣārī theology by a group of mystics (cf. L. Massignon, Essai1, 315), which included al-Maghribī and al-Dāḥkīk; the famous ʿUkhayrī q.v.] was a pupil.


( W. Montgomery Watt

Ibn al-Furāt, name of a number of persons who held the offices of secretary or vizier under the ʿAbbāsid caliphs or the ʿIkhshīdīd amirs and who belonged to the ʿIshī family. The earliest member of the family of whom anything is known is ʿUmar b. al-Furāt, who represented the ʿAlīd ʿAlī al-Riṣād and was executed in Baṣydīd in 203/818-9, on the orders of ʿIbrāhīm b. al-Mahdī at the time when the ʿIrāqīs were in revolt against the ʿIshī policy of al-Maʿmūn. A certain Muḥammad b. Mūsā b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Furāt, imprisoned at the end of the caliphate of al-Muʿtaḍīd following the fall from power of his brother ʿAbd Allāh b. Bulbul, was set free by the caliph al-Muʿtaḍīd, who, at the beginning of his reign, commissioned him to restore the state finances, entrusting him with the direction of the land department of ʿIrāq, then, for some months, with the control of that of the whole empire. Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās, assisted by his brother Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAll, then proceeded to obtain financial statements from the Sunni secretaries, particularly from the members of the Banu ʿAbd Allāh; he became the right-hand man of the vizier al-ʿAbdāb b. al-Ḥasan, and then was himself chosen as vizier by the young al-Muṣṭadīr after the failure of the plot of Ibn al-Muṭazz (Rabiʿ1 296/December 908). Ibn al-Furāt, all-powerful during this first period as vizier and controlled only from a distance by the group of the Dignitaries (Ṣadāt), which included in particular the caliph’s mother and the chief eunuchs of the Palace, made the mistake of indulging imprudently, and on several occasions, in embezzlement of large sums, which led to his dismissal in Ḥaʿī ʿIīdīdī Ḥaʿīdī Ḥaʿīdī Ḥaʿīdī (July 912). He was re-appointed vizier in Ḥaʿī ʿIīdīdī Ḥaʿīdī Ḥaʿīdī Ḥaʿīdī (June 917, and this time became the victim of the difficulties caused by the revolt of the governor of ʿAḍhārīyān; he was again dismissed in ʿIīdīdī Ḥaʿīdī Ḥaʿīdī Ḥaʿīdī (November 918. He was imprisoned in the Palace throughout the vizierate of his successor and released at the time of the revolution of Ḥaḍīdī Ḥaʿīdī Ḥaʿīdī (August 923). This third and final vizierate of Ibn al-Furāt was to prove a particularly dramatic one: the minister, assisted by his son al-Muḥāsīn, had no hesitation in taking a brutal revenge on those who, in the preceding years, had treated him badly, nor in using violence to extort large sums of money from all those who had accepted office during his predecessor’s vizierate.

The methods which Ibn al-Furāt and his son used this time soon aroused among the caliph’s entourage high feelings, which were increased still more by the news of the attack on the Pilgrims by the Karmātīs in Muḥarram 312/April-May 924. Under pressure from the chamberlain and some of the officials in charge of the guards, al-Muṣṭadīr therefore decided to arrest the vizier (Rabiʿ1 312/June 924). Ibn al-Furāt and his son were brought to trial, but the somewhat insolent attitude of the former minister had the effect of turning the caliph against him, while the newly-appointed vizier instigated some sections of the army to demand that the prisoners be executed without further ado. The caliph, yielding
to popular fury, gave orders to the Prefect of the Police, Nāzūk, to put them to death (Râbic II 372/ July 924). Ibn al-Furat was the ignominious end of a man who had been a prominent financier and a politician, but had never shown himself to be a loyal servant of the caliph. An educated man of great culture, an experienced administrator in the organization of the financial services, he had demonstrated his ability to solve rapidly what appeared to be the most complicated problems, restraining effectively when necessary the frauds which seem to have been very common at this time at the various levels of the central organization; remarks attributed to him indicate also that he had a clear grasp of the conditions of economic life in the 'Abbâsid empire and of the measures which would permanently increase the resources of its Treasury.

Highly intelligent and of great eloquence, Ibn al-Furat had gained the sympathy of the young al-Muktadir, whose mentor he had been and who showed, until the last moment, his admiration for al-Furat. An educated man of great culture, an experienced man who was always to exert a sort of fascination over him. He was moreover a perfect courtier, whose ostentatious generosity and seeking after luxury were part of a policy of enhancing his prestige. Concerned with his own personal glory, which at times coincided with that of the caliph, he restored the authority of the central government in a province such as Pars, but was too often concerned primarily with increasing his own wealth, that of his collaborators and that of the members of the secret political-religious party to which he belonged and which was an extremist sect of the Twelver movement.

Bibliography: L. Masségon, Les origines shi'ites de la famille visirale des Banû l-Furat, in Mélanges Gaudufoy-Demombynes, Cairo 1935-45, 25-9; idem, Recherches sur les Shi'ites extrémistes à Bagdad à la fin du troisième siècle de l'Hégire, in ZDMG, xci (1936), 378-82; H. Bowen, The life and times of 'Ali ibn Isâ, the Good Vizier, Cambridge and London 1928, index; D. Sourdel, Vizirat, index.

(3) Abu 'l-Khattâb Dâ'far b. Muhammad, brother of the above, was in 296/908 put in charge of the land department of the East and of the West, but died in 297/909-10.

(4) Tâdân Fâdî b. Dâ'far, called also Ibû Hinâzâra (from his mother's name), son of the above and nephew of the vizier, replaced his father in 297/909-10 at the head of the land department for the East, where he remained until 299/911-2, and again held this office from 304/917 to 306/918 during the second vizirate of his uncle, then from 315/927 to 318/930, during the second vizirate of 'Ali b. Isâ [g.8], and the vizirate of Ibn Mukhâ [g.7]; he was put in charge of the land department of the Sawad in 319/931, thanks to the influence of the amir Mu'nis, then again of that of the East from 319/931 to 320/932, under the vizirate of al-Husayn b. al-Kâsim, a minister of Shi'i sympathies who surrounded himself with former collaborators of Ibn al-Furat. He finally became himself vizier, in 320/932, but only for a few months. Unable to improve the very dangerous political and financial situation, he had to evacuate the caliph to relax the advance of the commander-in-chief Mu'nis, who had then returned from Upper Mesopotamia, and to march at the head of his own troops against the rebellious leader: during the fighting which ensued the caliph was killed. Al-Fadl was next, during the caliphate of al-Râdî, put in control of Egypt and Syria with the title of inspector; he then restored the emirate of Egypt to Muhammad b. 'Uthmân, then appointed to the vizirate in 325/937 by the shirî amîr Ibn Râdî, to whom he had married his son. In 326/937, he retired and left for('rās for Egypt. He died and was buried at Ramla in Palestine in 327/938.


(5) Abu 'l-Fadîl Dâ'far b. al-Fadîl, son of the above, born in 308/921, was vizier of the Ikhshidids of Egypt, in charge of the administration of the country in the time of the amirs Anûdîr (334/945-6) and 'Ali (340/950), then of the eunuch Kâfir (355-7/966-8), who, after having been regent, succeeded in getting himself recognized as ruler by the caliph of Baghdad, but died soon after this. Dâ'far remained in office during the eventful year between the death of Kâfir and the arrival of the Fâtimids, but was unable to remain in command of the situation created by the political, economic and social crisis of the outside. Various extortions led to mutinies by the Kâfirid and Ikhshidid contingents, which took place on two occasions, ending in the pillage of Dâ'far's palace and obliging him to go into hiding. Al-Hasan b. 'Ubayd Allâh, a relative of the new amir and governor of Syria, thought it his duty to intervene and had Dâ'far arrested. He was, however, released soon afterwards and appointed governor of Egypt. As such he received the emissaries of the Fatimid general Djawhar [q.v.] and facilitated the entry of the Fatimid troops into Egypt, but he later refused the vizirate which was offered to him. He died in 391/1001, during the reign of the caliph al-îhâkîm, who was to execute his son Abu '1-Abbas in 405/1014-5 after having appointed him vizier for a few days.

Dâ'far b. al-Fadîl left behind him the reputation of a generous patron of poets and scholars, having in particular invited to Egypt the traditionalist al-Dârâkûni, but also that of an eccentric who had acquired a collection of snakes and scorpions which terrified his neighbours.


(4) D. Sourdel

IBN AL-FURAT, NASIR AL-DIN MUHAMMAD B. 'ABD AL-RÂMÎ B. 'ALI AL-MISRÎ AL-HANAFI (735- 807/1334-1405), Egyptian historian, author of a vast universal history, Ta'rikh al-duwal wa'l-mulûk, of which he finished completely only the volumes covering the years after 500/1106-7. The majority of the fragments which survive (mainly in Vienna) are autographs and the work does not seem to have been much copied, or indeed much valued in its own time (perhaps because of suspicions concerning its style and orthodoxy), although it was used by al-Mâkrizi and others. Its value rests not only in its being very detailed, but also in the wide range of its sources, which are often cited side by side verbatim and chosen with great broad-miss and choice, the Shi'i Ibn Abî Tayyî and the Christian Ibn al-'Amîd, for example, appearing together with writers of irreproachable Muslim orthodoxy. Not all the volumes are of equal interest today, their value varying according to whether or not the sources used themselves survive: the volumes covering the first two-
thirds of the 6th/12th century are of considerable interest owing to the wide use made of the lost chronicle of the Shi'ifting of Aleppo, Ibn Abi Tayyib, of the Egyptian Ibn Tuwayr, etc.; those concerning the Ayyubid period and that of the early Mamlikhs are of less importance, though not without interest, while those concerning the period of the author's own life are once again important. Apart from a few extracts here and there, there have, up to now, been published only two volumes (vol. ix of Vienna) covering the years 789-90/1387-97 (by C. K. Zurayk, Beirut), and two others (vols. vi and vii) covering the years 672-96/1274-97 (same editors, 1939-42); nothing has been found on the period of over a century which separates them. There do exist, however, in addition to a few volumes on the early periods (Paris, London, Bursa), the whole of those for the years 500-65 and 585-696 (the lacuna which until recently existed between 625 and 638 has just been filled by the discovery of a volume in Morocco, of which photographs have been sent to the American University of Beirut, which published the volumes edited by Zurayk). Similarly, the years 663-8 and 585 (which come together in vol. iv of the Vienna MS) have been published by M. Hasan M. al-Shamma' in Basra 1967. The manuscripts for the 6th/12th, 7th/13th, and 8th/14th centuries all belong to the autograph series Vienna AF 841-16, which may be inserted in the MS Vatican V 720 (years 639-58) and the manuscript of Morocco. Al-Saighawi (see, e.g., F. Rosenthal, *Historiography*, 419) accuses Ibn al-Furat of vulgarity of style, but this can apply only to the later years, the remainder of the work consisting of extracts from earlier writers.


Ibn al-Fuwat also wrote a centennial history, apparently the first to be expressly designated as such in the title, al-Ḥawaddith al-dimāma wa-l-tājaddār al-māʾinīa fī l-maʾa al-sābīa. An annalistic history covering the years 626-700/1228-1301 was published as this work by Muṣṭafā Dījadi in Baghdad in 1351. There is no manuscript authority whatever for the ascription of this published text to Ibn al-Fuwat, and more recently it has been shown by Muṣṭafā Dījadi that Dījadi was wrong in his statement that his work was compiled from the uncorrected ascription cannot be correct. The work, which, in particular through its reports on unusual occurrences of daily life in Baghdad, is of very great interest, goes back to a contemporary or near-contemporary writer, but its true authorship remains to be ascertained. Ibn al-Fuwat refers, in connection with an event of the year 712, to his annalistically arranged al-Tawīlī wa-l-hawaddith (Talḥīs, iv, 139), which may be identical with al-Ḥawaddith al-dimāmā (cf. Dīhabi, *Husfās, iv, 274-6: Ḥawaddith al-maiʿa al-sābīa wa-šīd an māt), or another more comprehensive historical work of his.

Other works, known by title or through rare quotations, are a poetical-biographical anthology, *Naṣm al-durar al-nasīʿa fī ḥudārā ish-al-maiʿa al-sābīa* (Talḥīs, iv, 253, 244, 961, 1101; 280, pars. 151 f., 436, and, probably, 57, 62, 88), and a collection possibly of similar contents, *Durar al-aẓāzāl fī ḍawʿar al-aʿussāl* (Talḥīs, iv, 280). He wrote genealogical tables (Kītab al-nasab al-muḥaddjadiy, *Talḥīs*, iv, introd. 59 f.), on the men named ʿAbd al-Karim (al-Durr al-naṣīm fī man tasamāʿ ʿAbd al-Kurim, *Talḥīs*, iv, 1195), and on scholars with gentilics derived from the professions and crafts (like his own, "maker of fuwat, cloth wrappers of various kinds") (Baddāl al-tufaaf fi ʿabād man maṣbuṭ min al-ulāma").
iba 'l-sandu wa- 'l-biraf, cf. Talkhis, iv, intro. 60 f.), as well as a list of homonyms in tabular form (al-Muwalla wa-'l-muwalla), and other works. His early works, written while he was still in his teens, was in praise of wax candles (fi wasaf al-hawwas) (Talkhis, iv, 45). Another early work written in Macagha was, it seems, a handbook for those working in the Observatory there, Kitab Man basada 'l-rasad (Talkhis, iv, 569).

Bibliography: In addition to all the later reference works in which Ibn al-Fuwati is listed, the most accurate data on his life can be found in the Talkhis, a history of Muslim historiography, by Y. Djalow in the detailed biography prefixed to his edition. See further: Brockelmann, II, 208, II, 202 (contrary to S J, 590 f., there is no apparent connexion between Ibn al-Fuwati and the Muhhataras akhdhar al-halafa of Ibn al-Sali, Bilal 1309); M. Iqbal, in IC, xi (1937), 516-22; Muhammad Ridal al-Shabibi, Muwarrid 'l-Yaik Ibn al-Fuwati, 2 vols. (Baghdad 1930-70/1950-58); F. Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography, Leiden 1952, 414; Kurdis 'Awmdaw, in Sumer, xiii (1957), 53 f. (F. Rosenthal).

*IBN GABIROL*, ABU 'AVYVb SALAYMI b. YAHYA (in Hebrew: Shelomoh ben Yehudah; the public) the usual commonplaces of this literary genre [see AKHLAK], a collection of ethical sentences, which is preserved, apart from a few fragments, in a Hebrew version (Mibhar ha-penim "Selected texts"); the attribution of which is, however, uncertain; and, most important, a lengthy metaphysical treatise in dialogue form: the Arabic original of this, which is preserved, apart from a few fragments, in a Hebrew version (Mihbar ka-paninim "Selected pearls")... The Hebrew extracts, made by Shemtob Ibn Palkera, lost, most probably had as its title Yedidat al-andalus, K. Tabakat al-umum, ed. L. Cheikho, Beirut 1912, 89 (tr. R. Blanchere, Livre des categories des nations, Paris 1935, 159; Eng. tr. by J. Finkel in JR, n. s., xviii (1927-8), 45 f.); the notice by Moses Ibn Ezra has been translated into French by Munk, Mlndges de philosophie juive et arabe, Paris 1857 (the later editions are only unaltered reproductions of the first), 1-306; M. Steinschneider, Heb. Ub., §219, pp. 379-88, and Arab. Lit. Jud., §81, 125-9. Biographical notice by Ibn Sadi al-Andalusi, ed. L. Cheikho, Beirut 1912, 89 (tr. R. Blanchere, Livre des categories des nations, Paris 1935, 159; Eng. tr. by J. Finkel in JR, n. s., xviii (1927-8), 45 f.); the notice by Moses Ibn Ezra has been translated into French by Munk, Mlndges, 263 f., and into Spanish by J. M. Millas Vallicrosa, Selomo Ibn Gabirol como poeta y filosofo, Madrid 1945, 13. Latin text of the Fons vitae, ed. C. Bumkner, Munster 182-5; Islah al-akhdhar, Art. text ed. S. Wise, New York 1901. To the bibliographical notices by Steinschneider and by G. Vajda, Juiddische Philosophie, Berne 1950, 14-6, may be added F. Brunner, Ibn Gabirol-Avicembron, La Source de Vie, Livre III (annotated Fr. tr.), Paris 1950; idem, Fons Vitae d'Avicembron (Ibn Gabirol) livre III, in Studia Philosophica, xii (1953), 171-83; La Doctrine de la matiere chez Avicèbron, in Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, 1956, 201-79 (cf. ibid., 285-93); Études sur le sens et la structutre du "Coetus" d'Avicèbron, in Bulletin John Dil em, Année de Documentation Médavorite, i (1958), 295-317; the article in Hebrew by S. Fines, Fragments of the Arabic original of Fons Vitae in Moses Ibn Ezra's work Arugat Habbosam, in Tarbiz, xxvii (1957-8), 218-23; J. Schlanger, Sur le rôle du "t offshore" dans la création selon Ibn Gabirol, in REJ, cxxiv (1965), 125-35; the theses in progress by Jacques Schlanger: full Fr. tr. of the Fons vitae et La philosophie de Salomon Ibn Gabirol. See also E. Bertola, Salomon ibn Gabirol (Avicembro), vita, opere e pensiero, Padua 1953; J. Schirrmann and J. Klausner, art. Ibn Gabirol in Encyclopaedia Judaica. The Arnetis Press, Zurich-Stuttgart, have now (1957) announced Salomo ibn Gabirol et sein Kreis, by F. P. Bargebuhr. (G. Vajda)

*IBN GHALBUN*, Muwallad leader who, at the time of the reyes de taifas, emerged as the leader of the Molina de Aragón, the small town situated at the highest point of the land lying between the Tagus and Jalon rivers, its territory belonging partly to Aragon in the north and partly to Castile in the south. El Cir, on settling at el Poyo de Calamocha, conquered Ibn Ghalbun, who became his exceedingly loyal subject, as is related with striking emphasis by el Cantar del mio Cir.
he had been known hitherto only by his ma‘rifa, but it is now known that his name was ‘Azzūn, since one of his two sons was called Abu ‘l-‘ghamr b. ‘Azzūn and the other ‘Azzūn. Among the outstanding figures of the Mamluk administration of al-Mansūr bi ‘l-imānma. All these names are honorific additions in - on, so frequent in the Hispano-Muslim upper classes, such as Ibn Badrūn, Ibn Zaydūn, Ibn Khaldūn, and many others.

When Dona Jimena and her daughters went to Valencia to join the Campeador, who had just conquered the city, ‘Azzūn b. ‘Ghāblūn would not have welcomed the horsemen sent to escort the ladies and added two hundred cavalry to their retinue; from Medinaceli onwards, he honoured the wife and daughters of El Cid, with Alvar Fañez, and had them splendidly accommodated at Molina. When the Almoravid army took up its position in front of Valencia with the purpose of reconquering the city, Ibn Ghalbūn did not follow the example of the petty kings of Albarracín, Alpuente, Lérida and Tortosa, who complied with the order to join the army sent by Yusuf b. Tāshfīn against El Cid; the Cantar praised him yet again for the noble way in which he welcomed and accompanied the daughters of El Cid and the princes of Carrion on their unfortunate wedding journey, but the minstrel, instead of dealing passionately with this episode—so ill-fated in its outcome—clowns it in a legend and, carried away by his manifest hatred when dealing with the courtly faction of El Cid’s enemies, he derides the princes’ cowardice at the battle of Cuarte and their panic before the lion let loose at the Valencian court, and lingers over the scene at Corpes, as cruel as it was unjust; such is his hatred that he goes so far as to ascribe to the princes the intention of killing Ibn Ghalbūn in order to steal from him the riches with which he had so splendidly regaled them; after the failure of this plan as a result of the denunciation of a Latiuized Moor, he depicts El Cid’s faithful friend as a perfect gentleman who cast their dishonourable conduct in their teeth, yet refrained from punishing them because they were the sons-in-law of his great friend El Cid to whom he restored his daughters.

So ends, in the Cantar, the passage through history of this Muslim who, transformed for his loyalty and devotion to the Campeador, but we have strong reasons to tone down these eulogies, since the same person affirms: “Even if we wish him to take part in the battle of Cutanda against the Aragonese on the battlefield; without hesitation, he hastened with his men to take part in the battle of Cutanda against Alfonso I, el Batallador, in the summer of the year 514/1120, alongside the governors of Lérida, Valencia and Granada, with the other local leaders who, like himself, had acknowledged and supported with their arms the rule of ‘Ali b. Yusuf. This interesting unpublished item of information is revealed by al-Bayān al-mugrib.

Nothing more is known about Ibn Ghalbūn, as the territory of Molina de Aragón was before long occupied by the conqueror of Cutanda and subsequently became the domain of Enrique de Lara and his descendants. It is very probable that he retired to Andalusia where we find two of his sons who, at the collapse of the Almoravide empire, following in their father’s footsteps, succeeded in setting themselves up as petty kings of tā’ifas at Jerez and Ronda. The elder, Abu ‘l-‘Ghamr ‘Azzūn, was quick to acknowledge the Almohades when they landed in Spain and gave them proofs of the sincerity of his allegiance, which were far greater and more effective than the gallant courtesies of his father towards El Cid. In contrast to the other petty Andalusian kings who rose up against ‘Abd al-Mu‘min, from the moment that he learnt of the revolt of al-Masal and of his victory, he not only remained loyal, but also collaborated with Barrāz in the capture of Seville and with the brothers of al-Mahdī in expelling the Almoravids from Algeciras; he even accompanied them when they went to present themselves in Marrākush.

When Alfonso VII besieged Cordova, he contributed with great decisiveness and speed to the lifting of the siege by bringing into the stronghold the Almohad troops which were stationed in the Sierra de Cordova; finally, at the side of Sayyid Yusuf, the son and future successor of ‘Abd al-Mu’min, he took part in the battle of Za’bula or Zaghabbula in Rabī‘ I 553/April-May 1158, in the region of el Viso and Mairena del Alcor, to the north of Alcalá de Guadaira, against the army from Avila commanded by the famous count Sancho Jimeno, the Hunchback; during the rout, this son of Ibn Ghalbūn died a martyr’s death.

His brother Abu ‘l-‘Ali, who helped him to seize Ronda, as well as the descendants of both brothers, occupied high posts in the Almohade administration and distinguished themselves by their loyalty, to whom the Caliph Ya‘qūb al-Mansūr bore witness most vividly when, in his testamentary speech, he recommended one of them as being “among the most intelligent and perfect men who have given their allegiance to the cause of Ibn Tūmarī”.

Bibliography: Menéndez Pidal, La España del Cid, i, 498-9, 501; El Cantar del mio Cid, id. Menéndez Pidal, verses 1517-28, 2635, 2659-88, 2978; Ibn Ḥishārī, two unpublished folios of the Almoravide Bayān in the Library of al-Karawiyyin, Fes; Ibn al-Aṣghīr, x, 98-9; A. Arenas, Orígenes del mundo hispanomusulmán, ch. IV-V, 83-136; A. Huici, Historia política del imperio almohade, i, 383 and note 4; idem, Un nuevo manuscrito de al-Bayān al-mugrib, in: al-Andalus, xxv/1, 81-4. (A. Huici Miranda) IBN GHALBÚN [see Muhammad b. Khalīl]. IBN GHALĪB, Muḥammad b. Ayyūb al-Ghār-nāṭī, historian and geographer, living in Grana- da in the 12th century. His fame rests on an excellent work entitled Farhat (or Fardāţ) al-anfus fi tarīkh al-Andalus; the text has been lost, but lengthy extracts have been reproduced by al-Maḳḳārī, Ibn Sa‘īd, Ibn al-Khāǰīb and others, and an abridged version of the geographical part, Ta’ilik munštah min Farhat al-anfus fi tarīkh al-Andalus, has been preserved (ed. Lutfi ‘Abd al-Qadī in RIMA, i/2 (1955), 272-310). The passages quoted by al-Maḳḳārī are numerous, but the most extensive (Analectes, i, 84-90) gives interesting details about the habitats of the Arab tribes in Spain. The abridged version of the geographical part is much more valuable, for it contains the most important passages of th. “Description of Spain” by Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Rāzī [see al-Rāzī] the text of which E. Lévi-Provençal tried to reconstruct without being able to take advantage of Ibn Ghalbūn’s work, which was still unpublished and unknown (see La “Description de
IBN GHALIB

I'Espagne" d'Ahmad al-Rdzlt in al-Andalus, xviii/i (1953), 5i-108.

Farfyat al-anfus was a work on the history of al-

The best-known of his works is the Kashf al-asrdr

Another innovation is also owed to him, the versi-

Another Ibn Ghanim al-Makdisi, Nur al-Din


IBN GHANNAM, ABū Tahir Ibrāhīm b. Yahyā b.

IBN GHANNAM, Abū l-Hasan al-Rāzī fī 'l-‘alāmār fī ‘l-muṣāfār wa’t-taṣbih wa’t-‘adām wa’t-taḥqīq wa’t-nū‘ūd, i (1220/1805-6); Baghdad, 1221 (1221/1807; 1810). The author of a long commentary, he expanded the text of this treatise for the benefit of his disciple, the shaykh Muhammad b. Sulayman, one of the two famous 'ulama? of the Wahhabīyya, where he at first attended the lectures of Shaykh Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhab, were among his pupils at al-Dirīyya. The first Wahhābī capital in Najd (Ibn Bishr, 1940), was a faithful adherent of the Wahhābīyya & its first authentic chronicler. Little is known about his early life at al-Abāt except that he studied theology and philology under the 'ulama? there. He later moved to al-Dirīyya, where he at first attended the lectures of Shaykh Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb, and thereafter taught Arabic and theology. The Shaykhs 'Abd al-Raḥmān and Sulay-
The Rawda is in two volumes:

(1) Rawdat al-afkdr, a theological exposition of Wahhabism divided into five chapters; the first reveals the religious situation in Arabia and the neighbouring Muslim territories where, according to the Rawda, Muslims are "sunk in the abyss of paganism, steeped in shame and defiled by the taint of corruption". Chapter two details the genealogy of Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab and his rise to fame. The Rawda differs markedly from another contemporary account, the Lam'i al-ghikab. The comments of the author in the final three chapters reveal his vast theological knowledge. He is here commenting on some letters of Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab sent to various dignitaries within and outside the Arabian peninsula. From internal evidence it is clear that the Rawda was written after the death of Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab.

(2) al-Ghazawdt al-bayaniyya wa-l-futuhdt al-sudur, the geographical and historical account of the Wahhabism divided into five chapters; the first reveals the religious situation in Arabia and the neighbouring Muslim territories where, according to the author, Muslims are "sunk in the abyss of paganism, steeped in shame and defiled by the taint of corruption". It is curious that the latter author, though not yet 20 years old, was not yet an adult, and the events of 1212/1797, despite the fact that the author lived until 1225/1810. It is an invaluable source for the 18th century history of Arabia, which surpasses in wealth of detail Ibn Bishr's 'Unudn al-majd.l. It is curious that the latter author, though a Wahhabi, does not mention Ibn Ghannam's history. Close examination of the two texts, however, reveals that Ibn Bishr modelled his work, which carries the Wahhabi history down to 1851, on Ibn Ghannam's Ghasawut (with the principal differences that Ibn Bishr does not digress to describe religious matters).

Ibn Ghannam's Ghasawut was used extensively by H. St. J. Philby and other writers in western Arabia, e.g., Amin al-Rihani, G. Rentz and R. B. Winder, in compiling their works on Arabia (cf. Bibliography).


(A. M. Abu-Hakima)

**IBN AL-GHARABIL** [see IBN KASIM AL-GHASSIL].

**IBN GHARISSA,** Abu 'Amir Ahmad, Andalusian writer and poet, who spent his life at Denia and the service of the Slav (and former slave) Mudjadh al-'Amir [q.v.], the ruler of this province from 400/1010 to 436/1044, and of his son 'Ali Ikbil al-Dawla (436-68/1044-76). Both father and son had need of authors and poets to exalt the merits of the Slavs and to contest the alleged superiority of the other reyes de taifas of Arab origin; Ibn Gharissa offered himself for this and, seizing the opportunity of an argument that had taken place between himself and a man of letters from Cordova called Abu Dharar Ahmad b. al-Dirar (or al-Kharraz according to Ibn Bashkawal, Sia, 9; Ibn al-Abbâr, Tahmi.ta, 157, and al-Mâk'ar, Analectes, ii, 280, 327), he wrote a violent, insulting and bitter risâla against the Arabs, glorifying the Slavs, the Rûm and all the non-Arabs ('andâm); this risâla is perhaps the most violent and characteristic of Shu'ubiyya in Muslim Spain; it takes up all the arguments against the Arabs put forward by all the Shu'ubîs of the East, and presents them in a complicated style. This work brought fame to Ibn Gharissa and provoked a number of contemporary authors to draw up even more violent replies in favour of the Arabs. Ibn Bassâm reproduced the risâla and several of its replies in his Shahârîra, and MS coll. Gayangos de la Real Acad. de la Historia, Madrid, no. 12, fols. 120 ff.; the text with some replies can be found again in MS 538 of the Escorial.

Besides the risâla we have some verses by Ibn Gharissa, reproduced by Ibn Sa'id, in praise of Ikbil al-Dawla (also called Mu'tizz al-Dawla). According to Ibn Sa'id (Mugrib, ii, 406-7) and Yusuf b. al-Shaykh al-Balawi (Alif bâ', Cairo 2827, i, 350), Ibn Gharissa was of Basque origin; having been taken prisoner in his childhood he was brought up in the Islamic faith. Although he was proud of his non-Arab origin he was a fervent Muslim, very much attached to the Arabic language. No further information has come to light about his life and work.

**Bibliography:** mentioned in the text. The Risala was published for the first time by I. Goldzweber with a study on the Shu'ubiyya in Muslim Spain in his article: Die Shu'ubiyya unter den Muhemedandern in Spanien, in ZDMG, 1898; ed by 'Abd al-Salam Hârân, Cairo 1950, with the replies; ed. by Ahmad Muhtâr al-Abbâdî in his essay: al-Sakâliba fi Isbâniyya (publ. of the IEF Madrid), 1950, 31 ff. (H. Monès)

**IBN GHÂSÎL** [see 'Abd Allâh b. Hanzala].

**IBN GHÂZÂR** Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad al-'Uthmânî, Moroccan scholar of the 15th century, was born at Meknès in 858/1454 and died in 910/1513 at Fez, where his tomb may still be seen. Of his many works (full list in Cordes, p. 230, n. 2) the most useful to present-day scholars is al-Raud al-hatât fi ahdâr Muhâmasât al-Zaytûn (Fez 1320/1908; partial tr. Houdas, Monographie de Mequinez, in J.d., i, 1889, 101-47).

**Bibliography:** Le Livre de l'histoire, Historiens des Chorfa, Paris 1922, 224 (full treatment).

(J. F. P. Hopkins)
previous post and manoeuvred his less-talented older brother, Fakhir al-Dīn Madjīd (d. 511/1409), into the position of vizier. Owing to internal Mamluk squabbles after Barkūk's death, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz reigned, ʿIrābīm was again in trouble a year later but recovered his political position to such an extent that within a short time he became the real power in the state (cf. Ibn Iyās, i. 347). He was named Privy Secretary (kābiṭ al-ṭīr) and Head of the Advisory Council (raʿa masqūwara). Temporarily distanced during the two and a half month period in which Sultan Farādīd was deposed and his younger brother ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz reigned, ʿIrābīm was instrumental in returning Farādīd to the throne and was rewarded with the rank of Emir of the First Class. Shortly thereafter, he fell ill and died after a long illness, not yet thirty years old. At the time of his death he was referred to as “al-kādī al-āmir ...”.

The Arabic sources are sharply divided in their attitude towards Ibn Ḥurāb. His personal generosity, especially during the great plague of 807/1405, is highly praised by Ibn Taghribirdi (Manhal, i, 93) and Ibn Iyās (Tawārikh, i, 348), and his character is lauded (Ibn Taghribirdi, vi, 277), but he is also sharply denounced as having ruined the countryside by his rapacious levies (cf. Allāh al-Asmār, al-ṣafāl fī ṣaḥīḥ Kaltta wa-Dimna, i, 43) and his manipulation of the price of gold (Maḳrizi, Khtāf, ii, 420). His tomb in Kirman; here he addressed his eulogies to the first two genres the poet imitates Ibn al-Ḥabbariyya, which must have


IBN AL-HABBARIYYA, ABū YA’leader of the Mamluk dynasty of the Ayyubids, from ca. 1240 to 1260. He was a member of the family of Qalawun, and played a significant role in the affairs of the Ayyubid Empire. Ibn al-Ḥabbariyya is in fact the author not only of one of the earliest works on poetry, but also of the first two genres the poet imitates Ibn al-Ḥaddājī (q.v.), as ʿImād al-Dīn noticed, but he seems, like his model, to present a curious example of split personality, for he can on occasion compose more respectable poems and, what is more, set himself to poetry. In order to obtain the money necessary for his life of pleasure he was forced to sing the praises of the great men of his day, at first of the Ayyubid rulers (see Šīb Ibn al-Djurwi), but his inclination for satire made him unsuited to this kind of servile flattery and he soon fell foul of his patrons; when, for example, the young Ibn al-Djāhr became for the second time vizier of the caliph in 484/1091, he greeted this appointment with a biting satire which was soon on everyone's lips. His habit of attacking his contemporaries soon made him unbearable to Sultan Farādīd, who was forced to go and try his fortunes in Isfahān, in the court of Nizām al-Mulk (q.v.), who finally admitted him to his entourage; by his taciturnity, however, he incurred the wrath of his patron, who, after having ordered his execution, finally pardoned him thanks to the intervention of the ʿalāʾ al-ʿadl al-Mulk al-Khus̱andī. He also enjoyed the patronage of Tādž al-Mulk and of Nizām al-Mulk, but in the latter he was forced to leave Isfahān and go, at a date unknown, to Kirman; here he addressed his eulogies to the vizier Mukram b. al-ʿĀla and particularly to the Saljuqšah ʿA lã, who reigned there from 489 to 494/1096 to 1101. But it was to his former patron, Madjīd al-Mulk, that he dedicated, between 489 and 492, his verse rendering of Kāliṭa wa-Dimma entitled Nāṭeṣ al-ṣafā fī nasr Kāliṭa wa-Dimma; and it was to the Mazyādīd Sadaqa b. Maṣūr that, after the foundation of al-Ḥilīa (495/1101-2), he sent his other book al-ṣāḥīḥ wa-l-bāghīm. At this time he had not left Kirman, where he died probably in 509/1115-6 (rather than 504/1110-1) at a very advanced age (95 years, it is said).

Ibn al-Ḥabbariyya left a Dīnān which must have been very extensive, since it consisted of three or four volumes, but there remain only a few extracts from it, which have survived thanks to ʿImād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī (Kharīdāt al-Kāsī, MS Leiden Or. 21a); the genre most fully represented are ṣafā (q.v.), satire, and next parodies and panegyrics. For a brief biography of his brother Madjīd, see the obituary notice in Ibn Taghribirdi, vi, 290; al-Salāḥwī, Danāʾ, v, 234. (W. M. Brinner)
IBN AL-HABBARIYYA — IBN AL-HADDAD

Yakut (Irshad, vi, 297) mentions in passing a K. al-Lakd*it, which was probably a work of lexicon. His works on the formed part of the Sādak, it is to be found at the end of the Paris manuscript of the Kharidat al-ṣadīqīb.

**Bibliography:** besides the references in the text: Samānī, Amāb, 587b; Ibn al-Anbārī, Nushal al-alībba', Cairo 1249, 437; 'Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī, Nurāt al-fatra, MS Paris 2146, 35a, 60a, 103a, 104-5; Yākūt, i, 555, 694, ii, 46, iv, 509; 'Askalānī, īṣām al-Mīṣrī, v, 367-8; Ibn Abhāakhir, i, 283, ii, 386-7; Ibn Thīrāk, Fāḥiri, i, 266-7; ʿAṣāfī, Baghdad 1261, i, 124-45 and index. (Ch. Pellat)

**IBN AL-HABIB** [see URAYD ALLĀH B. AL-HABBAR] 775

IBN HABB, Abū Marwān Ābd al-Malik b. Hābīb al-Sulami, Andalusian scholar claiming descent from the Arab family of Sulaym b. Manṣūr; he was born at ʿIṣīn Wāṭ (identified by Simonet with Huétor Vega), about 180/796 and died at Cordova in 238/853. He studied at Elvira and Cordova, and after he had made the pilgrimage and become acquainted with the doctrine of Mālikī [q.v.] at Medina became one of his most ardent propagandists in Muslim Spain, where the school of al-Awzā[1]ī [q.v.] had dominated until then. By virtue of his exceptional erudition he became known as the scholar of Spain par excellence and was compared with Sahlīn b. Sādīq [q.v.], the famous jurist of Ḥirṣiyā. According to his own account, his works numbered 1050, but of these none remain but an unpublished manuscript preserved in the Bodleian at Oxford, which, despite its antiquity, is of little value. This account, in which he mingleth Biblical history with that of Muḥammad and the first Caliphs, the history of al-Andalus with theological questions, is full of fabulous material. Travellers from Spain, greeted in the East as ignorant rustics, accepted as historical truth Egyptian legends which he had received from his library of manuscripts, of moving statues, and of devils imprisoned in boxes by Satan, such as are reproduced in the History of the conquests of Egypt and the Maghrib by the Egyptian Ibn Ābd al-Hakam [q.v.].

**Bibliography:** Dabbi, no. 1053; Ibn al-Farrād, Tāriḥ, no. 814; Abu 'l-ʿAlā' ʿIyābād ʿulamāʾ? Ḥirṣiyā, ed. M. Ben Chenes, Algiers 1912, 81 (tr. M. Ben Chenes, Classes et Savants de l'İṣāqiyā, Algers 1920, 151); Duzī, Recercheres, i, 28; Wüstenfeld, Geschichtsschreiber, no. 56; Pons Boigues, 29 ff.; González Palencia, Letteratura, 141; Brokkelman, i, 149-50, S. 1, 231.

(A. Husi Miandira)

**IBN HABB, BADR AL-DIN Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥassān B. ʿUMAR AL-DIMAYYIṢ ʿAL-ḤALABI al-SHAFII** [760-1007] 777

This author of several historical, juridical, and poetic works, was born in Damascus. His father Zayn al-Dīn Abī Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad al-Ḥassān Ābd al-Malik b. Sumādī, 443-90/1051-97). He became a well-known writer in his own lifetime. In 753/1354 he visited Tripoli, where he was honoured and rewarded by the Mamluk viceroy of that town, Manqāl b. ʿAbī Maqīb, and persuaded him to remain there for two years. In 759/1358, after Manqāl became viceroy of Damascus, he invited Ibn Habbīb to that city from his home in Aleppo and the scholar, once more the centre of attention and respect, remained there for three years before returning to Aleppo, where he lived until his death in 779/1377.

IBN HABB, Muḥammad [see Muḥammad B. Ḥassān].

A most critical evaluation of his work as an historian comes from Ibn Taghbūrīdī, who wrote (Nudīm, v, 331): "He was the paragon of his age in the scirbal art (inṣāha) and in formulating judicial decisions (ḥurūfī) . . . His History is in ragās-metre and is of little worth and quite inexact. I have, therefore, cited it only if rhyme did not please him he would omit a datum. This is not my way of writing history!" 

**Bibliography:** Ibn Taggbūrīdī, Mankal (Wiet), no. 1720; Ibn Ḥadījar, Durrā, ii, 20; Quatremère, Histoire des Sultans Mamluks, i/b, 204 (incorrect dates given there); Wüstenfeld, Geschichtsschreiber, no. 440; Brokkelman, ii, 36; S. II, 35; Orientaalia, Leiden 1846, ii, 197-489; P. Leander, Aus . . . bin Habīb's Durrat al-ṣadīqī, in Le Monde Oriental, vii (1913), i-51, 242-3.

(W. M. Brinner)

**IBN HABB, MUḤAMMAD** [see Muḥammad b. Ḥassān]. B. ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad al-Ḥassān B. ʿAbd al-Malik b. Sumādī, 443-90/1051-97. Towards 461/1068-9 he had to flee from Almeria and was persuaded to remain there for two years. In 759/1358, after Manqāl became viceroy of Damascus, he invited Ibn Habbīb to that city from his home in Aleppo and the scholar, once more the centre of attention and respect, remained there for three years before returning to Aleppo, where he lived until his death in 779/1377.

IBN HABB, Muḥammad [see Muḥammad B. Ḥassān].

A most critical evaluation of his work as an historian comes from Ibn Taghbūrīdī, who wrote (Nudīm, v, 331): "He was the paragon of his age in the scirbal art (inṣāha) and in formulating judicial decisions (ḥurūfī) . . . His History is in ragās-metre and is of little worth and quite inexact. I have, therefore, cited it only if rhyme did not please him he would omit a datum. This is not my way of writing history!" 

**Bibliography:** Ibn Taggbūrīdī, Mankal (Wiet), no. 1720; Ibn Ḥadījar, Durrā, ii, 20; Quatremère, Histoire des Sultans Mamluks, i/b, 204 (incorrect dates given there); Wüstenfeld, Geschichtsschreiber, no. 440; Brokkelman, ii, 36; S. II, 35; Orientaalia, Leiden 1846, ii, 197-489; P. Leander, Aus . . . bin Habīb's Durrat al-ṣadīqī, in Le Monde Oriental, vii (1913), i-51, 242-3.

(W. M. Brinner)
known among his poems are those dedicated to a Christian nun called Nuwayra who, according to Ibn Faḍl Allāh ibn ʿUmari (Masālik al-ʿabār, Cairo 1924, i, 385), was a Coptic nun living in the convent of al-Ṣawār in the valley of the Nile. Ibn al-Ḥadād had seen her while going through Kūs to ʿAyyūh in order to embark for the Highār; her beauty dazzled him to the extent that he forgot to make his pilgrimage and settled near the convent for a long time; she continued to inspire him long after his return to Spain. The odes addressed to Nuwayra are his best poetry. The divān of al-Ḥadād was written in the latter half of the thirteenth century, and the passages reproduced by Ibn Bassam show a deep far-fetched images and expressions; most of the prose passages reproduced by Ibn Bassam and the pamphlets which he called hadīfrat al-hakīka were even arranged in alphabetical order of the rhymes. He was particularly proud of a ʿāṣida in sin which he called ṭabāh al-baḥīth (garden of truth) and of which we only possess two verses; they show his tendency to meditation and his liking for ḥikma poetry which he called falsafiyātī (my philosophical prose). His prose is pedantic and encumbered with non-professional but very intense interest in religious learning that was characteristic of the Muslim upper middle classes. The loss of his parents meant no material disadvantage for him, on the contrary, he was able to stay in the house in which he was born until he married. It seems to have had a somewhat retardant influence on his early education inasmuch as he went to school only when he was five. He had memorized the Qurʾān by the age of nine. The sojourn in Arabia with Zaki al-Din ordered by his father meant 110 interruption of his studies. These began in earnest after his return to Egypt and Zaki al-Din's death. According to the custom of the time, he recorded his studies in the minutest detail, with the names of all his teachers and the books he read, in a series of works, such as al-Muṣṭafid al-muḥāras (autograph Istanbul, Murad Molla 603, cf. Ritter, loc. cit.; important ms. in Cairo, muṣṭalḥ al-ḥādīṯ 82, and in Leningrad, cf. V. Rosen, in Bulletin de l'Acad. Impér. des Sciences de St. Petersbourg xvi (1880), 18-26, reprinted in Mélanges Asiatiques, vili (1881), 691-702), the Madīma al-muʿassas bi(l)-i-Muṣṭafid al-muḥāraṣ (Cairo, muṣṭalḥ al-ḥādīṯ 75; M. Weissweiler, Istanbuler Handschriftensstudien, Leipzig 1937, no. 105), the Maḥāṣīd al-ṣiyāṣīyya (al-ṣiyāṣa fi firḥist al-murāżiyya (al-kutub wa-l-ʿadād) al-murāziyya) (= ms. Berlin 1023; Y. al-Ṭishk, Fīris al-Maddal Dār al-Kutub al-Sāhiryiyya, Damascus 1366/1947, 310), and the Madīna (Istanbul, Feyzullah 534, cf. Ritter,
to which should be added his *Tadhkira* with
the autograph iddāzas of his teacher, Shams al-Dīn Muhammad b. ‘Ali Ibn al-Kāṭṭān, influenced the direction of his studies in an important
respect. He introduced him to historical literature and
stimulated his interest in the historical side of
religious studies. When Ibn Ḥadījārt decided to
specialize in *kāḥith*, Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irākī (d. 806/1400) became his principal teacher. He also seems to
have profited greatly from his contact with ‘Īz al-Dīn Ibn Dīmāša with whom he studied from
790/1388 until Ibn Dīmāša’s death in 819/1416. However, none of his teachers exercised upon him
the overpowering influence which he himself came to exercise later on upon some of his students.

Ibn Ḥadījārt took his first steps into scholarly
*pādth* research at the age of twenty. The decision
to devote himself entirely to it came three years later,
in 796/1393-4. In Shaybān 798/May 1396 his guardian
and teacher, Ibn al-Kāṭṭān, arranged for him to
marry a girl from a highly respected family, then
about eighteen years old, Uns, a daughter of the
Inspector of the Army (*nāṣir al-dīwāy*) ‘Ībād al-
Karīm b. Ahmad. On her mother’s side, she was a
great-granddaughter of a daughter of Mankūṭmir, who had introduced the Evening Prayer after him shortly before his death in 698/1298. Ibn Ḥadījārt
moved into the family mansion of his wife, where he
lived until he died. There were later marriages,
but no other wife of his was ever brought into the house
to live with Uns under the same roof. Uns herself
survived him by almost fourteen years (d. Rabi’ī 1
867/November-December 1462, cf. *Daw*[*i*], xii, 10 f.). He had spent the months preceding his marriage in Alexandria, in study and research, and the following
year, in Shawwāl 799/July 1397, he left for the
Ḥidījārt and the Yemen on a journey which extended
into 801/1398. The year thereafter, he studied in
Palestine and Syria. Although he later went on the
Pilgrimage several times, re-visited the Yemen in 806/1403, and undertook a lecture and study tour of
Syria in 836-7/1432-3 in the entourage of Barsbay[97] (g.v.), his student travels ended when he
returned from Syria in 803/1400. The last years of
the eighth century also saw the beginnings of his
qualities of character as well as his religious and
standards of Islam, and there seem to have been few
influences which Ibn Ḥadījārt considered as completely conforming to the ideal
of the Baybarsiya was an alphabetical filing system
for the beneficaries of the institution, which was
imitated by other colleges and by the *Dīwān al-
Dīwāy*. In addition to other lecturerships in *pādth* and, occasionally, in *tāfṣir* and *fiqh*, Ibn Ḥadījārt held the office of *muftī* in the Dār al-ʾAdl from 812/1409-9
until his death, and that of associate preacher and
māzām in the Mosque of al-ʾAzhar and the Mosque
of ‘Amr. In 826/1423, he took over the administration
of the library of the Māḥmūdīya with its approximately 4,000 valuable manuscripts. During his
librarianship, which lasted until his death, he
compiled two catalogues, one arranged alphabetically and the other according to topics.

A judgeship, which he did not accept, was offered
to him in the Yemen in his early years. Reluctantly,
he had been holding an associate judgeship in conjunction with Dījālāl al-Dīn al-Bulkīnī when his great opportunity came on 27 Muharram 827/31
December 1423 (*Dīwān al-Ḥidījārt*: Saturday, 22 Muharram/Sunday, 26 December). He was dismissed for the first time less than eleven months later, but the office of Chief Judge of Egypt (and Syria) remained his for a combined total of about twenty-one years.

In 816/1413, he lost the position but was re-instated
in 817/1414; and re-instated in 819/1419 and 820
and 821/1420-1 after two days out of office (followed by another even briefer period out of office
in Rabi’ī 821/1422). He lost the office finally on 25 Dīdūmād I 822/26 August 1424. A few months later, about an hour after the evening prayer in the night of Saturday, on 26 Dīdūmād I 822/26
August 1424. He had been re-instated on 2 Radjab 820/20 May 1425; dismissed on 26 Safar 831/24 November 1429, and re-instated on 26 Dīdūmād I 834/16 February 1431; dismissed on 5 Shawwāl 840/12 April 1437, and re-instated on 6 Shawwāl 841/2 April 1438; dismissed in Muharram 844/June 1440, and re-instated on 26 Safar 844/July 1440; dismissed on 15 Dūl ‘l-Ka’dā 846/17 March 1443, and re-instated and followed by another even brief period out of office in Rabi’ī 848/1June 1444); dismissed on 17 Muharram 849/19 April 1445 (after the collapse of a minaret with much loss of life, when attempts were made to hold
the office of the Chief Judge responsible for the safety
of the structure), and re-instated on 5 Safar 850/2
May 1446; dismissed in Dūl ‘l-Hidījārt 850/March
1447, and re-instated on 8 Rabī’ī 852/19 June 1448.
He lost the office finally on 25 Dīdūmād II 852/26
August 1448. A few months later, about an hour after
the evening prayer in the night of Saturday, on 28
Dūl ‘l-Hidījārt 852/Saturday, 22 February 1449, he
died. His last will and testament, with a variety of
individual bequests, has been preserved (*Dīwān al-Ḥidījārt*, fols. 324b-325b; also ms. Istanbul, Reis-iil-kütatp 498, fols. 173b-175a). His physical appearance and
his qualities of character as well as his religious and
moral behaviour are described by his pupil al-
Sakhāwī as completely conforming to the ideal
standards of Islam, and there seem to have been few
dissenting voices among his biographers, al-Biṣārī
being a notable exception (cf. *Daw*[*i*], i, 104 f.). He
was a good chess player, and he seems to have remained
fond of poetry throughout his life.

Amidst all the success and acclaim which he found
as a scholar, teacher, and official, his family life
was not free of great disappointments. His wife,
Uns, bore him no living male children but only five daughters, and...
IBN HADJAR AL-HAYTAMI — IBN AL-HADJDJ
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	hadjar al-Sa’di (after the Banu Sa’d in the Sharkiya province of Lower Egypt, where his family was originally settled), a famous scholar and prolific writer of the Shafi’i school. On account of the linguistic and religious enterprise of the Fathiyia, who was nicknamed Hadjar because of his taciturnity, moved to the village of Mahallat Abi l-Haytam in Sharkiya province, and there Ibn Hadjar was born towards the end of the year 909/1504 (some say in Raqib, the month in which he was to die). While still a child, he lost his father and then his grandfather, but his father’s teachers, Shams al-Din b. Abi l-Haytam (the Shafi’i of a city), and Shams al-Din Muhammed al-Shanawi, a disciple of this last, looked after his maintenance and education. Al-Shanawi placed him in the sanctuary of Sayyid Ahmad al-Badawi in Tanand and, after he had completed his elementary education there, sent him to the Azhar mosque in Cairo where he continued his studies from 924/1518, having a very hard time at first. His main teacher at the Azhar mosque was Zakariyya al-Muhasibi (d. 932/1526), and performed the Pilgrimage in 933/1527, remaining in Mecca during the following year. During this stay in Mecca, he started writing on fikhs, but not before Harith al-Muhasibi had given him in his sleep and encouraged him. When he was still a student, Ibn Hadjar had expressed his ambitions as an author on fikh in a Freudian dream which stated that “an act of worship consists of two parts: an act of worship without the exact application of the principles of the Shafi’i school, and it has often been printed. Whereas the followers of Ibn Hadjar (chiefly in Hizlas, Yaman, Hadramawt and East Africa) and the followers of al-Ramli had at first disputed fiercely with one another, the opinion finally prevailed that both were to be regarded as equally authoritative and indispensable expounders of the correct Shafi’i doctrine. Of almost equal importance are his fatwas on fikh, al-Fatwasy al-Hubara al-Fikhraya, Cairo 1308, collected by one of his disciples; they include several lengthy treatises with separate titles, e.g. his two polemics against Ibn Ziyad; many of the fatwas, and also, incidentally, some of Ibn Hadjar’s other writings, are concerned with contemporary problems. One of these writings is al-Sa’idah al-mubarsa fi ar-radd ‘ala ahl al-sagy (or ar-rafai) wa- Donald, a defence of the legitimacy of the offices of the first four Caliphs against the claims of the Shi’as; this work, completed in Shawwal 950/January 1544, gave out of lectures which Ibn Hadjar gave, in answer to numerous requests, in the Great Mosque of Mecca; it had an immediate success, spread in a few years “in innumerable copies to the remotest countries”, and has often been printed. Another is the Kaff al-nu’ra‘an (on muharammadi al-lahu wa’l-zandaka, al-rafd) wa’l-samd, a director of conscience, being one who considered “knowledge” and “action” to be inseparable. He also based his work on the principles according to which “an act of worship without the exact intention cannot be in accordance with the Law”, and he stated that “an act of worship consists of two parts: the first is the attitude of the body, the second the intention of the heart, but it is the second which is the more important”. In this can be clearly seen the application of the principles of the Ibay (he quotes al-Ghazali, i, 12) to the Maliki formalism which was very ready to identify, in the name of intention (niiyya), the science of law with the analysis of spiritual and practical music and games as practised in the Mamluk period and a poet and theologian who wrote a commentary on al-Sanusi.

The Maliki jurist was Abu Abd Allah Muhammad al-‘Abdari al-Fasi, born in Cairo in 732/1336. He is known especially for his Kitab al-Zawaj (printed in Cairo in 1329). In it he appears as a scholarly anxious to popularize his learning, as a jurist who was to a certain extent a director of conscience, being one who considered “knowledge” and “action” to be inseparable. He also based his work on the principles according to which “an act of worship without the exact intention cannot be in accordance with the Law”, and he stated that “an act of worship consists of two parts: the first is the attitude of the body, the second the intention of the heart, but it is the second which is the more important”. In this can be clearly seen the application of the principles of the Ibay (he quotes al-Ghazali, i, 12) to the Maliki formalism which was very ready to identify, in the name of intention (niiyya), the science of law with the analysis of spiritual and practical music and games as practised in the Mamluk period and a poet and theologian who wrote a commentary on al-Sanusi.

IBN AL-HADJDJ, name of several persons, including in particular a famous Maliki jurist, four grammarians, two Andalusi men of letters of the Nasrid period and a poet and theologian who wrote a commentary on al-Sanusi.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, C. van Arendonk (J. Schacht)
Sulayman b. Ibrahim b. Muhammad b. Haydara al-Kinawi al-Kifri (d. 598 or 599 H/1002-3), was a poet, a wit and a traditionist as well as a grammarian. He was the pupil of Abu Tahir Ibn al-Salt of Alexandria. He seems to have excelled in didactic poetry, which accorded particularly well with the wide extent of his learning. This specialist in adab and grammar, himself an eminent stylist, was the author of various treatises on philology as well as of a homily addressed to Sahl al-Din. He also wrote on Maliki law (see Ya'qub, Cairo ed., xi, 278); cf. al-Suyuti, Bughya, 567.

The 9th and 10th century grammarians were also called Ibn al-Hajj. They were Abu 'L-Abbas Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Sulami (d. 1273/1856) and Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Hamdu'l-Sulami (d. 1274/1857). They both wrote commentaries on the classic al-Afiyya (see Sarkis, 70).

Among the Andalusians, Abu 'L-Barakat Muhammad al-Balafi (d. 771/1370) was one of the persons who were most characteristic of his period. Musa al-Sabi has written an exhaustive monograph on him in al-Andalus, xxvii (1963), 381-424. Ibn Dzari considered him to be, in addition to his other talents, an outstanding "reader" of the Qur'an (ed. Bergstrasser, no. 3391).

Abd al-Mu'min b. Ya'qub b. Sa'id produced a poetic version of the little 'Abida of al-Sanusi [q.v.]; see Brockelmann, S II, 355; Burstani, Dala'il ma'drif ii, 442. (J.-C. Vade)

IBN AL-HADJIDJ. Abu Ishak Ibrahim b. 'Abd Allah al-Numi, Andalusian scholar and poet of the 8th/14th century. Born at Granada in 713/1313, he left Spain in 737/1337 and did not return until 759/1358, having during his absence made two journeys to the East and served as kadi under the Marinids and Hafids. Until his death in about 785/1383 he held the office of kadi and undertook various ambassadorial missions for the Nasrids.

Of his literary output, known by twenty titles, nothing is known to remain but fragments of verse scattered through various anthologies, biographical dictionaries, etc. This corpus has yet to be examined in detail. It is divided into three distinct groups and it is not firmly established that they are all by the same Ibn al-Hadji.


IBN AL-HADJIDJIDJ. Abu 'Abd Allah al-Husayn b. Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Da'far b. Muhammad, a Shi'ite Arab poet in the time of the Buyids [q.v.]. Born in Baghdad in about 330/941-2, of the family of government officials and secretaries, he completed the traditional studies and was partly trained by Abu Ishak Ismail al-Sabiri (213/829-925/929 [see al-Sabri]) who made him take up an administrative career, but he very quickly perceived that his poetic talents could prove more profitable and resigned his post. At first he was connected with the vizier al-Muhallabi [q.v.] for whom he wrote a panegyric and a satire on al-Mutanabbi (see R. Blachere, Abu l-Tayyib al-Mutanabbi, Paris 1935, 224-5), and whose death (353/965) he lamented. He next attached himself to the viziers Abu l-Fadl al-'Abbass al-Shirazi and Abu l-'Abbass Muhammad b. al-'Abbass, for whom he acted as a kind of enter-tainer, and fell out with a kadi of 'izz al-Dawla [q.v.] as a result of which he was committed to prison for a time. Shortly afterwards, on the strength of a poem addressed to the last-named, he succeeded in getting himself appointed muhtasib of Baghdad, under the vizierate of Ibn Bakriyya (362/973-7 [q.v.]) and even in resuming this position after being compelled to surrender it. At this period he also came in touch with Abu Tahir Ibn al-Amid (see Ibn al-'Amid, II) who greatly admired his poetry, and then received some kind of pension from Ibn 'Abbâd [q.v.] and profited from the bounty of the Buyid rulers; but it was principally the viziers and other eminent persons whose company he sought, living very familiarly with them and enjoying their protection and liberality, and this appears to have been his real objective. He even received 1,000 dinars from a Fâhimiyya who obtained a eulogy for him and feared his attacks. Thus, by the practice of what was perhaps a kind of blackmail, he succeeded in amassing a fortune, which he was clever enough to make still more productive, purchased estates, and even farmed the taxes in certain villages; in short, he became an influential man of affairs, and lived in prosperity until his death, which took place on one of his estates in Qumâdâ 1139/1725 May 1001; he was buried in Baghhdâd at the feet of Músâ al-Kâzîm [q.v.].

A mu'tasib and man of affairs, a family man devoted to his kin, such is one aspect of Ibn al-Hadjijidji's personality; but there is another, entirely different one which leads to the eye as soon as one begins to read his poetry, so different indeed that some have found it possible to speak of a dual personality. But his poetry, very extensive since his Diwan comprised ten volumes, also presents itself in two contradictory aspects: on the one hand, Ibn al-Hadjidji wrote mediocre and traditional panegyrics, following the neo-classical line; on the other hand, and of greater importance, he made himself the champion of a new type of poetry characterized by what he himself called sukfi [q.v.], giving to this term the sense of obscenity in scurrilous and vulgar language, lewdness, insolent grossness, cynical and aggressive non-conformism; sexuality and scatology are the basic features of this poetry, which respects nothing, neither Islam, nor the most honourable personages, nor even the poet himself. This sukfi is either the sole component of a short piece, or else one of the elements of a poem apparently serious. In Ibn al-Hadjidji there are thus two men, two poets, even two styles; in the traditional poetry, the expression is polished, the resources of a Âdâf are called into play, while in the sukfi the poet abandons himself to the inspiration of a fleeting and does not hesitate to use gutter slang, which gives his work a completely original flavour and makes him the master of the genre; an innovator, he had scarcely any rivals, and Ibn al-Habbâriyya [q.v.], who might come to mind, is far from possessing his verve.

The Diwan of Ibn al-Hadjidji has always been very much sought after, to the point that certain authorities have had to forbid the reading of it (see Machriq, x, 1085), but it has not yet been published, despite the existence of a complete manuscript in Baghhdâd, in the Library of Wâkfs; other libraries possess odd volumes (Dâr al-kutub, Cairo, Adab 7342, Maktaba Taymuriyya, 468, 606, 657; Brit. Mus. Or. 4591, Add. 7388; Göttingen, ar. 76). His contemporary and friend al-Sharîf al-Râdí (d. 406/1016/17) had made a collection of serious poetry under the title al-Nasîf min al-suhfî, while al-Astu'ri (d. 534/1139-40) had concerned himself more particularly with the sukfi; his collection entitled Durrat al-lâdig fi shir Ibn al-Hadjidji (MS Paris B.N., 5913) copied and glossed by Ibn al-Khshshâb [q.v.] was the subject of an unpublished work, presented as a thôse complémentaire at the Sorbonne in 1953, by 'Ali 'l-Tâhir who introduced it.
with a study on Ibn al-Ḥāḍjdjādī. Finally, Ibn Nubātā al-Miṣrī (586-768/1237-1336) et al. also made a selection of poems under the title Lāḥad il-ḥālij (MS Copenhagen, 260).

Bibliography: Thālibī, Yatīma, iii, 30-102.


D. S. Margoliouth-Ch. Pellat

IBN AL-ḤĀDJDJĀDĪ, Dmāl al-Ḏīn Ābuʾ ʾAmr Ūṯmān b. ʿUmar b. ʿAbī Bakr al-semblies, Mālikī fāṣḥī and grammarians who owes his popular name to the fact that his father, a Kūd, was chamberlain (ḥāджīdī) to the amirs ʿIzz al-Ḏīn Mūsā al-Ṣaḥlāḥ. He was born at ʿAṣnā, a village in Upper Egypt, after, 570/1174-5. He studied the Islamic sciences in Cairo with great success, particularly with al-Shāṭībī and Muḥammad al-Ūṯmānī. After that, at least for some years, he must have lived and taught in Cairo, as is shown by the Amālī dated from that town, the earliest in 609/1212-3, the latest in 616/1219-20. Ibn Kādī Shuhba (401) places his departure from that town. In Damascus, Ibn al-Ḥāḍjdjādī taught in the Maliki school; in manuscript (Brockelmann, S, i, 539; 541). (7) K. al-Makhdūr al-ṣalīl fi ʿilm al-khalil: an account of Arabic prosody, versified (in the Basīt metre); in manuscript in several libraries (Böckelmann, S, i, 371, S 1, 537); moreover (s优于) references to the manuscripts of seven commentators. Freytag published this Arabic prosody in verse (334-43), with German translation. Darstellung der arabischen Verseitung (Bonn 1830). (8) An Ṣāḥība: profession of Muslim faith; in MS (Böckelmann, S, i, 539; 541), for correction, Esc.1 1561, 6. (9) ʿI ṣbā bikdī ḍām min al-ʿKurʾ an al-ʿazīm, in manuscript at Aleppo, in the ʿŪṯmānīyya madrasa (and not in Mecca); see MMIA, xii, 470 and 471 foot. (10) Munḥahal ʿi-sūl wa al-nāmāl fi ʿilm al-ʿazīm wa ʿi-sūl: a treatise on the sources of law according to the Maʾlikī school; in manuscript (Böckelmann, S, i, 372 and S 1, 537). Ibn Ḥāḍjdjādī made extracts from it: Yūḥūn al-adīliya (MS, Paris, 5318) and an abridgment, Muḥḥāṣar al-Munḥahal fi ʿi-sūl (numerous MSS, Böckelmann, ibid.). This Muḥḥāṣar was the subject of numerous commentators (and then of glosses on the commentaries, and super-glosses; see ibid.). It has been published (Bölak 1316-9), with the Commentary of Aḥmad b. al-Ṭajīl (al-Muṣībāḥiyin, and different glosses; also published, Cairo 1326, (11) al-Muḥṭāṣar fi ʿi-sūrā or Dīmās al-Ummāhāt or simply al-Muḥḥāṣar al-ṣalīl (titles as given by Mūḥ. Ben Čeneb, in El1, s. v. Ibn al-Ḥāḍjdjādī). This compendium of Maliki law is still in manuscript (see Brockelmann, S, i, 373 and S 1, 538-9). It was commented on (al-Tawṣīḥ) by Khawāl b. ʿI ṣbā al-Dinī (Ṣīr Khawāl in Algeria) who, in regard to law, looked on Ibn al-Ḥāḍjdjādī as his model; also in manuscript, as are the glosses (see Brockelmann, ibid.).

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the text: Brockelmann, S, i, 367-73 and S 1, 531-9; M. Ben Čeneb, Etude sur les personnages mentionnés dans l’Idāsīa du Cheikh ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Fāṣī, Paris 1907, no. 191; M. Morand, Le droit musulman algérien (role malikite), Les origines, Algiers 1913, 9 ff. Arabic sources: first Sūyūṭī, Bāṣbq, 323 and Ibn Ḥaḍjdjādī, Wafṣāf, Cairo, ii, 413-4 (no. 386); then Taṣīr “īn Diḥār al-Kādī al-Shuhba, Taḥākāt al-nuḥāt wa ʿal-ḥuqqaṭiyin, MS. Damascus, Zāḥīriyya, 438 taʿrīh, 401-2, and Ibn Fārūn, al-Diḥīb, Cairo 1239, 157-9; then Ibn Khālidīn, Muḥāṣar, iii, 13-14 (tr. Rosenthal, iii, 18-19). Further, M. S. Howell, Gr. of the Classical Arabic Language (1990 edition, see ibid.).

IBN ḤĀDJDJĀDĪ, Aḥī b. Aḥīb al-ʿĀṣīr b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Nūmān, called Ibn Ḥāḍjdjādī al-Nūmān, 1275, 2 vols. But there is still no really convenient edition of this remarkable work, such as that of the Sharḥ on the Shafīʿiya referred to above.—On the manuscripts of the treatise of Ibn Ḥāḍjdjādī, see Brockelmann, S, i, 367-8, S 1, 531-5. (5) Amālī: his oral teaching, dictated to his hearers or to his son al-Muḥdjdal. Böckelmann here distinguishes two series, including different dates (unpublished; MSS: 2, 372-1, S 1, 537): (a) on the Kūrʾan, al-Mutanabbī and other poets, etc. (b) on some passages from the Kūrʾan and especially on the Mufassāl of al-Zamakhshāri. (4) al-Ṭāṣīd al-muṣāf al-zamān and ʿl-maṣāf al-zamān, a versified enumeration (in Kāmil) of feminine nouns without a feminine termination; published in A. Haffner and L. Cheikh, Dix anciens traités de philosophie arabe (2nd ed., Beirut 1914), 157; reproduced in Dīwā-ul-maṣāfīr of F. A. al-Būsṭānī, i, 1958, 426.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the text: Brockelmann, S, i, 367-73 and S 1, 531-9; M. Ben Čeneb, Etude sur les personnages mentionnés dans l’Idāsīa du Cheikh ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Fāṣī, Paris 1907, no. 191; M. Morand, Le droit musulman algérien (role malikite), Les origines, Algiers 1913, 9 ff. Arabic sources: first Sūyūṭī, Bāṣbq, 323 and Ibn Ḥaḍjdjādī, Wafṣāf, Cairo, ii, 413-4 (no. 386); then Taṣīr “īn Diḥār al-Kādī al-Shuhba, Taḥākāt al-nuḥāt wa ʿal-ḥuqqaṭiyin, MS. Damascus, Zāḥīriyya, 438 taʿrīh, 401-2, and Ibn Fārūn, al-Diḥīb, Cairo 1239, 157-9; then Ibn Khālidīn, Muḥāṣar, iii, 13-14 (tr. Rosenthal, iii, 18-19). Further, M. S. Howell, Gr. of the Classical Arabic Language (1990 edition, see ibid.).
secretary, anthologist and wit of the Buyid period (340-423/951-1031). He came of a family of viziers and secretaries which was particularly in favour with the Buyids of Iran, who were probably the authors of his success. He also served the caliphs al-Tāhī and al-Kādir. He was a bitter rival of Abu 'l-Fālā ibn Turayk, who at one time succeeded in supplanting him at the court of al-Kādir. He had a very wide knowledge of literature. According to the Fihrist, 116, he compiled a sort of anthology of the al-imdār, Ibn al-Hadrami started to fight, but he had a temporary governor, Ziyad b. Abihi, was terrified and had to abandon the arbitration. After consulting 'Amar, he then decided to send Ibn al-Hadrarmi to Başra and gave him precise instructions: his agent was to base his propaganda on the recent successes of the Umayyads and the doleful memories of the Battle of the Camel [see qama]; he was to distract the Rabštā' (Abu al-Kays), win the friendship of the Azd and rely on the Mużāris (Tamil) in order to secure acceptance of the arbitration and to try to withdraw the town from 'Ali's authority. In fact, the Başrans were very divided, and their chief concern was to live in peace. Thus, from the time of his arrival, Ibn al-Hadrarmi encountered very strong opposition, and the neutrality of al-Ahnaf b. Kayy [q.v.] was not unconnected with his final failure. Nevertheless he succeeded in rallying part of the inhabitants who were ready to "avenge the cause" of 'Ali and was able to make the temporary governor, Ziyād b. Abī, terrified and had to abandon the dār al-imāra to seek refuge with the Azd. Ibn al-Hadrarmi's supporters then tried to seize the governor's residence, but al-Ahnaf intervened and order was temporarily restored. It was at that point that 'Amar sent to Başra Aṣ'yan b. Dubayya al-Muğāšī, who, for a day during which the opposing groups had not been sufficiently inflamed for any fighting to break out, was assassinated, probably by the Khārijīs. The lack of enthusiasm of the Azd, who refused to fight, delayed events still further, but the situation developed after the arrival of Dīrāya b. Kudāma [q.v.], sent by 'Amar. While the Azd were trying to bring Ziyād back to the dār al-imāra, Ibn al-Hadrarmi started to fight, but he was beaten and compelled to take refuge in the house of a certain Sunbī who had given him hospitality at the time of his arrival. Dīrāya, following up his advantage, surrounded and set fire to Ibn al-Hadrarmi's hiding-place, and he and his companions perished. Mużāwiyâ, his hopes disappointed, had to wait until 41/661, when at last Başra was brought under his authority, through the energetic intervention of Busr b. Abī Artā [q.v.].

**Bibliography:** Tabārī, i, 3413-7; Ibn Habīb, Muḥabbār, 290; Tabārī, Ansāb, i, 556a; Ibn Abī 'l-Ḥadīth, Sharḥ Naḥdī al-baladā, i, 348-55 (which makes use of Wâlid and the Kitāb al-Ghārid of Ismā'īl b. Hâlî al-Thâqafī); Ibn Sa'd, Tabārī, Yâsīn, vii, 450; Ibn Hāzīm, Dīmāhrâ, 210; Caetani, Annali, x, 151-67; see also Bibl. to Ḵārīya b. Kudâma. (Ch. Pellat)

**IBN HADFÎN** [see 'Umār b. Ḥafṣîn].

**IBN HÂMÂDÛ** [Ibn Ḥâmâdû], Abī 'Abd Allâh Muḥâammad b. 'Allâb āba b. Yâsîs b. 'Abî Bakr al-Sanârî, a Berber kâdi and historian related to the Banû Ḥamîdû [q.v.] and a native of a village near their Qal'a [q.v.]. After studying at the Kal'a and in Bougie, he was kâdi of Algiers and Salé (unless there is some confusion on the part of the writer of the Mafâkhir al-Barbar (65), who gives him the kunya of Abu 'l-Ḥasan, he was also kâdi of Azamûr in 616/1220), and he died in 628/1223. His Kitâb al-Nabûdâ al-muhâdîfîa fi ašhâr malîk Şâhândâ bi-Iṣâriyya wa-Baṣrîyya, which was used by several later historians, in particular Ibn Khâlîd (Ibars, vii, 43) and the anonymous author of the Mafâkhir al-Barbar (ed. E. Lévi-Provençal, Rabat 1934, 51), appears to be lost, but there survives his short history of the U'baydîs, written in 617/1220 and preserved in manuscript in Paris (Bibl. Nat., 1868) and Algiers (1988, 3); it was first translated in part by Cherbonneau (in JA, 1862, ii, 470 ff., 1869, i, 199 ff.), and later was edited and translated in full by M. Vonderheyden (Histoire des rois obâdites, Algiers-Paris 1927). Ibn Ḥâmâdû also wrote poems, some specimens of which have been preserved by al-Ṭîjâni (Rīhla, ed. H. H. Abî al-Wâhâb, Tunis 1372/1958, 126-7).

**Bibliography:** Qubrīnî, Umayān al-dârîya, ed. M. Ben Cheneb, Algiers 1910, 128-30; Amari, Bibliotheca arabo-sicula, 317-8; Saâdi, iv, 157-8, no. 1692; F. Bustâlî, Dâ'irat al-maṣâfîr, ii, 473-4; R. Brunschvig, in Mélanges Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Cairo 1935-45, 156, n. 2; H. R. Idris, Zîrîdîs, i, p. XIX.

This Ibn Ḥâmâdû should not be confused with his homonym Abî 'Abd Allâh Muḥâammad b. Ḥamîdû al-Burnûsî al-Sâbî who lived in the 6th/12th century and was the pupil of the kâdi 'Iyâd [q.v.]; he is the author of a large work entitled Hububîs fi ašhâr al-Mugâšî wa-l-'Andalus, now lost.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Uqhârî, Bayân, i, trans. 314, n. 1; Mafâkhir al-Barbar, 43, 46, 58, 64; E. Lévi-Provençal, in Arabica, i (1954), 25-6, n. 3; R. Brunschvig, in Mélanges Gaudefroy-Demombynes, 156, n. 2; H. R. Idris, Zîrîdîs, i, p. XIX. (Ed.)

**IBN HAMÁMÁ** [see BILÂL B. Râbab].

**IBN HâMÎDÎS** [Abî al-Dîrâbās Abî Muḥâmmad b. Abî Bakr al-Azdî, Arab poet of Muslim Sicily. From the date of his death (527/1132-3) and some verses in which he refers to himself as an octogenarian, it may be deduced that he was born, at Syracuse, in about 447/1055, i.e., just before the Christian conquest of the island, which was begun in 1066 and completed by the joint action of Robert and Roger d'Hauteville, called to Sicily by Ibn al-Thumân [q.v.], amir of Catania.

Practically nothing is known of the period of his youth, which the poet must have spent in Sicily, but judging from allusions in his poems (Didoé, ed. C. Schiaparelli, nos. 27, 110, 127, 157, 260, etc.) to revels and deep drinking, it seems to have been a gay one. And even allowing for the conventional use of these poetical motifs, which are found in almost all Baccanalian Arabic poetry, one thing is clear: the poet's sincere nostalgia for certain places on the
IBN HAMDIS — IBN HAMDUN

Island, objects of his longing, whose location remains unknown to us apart from Syracuse and Noto, which are occasionally mentioned in his poems. Nor is it known whether the poet took part in some of the battles against the Normans before he left Sicily for Spain in 471/1078-9. At Seville he was received at the court of the prince al-Mu’tamid Ibn ʿAbbad (Diwan, 344), who attracted to himself poets and men of letters. In this first exile he was fortunate to live in a literary circle of which the prince was the patron and animating spirit, to take part in the gay life of the ʿAbbadid capital, and to follow the political events of that time, which are reflected in his poetry. Ibn Hamdis declares (Diwan, no. 328) his aversion for satire and indeed no poems of hijād are found in the Diwan.

Ibn Hamdis’s style and his use of poetic language are both unequal: in his poems, together with great verbal and syntactical simplicity, is found the frequent use of an excessively precious vocabulary and of constructions which are merely tricks of paronomasia and alliteration, puns used to mask the poverty of the thought behind them. In this respect it is fairly certain that the charm, or rather the fashion, of the poetical neo-classicism represented by al-Mutanabbi, under whose influence the poet came, especially in panegyric; but his real poetic talent is seen more often in the descriptive fragments, which may have been influenced by the Andalusian poetic environment.

Bibliography: The first scholar to be interested in Ibn Hamdis was M. Amari, who in his Biblioteca arabo-sicula (Antwerp, 1891; Leipsig, 1857; Ital. tr., Turin 1888-2) published a certain number of poems relating to Sicily, and in his Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia, Catania 1933-9, ii, 592-602 collected information on the poet’s life from different sources. Later, the whole of the Diwan was edited, on the basis of the two surviving manuscripts, by C. Schiaparelli (Rome 1897) who prepared a complete Italian translation of it, which remains unpublished. A new edition, based on only one of the manuscripts (that of the Vatican) and with a certain number of emendations, was published at Beirut in 1960, by Ihsan Abbās, who was able to add to the first edition of the Diwan about 100 verses from various sources. Translations into European languages of verses of Ibn Hamdis are found in: A. von Schack, Poesie e storia dell’Arabo in Spazien und Sicilien, Berlin 1855, ii, 16-33; L. Bercher, Le palais d’El-Mansour à Bougac, in RT, xxix (1922), 50-6; H. Massé, Un chapitre des anecdotes d’al-Maghrビ上 la littérature descriptive chez les Arabes, in Mélanges René Basset, Paris 1923, i, 235-58; F. Gabrieli, Ibn Hamdis, Mazzara 1948; idem, Sicilia e Spagna nella vita e nella poesia di Ibn Hamdis, in Dal mondo dell’Islam, Milan-Naples 1954, 109-26; idem, Il palazzo hammādī d’al-Mansūr, in Festschrif für Ernst Kuhnel, Berlin 1959, 54-8. Reference may also be made to: U. Rizzitano, Il contributo del mondo arabo agli studi arabo-siculi, in RSO, xxxvi (1961), 89-93; ʿAbd al-Muḥammad al-Minghāwī and Muṣṭafā al-Sakkā, Tārīqmat ibn Hamdis al-Ṣikilli, Cairo 1347/1929; Zayn al-ʿĀdīn al-Sānūsī, Fi l-ʿadab al-ʿarabī wa-diwan Ibn Hamdis, Tunis 1952; U. Rizzitano, Maʿ ibn Hamdis al-Ṣikilli, in Fikr, vii/6 (March 1962), 563-70; F. Bustānī, Dāʾirat al-maʿārifī, ii, 469-71; MMIA, xxxvii (1962/3), 407-13.

(U. Rizzitano)

IBN HAMDUN, name of the members of the family of the Banū Hamdun, a line of “boon-companions” (nadīm) of the caliphs, who flourished mainly in the first half of the 7th/13th century. A great deal of information is available on Aḥmad b. ʿIbrahim b. Dawūd b. Ḥamdun, a contemporary of the caliphs al-Muṭaṣim, al-Wāṣīk and al-Mutawakkil, but very little on the other members of the family. Unfortunately the Arabic sources, accepting the claims of the Banū Hamdūn to noble descent, have endowed them with a disproportionately long genealogical tree in which it is difficult to distinguish about Sicily and Andalusia, or various subjects such as nature, war, animals, hunting, etc. (Diwan, nos. 3, 6, 17, 21, 23, 31, 81, 116, 164). Ibn Hamdis declares (Diwan, no. 328) his aversion for satire and indeed no poems of hijād are found in the Diwan.
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IBN HANI AL-ANDALUSI, MUHAMMAD B. HANI B. SADUN AL-ANDALUSI, famous court poet of the Banu Hamdun, rulers of al-Andalus and of the fourth Fatimid caliph, al-Mu'tizz li-din Allâh; he belonged to the Yemeni tribe of Azd, who, ever since the conflict between 'Ali and Mu'sâwiyah, many times supported the Shi'î cause. His Irâkîan descent was in a direct line from one of the most illustrious amirs of the famous family of the Muhallabids, Yazid b. Hatim, who governed Irîkiya for the Abbâsids from 155 to 171/772-87, distinguishing himself by an energetic policy of pacification and administrative reorganization.

Nevertheless, hardly anything is known of the life of Ibn Hânî. The information about him found in the Sunnî as well as the Ismâ'îlî sources is concerned almost exclusively with his career as a writer of panegyric poetry, at the court of Masila and then at that of al-Manşûriyya. The fact that he belonged to the Ismâ'îlî sect surrounded him, even in his own lifetime, with an aura of mystery which is very difficult to penetrate.

He was born in Seville in the reign of the first Umayyad caliph, al-Nâṣir li-din Allâh, probably between 322 and 326/934-8. His father, a native of Irîkiya, seems to have settled at Seville after having lived at Cordova, probably at the time when the young 'amir of al-Andalus, having pacified the kingdom of his ancestors, had just proclaimed himself caliph, while at the other end of Barbary the first Fâtîmid, al-Mahdî bi'llâh, was reasserting in his new capital of al-Mahdiyya, and after the failure of his two attempts against Egypt, his expansionist ambitions concerning the throne of Cordova. Such information as exists on the Fâtîmid propaganda seems to indicate that Hânî, himself a poet, was one of the many missionaries (das'âs) whom the Ismâ'îlî imâm maintained in Muslim Spain after the foundation of the Fâtîmid anti-caliphate in 297/909-10. Ismâ'îlî agents had already been working for a long time among the Mozarab supporters of Ibn Haşûn and with the Arab nobles of Kalbi descent, settled in Seville and other fortified towns, whom 'Abd al-Rahmân III, after his grandfather, the 'amir 'Abd Allâh, had great difficulty in reducing. Hânî, like the Mozarab and Arab nobles, was more at ease among the mystics, ascetics or men of science and letters, must have found, from Seville to Elvira and even Cordova, a fertile field for the dissemination of the Ismâ'îlî da'wâ. In addition, the intellectual development of the young Muhammads b. Hânî, at first at Seville itself, then in Cordova and Elvira, demonstrates the Ismâ'îlî influence which his father must have had on him, as well as the philosophic teaching which the disciples of Ibn Masârî (d. 319/931) continued to disseminate. The future panegyrist of al-Mu'tizz in fact pursued his studies in a period when the rationalist theories of Mu'tazilism and the metaphysical theories of Ibn Masârî, close to those of the Ismâ'îlî Bâtiniyya, were spread among a heterogenous population which was composed for the greater part of Mozarabs and of Arabs of Yemeni extraction, hostile to the power of the Umayyads and susceptible to Fâtîmid propaganda. At Elvira (near to Bobastro, a fief of the Mozarabs who had for long been in revolt against Cordova) as at Seville (a bastion of the Banu 'l-Hâdjîdâdî and other great families of the Yemeni nobility), the young poet lost no time in expressing publicly in a region so hostile to the Umayyads his Ismâ'îlî convictions. But having made himself conspicuous by publishing his pro-Fâtîmid sympathies, at a time when in Cordova, thanks to the energetic support of al-Nâṣir, the strictest type of Sunnî orthodoxy, that of Mâlikîm, had gained the ascendancy, the young Ibn Hânî was bound eventually to become the object of persecutions. Neither Seville nor Elvira, having finally submitted to the central power, could with impunity offer him protection, in spite of the great authority which its protectors, the Banu 'l-Hâdjîdâdî, had nevertheless retained.

Thus Ibn Hânî was obliged to leave al-Andalus for Irîkiya, particularly since, with the accession of al-Mu'tizz, 171/985-3, the fortunes of the Fâtîmids after a brief eclipse due to the Khâridjî insurrection of Abû Yazid [q.v.], were once more enjoying a brilliant success.

In 347/958, the Fâtîmid army, in a campaign in the extreme Maghrib under the command of Diawhar, had arrived in northern Morocco. After this, Ibn Hânî had no hesitation in leaving al-Andalus for good, to join, outside Ceuta, the Fâtîmid general, of whose glory he immediately began to write, vehemently condemning the "accursed" Umayyads. From this time there began for the young poet a brilliant career as a panegyrist, an ardent defender of the cause of the Fâtîmids, who were intensifying their imperialist propaganda in the West as well as in the Muslim East. The sources stress Ibn Hânî's role as propagandist. Among the lords of Masila, the brothers 'Ija'far and Yâhîya (the former being the foster-brother of al-Mu'tizz), Ibn Hânî received a great welcome.

At the court of al-Manşûriyya, where the talented poets included al-Faza'irî and Ibn al-Iyâdî, the young Ibn Hânî distinguished himself by the zeal which he showed in praising the merits of the imâms and in composing very extravagant panegyrics to the glory of al-Mu'tizz. His poems, which immediately became widely read, ensured that the imperial aims and the doctrines of the masters of Irîkiya became widely known within their territories, and also beyond their frontiers as far as Cordova to the west and Baghdad to the east.

Thus his poetry is of documentary value in providing information on the political propaganda of the Fâtîmids, who were certainly planning to oust the Umayyads. The 'Abbasids who also maintained an opportunity of making known their claims in Muslim Spain, where their hereditary enemies, the Umayyads, were attempting to prevent the infiltration of their doctrines and to put a stop to their subversive intrigues. In addition to their considerable use to the historian of the Fâtîmids, those famous panegyrics dedicated to al-Mu'tizz have also an undeniable literary value, despite the exaggerated condemnation of them by Ma'ârî and the more temperate criticism of Ibn Şaraf. There is no doubt that Ibn Hânî is a great poet, the first great poet of the Muslim West. His taste for hyperbole and the secret of his symbolism can be explained by his Ismâ'îlî faith and the sincerity of his adoration for his imâm. Ibn Hânî's works may for this reason form an enigma for readers who do not possess the knowledge, albeit elementary, of Ismâ'îlî doctrine which is required to understand his poetry and appreciate its true value.

His death also is shrouded in mystery. The circumstances of his death are not known; it may have been a political murder carried out by agents in the pay of the 'Abbasids or the Umayyads, or perhaps a crime passionnel after a quarrel. Even the date is uncertain. Ibn Khallîkân states that he tried in vain to establish it with certainty and found it only in the Kawkâlī.
al-dhahab of Ibn Rashik (where it does not in fact appear). The generally...  


IBN ḤABR [see 'Abd allāh b. Saba‘; al-Kindi, Ibn Ḥarr]  

IBN HARMA, Ibrāhim b. ‘Ali b. Salama (b. ‘Amir) b. Harma al-Fihrist, Abū ʿIṣāk, Arab poet of Medina, born in 90-909, who, if his genealogy is correct, was a distant relative of the tribe of Kuryah. Little is known of his life. A supporter of the ‘Alids, he attended and paneegyrised ‘Abd allāh b. al-Ḥasan [q.v.] and al-Ḥasan b. ʿAzīz [q.v.], but he is said to have refrained from giving his support to Muḥammad b. ‘Abd allāh [q.v.] when the latter revolted against the ‘Abbasids. The Aghānī names several persons for whom he had occasion to exercise his poetic gifts, but it must be remembered that after singing the praises of some Umayyads—especially al-Walid b. ʿAzīz—he tried in 140/757 to gain the favour of al-Maḥrūṣ, who pardoned his past conduct; perhaps he also approached al-Mahdī, for it is possible that he lived until about 170/786. He was buried at Bākī [q.v.], but by then he had fallen into such complete obscurity that no writer is able to give the exact date of his death. Al-Zubayr b. Bakhr, however, wrote a Kītaḥ Ḥabbār Ibn Harma (Fihrist, Cairo ed., 161).  

The physical and moral portrait of Ibn Harma is scarcely an attractive one. Ugly, small in stature, impolite and avaricious, he was furthermore addicted to drink, a vice which earned him some disapprobations, although it is related that al-Maḥrūṣ found a way to safeguard him by decreeing that he would be punished by 60 lashes of the whip if found drunk, but that the policeman who brought him before the governor of Medina would receive 20 lashes. Of his poetry, handed down by his rāwī Ibn Rubayh, and collected together by al-ʿAṣmā‘i, and later by Ibn al-Sikkil, al-Sukkari and al-Ṣūlī, all that survives is a small number of verses scattered through works of adab. His quite extensive Dīwān included free translations of Bedouin type, some rude tales, and some erotic and Bacchic poetry; but it is important to note that al-ʿAṣmā‘i and Abū ʿUbayda described Ibn Harma as one of the poets who have “sealed (khālama) poetry” and represent the rearguard (ṣāba) of classicism; he is thus one of the last to be regarded by philologists as an authority on the subject of the Arabic language. Al-Dāhibī gives particularly the text of his short fable of the lizard and the frog, and another context, places him in the same rank as Bashshār [q.v.] for the use of bādir [q.v.]; indeed, he seems to have been one of the first poets to exploit the resources of the “trade”, as is proved by a bāsid (poem) consisting solely of undotted letters.  

Bibliography: Dāhibī, Buhālīda, Bayānd and Hayawān, indexes; Ibn Ḥarmany, Bb., 719-31; Buṭūrī, Ithānāsa, index; Abū ʿAmīmā, Hamāsā, 68, 247; Ibn al-Muṭṭalib, Taḥbīb, 2-4 (notes); Masʿūdī, Muṣafar, vii, 175-6; Aṣkhānī, in Beirut ed., iv, 369-97; Ḥusnī, Zahr, 68, 555, 824; idem, Dīwān, 103; Baghdādī, Khizānā, Būlān, i, 203-4 (Cairo ed., i, 383-4); Thālibī, Iḥrām, 353; Damīrī, s. v. naʿāma; Brockelmann, S. i, 134; F. al-Bustānī, Dīwān al-mawṣī‘, 122-3. (Ch. Pellat)  

IBN ḤASAN AL-NUBĀḤI [see al-Nubāḥ].  

IBN ḤAWRĀL, Abū ʿl-Ḥaṣim b. ‘Alī al-ʾNabīsī, }
Arab geographer of the second half of the 4th/10th century, one of the best exponents, with his contemporary al-Muṣṭaḍḍāsī (q.v.), of geography based on travel and direct observation (īṣān).

Ibn Ḥawkal was born in Naṣīḥīn (Nisibis) in Upper Mesopotamia (al-Dījāzira). He probably spent his early years in this region before beginning, on 7 Ramdān 332/15 May 943, an impressive series of journeys, the course of which it is possible to trace, at least in outline, by means of the few dates given in his work: North Africa, Spain and the southern edge of the Sahara (336-40/947-51), Egypt and the northern regions of Islam: Armenia and Ḥādibil bāydayn (about 344/955), al-Dījāzira, Ṭrāk, Ḫūzistān and Fārs (350-8/961-9), Ḫwāzām and Transoxania (about 358/969), and finally Sicily (362/973), after which we lose trace of him. It may be said with fair certainty that Ibn Ḥawkal was engaged in the activities of a merchant and missionary. As to the first, there may be noted the details (often with figures) of prices, products and of economic activity in general. As for his political-religious sympathies, the Fāṭimid professions of faith which are found in his work indicate that he was at least sincerely in sympathy with the movement; although it is difficult to state categorically that he was a Fāṭimid dā'ī, with the convinced and militant attitude which this implies, the interest which he took in Fāṭimid policy certainly appears quite clearly. It is within this context that it is possible to explain, among other details, the passages on Nubia or on the history of North Africa, also Ibn Ḥawkal’s opinions on Umayyad Spain and Kalbī Sicily, his occasional complaints against the administration of Fāṭimid Egypt being explained by strictly commercial considerations.

Apart from a work on Sicily, which has not survived, Ibn Ḥawkal’s main work was a description of the Islamic countries, known under the titles Kītāb al-Maṣālik wa l-mā’ālik or Kītāb Šarāt al-arḍ. It has so far been impossible to establish with certainty the history of the text; it nevertheless seems clear that it appeared in several successive redactions. The first is dedicated to the Ḥamdūnī Sayfī al-Dawla and is therefore earlier than 356/967, when this ruler died. The second, full of criticism of this dynasty and others of the Sabānīn who had borrowed his work must have appeared in about 367/977. Finally, a definitive and complete version of the work must have appeared in about 378/988. The appearance of the work in successive versions is clearly the reason for some of the obscurities to be found in it and in particular those which appear on more than one point in the description of Sicily.

Another, and perhaps the most important, source of confusion is to be found in his plagiarizing, more or less closely, the text of al-Ṭaḥkhrī (q.v.), which Ibn Ḥawkal took as the basis for his own description. No detail can be extracted from Ibn Ḥawkal’s work and no judgement pronounced on it before the origin of the passage in question has been determined. Moreover, the patient and systematic comparison of the two texts has the advantage of illustrating Ibn Ḥawkal’s originality compared with his predecessor. It appears on the whole that, leaving aside certain alterations of style intended, in Ibn Ḥawkal’s opinion, to raise the tone, to amplify a phrase or to form a complete break with convention; for one thing, Ibn Ḥawkal is much less interested in rare or precious products than in the basic agricultural and manufactured products, and secondly he was able to study on the spot a given economic situation in relation to a particular period or with reference to an implicit norm. He was the only Arab geographer of the period who really sketched a vivid picture of production.

To begin with, Ibn Ḥawkal probably intended nothing more than to make, in the form of corrections, his contribution to the corpus of the geographical school of al-Balḵāḵī (q.v.). To judge from the terms in which he describes his meeting with al-Ṭaḥkhrī and the encouragement which the latter gave him, it was as a collection of maps of the Islamic world alone that Ibn Ḥawkal first envisaged his geographical work. However, very soon the facts which he accumulated during his travels must have encouraged him to devote the greater part of his effort to the description of places in al-Ṭaḥkhrī, was only secondary, being primarily merely a commentary on the maps in the old tradition of the šūrah Na’mānīyya. Ibn Ḥawkal’s innovation therefore was first to transform this commentary into a work in its own right, considerably expanded and independent of the maps.

Another modification was that, without in the plan of the work going beyond either the general framework of Islam or, in the description of details, the boundaries of each province (ṣīrām) dealt with one by one, Ibn Ḥawkal, adopting in this an outlook of administrative geography as found for example in al-Dījahānī (q.v.), adds to his description remarks on various countries or peoples bordering on the Islamic world which he considers to be of particular importance: notable examples are the passages on the Turks, the Khazars, the towns of southern Italy, the Sudanese and the Nubians.

Within the Muslim region proper, he similarly provides additional facts, the important pages here being those devoted to the West (the Maghrib, Spain, Egypt, and Sicily) and the North-East (Ḵurāsān and Transoxania in particular). Nevertheless it would be wrong, however great their interest, to limit our attention to these pages. Everywhere, in fact, Ibn Ḥawkal imposes on the work of his predecessor, even if only by corrections of detail or of the order of words or lines, the stamp of his own work, the main aim of which is to place the book firmly within his own period. His constant care to depict a region precisely in the state and at the date that he himself had seen it, and occasional references to the distant or more recent past, give to his text, besides a vividness of description and the rigour which is a hallmark of his identification of geographical phenomena, an undoubted value for the historian. This is particularly true of the notes on economic matters, which form a complete break with convention; for one thing, Ibn Ḥawkal is much less interested in rare or precious products than in the basic agricultural and manufactured products, and secondly he was able to use the spot a given economic situation in relation to a particular period or with reference to an implicit norm. He was the only Arab geographer of the period who really sketched a vivid picture of production.

An edition of Ibn Ḥawkal was published by De Goeje (Leiden 1873). This is now superseded by that of Kramers (Leiden 1938). A translation of the text which had been prepared by Kramers was published with revisions by G. Wiet, Configuration de la terre (Paris-Beirut 1964).

Bibliography: In addition to the introductions by J. H. Kramers and by G. Wiet, we give here, from a relatively abundant bibliography, the most recent works, which discuss the points at issue: Brockelmann, I, 263, S I, 408; Kabībī, Muwilām al-mu‘allīfīn, xi, 5; R. Blachère and H. Damman, Extraits des principaux géographes arabes du Moyen Âge, Paris 1957, 134 ff.; I. Yu.

IBN HAWSHAB [see MANŞUR AL-YAMAN].

IBN AL-HAWWS, ‘Ali b. Nimra, was one of the khâdis who shared Sicily after the last Kalbi amir, al-Hakim (395-411/1005-21), was deposed in 444/1052-3 (according to Ibn Khaldun: 437/1043-4). This was the most obscure and chaotic period of Muslim Sicily, racked by civil wars and the rivalries of the local leaders who sought at the same time to bring about Byzantine intervention and the landing in the island of a Zirid army. In this same time to bring about Byzantine intervention and the landing in the island of a Zirid army. In this

Some time afterwards the two brothers-in-law fought each other over an entirely family matter; following his victory, near Castrogiovanni, over his adversary, Ibn al-Hawwas became the only powerful amir who shared Sicily after the last Kalbi amir, al-Hakim (395-411/1005-21), was deposed in 444/1052-3 (according to Ibn Khaldun: 437/1043-4). This was the most obscure and chaotic period of Muslim Sicily, racked by civil wars and the rivalries of the local leaders who sought at the same time to bring about Byzantine intervention and the landing in the island of a Zirid army. In this disturbed atmosphere, the khâdi Ibn al-Hawwas managed to remain lord of Agrigento, Castrogiovanni and Castronuovo with their surrounding districts, while his brother-in-law, Ibn al-Maklati, occupied Catania, which was soon taken from him—together with his wife (Maymûna, Ibn al-Hawwas’s sister) and his own life—by his rival Ibn al-Thumna [g.v.], lord of Syracuse.

The works best known to us are:—(1) Maâkla fi ‘istkhûrid samt al-kibla (cf. C. Schey, Abhandlung über die Bestimmung der Richtung der Qibla, in ZDMG, ixxv (1921), 242-53) in which he established the theorem of the cotangent:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sin \varphi & \pm \cos (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) = \cos \varphi_1 \pm \varphi_2 \\
\sin (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) & = \pm \cos \varphi_1 \pm \varphi_2 \\
\end{align*}
\]

(2) Maâkla fi hay‘at al-dîlâm (which had two Hebrew translations, one in 1572 by F. Risner under the title Thesaurus Opaticus. In the fifth maâkla Alhazen’s mathematical genius attained its highest development when he resolved the problem which today bears his name: two points, A and B, are fixed on the plane of a circle with centre O and radius R. Find in the circle (idealized in a mirror) the point M where the ray of light emitted by A must be reflected in order that it may pass through B. Alhazen’s demonstration, which is very complex, leads to an equation of the fourth degree which he solves by means of the intersection of an equilateral hyperbole with a circle. Leonardo da Vinci later became interested in the problem, which he could only solve mechanically, for lack of mathematical means. C. Huygens (d. 1695) finally gave the most elegant and simplest solution (cf. Encyclopédie delle matematiche elementari, i/2, 388-9). (4) Maâkla fi daw‘ al-kamar, an important work on account of the ideas expounded on light, colours and the celestial movements. (5) Fi ‘l-marâdî ‘l-murâfbîk bi-l-daw‘îr (cf. Schey, ii, 18 and iii, 8), translated by E. Wiedemann in Bibliotheca Mathematica, x (1910), 293-307. (6) Fi ‘l-marâdî ‘l-murâfbîk bi-l-hulûf on parabolic mirrors (translated by J. L. Heiberg and E. Wiedemann, in Bibliotheca Mathematica, x (1910), 201-37). (7) Fi anna ‘l-kura awsa* al-akhkhîl al-muqâjama allati šâha‘hâ mutasâsiwâ (translated and commented on by H. Dilgan (Actes IX* Congres Intern. d’Hist. des Sciences, 1959, 453-60). In it he demonstrates that “of two regular polygons inscribed in the same circle, that which has the greater number of sides has also the larger surface and the larger perimeter.” (8) Fi kâysfiyát al-isâlî (abridged translation by E. Wiedemann, in SBPEMS Ergl., xxxix (1907), 226-48). (9) Fi athar alladhi fi l-kamâr (tr. C. Schey, Hanover 1925). (10) Fi ‘l-daw‘ (ed. J. Baermann, in ZDMG xxxvi (1882), 195-237, ed. Cairo 1936). (11) Fi ‘l-ma‘âlîn (abbr. tr. by E. Wiedemann, in SBPEMS Ergl., xii (1909), i-25) which has no connexion with (12)
FI 'T-MA'KĀN WA 'T-ZAMĀN (cf. Schramm, ii, 2 and iii, 68).

Besides the contributions already mentioned, it should be noted that Ibn al-Haytham established that the astronomical twilight began or finished when the negative height of the sun reached 19° and, proceeding from there, he fixed the height of the atmosphere at 52,000 paces; he correctly explained atmospheric refraction and the augmentation of the apparent diameter of the sun and moon when they are seen in the horizon. In the field of mathematics he nearly resolved the problem of al-Mahani, wrote a treatise on parallax. In the field of mathematics he nearly resolved the problem of al-Mahani, wrote a treatise on parallax. In the field of astronomy he neatly explained the difficulties. But he did not consider the caustic curve; he determined that the Milky Way was very remote from the earth and that it did not belong to the atmosphere, since it had no apparent diameter, and that it outside the earth. Without him, we should not be able to check, thanks to numerous quotations, the greater part of the chronicle of Ibn Shubair. Without him, we should have no quotations from the Muktabis, which covers the history of his own time, namely, nearly the whole of the 9th/10th century, in sixty parts or volumes with an admirable attention to detail and an exactitude which are highlighted by a rare political understanding of events. Although all the volumes of the Muktabis are lost, the author's great admirer Ibn Bassam (d. 993) has preserved for us in his monograph and extensive passages that, thanks to the (still incomplete) edition of the Dhakhira published in Egypt, it has become possible to reconstruct—admittedly with difficulty—a large part of the vanished text: this arises from the scrupulous fidelity, rare in mediaeval literature, with which Ibn Bassam always indicates the beginning and end of the passages transcribed.

"Whenever one considers any particular aspect of the work of Ibn Hayyān," states its most authoritative historian, E. Lévi-Provençal, "one is nearly always obliged to revert to Ibn Hayyān. Without his Muktabis, we should have no quotations from the two Rāzāls, nor from two other chroniclers of the 10th century, almost as important and of the same school, the Kurayshī Mustawiya ibn Ṣīhar ibn al-Mahāni and another Cordovan of Arab stock, al-Ḥasan b. Mufarrid. Without him, we should not be able to check, thanks to numerous quotations, the greater part of the chronicle of Ibn al-Kūṭiya and extensive passages from the writings of al-Khushānī and Ibn al-Paradī in less abridged versions than those which have been published. Lastly, without Ibn Hayyān's skeletal compilation (tablātī) of Ibn 'Īdrīsī's al-muṣṭafā bi l-ma'ārif, we would never have known the light of day, nor probably, as a result, would Dozy's history."

The third part of the Muktabis has been published by M. M. Antuña, under the title: Chronique du
IBN HAYYÜS, ABU 'L-FİTYÂN MÜHAMMAD b. SÜLTAN b. MÜHAMMAD b. HAYYÜS b. GHAŅAWI, Syrian poet of the 5th/11th century. Born at Damascus in 394/1003, he seems to have been at first attached to the Banû 'Ammar [see 'AMMAR] of Tripoli in Syria, although he is referred to as being in Aleppo in 429/1037-8; his sympathy with the Fātimids of Egypt caused him to fall out of favour with the Banû 'Ammar, who had become independent, and in 464/1072 he was summoned to Aleppo by the Mīrādīs [q.v.]. Maḥmūd b. Naṣr (457/1065-75), in whose praise he began to write. On the death of his patron, he wrote a marthiya which was also an eulogy of Naṣr b. Maḥmūd (467-8/1075-6). After the latter had been assassinated, Ibn Hayyūs remained at the court of his successor, Sābīk b. Maḥmūd, though this did not prevent his addressing praises also to Muslim b. Kurayyah, who captured Aleppo in 473/1080; as a reward Muslim gave him al-Mawsil as a fief, but the poet died before he was able to take possession of it, in Sha'ban 473/January-February 1081.

Ibn Hayyūs, who is considered as one of the greatest Syrian poets of the 5th/11th century after al-Maṣrī, left a Dīwān which was published in Damascus by Khalîl Mardam in 1951 (2 vols.).


IBN HAZİM [see MÜHAMMAD b. HAZİM].

IBN HAZİM, patronymic of an Andalusian family, several members of which played an important rôle during the Umayyad caliphate. The most famous of them is without doubt Abû Mūḥāmmad 'All Ibn Ḥazım [see the following article], but some brief details on the Banû Ḥazım are given here, since confusions often arise.

(1) 'All's father was Abû 'Umar ʻAbd Allâh b. Šaʻd b. Ḥazım b. Ǧālīb b. Šalīh b. Ḥalāf. A dignitary at the court of the kādījī Banû Maṣṣûr Ibn Abl 'Amir and that of his son al-Muẓaffar, he was greatly affected by the serious events which occurred in 399/1009 [see AL-ANDALUS] and died on 28 Dhu 'l-Ka‘aḏa 402/21 June 1012. See Ibn Baqīṣū, Šīla, no. 40; Abû ʻAmir, Ḥalāf, and E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Exp. Mus., index; idem, En reisant le "Collier de la Colombie", in al-Andalus, xv/2 (1950), 345-7.

(2) 'All's elder brother, Abû Bârîk, of whom only the ḥimyā is known, was born in 379/989 and died at the age of 22 during the epidemic of plague which ravaged Cordova, in Dhu 'l-Ka‘aḏa 401/June 1011. It was to him that Ibn Shuḥayd [q.v.] dedicated his Risāla li-ta’āwūsī 'ša‘ la-‘uṣūsī, which indicates the date at which this work was written. See Ibn Ḥażım, Tawik al-ḥamāma, ed. and tr. L. Bercher, 303, 309; E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Exp. Mus., ii, 64-5; idem, En reisant, 358.

(3) 'All's son, Abû Râfî' al-Fâdîl, entered the service of the 'Abbâdîs of Seville and was killed at the battle of al-Zallâkât [q.v.] in Radjab 479/October 1086. He is the author of a historical work entitled al-Hādî tā mawrijat an-nasa‘ al-abbâdî. See Ibn al-Abâr, Ǧūlla, ed. Muḥnis, ii, 34.

(4) Another Ibn Ḥażım fairly often mentioned is 'All's cousin Abû 'L-Muqīyīr Abû al-Wâhîb Abû 'L-Muqīyīr Abû Ḥamād b. Abû al-Râhîm b. Ḥazım. Servant to the administration and a wit, he was appointed vizier by al-Muṣṭârīf during the brief caliphate of the latter (414/1023) and then entered the service of the petty kings of Saragossa; he was vizier of Munqīh b. Yâḥyâ when the town fell, in 431/1040, and was imprisoned and then probably released after a ransom had been paid. He died in 438/1046. He had belonged to the group of young Cordovan aristocrats of brilliant literary talent, and his relations with Ibn Shuḥayd were well-known; according to Ibn Khâkân (Majma‘, 22 = al-Mākārī, Analectes, i, 408-9), Ibn Shuḥayd was not a good influence on Abû 'l-Muqīyīr, who led a more sober life after his friend's death. Ibn Ḥazım (apud Ibn Bassām, Dhakhīra, i/i, 111), who thought very highly of his qualities as a poet and prose writer, states that he wrote in his youth a number of works and adds that he always won any arguments with his cousin because of his ready wit and his learning. It appears that he enjoyed some degree of fame even beyond the frontiers of Muslim Spain, since it was to him that the Ǧâyrawānī Ibn al-Râbī [q.v.] addressed the famous epistle in which he criticized the Andałūsīs for not perpetuating the memory of their famous men; Abû 'l-Muqīyīr replied to these criticisms at some length, but Ibn Bassām (Dhakhīra, i/i, 113-6) did not consider it necessary to preserve the whole of the text of this reply, and in particular made the regrettable decision to suppress the list of Andałūsī works with which it ended. It is known that 'All Ibn Ḥazım also replied to this letter and that the text of his reply survives, probably in full [see Ibn al-Râbī]. In addition Ibn Bassām and al-Mākārī wrote about Abû Ḥamād in a certain number of prose and verse texts by Abû 'l-Muqīyīr which clearly show considerable literary qualities. See Ibn Bassām, Dhakhīra, i/i, 110-52; Ibn Ḥazım, Tawik al-ḥamāma, ed. and tr. L. Bercher, 327; Ibn Khâkân, Majma‘, 22; al-Mākārī, Analectes, index; Ibn al-Ḳāṭīb, A‘mad al-‘ālām, 197; H. Pêres, Poésie, 14, n. 4, 57; E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Exp. Mus., ii, 334; Dozy, HME, ii, 330; Ch. Pellat, in al-Andalus, xii/1 (1954), 53. (Ch. Pellat)

IBN HAZİM, ABû MUHAMMAD 'ALI b. ABD ALLÂH b. ŠA‘D b. SÜLTAN b. MÜHAMMAD b. HAYYÜS b. GHAŅAWI, born at Cordova in 384/994, died at Manta Lishān 456/1064, Andalusian poet, historian, jurist, philosopher and theologian, one of the greatest thinkers of Arabo-Muslim civilization, who codified the Zâhîrī [see Zâhîriyya] doctrine and applied its method to all the Ǧur‘ānic sciences.

The life of Ibn Ḥażım and the political events of his time. E. García Gömez has pointed out the period in which Ibn Ḥażım lived corresponds to the "most tragic moments of Muslim Spain" and to "the decisive crisis of Islam in Andalusia". His family origins are obscure; the most probable suggestion is that he was descended from Christian converts to Islam. His grandfather Ša‘dī settled at Cordova; his father Ḥamād rose to a high position in the administrative hierarchy, becoming vizier to
al-Mansur and to his son al-Muzaffar: he had enough skill and pliability to remain faithful to the Umayyad caliph, who was officially on the throne, without arousing suspicions of the hādīth al-Mansūr Ibn Abī ʿAmir.

Ibn Hazm spent his early years in the surroundings of the harem. Asin Palacios and García Gómez have stressed this point: “an impressionable child and abnormally highly-strung”, the revelation of sexual matters and the discovery of the subtle feminine psychology were to have a profound influence on him. This is true; but Ibn Hazm should not all the same be regarded as having been a morbidly amoral person. Until the age of fourteen the child led a pampered and easy life; but after that he was to suffer from the repercussions of the political struggles between Andalusians, Berbers and Slavs. His father fell into disgrace after the fall of Amir. His experience as an adult of those in power or Slavs. It was in these unhappy circumstances that he died in 402/1012. A period of violence had begun; the house of Ibn Hazm’s family at Baḥr Mughīth was destroyed in 403/1013. He himself was forced to take refuge in Almeria, where he was able to enjoy a respite until 407/1016, the year in which the governor of this town made an agreement with the Berbers to overthrow Sulaymān. Ibn Hazm, suspected of carrying out pro-Umayyad propaganda, was imprisoned for some months and then banished.

Accompanied by his friend Muhammad b. Isāk, Ibn Hazm found refuge at Ḥiṣn al-ʿAṣr, which, according to Garcia Gómez, is not the present day Aznalcázar near Sanlúcar, but was in the region of Malaga or of Murcia. The two friends did not remain there for long: having heard that an Umayyad claimant to the throne, ʿAbd al-Rahmān IV al-Murtadā, who had been living in Valencia, was raising an army against the Berbers of Cordova, they set out to join him. Ibn Hazm became al-Murtadā’s vizier and advisor. He took part in the battles of Alarcón and of the Guadalquivir. He was taken prisoner and then released. In about 412/1022, Ibn Hazm, who had retreated to Jativa, began to write the Taʾṣīk al-ḥamāma, which contains many autobiographical passages relating to the above events.

The Berbers retained Cordova until 414/1023, when al-ʿAskīs b. Ḥannāmīd was overthrown. The new caliph ʿAbd al-Rahmān V al-Mustāsīrah appointed his friend Ibn Hazm as vizier; unfortunately, he was assassinated after seven weeks, and Ibn Hazm was once again put into prison. He re-appears in 418/1027 at Jativa. According to al-Ḥiyyānī, reported by Yākūṭ, he became vizier again under Ḥiṣam al-Muʿīzād. But his experience of political life had destroyed the ideals he had had in his youth. From now on he devoted himself, in semi-retirement, to intellectual work and study, to writing his books and teaching. His virulent attacks against the Mālikī ḫubāḥī, who, always supporting those in power, held sway in the schools and exerted their influence on political and social life, his stand against the ʿAṭḥādīs of Seville whose impostures he denounced, in short his radical non-conformity, earned him the hatred of the official thinkers and the hostility of the rulers, who found such a person undesirable in their territory. This was the period of the Mūlāk al-Taʾāṣīf (Reyes de Taifas), which began after the abolition of the caliphate of Cordova, so that the traditional legitimist party, always trusting those internal recesses of the soul in which are hidden unexpressed and unexpressible intentions, double meanings whose ambiguity leads to indecision. His experience as an adult of those in power or
seeking power confirmed in him a mournful scepticism. It may be said that the ideas which govern all men and society as a man passionately convinced of the truth, and all his researches led towards a truth supported by incontrovertible evidence with incontestable proofs. This Truth is the God of Islam, Who is the foundation of all the other truths. The Muslim faith, in its authenticity, is the basis of a truly human life; but it must be purified of all that may have been suppressed or modified. Although God is the basic refuge, Ibn Hazm, meditating in his own way on this faith, discovered in the statements of the law solid bases which can be relied on and used as arguments to combat error and deceit. First, in spite of, and perhaps even because of, his misanthropy, Ibn Hazm recognized friendship and gave it an important place in his ideal conception of human relations. He considered that true friendship is the source of truth, frankness, mutual understanding, and sincerity. It is in friendly relations that verbal statements may be taken at their face value, without any need to suspect something left unsaid or thoughts skilfully and shrewdly disguised. This strongly held opinion explains Ibn Hazm's religious respect for the language itself, in which his Zahir doctrine has its roots. In the same order of ideas, but at another level, Ibn Hazm was convinced that the supposedly rational arguments of the philosophers, of the theologians and of certain jurists merely revealed their passions, prejudices and personal preferences, all things unjustifiable in themselves but given a semblance of legitimacy by means of false reasoning. From them stem the innumerable deviations of those who, instead of listening to God, as he himself practised in his own day. He was taught by Islam that there is no refuge from such evils except in God and he adhered to this belief with all the force of his being. It should not be forgotten that he himself lived out his own belief with intensity before giving expression to it dogmatically in a vast system in which it is set out together with all its various consequences, and before defending it passionately against those people whom it is said he had attacked in their own defence.

Ibn Hazm confronted all these inconsistencies of man and society as a man passionately convinced of the truth. It may be criticized as being of this type, and Ibn Hazm does not seem to have avoided it entirely. But his powers of observation and analysis make him a very subtle psychologist and a notable moralist. This appears throughout his writings, but may be seen more particularly in two of his works: the Tawq al-hamamā and the Kitāb al-Ahālyā wa 'l-siyar. The first is a treatise on love and lovers. This subject was often treated by the commentators of the early poetry (naṣib of the kasida: ghazal); in this sense Ibn Hazm had predecessors, the most important of whom were al-Dirāzī and Ibn Dāwūd al-Isfahānī. His treatise belongs to a literary genre which was to become much favoured, that which may be termed the "Code of Love" and which very soon became a collection of clichés, anecdotes and observations, illustrated, more or less aptly, by numerous poetic quotations. Already the Kitāb al-Zahra of Ibn Dāwūd may be criticized as being of this type, and Ibn Hazm does not seem to have avoided it entirely. But
although from the time the genre was first used the theme was fairly trite, skilled writers like al-Dhâbî and Ibn Hazm were able to give it an original twist. The bibliography in Garcia Gómez lists the studies of the Taqwîm from this point of view. Here it may be mentioned that Ibn Hazm gradually detaches himself from the stereotyped productions of a light literature and that his discourse becomes increasingly serious. His secular subject becomes full of moral and religious reflections; the use of more personal examples and of direct observation lends it progressively more depth and reality. In this spirit, which grows out of the same time a hint of pessimism and of bitterness becomes more apparent. It is probable that the work was not written all at the same time, and that it reflects a certain development in the author's experience.

An example is the passage which begins with these words: wa 'aâbah raʾaʾuyuʾuʾ muʾaqqat an tawâsul màwaddatihâ fi ǧâzâri ʿiṭât Allâh (ed. L. Bercher, 348). In it he felt a certain religious and human feeling, an existentialist dialectic of love. The chapter entitled Kâth al-maṣâyiya contains completely personal autobiographical details which have the ring of truth, together with some very vivid notes on feminine psychology. Ibn Hazm's gifts as a psychologist and a moralist are well enough demonstrated by some remarks on apparent resignation (ch. 24, ed. Bercher, 238), also by some remarks on the apparent and the hidden meaning in the words of lovers (p. 180), and remarks on the diaphanous consolation (ḥumâ), in particular among poets who attempt to satisfy themselves "by means of externalizing the passion which grips them (gâhar); on the meaning of this word, cf. Dozy, Supp.), by displaying their mastery of profound ideas and extraordinary designs: each of them speaks according to the strength of his nature, but they merely use the language in an arbitrary way (tabâkhum biʾl-lishân), produce turgid discourses (tâqhâdâd fiʾl-hâlâm), and revel in rhetoric (istišâla biʾl-bayân), all of which is completely without authenticity"; they are demonstrated also by some remarks on the different motives which exist for apparently identical conduct and on the part played by ostentation (riyâ'), and by many other passages of the same type. These remarks however also indicate the way in which Ibn Hazm always shuns the ruthless analysis of the motives, intentions and secret meanings which reveals the reticences or dissimulations concealed under the cover of expression in speech. When a man speaks about himself, and in order to express himself, he does not follow the rules of a language which was made for accurate communication, but he distorts it to his own personal requirements to disimulate and deceive. When Ibn Hazm, in the Taqwîm, uses the term izhâr, it is always in a pejorative sense: a man does not show himself as he really is but adopts a mask. This is why, after criticizing human words, he seeks authentic truth...
of a system of logic capable of analysing the revealed and prophetic texts in the essence of their zabīr without the risk of debasing them by substituting for that which God means that which man wishes to understand. From this point of view, although he was acquainted with Aristotle and in spite of his own command of logic in the arguments which he advances against his opponents, his tendency is to reduce the importance and the range of application of logical procedures conceived as the instruments of an independent reason. He believes in the value of reason, but conceives its legitimate use only in the sense and in the manner of the Kur'ān (cf. the verses which include the verb yaṣlān); it is first the faculty of the necessary rational intuitions (the principle of contradiction, the principle that the whole is greater then the part, etc.). Next it is the faculty which understands the senses of creatures and, consequently, it must never in its use become divorced from the results of perception through the senses which it is its task to penetrate. It is reason also which understands words and to which the Word of God is addressed. Thus it has the power to distinguish the true from the false, but always in relation to a fact which is presented to it either by the experience of the senses or by speech. It has also the capacity to reach immediate inferences readily checked by the facts. But it has absolutely no power to discover a truth which has not been given to it, and still less to create or reconstruct one. It is unable to make any value judgement, particularly concerning the moral questions of good and evil. It does not carry with it any speculative or practical imperative which demands that God take it into consideration. Reason is not a ruler but a worker. Entirely subordinated to the service of the understanding of the “signs” of God, it is reason which performs tajwidh, but this personal effort contributes nothing, does not produce any material progress in knowledge; it must result only in a more perfect understanding of the revealed texts and in a knowledge of them which is formally more solid and clear.

Furthermore, Ibn Hazm does not recognize an area of logical realities consisting of genus and species, of specific differences, of characteristics. He does not use these words which he assigns always so in the sense which they have in language (fi 'l-tuğha) and never according to their technical acceptance, except in the case of polemic. Above all he refrains from building up a metaphysical system based on these so-called logical realities. There is no “Hazmian theory” of substance and accident, of act and power, of natures, etc. When he makes use of these words it is either in polemic, or to express a common idea, or in referring to the Kur'ān or to hadith. Thus, in his Fisal, there is a chapter in which he demonstrates that the word “nature” (labāa) may be used because the Prophet used it in referring to the character of some of his contemporaries. This is very far from the philosophic doctrine of the “natures” as the fāliṣṣa received it from the God of their predecessors. It is true that in his Kitāb al-Takrib Ibn Hazm presents a summary of Aristotelian logic, but it should not be concluded from this that he understood it in the spirit of Aristotle. The examples which he gives and which he draws from the Kur'ān and from hadith are already an important indication of this. But nevertheless it is undeniable that, regarded in itself, the logic of Aristotle is closely connected with language; as an instrument for the analysis of linguistic expression it is natural for a Muslim to take an interest in it, and on this point Ibn Hazm’s attitude is clear. In a dialogue preserved by al-Tawhidi between Abū Sa‘īd al-Da‘ūlī and Mutabb b. Yūnus, Abū Sa‘īd rejects Aristotelian logic on the ground that it is linked with the Greek language and could not be of the slightest use to the Arabs. In this work Ibn Hazm makes a point of mentioning several times that what he obtains from Aristotle is common to all languages and hence can be of profit in the study of Arabic. If the transmission of logic is a grace (lujf) of God, this is because this science is based on “the capacity for understanding which God has created in man”. This leads to the central importance of jahm. It is thus, for example, that the scientific difference is not at all to be regarded as a constituent element of a concept and still less, beyond the concept, as a constituent element of a nature or of a metaphysical essence, but merely as a means of distinguishing (lamyṣṣa) names and beings from one another.

Thus this recourse to Aristotle does not in the least contradict the logical conceptions set out elsewhere by Ibn Hazm (in particular in the Kitāb al-Ikhām). It should however be remembered that several Muslim writers on logic have claimed that Ibn Hazm’s conception of Aristotelian logic was not authentic, and indeed it is possible in one sense to say that he did not understand the full philosophical implications of Aristotle’s work. It is probably more exact to say that he did not wish to attribute such wide implications to logic.

Ibn Hazm regarded logic as intended to extract the precise meaning of the texts on which the Muslim faith is based and also (and this is perhaps his chief aim) to reconcile the various texts of the Kur’ān and of hadith whose agreement is not immediately obvious and which sometimes appear flatly contradictory. It is therefore a matter of a logic of the bayān. The zabīrin conception of language led to a zabīrī system of logic which, in its turn, produced a zabīrī theology and system of law.

The basic rule is that it is necessary at first to consider all the elements in a text in their general meaning (‘ala ‘l-‘umām). It applies in the first place to the ‘andisir al-kalām, which should be understood in their speech and in the sense in which they should be understood as a dissuasion. In the second place words are to be understood in the widest sense of their lexico-graphical meanings. If it is necessary to restrict them to a particular meaning (‘ala ‘l-khawṣṣa), a dalīl must be found. It can thus be seen that by “generality” Ibn Hazm does not mean a conceptual generality: in Arabic the various meanings of a word often have no semantic relation to one another; the ‘umām is thus only the sum of the meanings of a word. If there is no restrictive indication and if all possible meanings equally apply, then all may be retained. If certain of them do not apply, then concrete experience plays the part of dalīl, providing sufficient indication that these should be excluded. It is also the relations between the ‘umām and the khawṣṣa which are the basis of the theory of istīlāhā (exception). When two texts do not agree, the particular is discarded in favour of the general. These
are the basic principles of methodology which Ibn Hazm persisted in applying to all the problems of fiqh and kalām, adapting them with extreme ingenuity to each case.

Ibn Hazm and the sources of the law. As far as the Kur'an is concerned, Ibn Hazm's interpretation is always a literal one and a wide one, according to his system of applying the rule of generalization in the understanding of texts. In this way he succeeded in deriving, from verses which appear to have only a limited application, ideas on which he built a whole juridical system. Ibn Hazm (VI, 164): "wā-lā takṣiṣu kullu nafsīn iltī 'alā'yahā và (II, 280) "lá yakal[l]a 'iltī 'alā'yahī nafsīn iltī wusū'alā 'ahdī mā hasabat wa 'alā'yahī mā 'kasabat" are two verses proposed as the Kur'an's foundation for the doctrine of association (Kitāb al-Muhalld). It is clear that in these matters Ibn Hazm is not the only jurist to show great skill in exploiting the texts. In other cases he takes the verses in a very limited sense; for example in his treatise on loans and pledges, on the principle that, in a contract, any condition which is not found in the Book of God is null, he takes the terms of Sāra II, 282 in a very narrow sense.

To hadīth he applies very severe standards and, in his juridical controversies, he rejects the majority of those on which his adversaries rely. He applies moreover the ordinary rules of that criticism which he set out himself in his Kitāb al-Ikhān, showing in this an undeniable sense of history.

He was, in contrast to the Shafi'is, the great opponent of reasoning by analogy (ḥiyās), which he dismisses by demonstrating on the one hand the vagueness of the idea of resemblance and on the other the arbitrary element which exists in the wish to define a point of analogy. In his treatise on law (Kitāb al-Muhallā), when he is attacking a ḥiyās, he always concentrates on stressing the inconsistencies which it produces: why make use of analogy in one case and not in another?

He also reduced the scope of ẓidma' by bringing it back to the consensus of the Companions, the only one which is possible and certain.

Ibn Hazm as a jurist. He is the most representative of the Zāhirī school. On the theoretical level he built a whole juridical system. He was a lesser degree of Shafi'ism. But on the theoretical and the practical levels his great enemy was the Mālikism which was strong in Spain in his time. It may even be said that Ibn Hazm espoused Zāhirism because he saw in it an effective means of opposing and of condemning the tyranny of the Mālikī jurists. In this sense his work as a jurist constituted a liberation of the faithful. There are five akkām: the prescribed and the forbidden, that which is advised and that which is reprehended, and the permitted. In order to claim that an act falls into one of the first four categories, it is necessary to adduce a text in its ẓāhir. If no text can be brought, it is clear that the act in question falls into the final category, that of the muḥābā.

In response to the demands brought about by historical changes, Ibn Hazm applied himself to reconstructing a legal system stripped of all that he considered to be additions made by the jurists who came after the Prophet and the Companions. He therefore greatly simplifies the law on many points: particularly clear examples of this are found in the chapter on the zakāt in his Kitāb al-Muhallā, where, for agricultural products, he retains only wheat, barley, dates and zābīb, eliminating all the other types of cereals, fruits and fresh vegetables, and plants used for textiles, dyes and medicines, which other schools had included. Similarly in the walā', he limits considerably the forms of association by strict application of the principle that to each person is returned the fruit of his labour. His treatise on sale is also a return to a legislation inspired by such elementary forms of commerce as those for which the Prophet had laid down rules. On certain points, this return to the situation of the past presents great advantages: for example, in his treatise on marriage (Kitāb al-Muhallā), he set out himself in his Kitāb al-Ikhān, showing in this an undeniable sense of history.

He was, in contrast to the Shafi'is, the great opponent of reasoning by analogy (ḥiyās), which he dismisses by demonstrating on the one hand the vagueness of the idea of resemblance and on the other the arbitrary element which exists in the wish to define a point of analogy. In his treatise on law (Kitāb al-Muhallā), when he is attacking a ḥiyās, he always concentrates on stressing the inconsistencies which it produces: why make use of analogy in one case and not in another?

He also reduced the scope of ẓidma' by bringing it back to the consensus of the Companions, the only one which is possible and certain.

Ibn Hazm as a jurist. He is the most representative of the Zāhirī school. On the theoretical level he built a whole juridical system. He was a lesser degree of Shafi'ism. But on the theoretical and the practical levels his great enemy was the Mālikism which was strong in Spain in his time. It may even be said that Ibn Hazm espoused Zāhirism because he saw in it an effective means of opposing and of condemning the tyranny of the Mālikī jurists. In this sense his work as a jurist constituted a liberation of the faithful. There are five akkām: the prescribed and the forbidden, that which is advised and that which is reprehended, and the permitted. In order to claim that an act falls into one of the first four categories, it is necessary to adduce a text in its ẓāhir. If no text can be brought, it is clear that the act in question falls into the final category, that of the muḥābā.
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He also reduced the scope of ẓidma' by bringing it back to the consensus of the Companions, the only one which is possible and certain.
Ibn Hazm had read widely, and he reveals that he had himself carried out some of the enquiries and that he is well informed both on the past history of these religions and on their present states. He does not omit, for example, to point out when an ancient doctrine is still held in his time or when it has been modified. His qualities as a historian are undoubted, but the Fisal is not only the work of a historian: it is that of a man inspired by a theological ideal. Its general plan is a sign of this: Ibn Hazm begins with basic philosophical questions, those concerning knowledge and the possibility of attaining a truth, then he classifies the answers which have been given, eliminating that of the "Sophists", that is the sceptics, and retaining that which admits that it is possible for man to apprehend the truth. He then proceeds to study the problem of the eternity of the universe and that of the Creation. He deduces this in favour of an examination of those which believe in a Creation; and by the same process, he deduces the truth of monotheism, and then the reality of a God Who sends to men a revelation through prophets. Thus by degrees he approaches the fundamental dogmas of Islam, whose features are stated more and more clearly as the errors are demolished. In pursuing this line Ibn Hazm examines, in order to criticize them, various philosophical and religious systems: speculations on time, space and bodily matter; the astral religions, dualism, metempsychosis, the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, the various conceptions of prophecy in Judaism and in Christianity (concerning the person of Jesus). Finally, when it begins to deal with Islam, the Fisal becomes a treatise of heresiography which concentrates on theological and juridical ideas and not on the history of the sects. The various controversial problems of Muslim theology are considered and resolved according to the principles of a systematic Zahirism. Two points should be mentioned: in discussing the non-Muslim religions, Ibn Hazm does not attempt to understand them in themselves; he is interested in them only in relation to dogmas or problems which enable him to compare them with Islam. Thus he attacks the Jews for their two confinements, on hearing the word of God, to take it in the manner prescribed, or fight against men until they testify "...". Only the tongue can be compelled by force; this being so, Ibn Hazm demonstrates by philosophic methods, by a study of temporality and of time, that the world is created (muhdath), that it has a Creator (muhdath), called also al-khidlik), and that this Creator is unique. Similarly, he attacks the Gospels, demonstrating that they show no guarantee of being a revealed text, since they have not the nature of one (the Qur'an being taken as the criterion), and that they do not even achieve the credibility of hadith, since they are totally lacking in tanda (Ibn Hazm demonstrates this from the prologue to St. Luke's Gospel). The second point to be noted arises from the first: Ibn Hazm is always well informed, whether he is writing of non-Muslims or of Muslims whom he is criticizing. He sets out the positions of his adversaries honestly, accurately, and often in detail: this shows him to be a good historian of ideas. Unfortunately he never attempts to understand the importance and the gravity of the problems which occupy the men with whom he disagrees. Starting from the Kur'anic principle that one may not question God, he regards philosophical and theological speculation as no more than the expression of the vain curiosity of a disobedient human spirit. Thus, from the beginning he has no sympathy with the basic steps which form the various points at issue. This is why his sole aim is to trap his interlocutors by means of his dialectic, to make them contradict themselves by processes which are merely splitting hairs, to confound them by confronting them with facts of experience which are striking rather than convincing. To give one simple example: he accuses the Mu'tazilis, who set a limit to the power of God, of attributing to God a weakness greater than that ever experienced by bugs, fleas or worms. Although he does not always go to such extremes, Ibn Hazm often has a tendency to do so. This seems more likely to be due to his impatient personality than to a genuine will to understand. Behind these exaggerations there lies a state of mind, an outlook on the world, and a Zahirist conviction. Ibn Hazm does not enter into the deeper thoughts of others but he is very well able to understand their methods of argument: he therefore skilfully makes use of the argumentum ad hominem.

The Islam of Ibn Hazm and his theology. At the beginning of the Kitab al-Muhallal there is a chapter almost identical to which is a summary of the shari'a of Ibn Hazm. The first obligation upon every man, without which there is no islam, is to know in his heart with certainty and complete sincerity, with a knowledge in which there remains no trace of doubt, and also to pronounce with his tongue, that there is no god but God and that Muhammad is His Messenger. He does not consider the question of the "akda bi 'l-kalb as implying the development of an inferior religious life. It is an "act of the soul" which, during religious worship, accompanies the actions of the body. This statement is based solely on the Kur'an (XCIII,5). Ibn Hazm's thinking on this point is clearly shown in another passage, on the subject of the nitya, of which he states that in order for it to be authentic there is no necessity for it to be guaranteed by another earlier nitya, since then there would be an intention of the intention, and this would proceed to infinity. He mistrusts the recesses of the human conscience. It is not necessary to cultivate in oneself, in one's heart, a perfect purity of intention: the heart intervenes only in order to extend itself beyond its own confines, on hearing the word of God, to take it in the manner prescribed, or fight against men until they testify "...". Only the tongue can be compelled by force; this being so, Ibn Hazm demonstrates by philosophic methods, by a study of temporality and of time, that the world is created (muhdath), that it has a Creator (muhdath), called also al-khidlik), and that this Creator is unique. He created the world without any reason forcing Him to do so (la-ghayr min 'illa awadabat 'alayhi). The soul is created; it is no different from the spirit: it is the living part of man, the part endowed with sensibility and with speech. Some hadiths refer indifferently to either the soul or the spirit as being in the hands of God when a person is asleep. The Throne is created, for it is said of God that He is the Ruler of the Throne (IX, 130), and whatever has a master is created. Finally, nothing may be likened to God.

Prophecy is a means by which true knowledge may be obtained. The proof of this is that there are many facts which we can know only if they are reported to us (knowledge by khabar). Muhammad is the seal of the prophets: God by his milla has cancelled all the others and He requires all men and all dhims to follow the Kur'anic Law. There have
been other prophets, some mentioned in the Kur‘an and others not (IV, 149). It is an obligation (fara‘) to believe in them all. They are men created like all other men and are servants of God.

Paradise is a place of sojourn created for the believers. Hell is a created abode, but no believer remains there eternally. God decides which Muslims remain there eternally. God decides which Muslims shall go there: those whose great sins are spoken of in the Book, even though the reader may not understand how they are so (nu‘minu bi-tä mäli‘ä nadri kâyta niya). Anyone who refuses to accept one letter of the Kur‘an which is in the hands of the Muslims, from the Fatihah or Umm al-Kitab right up to the two final sûras (al-mu‘awwādi‘atayn), is a kafir. No person possesses a secret concerning religion (cf. II, 159, 174 and III, 187). It is necessary to believe in the angels, in the dinmins, in the Resurrection, in the sûrat, in the scales, in the basin, in the pages on which the angels record the actions of men and in the final rendering of the account of those acts: all this is real. Examples of this account: if a man thinks of a good action and does not do it, this is recorded to his credit as one good action; if he performs it, it is recorded as ten; if he thinks of a bad action and refrains from committing it for God’s sake, this is recorded for him as a good action; if he is forced to refrain from it or refrains for any other reason, it is not recorded at all; if he commits it, it is recorded against him as one single bad action. If an unbeliever commits a bad action, then becomes a Muslim and continues in this evil, account is taken in the next life of what he did in his gharā and in his islam; if he repents in his islam, that which he did in his gharā is disregarded; if he has done good while an unbeliever and then repents in his islam, all is forgiven for his good works done both while he was an unbeliever and while he was a Muslim; if he remains an unbeliever, he is rewarded in this world for the good he has done, but gains nothing from it in the next life.

If anyone, through his ignorance or misunderstanding of Arabic, is incapable of knowing all this, he must, when it has been explained to him, believe in his heart and utter with his tongue the profession of faith, adding that all which Muhammad revealed is true and that all religions apart from his are false.

No person is allowed to refer to God by names other than those which He has used of Himself, nor to describe Him in different terms from those which He Himself has taught us. One may not use derogatory expressions (iqtibād) in order to apply to Him a name which He has not given to Himself. Thus, He is seated on the Throne, but he may not be invoked by calling him the Seated. On His attributes, Ibn Hazm states that God created istid‘ā. In short, man is created free in all his acts, and that wisely, for God puts each being in his rightful place. Freedom belongs to man while still remaining in the hand of God.

All these articles of faith, briefly set out in this chapter of the Muḥaddith, are developed in the course of many controversies, in particular with the Mu’tazils and the Ash‘aris, in the Fiṣal. Concerning the relations of faith with istid‘ā, it is stated, in this Kitab al-Ta‘awib, that he who believes firmly in his heart and who declares his faith with his tongue receives help from God, whether or not this is accompanied by recognizable indications. This question forms the subject of a very interesting risāla, on Faith, addressed by Ibn Hazm to his friend Ibn al-Hawwāth. In it Ibn Hazm studies the delicate problem of taklid and demonstrates that to follow the teaching of the Prophet is not to imitate blindly.

It can thus be seen that the principles of the zahir were extended from juridical methodology to theological. This simplifies the problems and may appear inadequate to a theoretician. But it is a fact that life has its own logic, which easily surmounts the insurmountable theoretical contradictions which defeat speculative logic. In following the teaching of language, which is the very expression of life, Ibn Hazm was able easily to deride the embarrassments of hâlām and condemn it.

Ibn Hāzm’s political ideas. By tradition and through the events of his life, Ibn Hāzm was a legitimist, a partisan of the Umayyads. It may seem
surprising that a religious thinker of such strict principles should have supported a dynasty which the Muslim historians have often reproached for its lack of scrupulousness. Ibn Hazm's reasons probably arose mainly from personal motives of loyalty and friendship. In addition however, he seems to have regarded the Umayyads as representing Arabism. All his religious thought moves against an Arab background. This appears in an unusual way in his work entitled Djamhurat ansab al-'Arab. He writes "God has said: We have created you from a male and a female and We have divided you into nations so that you may know each other, but assuredly the most noble among you in the eyes of God is the most devout. Although God has decreed that the most noble is the most devout, even if he be the son of a black prostitute, while the rebel and the unbeliever is placed at the lowest level, even if he be the son of prophets. He has nevertheless made it an aim, by creating us in nations and in tribes, that men should give recognition to each other. Consequently the science of genealogy is of necessity a science of great dignity". There are various types of genealogical research. Some are religious and obligatory for all Muslims, such as knowing the genealogy of the Prophet or making sure that the caliphate is in the hands of a Kuraysh, or of ascertaining the family connexions of the person with whom one wishes to marry in order to avoid entering the prohibited degrees. Others are fard *ala 'l-kifdya: thus it is necessary for the Umma to retain the memory of the genealogy of the Muhaddis-sun and the Ansâr. Another application which he gives is: "Certain jurists make a distinction, in regard to the levying of the poll-tax and the right to take into slavery, between Arabs and non-Arabs. Thus they make a distinction between the status of the Christians of the tribe of Taghib and that of the remainder of the People of the Book...". This being so, Ibn Hazm generalizes: "God has related to us in the Kur'ân the issue of the generations from which the prophets have emerged. This constitutes the science of genealogy. The Prophet himself spoke of ancestral descent: 'We are', he said, 'sons of al-Nâdîr b. Kinâna'; and he recalled the sub-divisions of the tribes of the Ansâr, when he assessed the numbers of the various types of genealogical research. Some are

This justification for research into the genealogies of the Arabs clearly shows that Ibn Hazm attached to it great importance. He delights in comparing the character of the Spaniards and the Kurayshs, in their good qualities and in their faults. The letter on the merits of the inhabitants of al-Andalus preserved by al-Maqaqzâ and Maqaqzâ contains some significant details on this point, while at the same time it reveals in Ibn Hazm a certain chauvinism. He certainly praises Bagdâd and Basra, which were in advance of the other towns in raising the standard of learning. He adds: "As for our own countries, they are in this matter in the situation referred to in the proverb: the people to whom least attention is paid in a country are its inhabitants. I have read in the Gospels that Jesus said: No one is a prophet in his own country". There was no better way of saying that it was time for Spain to stop admiring the East and to think of appreciating its own glories. It seems that the three ideals which were held by Ibn Hazm were Zâhirism, Arabism and Umayyad Spain. When his political ideal was lost, it can be understood how he devoted all his energies to the other two, seeing in them the only hope of salvation, or at any rate a sufficient reason for continuing the struggle.

After his death, Ibn Hazm was attacked by the hâkî Ibn al-Arabi [q.v.], who was much influenced by the thinking of al-Ghazâlî, and in a work entitled Kitâb al-Mu'âwila, written in the 6th/12th century, this great adversary of their school was attacked by some Mâlikî theologians: ʿAbd al-Hâjî b. ʿAbd Allâh and Ibn Zurîn (who wrote a Kitâb al-Mu'âwila, against the Muâwila). On the other hand, the botanist Ibn al-Rûmîyya and the great mystic of Murcia, Ibn al-'Arabi [q.v.], were supporters of Ibn Hazm. Ibn al-'Arabi wrote, under the title of Muâwila, a summary of the Muâwila. He showed himself to be of beneficial to contemporary Islamic thought and help it to solve many problems.
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systematically arranged than in the books of his predecessors. It was still studied in the 19th century (Shawkani, Ikhāl al-akhār, 69; see also Ibn Sālim al-Makki, al-Turāth al-sulā'i, al-Anām, Haydarābād 1328, 35). His (Ta'rikh) al-Takhrīr is an authoritative work on the trustworthiness of the transmitters of traditions, currently referred to by Dhabahi, Ibn Ḥadžjār and other critics. A short extract of it is the Kūṯāb Maḏahār ‘ulāmā al-ṣamāyār, ed. M. Fīlschhammer in Bibliotheca Islamica, xxii (1959). We also possess one of his books on adab, the Rawd al-‘ādīr (MS: Wetzlar, ii, 289), fol. 80 v.; Muntakhab min Ta’rikh Kutb al-Dīn al-Nahrawndī (MS: Leiden 17x-33)

Ibn Hibbān was a prolific writer, as is shown by his numerous volumes which the dependable editor E. M. Yacoubi devotes an entire chapter to (Ibn Hibbān, ibn al-Habbarīyya’s...)

Ibn Hibbān left an important body of works, both in prose and in poetry. Of his poems, which he collected under the title Ta’rikh Samarkand (see Idrisi, d. 405/1014, 331-405/933-1014), the most famous is his Bādī‘yya (or Tahdīr Abī Bakr), in praise of the Prophet; comprising 143 verses, it contains 196 figures of bādī‘, mentioned by name. On it, in 826/1423, the author wrote a commentary entitled Khisānāt al-adab wa ǧhayāt al-arab (publ. Calcutta 1920 as an appendix to the Diwan of al-Mutanabbi; Būlāk 1273, 1291; Cairo 1301). As his Bādī‘yya was written to rival those of ʿIzz al-Dīn al-Maṣūṣī and ʿAṣf al-Dīn Hilīl, he attempted to prove its superiority in the Diwan of Abū ʿĪsā (see also Ibn Salīm al-Mufīḍ al-Dīn, Itjāf al-akbār, 69; see also Ibn Salīm al-Mufīḍ al-Dīn, Itjāf al-akbār, 69; see also Ibn Salīm al-Mufīḍ al-Dīn, Itjāf al-akbār, 69)
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IBN HINDJÁ — IBN HISHÁM

2010), fol. 85 v.; Brockelmann, S. I., 448, II, 8; F. Bustáni, Dá'irat al-ma'árif, ii, 436. See also Baláqiah and al-má'áwid h-l-bayán.

(C. Brockelmann*)

IBN HINDÚ, ABU 'L-FADL IBN 'ALI, AL-HUSAYN AL-KÁTÁ'B, secretary of the chancellery, man of letters, poet and physician, a native of Rayy but educated at Nishápúr, where he was introduced to Greek science. He belonged at first to the diván of 'Aqód al-Dawla, for whom he wrote a number of letters; he appears at Arádírán in 354/965 during the visit of al-Mutanabbi, and he seems to have remained in the service of the Buwayhids until his death, probably in 410/1019 rather than 420/1029.

In addition to a Diván, which is in part preserved in later anthologies, he was the author of a number of works, of which, Místák al-láib, is still in manuscript, and another, al-Kalim al-rúháníyya min al-hícham al-yámidíyya, was published in Dámascus in 1318/1900; there is attributed to him also a K. al-Nájfs, al-Mákála al-músháwákta fi l-madkhal li 'l-im al-falsafá (I'm al-falsafá ilí), ii, 436. See also F. Bustáni, Dá'irat al-ma'árif, ii, 436. See also F. Bustáni, Dá'irat al-ma'árif, ii, 436.

Bibliography: Abu Háyáún, Mathálib al-wašárayn, 253; Thálablí, Yátima, iii, 20, 21, 212-4; idem, Tasmát al-Yátíma, i, 134-44; idem, Khás al-khás, 167; Báhlzári, Dumyat al-ásár, 135-5; Ibn 'Asákír, Ta'írık Dímaghí, xi, 547; Ibn AbúUSBáía, i, 323-7; Yáküd, Údabd*, xii, 36-46; Kutúbi, Fánsí, ii, s.v.; R. Blachère, Mutanabbi, 237; F. Bustáni, Dá'irat al-ma'árif, iv, 127-8; Brockelmann, S. I., 425-6. (Ed.)

IBN HINZÁBA [see IBN AL-FURÁT].

IBN HIRZÍHIM, ABU 'L-HASAN 'ALI B. ISMÁ'IL B. MUHAMMAD B. 'ABD ALLÁH, jurist and wázir, a native of Fás, to confer the benefits of his learning upon such brilliant, who, in Spain particularly and to a lesser extent in the Maghrib, had the courage and strength of character to make a solemn protest against the severities and abuses of the Almoravid inquisition, thus helping to prepare for the fall of the dynasty, which Ibn Támart, another 'áyáb, claiming kinship with the school of al-Ghazálí, was to overthrow.

Sirí 'All's tomb stands some fifteen kilometres to the south-east of Fás, at Sídi Harázer, where there is a hot spring much frequented by the townsfolk.

Bibliography: 'All b. 'AbúZar', Fás 1303/1886, 191; Ibn al-Kádí, Diámod al-shába, Fás 1309/1892, 293; Kátání, Salátí al-anfús, Fás 1316/1899, iii, 69; Ahmad Bááha, Náfíl al-shába, Fás 1317/1900, 182; on the form of the name Hirzíhím, see El-Maysád (Vies des saints du Rif), tr. with notes by G. S. Colin, in AM, xxvi (1926), 120, no. 385; Taddílí, Táshawwuf, ed. A. Faúre, Rabat 1958, 147 ff.; the first work to consult is this collection of the lives of saints, which constitutes the earliest biographical source concerned with the saintly personages, especially in the 13th and 14th centuries in the Maghrib, and more particularly in Morocco.

(A. Faúre)

IBN HISHÁM, ABÚ MUHAMMAD 'ABD AL-MALIK, a scholar best known for his work on the biography of Muhammad. His family was usually said to be of Himsirí origin, and had moved from Básra to Egypt, where he was born and spent his life. His knowledge of genealogy and grammar was outstanding. He died in Egypt on 13 Rabí‘ II 218/8 May 833 or in 213/828. His Kitáb al-Tidáján on South Arabian antiquities is extant. He is chiefly famous, however, for his edition of the Síra (Life of Muhammad) of Ibn Isták (q.v.), which became the basic work on this subject. The Síra of Ibn Isták is not preserved as a single work, but passages from it, which have been omitted by Ibn Hishám, are preserved in the writings of historians like al-Jabari and al-Azaráki. Comparison shows that what Ibn Hishám has omitted was chiefly material not directly relevant to the career of Muhammad. He also gave more accurate versions of some of the poems in the Síra, and explained difficult words and phrases. This accounts for the great popularity of Ibn Hishám's edition. (The additions by Ibn Hishám can be conveniently studied in A.
Guillaume’s translation of Ibn Isfahân, where they have been separated from the main text.) Ibn Hishám’s work was a pupil of his called Ibn al-Bârîki (see al-Dhâhâbî, Tadhkirat al-buhûs, Haydârâbâd 1955-5, class 9, nos. 45, 46). See also Sîra.


(W. Montgomery Wattr)


Ibn Hishâm lived in Cairo; we know of only two journeys, made to Mecca in 749/1348 and 756/1355. A Shâfî’s fîkhî, he became a professor of Tafṣîr (Kur’ânic exegesis) at the Kubba Mansûriyya. Being unable to obtain a professorship in a madrasa of his own madhhab, he went over to the Hanbalis, who provided what he was seeking in one of their madrasas in Cairo (according to Brockelmann, II, 27); this was five years before his death. It is not clear why this celebrated man was kept in the background. The reason may have been jealousy. In any case, it is certain that his reputation was very great. Ibn Khallikân (iii, 249; Eng. tr., Rosenthal, iii, 289) recognized Ibn Hishâm as one of those very rare men who, in the history of Arabic grammar, have succeeded in mastering the whole of their subject. He did indeed have an extremely good knowledge of its entire systematization. He for his part was not without envy: al-Shawkânî (i, 401) suggests that his hostility to Abû Hayyân was the result of a secret desire to gain recognition and greater eminence, by attacking a master with a great reputation for learning.

In grammar, Ibn Hishâm’s general method was one that had been long practised—résumé and commentary (or simply commentary). Just as Ibn al-Ḥâfîzî [g.v.] had composed and commented on al-Šâfiyya and al-Kâfîyya, Ibn Hishâm wrote the Kârâr al-nadâd and the Shu`dîr al-nahwîyya and commented on them; but he succeeded in producing a far-reaching work, with an unusual method of presentation, the Muqâm ‘l-labbūb, a description of syntax arranged to start from each particle, either conjunction, preposition or some other, in alphabetical order. This work won the complete admiration of Ibn Khaldûn (iii, 283; tr. Rosenthal, iii, 324-5).

Ibn Hishâm died in Cairo while still quite young on Friday 5 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 761/18 September 1360, on Friday 5 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 761/18 September 1360, leaving a considerable number of grammatical works, several of which are lost—nos. 4, 5, 7, 10, 13, 15, 21, 24, 25 (list, Tarjâmât Ibn Hishâm, 7-8, by the editor of the Shu`dîr al-nahwîyya and the Sharh Kârâr al-nadâd, see below).

Remarks: (1) In the Arabic historical sources on the question of Ibn Hishâm’s full name, two forms are to be distinguished, that of Ibn Ḥâджâr al-‘Askâfî, his earliest biographer, followed by Brockelmann II, 27, and S II, 16, and retained here; and that of al-Sûyûfî, BughÎa, 293, reproduced in EI in the corresponding article: it supersedes b. Yûsuf b. ‘Abd Allâh and adds the nuwa al-‘âdîr. With the evidence at present available the question cannot be settled. (2) Ibn Tâghribîridî (v, 173) speaks of an Ibn Hishâm who was at first Ḥanâfî, then Ḥanbalî. Brockelmann (II, 27 and S II, 16) concludes from this that Ibn Hishâm successively adopted the three madhabs, Ḥanâfî, Shâfî and Ḥanbalî. This is not evident: Ibn Tâghribîridî mentions only two rites and he may have been mistaken about the first.

Works: (1) Kârâr al-nadâd was published Cairo 1304, 1307, 1317, and 1348; 1385, 2nd ed. of Muḥ. Muḥyî ‘l-Dîn ‘Abd al-Hamîd, Cairo, 13th ed. 1961/1983 for the 1st; 5th ed. 1931/1971 for the 2nd. (2) Muqâm ‘l-labbūb ‘an kutub al-ṣârib, the great treatise on syntax. A first draft made in Mecca (749/1348) was lost on the return journey; the present text was rewritten, also in Mecca (256/1355; see the beginning of the work). This treatise was printed several times, notably at Cairo in 1302 (2 vols. with the commentary of Muḥ. al-‘Amîr in the margin), 1305, 1307, 1317, and 1348; 1385, 2nd ed. of Muḥ. Muḥyî ‘l-Dîn ‘Abd al-Ḥamîd, the most practical one. Numerous commentaries are in existence; note al-Fâhî ‘al-karîb of al-Sûyûtî, for the Shawkânî, published Cairo 1322, 1324, etc. (4) al-Tâfîr ‘an bawâsî’d al-ṣârib, an introduction to the study of the Arabic sentence, published (73-92) and translated into French (155-223) by S. de Sacy in his Anthologie grammaticale arabe (Paris 1829), published (after the Sharh Kârâr al-nadâd) Bûlak 1253; several commentaries. (5) Mâhid al-ahdâm wa-mâhid al-nasâ’în, on some grammatical difficulties, Cairo 1279, in a Madâjmûa. (6) Awâb al-masâlîlâ ila Ahîsfiyyal Ibn Mâlik, a commentary on this Ahîsfiyya (also known incorrectly under the title Tâwa’dîb); printed several times, particularly Cairo 1304, 1316.

The following studies, in manuscript, were included by al-Sûyûtî in al-ʿâdîr wa-’l-nâwî fi ’l-nahw (published Haydârâbâd, 2nd ed., 4 vols., 1359-61), respectively at ii, 298-316, iii, 187-205, iv, 32-40, and 111-22; references omitted by Brockelmann. (7) Sharh Kârâr al-nadâd wa-’l-kafta al-nahwîyya wa-’l-kafta al-nahwîyya, commentary on versified grammatical puzzles. (8) Risâla fi nisîb (ʿālîb) lughât wa-’l-mu’âkâl al-ḥadûm al-dawâ bi-hilâl wa-sâyîd wa-’l-kalâm ‘alîd halûmûa dijirâ, grammatical study on these expressions; it is the same as Masâdî ‘alî-’l-nawî wa-adwâjibâtuhû. (9) Mas’alât al-ṣîrâr al-ṣârib ‘alîd ‘al-ṣârib, discussion of a particular construction of conditional propositions. (10) Faṣîh al-ḥadâ’îd wa mas’alât al-ḥadâ’îd, a revised edition, on the question of khabî, of the K. al-Ṣâhib al-ḥadâ’îd wa-’l-kafta al-ḥadûm of Abî Hayyân. (11) Al-ḥaṣîb, a collection of grammatical difficulties dedicated to the sultan al-Malik al-Kâmil (d. 1275/1356), printed Cairo 1304. (12) Sharh Bûnât Su’d, commentary on the poem of Ka’b b. Zuhayr in honour of the Prophet, edited by I. Guidî (Leipzig 1871) and Cairo 1304, 1307.

In al-ʿâdîr wa-’l-nâwî of al-Sûyûtî, referred to above, iv, 2-32 and 41-50, various grammatical studies of Ibn Hishâm can also be read; we should note 2-9, on interrogation and its particles, 6-36.
and 28-9, on some verses of the Qur'an; then other studies, iv, 92-111. A list of the other works still in manuscript will be found under nos. 7, 8, 10, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, and 25 of Brockelman; note no. 17 on a subject that is unusual for Ibn Hīṣam.

Note: Another edition of Shuḥdar al-ḥakab and its Sharh was published in Cairo 1381/1962, by ʿAbd al-Muṭafalʾ al-Šaʿdī.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the text: first, Ibn Ḥādjar al-ʿAṣkalānī, al-Durar al-kāmima, ii, 308-10 (no. 2248), Haydārābād 1349; Suyūṭī refers to this and reproduces it, Bugāy, i, 339 f.; for the form of the name, in De Koning has published two chapters of it in his Da*irat al-maʿarib, ii, 141 ff.; Brockelmann, I, 490, S I, ii, 1453, 1456, 1471, 1481, 1488; Yāqūt, ii, 1944, 1984, iii, 2504, 2505; S. W. Müller, ii, 197-198, 205-206, 218-219; De Koning, ii, 21-22, 24, 25; Brockelmann, III, 27-31 and S II, 16-20, provide information about existing manuscripts and commentaries.

(Ḥ. FLEISCH)

IBN HUBAL, MUḤADDĪB AL-DIN ABU ʿL-ḤASĀN ʿALI B. AHMAD, physician, born in Baghdād in about 515/1122, who at first studied grammar and ʿilm in the Nīẓāmīyya but rapidly turned to medicine. He next became physician in ordinary to the ʿAbbāsī Arman in Khīlāṭ and acquired great wealth, then entered the service of Badr al-Dīn LuḤu, in Mardm, 650/1252-53, and finally went to al-Mawsil. At the age of 75 he had the misfortune to become blind, but lived on until 610/1213. His chief work is entitled al-Muḥaddīb fi ʿilām (ed. Haydārābād, 4 vols., 1362-4/1943-4); De Koning has published two chapters of it in his Traité sur le calcul dans les reiis et dans la vesse, 196 ff. Ibn Hubal, who was also a poet, left a son, Shams al-Dīn Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās Ahmad, who in his turn became a physician and practised at the court of the Sālджūkī Kāyāwūs, where he died.


IBN HUBAYRA, name of two persons, ʿUMAR B. HUBAYRA and his son YŪSUF B. ʿUMAR, who were both governors of ʿIrāk under the Umayyads; they both belonged to the Kaysi party [see KAYS], that is to say that of the Arabs of the north in their struggle against those of the south. Involved as they were in the great struggles for the succession on behalf of the caliphs who were the candidates of one or the other party, opposing the Yemenis solidly represented by the caliph Marwan II, was already lost and Ibn Hubayra had to abandon Marwan to his fate. ʿAmīr b. ʿAbdār, Ibn Hubayra's chief lieutenant, was killed at Diqābāl; Yūsuf was unable to hold Kufa, disturbed by the revolt of the Yemenis, and fled to Wāṣīt, where, after being besieged for over eleven months, he was compelled by his subordinate lieutenant, Ḥasan b. Khaṭṭaḥa. He was brutally killed with the officers of his entourage. Like his father, Yūsuf defended to the end the cause of the Arab aristocracy, of the "Arab empire", against the mawṣūlij, who had been able to win over to their cause a large section of the Yemeni party while deserting the leaders of this same party in favour of the new ʿAbbāsid propagandists. Although incapable of realizing the scope, and still less the development, of this conspiracy, the two Ibn Hubayras were not without energy or plannning ability.


IBN HUBAYRA, ʿĀWN AL-DIN ABU ʿL-MUẓAFFAR YĀḤYĀ B. MUḤAMMAD AL-ŠAYBAṈĪ AL-DURĪ AL-BADRĪ, wasir for sixteen years without interruption, until his death, under the ʿAbbāsid Caliphs al-Muktasim (330/1040-3/1140) and al-Mustādīḏ (555/1160-566/1170). He was born in Rabīʿ II 499/ Dec. 1105-Jan. 1106, in the village of Dūr in the

Kūrāsān forming also the subject of the area of which he was in charge, he began by delegating his responsibilities there, at the express command of the caliph, to a Kaysi lieutenant, Ṣaʿīd b. ʿAmīr al-Ḥarāshī, who was able to stir to enthusiasm the warriors of Ḥisān and strike terror into the people of Soghdiana, who were still hesitant to embrace the cause of their Arab conquerors. Nevertheless, Ṣaʿīd b. ʿAmīr was soon replaced by a Bakri, Muslim b. Ṣaʿīd b. Ṣamīl b. Zūrāʾ. Ibn Hubayra remained firm in his support of the Arabs of the north, al-Farāzūḏḵāš stating on one occasion that they were his glory and supreme support (Dhudūn, ed. Sawī, 416). Handsome in his treatment of those he conqueror, Ibn Hubayra seems to have governed in the name of Arabism and Islam, regarded as a religion of the sword. His methods of governing, however, were not above reproach, although in fact this great Arab nobleman, proud of belonging to the Ghatafān, was accused more of cynicism than of corruption. One of the first acts of the caliph Hīṣam, on his accession in 105/724, was to replace Ibn Hubayra by the Yemeni Ṣaʿīd al-Kāšī, who was well disposed towards the Kūrāṣījīs.

Yūsuf, the son of ʿUmār b. Hubayra, was also governor of ʿIrāk, from 129-32/741-9; before being appointed to this office, he had, on the orders of the caliph Hīṣam, taken extremely severe measures against Ḥālād al-Kāšī, who had profited from his father's fall from favour. His triumph came too late, however, and his term as governor was merely a lengthy struggle for a lost cause. He was obliged to conquer his province by degrees: he began by defeating the Ḥārādījīs at ʿAyn al-Tamr; in addition to thus pacifying the Sawād, he succeeded in regaining Ahwāz, the Dībāl and the Dijāzāra. He was less fortunate in his struggle against Abū Muslim, whose revolt occurred during his governorship. He did not hasten to the help of Naṣr b. Sayyār, the governor of Ḥīrāsān. When Ibn Hubayra's troops finally went into action the cause of the Umayyad caliphate, represented by the caliph Marwān II, was already lost and Ibn Hubayra had to abandon Marwān to his fate. ʿAmīr b. Ḍubūrā, Ibn Hubayra's chief lieutenant, was killed at Diqābāl; Yūsuf was unable to hold Kufa, disturbed by the revolt of the Yemenis, and fled to Wāṣīt, where, after being besieged for over eleven months, he was compelled by his subordinate lieutenant, Ḥasan b. Khaṭṭaḥa. He was brutally killed with the officers of his entourage. Like his father, Yūsuf defended to the end the cause of the Arab aristocracy, of the "Arab empire", against the mawṣūlij, who had been able to win over to their cause a large section of the Yemeni party while deserting the leaders of this same party in favour of the new ʿAbbāsid propagandists. Although incapable of realizing the scope, and still less the development, of this conspiracy, the two Ibn Hubayras were not without energy or planning ability.
district of Dudiayl, northwest of Baghdad, where he spent the early part of his youth. He went to Baghdad as a young man, and studied Ḥanbali fiqh under Abū Bakr al-Dinawari (d. 532/1142) and adab under the renowned Ḥanbali philologist al-Djawälī (d. 540/1145). He also studied traditions under several masters and was for some time the disciple of the ascetic preacher Abū Yaḥyā Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Zabīdī, with whom he roamed the streets of Baghdad proclaiming the inapplicable attributes of God.

As the caliphate of al-Muqtafi, Ibn Hubayra entered government service and gradually worked his way up to this caliph's waṣīr. With Ibn Hubayra the influence of the last Ṣaljukids came to an end. He also had a hand in Nār al-Dīn's conquest of Fāṭimid Egypt. The Handali school flourished under his ministry and patronage, and its institutions of learning continued to multiply, a trend which had been taking place before his advent and which explains in part his accession to power. He had many enemies, who apparently succeeded in poisoning him through his own physician, who is said to have been killed six months later, also by poisoning. Ibn Hubayra died on 12 Dumatād I 560/ March 1165.

During his lifetime, Ibn Hubayra was no less active in the field of learning than he was in politics. He composed a commentary in several volumes of the two canonical collections of traditions, those of al-Bukhari and Muslim, entitled al-Ifṣāḥ ‘an ma‘ānī ‘l-Ṣīḥah. While commenting on one of the traditions which involved an explanation of the term fiqh, he digressed into a long treatise on questions of law, both those concerning which the founders of the four schools of law were in agreement, as well as those upon which they disagreed. The idea so interested him that he caused specialized scholars of all four schools of law to be brought to Baghdad from outlying provinces at a reputed expense of over one hundred thousand dinārs. This he allegedly did in order to be certain of the accuracy of his work; but this gathering of scholars from many parts of the Muslim world at the expense of waṣīr must have also had its political importance. Several copies were made of this work, which found its way into the libraries of governors and waṣirs of provinces, as well as those of the Caliph al-Mustanṣir and the Ayyubid Sultan Nūr al-Dīn al-Zangi. This work, properly called al-Ifṣāḥ, but also al-Ifṣāḥ, after the original and more voluminous work, was edited by Rāghib al-Tabbāšī (Aleppo 1829).

Ibn Hubayra has other works to his name: al-Muḥāṣṣad, a grammar for which Ibn al-Khaṣṣāḥī (d. 567/1172) wrote a commentary in four volumes; an abridgment of the Islāh al-manṣūk of Ibn al-Sikkit; al-Idādāt al-khams, according to the Handali school of law; Urjūsā fi ‘l-maḥṣūr wa ‘l-mamād; Urjūsā ft ‘al-kaḥlib. His contemporary Ibn al-Djawāl (d. 597/1200) compiled a work based exclusively, it would appear, on statements which he had heard from Ibn Hubayra, entitled it: al-Muṣṭabās min al-faṣṣād al-Aṣwāyya (i.e., ‘Awn al-Dīn Ibn Hubayra). In another work, Maḥd al-maḥd, Ibn al-Djawāl compiled an anthology of highlights from Ibn Hubayra’s original Ifṣāḥ, i.e., the commentary on the traditions of al-Buḫārī and Muslim.

Most of what we know of Ibn Hubayra comes to us from his contemporary Ibn al-Djawāl, but more extensively from his biographer, the Handali Ibn al-Mārisktānīyya (d. 599/1200), from whose work, not extant, much of the Dhayl of Ibn Ṣadīb is derived.

Ibn Hubaysh, Abu ‘l-Kāsim ‘Abd al-Aslām b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd ‘ ISA al-ʾAnsārī al-Mursi, Spanish traditionist. Ibn Hubaysh was born in 504/1110 in Almeria of a family originally from Ṣahrīa (Jérica), Valencia. After preliminary studies in Almeria he passed to Córdoba in 530/1135 for three years, and having returned to Almeria, was present when in 542/1147 that city fell to the Christians under al-Sulayyīn, ‘the little Sultan’, i.e., Alphonsus VII of Leon. After an interview with the latter, during which he traced the genealogy of Alphonso back to the Emperor Heraclius, Ibn Hubaysh and his family were allowed to go free. He subsequently held posts in Dżarrat Shakir (Alcira), Valencia, for approximately 12 years. In or about 556/1161 he went to Murcia as preacher (ṣāḥib) in the principal mosque. Twenty years later he became Kādi of Murcia, and held the office till his death in 584/1188. One of his accomplishments, as recorded by a pupil (Ibn al-Abbār, Taḥmīla, ii, 574), was to have had by heart all or most of al-Taʾrīkh al-habir, an extensive work on Hadīth by Ibn Abi Khayyām (d. 279893, cf. Brockelmann, i, 272).

Ibn Hubaysh appears to have planned a continuation of the Kitāb al-Sīla of Ibn Bashkuwal (s.v.), which was never carried out. However, his notes and materials came into the hands of Ibn al-Abbār (s.v.), who made use of them in his own Takmīla (‘Completion’ of the Kitāb al-Sīla). The literary work of Ibn Hubaysh by which he is principally remembered was the Kitāb al-Qaḥṣawī, or Kitāb al-Maḥdīsī (‘Book of the Raids’), in full Kitāb (Dhikr) al-Qaḥṣawī al-dāmīna al-khafīla wa ‘l-futah al-dīlīma al-khafīla al-khāna fa ayyām al-khulsā, i.e., ‘Awn al-Dīn Ibn Hubaysh. This gave an account of the victorious expeditions in the first half of the 7th century A.D., for the most part, under the Caliphs Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uṯmān. Ibn Hubaysh received a commission for the book from the Almohad Abū Yaḥyā Yusuf (s.v.) in 575/1179-80 on the same day as he was appointed Kādi (see above), i.e., when he was nearly 70.

The work survives in several manuscripts, and has been utilized by De Goeje (Memoire sur le Fotouh as-Shām, Leiden 1864; Mémoire sur la conquête de la Syrie, Leiden 1900) and by Caetani (Annales dell’ Islam, Milan 1905), the latter in extracts made by J. Horowitz. More recently W. Hoenerbach has underlined the use made by Ibn Hubaysh of the Kitāb al-Qaḥṣa of Wākidī, a good early source (Waqīma’s Kitāb ar-Raḍi wa Inb Hājr’s Isbā, Akad. d. Wissens. u. d. Lit. in Mainz, Abh. d. Geistes- u. Sozialwissenschafel, Kl., 1951, Nr. 4, 220 ff.). In general, though Ibn Hubaysh was acquainted with Ṭabarī’s Annals (Tarīkh al-rusul wa ‘l-mulūk), he disposed of further materials, and for the early period of the Islamic conquests is doubtless an authority who deserves to be consulted. Ibn Hubaysh, called by Ibn al-Abbār the last of the great traditionists of Western Islam (wa-kdnna ‘alimmati ‘l-muḥaddithīn bi ‘l-Maghrib), yet
had several pupils of at least respectable attainments, notably Ibn Dihya (Brockelmann, I, 310, cf. 371; Pons Boigues, No. 238), the two brothers Ibn Hawt Allah (Pons Boigues, Nos. 223 and 229) and al-Kalā'ī (Brockelmann, I, 371; Pons Boigues, No. 239). Al-Kalā'ī wrote a Kitāb al-1īfīfī bimā tadammamānu min maghāṣī rasāl Allāh wa-magḥāṣī thalāḥātī l-1īfīfīfīfī, in the second part of which he followed especially his teacher Ibn Hubyash. Existing manuscripts of the Kitāb al-1īfīfī, which are rather numerous, may therefore be consulted for the text of the Kitāb al-1īfīfīfī. Brockelmann, Verzeichniss der arabischen Handschriften der königl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, ii, 550 (11 A. H., § 78) and indices; D. M. Dunlop, The Spanish historian Ibn Hubyash, in JRAS, 1941, 359-62.

In addition to this master-work, which is of the highest importance for the knowledge of the equestrian and military art in mediaeval Islam, he also possesses several other works of Ibn Hubyash, of less interest, and concerned with veterinary science in the K. al-Fawdīd al-musāṭṭara fi ʾīm al-bayfara (Madrid 1935), with belles-lettres in the K. Mabādīl al-udābāP wa mundāṭārī al-μuḏābāP and with politics in the K. ʿAyn al-adāb wa ʿl-siyāsāP wa sayyin al-ḥasab wa ʿl-riyāsāP. Two other works, on piety, are also attributed to him, only the titles of which survive, the K. Tadhkīrat man ʿudābī wa l. Kāndīl al-bughyā ʿl-nayyīl.

Although almost nothing is known of the life of Ibn Hubyash, from the tenor of his writings it is easy to imagine him as the ideal type of Spanish Muslim gentleman at the end of the 8th/14th century, sprung from a noble family, of perfect education and highly cultured, the image of the man of gentle birth who differed from his Christian neighbour only in his faith.


IBN AL-ʿIBRĪ (BAR HEBRAEUS, SYRIAC BAR ʿEBRAYĀ) Gvnrhor (YUHANNAN) ABU ’L-FARADI, a author of a history in Arabic, translator and the last classic in Syriac literature, was born in A.D. 1225-6 at Malatya; he owes to the Jewish descent of his father the nickname under which he became famous. During the Mongol invasion of 1243 Ibn al-lbri’s father obtained the post of physician in the entourage of a Tatar general, and in the following year settled with his family at Antākiya, which was still in the hands of the Franks. The son was versed in Syriac, Arabic and Hebrew, and studied medicine and rhetoric as well as theology at Antākiya and Tarābulus (Syria). After having been a monk for about three years, he was ordained Jacobite bishop of Gubbāb near Malatya in September 1246, and was transferred to the neighbouring see of Lakābbīn a year later. In 1253 he was appointed Metropolitan of Aleppo, a position that he succeeded in retaining during the serious rifts in the Jacobite hierarchy at that period. Ibn al-ʿIbri was present at the capture of the city by the Latins in January 1260. In 1264 he became Maphrāyān, i.e., head of the Jacobite church in the territories formerly under Persian rule. Thenceforward he travelled widely throughout his vast diocese, protecting the fortunes of his co-religionists during that troubled epoch. He made prolonged visits to Bagdad and to the Mongol court, where he was acquainted with princes and princesses; he had attended the Mongol ruler as physician in 1263. He commissioned the building of several churches and monasteries. When Ibn al-ʿIbri died at Marakchah in the year 1290, the Nestorians, Greeks and Armenians, united with
Jacobites in paying tribute to his qualities of tolerance and energy and to his independence in the face of pressure by religious and political leaders. He was buried in the monastery of Mār Mattai at Mosul.

Ibn al-‘Ibrī’s brother enumerates thirty-one works—and this is not an exhaustive list—by the polymath, on theology, philosophy, history, grammar and science in addition to poetry and belles lettres. His principal work in Arabic is Mughazzar tarīkh al-duwal (Historia compendiæs historiarum) authored Gregorio Abul-Pharajio, ed. E. Pocock, Oxford 1663 (with an Arabic version, A. Šāhāb-DĪwān, London 1890), compiled at the request of Muslim friends. It is an abbreviated translation of the first part of his Syriac Chronography treating of political history from the Creation to his own times; the Arabic version has additions on history (which it was superfluous to incorporate in the Syriac original) and on the mathematical and medical literature of the Arabs. The first part of the Syriac Chronography itself uses Arabic and Persian sources (by Islamic historians), and quotes the Persian history of Shams al-Dīn Šāhīb-DĪwān (d. 683/1284) for the Mongol period. The second and third parts of the Chronography, dealing respectively with the history of the Western Jacobite church and that of the Eastern Jacobite and Nestorian churches, were not translated into Arabic.

The extent to which Ibn al-‘Ibrī adopted the literary tastes of his Muslim contemporaries is revealed by his K̲h̲b̲h̲b̲h̲h̲ d̲h̲ T̲h̲ a̲n̲ n̲ n̲ a̲ n̲ y̲ e̲ n̲ o̲ g̲ h̲ k̲ h̲ b̲ h̲ k̲ h̲ n̲ e̲ (Laughable stories, Syriac text with Eng. tr. by E. W. Budge, London 1897), a collection of anecdotes reminiscent of adab literature but unexpected from the pen of a distinguished Christian scholar. By the 7th/13th century, however, the revival of Syriac literature but unadorned by its sheer bulk and the fidelity with which it was written into Arabic. The Jacobite and Nestorian churches, were not transcribed into Arabic.

Anecdotes reminiscent of adab literature but unadorned by its sheer bulk and the fidelity with which it was written into Arabic. The Jacobite and Nestorian churches, were not transcribed into Arabic.

His principal work in Arabic is Mughazzar tarīkh al-duwal (Historia compendiæs historiarum) authored Gregorio Abul-Pharajio, ed. E. Pocock, Oxford 1663 (with an Arabic version, A. Šāhāb-DĪwān, London 1890), compiled at the request of Muslim friends. It is an abbreviated translation of the first part of his Syriac Chronography treating of political history from the Creation to his own times; the Arabic version has additions on history (which it was superfluous to incorporate in the Syriac original) and on the mathematical and medical literature of the Arabs. The first part of the Syriac Chronography itself uses Arabic and Persian sources (by Islamic historians), and quotes the Persian history of Shams al-Dīn Šāhīb-DĪwān (d. 683/1284) for the Mongol period. The second and third parts of the Chronography, dealing respectively with the history of the Western Jacobite church and that of the Eastern Jacobite and Nestorian churches, were not translated into Arabic.

The extent to which Ibn al-‘Ibrī adopted the literary tastes of his Muslim contemporaries is revealed by his K̲h̲b̲h̲b̲h̲h̲ d̲h̲ T̲h̲ a̲n̲n̲ a̲n̲ y̲ e̲ n̲ o̲ g̲ h̲ k̲h̲b̲ h̲k̲h̲ n̲e̲ (Laughable stories, Syriac text with Eng. tr. by E. W. Budge, London 1897), a collection of anecdotes reminiscent of adab literature but unexpected from the pen of a distinguished Christian scholar. By the 7th/13th century, however, the revival of Syriac literature but unadorned by its sheer bulk and the fidelity with which it was written into Arabic. The Jacobite and Nestorian churches, were not transcribed into Arabic.

Anecdotes reminiscent of adab literature but unadorned by its sheer bulk and the fidelity with which it was written into Arabic. The Jacobite and Nestorian churches, were not transcribed into Arabic.
translated by E. García Gómez in *La toma de Valencia por el Cid, in al-Andalus*, xiii (1948), 97-156. The text of the Almohad Bayān, more complete, is contained in *El Almohadismo de Mawlāy Abd al-Rahmān*, Valencia 1917, which A. Huici has made known, in *Notes d'histoire almohade*, iii (1963), 313-30. (J. Bosch-Vila)


**IBN IDRIS** [II], Abu 'l-'Alā' Idrīs, son of the above, was born in Fās where he made a serious study of literature. As private secretary to sultan Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān, he was sent on a diplomatic mission to the French emperor Napoleon III. His task was to solicit his intervention with the Spanish government, in order to secure a reduction in the indemnity owed by Morocco after the unfortunate Hispano-Moroccan war of 1844. During July and August 1860, he spent six weeks in Paris where he left excellent impressions. From his journey he brought back an account (rīḥā) entitled *Tuwāfīt al-ma'iṣb bi-mamālik Barīz* in which, in elegant language, he described the French provinces through which he had travelled, the public buildings he had seen, the receptions he had attended, the customs he had observed, etc. This account was published in Fās in 1327/1907. Ibn Idrīs was entrusted with another diplomatic mission, to Spain; he died of the plague, in Rabat, on 14 Dzīdād II 1296/1879 June 1879.


**IBN AL-IFLIL** (or simply *al-IFLIL*), Abu 'l-Kāsim ibn B. Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā' al-Zunkri, ph. o. l. o. i. g. a. n. t. e. r. a. and man of
letters, born in Cordova in 352/963 of a family from al-Ifili, in Syria(?). After receiving a classical education, he acquired the reputation of a poet, but al-Hijjari [q.v.], though he was ignorant, it is said, of prosody, he prided himself on his poetry, but his verse and prose compositions as too lifeless, and to acquire a large library of their own. Owing to its late date of composition and its comprehensive character, it is still useful as a preliminary source of information, and as such it is often referred to in these pages. The absence of a serviceable index in the available edition (Cairo 1930-51) is, therefore, most regrettable.

IBN AL-IMAM, 'ABD AL-HAYY B. AHMAD, a Syrian teacher of the Hanbali school (1032-1089/1623-1679), completed, in 1680/1679, a large biographical history, entitled Shuhudat al-dhahab fi akhbar man dhahab, which is annalistically arranged and covers the Hijira years one to 1000. Although historical events are occasionally mentioned, the work concentrates on obituary notices, often rather detailed. The author intended it to be a help for impecunious scholars like himself who were unable to acquire a large library of their own. To judge by these extracts, the Simj is taken from the Mughrib, and it may be said that a quarter of the Specimens of poetry and prose reproduced by Ibn Mughrib Ibn Sa'id reproduces about 35 excerpts from the Simj, some of which are long enough to give an idea of its content and style. To judge by these extracts, the Simj is closer in style and character to the Dakhira of Ibn Bassam than to the Mathafy and the Matmafy, which are of the same type as those to be found in the Simj of Ibn Sa'id. Of his contemporaries Ibn Bassam (q.v.) and Ibn Khakan (see Al-Fath Ibn Khakan), he decided to write a sequel to their works, and to include the biographies that they had omitted and those of his contemporaries, as far as 550/1155-6 (he died shortly after that date). His work is now lost, but later compilers have preserved numerous extracts from it; the title appears in various forms but is generally abbreviated to Simj al-djumun, and the specimens reproduced by Ibn Mughrib are from this work. Ibn Mughrib's specimens of poetry and prose reproduced by Ibn Al-Imam are of the same type as those to be found in Ibn Sa'id, and it may be said that a quarter of the Mughrib is taken from the Simj.

IBN AL-IMAM AL-ASHAB, Abu 'Amr Uthman b. 'Ali b. Uthman, an Andalusi man of letters, biographer and historian of the 6th/12th century; born in Silves, he studied in Cordova and Seville, where he became a disciple of Abu Bakr Ibn al-'Arabi. As an admirer of his contemporaries Ibn Bassam (q.v.) and Ibn Khakan (see Al-Fath Ibn Khakan), he decided to write a sequel to their works, and to include the biographies that they had omitted and those of his contemporaries, as far as 550/1155-6 (he died shortly after that date). His work is now lost, but later compilers have preserved numerous extracts from it; the title appears in various forms but is generally abbreviated to Simj al-djumun, and the specimens reproduced by Ibn Mughrib are from this work. Ibn Mughrib's specimens of poetry and prose reproduced by Ibn Al-Imam are of the same type as those to be found in Ibn Sa'id, and it may be said that a quarter of the Mughrib is taken from the Simj.

IBN AL-IBN AL-IBNI, Abû Bakr Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Ma'ânî, Ma'tazîlî of Baghdad (270-326/883-938). He has a reputa. For information on the life and times of Ibn al-Imam, see his work in Spain (see al-Makkari, Analectes, 347-8; Ch. Pellat, in Dd^irat al-ma^drif, index; González, 173; Khatib Baghdad!, Takmila, Ibn al-Abbar, 1833; Ibn Sa'id, Mughrib, ed. Shawkî Dayîl, Cairo 1953, ii, index; Makkari, Fahrasa, Cairo 1953, ii, index; Makkari, 403-4; V. Bultot, in Dd'irat al-Mu'tazila, ii, 340 f.; F. Bustani, Ddrat al-Ma'arifî, 34, 186; Makkar, Alanez, index); González, 45, 46, 307; F. Bustani, Dwrat al-Ma'arifî, 34, i, 231; Ibn al-Murtada, Tabâhid, Beirut 1961, 100, 110; A. Nader, Mu'tazîlî, 45, 46, 307; F. Bustani, Dw'rat al-Ma'arifî, 206-7 = Pellat, in Dd'irat al-Ma'arifî, 206-7) who strongly criticizes the Si^s in the field of and addiction to the Minhâj al-'âlî wa-tawdbî, by Abu 'Amr Uthman Ibn Sa'id. Of his contemporaries Ibn Bassam (q.v.) and Ibn Khakan (see Al-Fath Ibn Khakan), he decided to write a sequel to their works, and to include the biographies that they had omitted and those of his contemporaries, as far as 550/1155-6 (he died shortly after that date). His work is now lost, but later compilers have preserved numerous extracts from it; the title appears in various forms but is generally abbreviated to Simj al-djumun, and the specimens reproduced by Ibn Mughrib are from this work. Ibn Mughrib's specimens of poetry and prose reproduced by Ibn Al-Imam are of the same type as those to be found in Ibn Sa'id, and it may be said that a quarter of the Mughrib is taken from the Simj.
IBN 'INABA — IBN 'IRS

became the pupil of Ibn Mu'ayyay and died at Kirman on 7 Safar 828/29 December 1424. He was the pupil of the genealogist Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Mutahhar al-Hilli and of Djialal al-Din Abu 'l-Kasim 'Ali b. 'Abd al-Hamid Ibn Fakhkhâr. The person who had the greatest influence on his education was his father-in-law Ibn Mu'ayyay (Tâdi al-Din Abu 'Abd Allâh Muhammâd b. al-Kasîm). The latter, who was connected with the jisra'awâ (q.v.), held an eminent position, as much because he had obtained sigdjas (petitions) notably from Ibn al-Mu'tahhar al-Hilli, Ibn Ta'ûs and Ibn Fakhkhâr. This is because he counted among his pupils al-shâhid al-'arsawal of the Twelvers, Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Makki al-'Ammîl; for twelve years he was Ibn 'Inaba's teacher in law, hadîth, genealogy, mathematics, poetry, etc.

Ibn 'Inaba's work sets a complex structure. According to the list in the A'yn al-'âlîfâ, it consists of: (1) 'Umdat al-fîlîb fi ansâb 'Abî 'Ali Tâlib (known as al-kuriib) completed in 814/1411-2. This is a copy of the collection of the Tajmîryâ; according to another tradition, the work is dedicated to Tîmûrâng, but it was in fact written for the Hussaynid Djâial al-Din al-Hasan b. 'Amid al-Din 'Ali b. 'Izâ al-Din al-Shârâf Muhammâd b. 'Abî 'I-Fadl 'Allî; this presumably corresponds to the edition of Bombay 1318/1900-1. (2) 'Umdat al-fîlîb ... al-nasab, dedicated to the Sâyyid Muhammâd b. Fallâh al-Muqsa'ahâ', al-Mahdî (or to his father); it is based, with some additions, according to the Kaghf al-pûnûn, on the Mu'khtâsar of Ibn al-Sûfî and the Ta'âlîf of Abû Nasr Şahî b. 'Abd Allâh al-Bukhrâî. This distinction between the two 'Umdas, denied by al-Kantûrî, who considers them to be identical, is supported by Khiyyânî and in the preface to the edition of Nadjîf 1918, in which the "little" 'Umda is regarded as the only one to have survived; it appears in the manuscripts with slight variations in the title (ansâb, or nasab or manâshib) and in the arrangement of the material, always, however, subdivided into five fasâls, corresponding to the five sons of Abî 'Ali Tâlib. This 'Umda seems to be that published in the Lucknow ed. (n.d. [1302/1884-5]), which dates it to 802/1399-1400, and in the undated but recent 'Umda al-kubrâ (ansâb, or nasab), and in the Vatican 1965, 80-1, n. 1672. (B. Scarcia Amoretti)

IBN 'IRÅK, ÂBÎ NÂSR MÅNÅSÖR b. 'ALÎ, an astronomer and mathematician who flourished ca. 1000 A.D. (the date of his death is uncertain), is best known as the teacher of al-Tawfîq (q.v.), the student of Abu 'l-Wafâ al-Buzgânî (q.v.). He was related to the Ibn 'Irâk family that ruled Khârazm before its conquest by Mâmmûd of Ghurân (q.v.), and this accounts for his titles: al-amir and mawla' amir al-mu'minân.

He is also known for his revision, completed in 1398/1007-8, of the Arabic version of Menelaus's Spherkî (ed. and trans. by Krause, 1936), of which the original Greek text is lost. Fifteen shorter mathematical and astronomical treatises, found in MS Banki'pore arab. 24/98, were published in 1948. These include treatises on the astrolabe; discussions of various problems in earlier sigjes (sets of astronomical tables); a solution of a difficulty in Euclid's Elements, Book XIII; and a treatise, jadâwal al-dâkhâbî, concerning special trigonometric functions.

In al-Birûnî's Treatise on chords, Ibn 'Irâk is cited as the discoverer of several mathematical proofs; in al-Birûnî's Chronology of ancient nations (ed. and trans. C. E. Sachau) he is credited with a method for determining solar apogee from three arbitrary points on the ecliptic "which is as much superior to that of the modern [Islamic] astronomers as the method of the latter is superior to that of the ancient astronomers"; and Nadjîf al-Din al-Tûsî [q.v.] cites his work in trigonometry.


IBN 'IRS (A.; pl. banát 'irs, rarely abûdân 'irs), denotes the weasel, Mustela nivalis, the smallest of the mustelidae (sammûr, pl. sarâtîb), whose area of distribution includes almost all the countries of Islam. The geographical forms of the weasel, with Mustela nivalis nivalis and minuta in the North and Mustela nivalis boccamela and subpalmata in the Mediterranean zone, present only slight differences of coat and size, and the species possesses a character of uniformity which is also found in the dialectal names of 'irs in Egypt, balîrîs in Syria and 'Irâk, and ben-l-îrs and sarsâal al-fîrân in the Maghrib. The terms sun'ûs and kalkasa are now entirely obsolete; and it is only in Palestine that it may be confused with the sable, Mustela sibirina, under the name smâmr, and in Algeria with the polecat, Mustela putorius, under the descriptive name fîrâj al-khayl (= "rat/mouse of horses").


(B. R. Goldstein)
The Arab authors, both encyclopaedists and naturalists, are very laconic on the subject of the weasel and for the most part are content to repeat, in this connexion, the fabulous inventions of the Greeks on its habit of dropping its young through the throat or ear, its precaution of chewing some rue (sagdhab) before attacking snakes (cf. Aristotle, Hist. des animaux, tr. J. Tricot, Paris 1957, ii, 60r and al-Dhahiri, Hayawan, iv, 228), the way in which it inserts itself into the crocodile's belly when the creature yawns, in order to devour its entrails, a practice attributed to the ichneumon (Herpestes ichneumon) of Egypt (nims), and its determined pursuit of shrews and field-mice to the very end of branches of trees to make them fall off into the mouth of its companion which has remained on the ground.

The pelt of the weasel has never been an article of furriery, and certain translators have been mistaken in identifying it with the fanak [q.e.]—and thereby confusing it with the fur of the stoat or ermine, Mustela erminea, in its summer coat, which at that season differs only in the black tip of the tail that is peculiar to itself and that it retains all the year round, in spite of its white winter colouration: fanak also denoted the furs imported from central Europe, of the mink, Mustela lutreola, and those of some canidae, such as the fennec, the jackal and the fox, from the Maghrib [see IBN AWA].

On the other hand, it is in the realm of hunting that the weasel has played a part in Islam, for its name in the list of beasts of prey or carnivores that are "accredited" (mu'allamad, dawwir*, djawwir), recognised as lawful instruments of the chase, on the same footing as fowling-birds (see BAYZARA and FAHD). Indeed, if we remember that the weasel was, with the beech-marten, Martes foina (dalah, sinsár), and long before the domestic cat, with the civet, Viverra civetta (sahhida, sina'ar zabdá), the genet Genetta genetta (djarwit, haft al-zahhäd, badis, zuwarjáh*) and the ichneumon or Egyptian mongoose, Herpestes ichneumon (nims, fár Fir'awm), a familiar guest attached to the hearth in all oriental and Mediterranean antiquity (for people sought, by adopting these little birds, (ytfyu*), was the indispensable aid in hunting wheatear (fakdák) with the merlin (ya'yuw), for these little birds, at sight of the falcon, darted into thorny bushes, and only the appearance of the weasel, held on a leash, forced them to fly out. This very diverting method of hunting was much appreciated since, being very inexpensive, it could be practised by the most impoverished and by children. Following the same procedure, the weasel, fastened at the neck or waist to a long leash, was used to dissuade the fox when it had gone to ground in its earth; terror made it take to flight, or else, its throat having been seized by these little jaws of steel, it was forcibly dragged out by the leash fastened to its assailant, which would never release its hold.

In the light of these texts, it can be said that the part taken by the weasel in hunting, in the East, was more important than that taken in the West by the ferret, Mustela putorius furo (ibn mihrad; Maghrib: nims through confusion with the ichneumon), a form that, through domestic isolation, has degenerated from a race of polecats imported, as early as the Roman epoch, from the mountain massifs of the Maghrib. Moreover, the certainty of the essentially European origin of the ferret, provided by the scientific data of modern mammalogy, rules out any simple connexion between ibn *ırs and this bastard member of the mustelidae which is incapable of living in freedom and, at most, is good only for driving rabbits out of their burrows.

The flesh of the weasel, like that of all carnivores, is forbidden as food in Islam, but early medicine recognized certain therapeutic properties in it, as also in the organs of this hunter which, as soon had the idea of taking advantage of the extremely bloodthirsty instincts of this miniature wild beast, its feline suppleness, its agility in creeping noiselessly into the narrowest fissure, the lightning speed of its leap, the inerorable vice-like grip of its jaws, its great aptitude for being trained, the few attentions


(F. VIRE)

IBN ʾĪSÂ, MAḤMĀD (sic) b. ṬABĀD b. ʾĪSÂ b. ʾAbū-ʾAbd Allāh, a MÛTOCCAN man of letters (to be distinguished from his homonymy, Abū ʾAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ahmad b. ʾĪsā al-Maghribi, d. in Damascus in 1867; Brockel-
The prince of Tabaristan. By including in his History a translation into Persian of the epistle, he has preserved for us this significant piece of Pahlavi literature (see A. Christensen, Iran sous les Sassanides, Paris 1944, pr. 119-209, and Parakh). The Ta’rikh-i Tabaristan, which he was still writing in 613/1216-7, contains much useful historical, geographical and biographical information. It is also of literary interest, and preserves a number of verses in Tabar dialect. A later and anonymous hand has brought the history of events from 605/1209, when the first domination of the Al-I Bâvand ended (81/1453-4), to 750/1349, when the second domination came to an end. The added section, found in most manuscripts, is taken mostly from Awiyâr. Allâh Amlû’s Ta’rikh-i Râyân, completed apparently in 784/1382.

**Bibliography:** Ta’rikh-i Tabaristan, ed. A. Ikbîlî, Tehran 1941, intro. and 1-8; An abridged translation of the History of Tabaristan, by E. G. Browne, London 1905; Storey, ii/3, 359-61. (J. SCHACHT)

**IBN ISHÄK, MUHAMMAD B. ISHÄK B. YAŞÄ B. KHYÄR** (according to some sources, b. KHAEBBÄR, or KÖMÄN, or KÖTÄN), one of the main authorities on al-sîra al-nabawiyyä, along with Musä b. Úkba and al-Wâkidî. His kurna is variously given as Abû “Abd Allâh or Abû Bakr. On the whole, the former is the better substantiated and the confusion may have resulted from the fact that he had a brother called Abû Bakr (Udähâ’b, vi, 400). He was born in Medina in about 85/794, and, according to the majority of the sources, died in Baghdäd in 150/767—alternatively dates for his death are 151, 153 and, in one case (Wââyût, i, 162), as early as 144/761-2. He was buried in the cemetery of Khûzûrân, near the grave of Abû Hanîfâ.

His grandfather, Yaşär, was among those taken prisoner at “Ayn al-Tamr in 12/634 and, according to Yâkût and al-Baghâdädî, was one of the first captives sent by Khâlid b. al-Walîd to Abû Bakr in Medina. He became the slave of Kays b. Mukhrâma b. al-Mu’tallîb b. Abû Manûl b. Kûsâyî and, having accepted Islam, was manumitted and became his masâl, thus acquiring the niza al-Mu’tallîbi. His three sons, Musä, “Abd al-Rahmân, and Ishäk, were all known as transmitters of âbbâr. Ishäk married the daughter of one of his predecessors and from this marriage Ibn Ishäk was born.

There are no details of his early life, but in view of the family nature of early âbbâr and hadith transmission, it was natural that he should follow in the footsteps of his father and uncles and become specialized in these branches of knowledge. He must have acquired an early reputation as a scholar for al-Zuhrî, who died in 124/741-2, to have spoken of him as “the most knowledgeable of men in maghâsî” (“Uyun al-athar, i, 1). In 119/737 he came to Alexandria and studied under Yâzîd b. Abî Habîb. Subsequently, as Ibn Hâdîj puts it, “he related on the authority of a group of the people of Egypt traditions which no one else related on their authority, so far as I know” (Tahâhîb, ix, 441). J. Fûck has suggested that Ibn Ishäk returned to Medina from Egypt, before departing finally for Irâq. There are frequent references to his having left Medina “of old”. This is substantiated by the fact that he has only one transmitter among the people of Medina, Ibrahim b. Sa’d (Udâhâ’b, vi, 399). His leaving Medina is usually attributed to the enmity of two men, Highâm b. Úrwa and Mâlik b. Anas. Highäm b. Úrwa is said to have objected to Ibn Ishäk relating traditions on
the authority of his wife, Fatima bint al-Mundhir b. al-Zubayr. As J. Horovitz has pointed out, Yahya was mistaken in identifying Hisham with the governor of Medina who ordered Ibn Ishak to be scourged for dallying with women at the rear of the mosque, since Hisham was governor of Medina for a four-year period up to 86/705, the approximate date of Ibn Ishak's birth; if the story has any validity, it might refer to Hisham's son, Isma'il, who was governor from 106/722-5 (op. cit. in Bibl., 169).

The antithesis towards Ibn Ishak was of a different order. It could have been due to professional jealousy, as the story related by 'Abd Allah b. Idris suggests: "I was with Mlik b. Anas when a man said to him: 'Muhammad b. Ishak says: Present to me the knowledge of Mlik, for I am the man to check it'. Mlik said: 'Look at this anti-

Christ saying 'Present to me the knowledge of Mlik' (Udaba, vi, 400). Another possibility, as A. Guillaume has suggested (Life of Muhammad, Introd., xiii), is that differences may have arisen between them over the contents of Ibn Ishak's lost book of Sunan. This could well have been so, for although later authorities such as Ibn Hanbal did not accept Ibn Ishak as an authority on legal matters, the latter did lay claim to being an authority on fiqh, as we can see from the reference in Ibn Hajar: "Ibrahim b. Sa'd had, on the authority of Ibn Ishak, about 100 hadith legal decisions, apart from maghazi" (Tahdhib, ix, 41). Another suggestion is that Mlik "objected to Ibn Ishak tracing the ghassawat of the Prophet by the means of the sons of the Jews who had become Muslims and remembered the story of Khaybar and other matters" (Tahdhib, ix, 43). Yet another explanation of Mlik's enmity towards Ibn Ishak is based upon the fact that Mlik objected to his having the grounds of his knowledge from a Shafi'i and a Kadaari (Udaba, vi, 400; 'Uyun, i, 9; Tahdhib, ix, 42). The same charge was levelled against al-Wakidi and others ...

Ahmad b. Yunos said: The scholars of maghazi were Shafi'i, like Ibn Ishak and Abu Ma'amhar and Yahya b. Sa'd al-Uumawi and others" (Udaba, vi, 400).

Having left (or been forced to leave) Medina, Ibn Ishak went first to al-'Abbas b. Muhammad, governor of Syria during the reign of al-Mansur, then to al-Hira, before finally settling in Baghdad. These peregrinations are reflected in the different riwayat of his Sira. There are some fifteen of these, with Kufa, Rayy and Basra figuring most prominently (Fuck, 44) and with only a single Medina riwayt. In addition to the Sira, he is credited with a Kitab al-Khulafa', which al-Uumawi related on his authority (Fihrist, 92; Udaba, vi, 401) and a book of Sunan (Haididj Khalifa, ii, 1088). As usual in the literature of ijar wa ta'dil, we find the usual early critics expressing diametrically opposed judgments on Ibn Ishak. In addition to the favourable assessment of al-ZuhrI referred to earlier, 'Asim b. Umar b. Katada was of the opinion that "knowledge will remain amongst us as long as Ibn Ishak lives" ('Uyun, i, 9; Udaba, vi, 400; Tahdhib, ix, 44). Shu'ba regarded him as "amir al-muwminin in tradition" (Tahdhib, ix, 44). Abu Zura', al-Madini, Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Sa'd regarded him as sound in tradition. On the other hand, al-Nisai and Yahya b. Ka'than did not accept him in matters of hadith. Al-Ahram, Sulayman al-Taymi and Muhyab b. Kholid regarded him as a liar—a charge which relates to hadith and is separate from the oft-quoted accusation contained in al-Dhunjabi, Ibn al-Nadmi and Yahya that Ibn Ishak included verses in his Sira knowing them to be forged. Al-Bulghari and Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. Numayr were not satisfied with his riwayt. Ibn Hanbal, whilst accepting him on matters relating to maghazi, did not draw upon him for hadith because he objected to his use of the collective inSad: "I see him relating on the authority of a group of people a single hadith and he does not distinguish the words of this one from the words of that" (Tahdhib, ix, 43). To single out Ibn Ishak on this score is an unfairluar, since the use of the collective inSad is a not uncommon feature in the writings of the early authorities on the sira-maghazi.


( J. M. B. Jones)
in praise of his grandson, 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Khayri. He once claimed authorship of a poem by his contemporary and rival Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Khayri (d. 685/1286), and the matter had to be submitted to the arbitration of Ibn al-Farîd, who discovered the truth.

Bibliography: Ibn Shâkir al-Kutubi, Fawâdi, Cairo 1283, ii, 269-74, 287-95; Ibn Taghribirdî, Nûdjîm, Cairo 1936, vi, 360, vii, 282-3, 369-70; 'Umarî, Masâlih al-abŷbûr (MS Cairo Lib. 559), xiv-xv; Diwan, Escurial 457; Brockelmann, I, 257; B. Lewis, in Arabica, xiii (1966), 257; F. Bustani, Diwâr al-ma'sârif, 1 (H. Mowâd). Ibn al-'Itnâbah al-Khazâ'irî, 'Amîr b. 'Amîr b. 'Azîd Manâth (see his genealogy in Ibn Sa'd, vii, 264, 2 in the article on his granddaughter Kabîsha bint Wâlik b. 'Amîr, wife of 'Abd Allâh b. Râwâha [g.e.], a pagan Arab poet named after his mother al-'Itnâbah, who belonged to the Banu al-Qayyâma. He was leader of al-Khazâ'irî [g.e.] in their feuds with al-Aws b. al-Nu'aym b. Zalîm (Agzdîn, 1973, etc.).

The author's father, Ahmad, as the grandson of one Mamlûk amir and the son of another, was no longer eligible for inclusion among the military élite of amîrs but became one of the awlâd al-nâs [g.e.] which, according to Ibn Iyâs, was equivalent to the âdîndâl al-balâh and served, in his time, as a sort of military reserve responsive to the Sultan's command. Ibn Iyâs cites an instance, under Sultan al-Zâhir Barkûq, Iyâs (ca. 750-830/1350-1427) rose to the rank of Second Executive Secretary (dawâdâr tînî) under Sultan al-Nâşir Farajî, the son of Barkûq (cf. Ibn Taghribirdî, fol. 278; Wiet, Mankan, no. 563). The author's father, Ahmad, as the grandson of one Mamlûk amir and the son of another, was no longer eligible for inclusion among the military élite of amîrs but became one of the awlâd al-nâs [g.e.] which, according to Ibn Iyâs, was equivalent to the âdîndâl al-balâh and served, in his time, as a sort of military reserve responsive to the Sultan's command. Ibn Iyâs cites an instance, under Sultan al-Zâhir Barkûq, Iyâs (ca. 750-830/1350-1427) rose to the rank of Second Executive Secretary (dawâdâr tînî) under Sultan al-Nâşir Farajî, the son of Barkûq (cf. Ibn Taghribirdî, fol. 278; Wiet, Mankan, no. 563).
BADÎ' AL-ZUHUR FI WAQİ' AL-DUHUR, a perfunctory survey of all Egyptian history down to the Mamlûk period, followed by a brief year by year summary of events, growing progressively more detailed as he nears his own time. In the first published versions in three volumes (Cairo, 1301-06/1884-88; reprinted Bülkû, 1311-12/1894), the history of Egypt from the beginning to the year 815/1412 is covered in the first volume, the second deals with the years 815-906/1412-1501, the end of the reign of al-Âdîl Tûmân Bây, and the third with the years 910-17, the reign of the last Mamlûk sultan al-Âshraf Tûmân Bây, omitting the reign of Sultan al-Ghawrî (906-21/1501-15). This brief résumé both indicates the disproportionate coverage allotted to various periods and points to the problem whether the entire work is to be attributed to Ibn Iyâs. The account of al-Ghawrî’s reign, while missing from the manuscripts on which the Cairo-Bûlûkk editions were based, is found in other manuscripts and was included in a re-edition of the parts of the work dealing with the years 872-928/1467-1522, i.e., that period of which Ibn Iyâs was an eyewitness observer (3 vols. ed. by P. Kahle, M. Mostafa, M. Sobernheim, Bibliotheca Islamica, v, 1931-39; revised ed., M. Mostafa, 1960-63). While earlier portions of the work (from the reign of Kâ‘ît Bây) are written in a brief, almost vernacular style, the final section, from 922/1516 onwards, is portioniîly fuller and more detailed, but also more finished and polished in style, leading K. Vollers (in Revue d’Égypte, 1895, 544-73) to the conclusion that Ibn Iyâs may not have been the author of this later section, a view disputed by M. Sobernheim (ET¹, ii, 414), who saw in this difference in style the possible conflation of two versions or the combination of a personal diary with a court circular. These later portions include detailed reports on life in Cairo, especially at the Mamlûk court, obituaries, extracts from Djawîhir al-sulûk’, Nuzhat al-umam fi ‘l-*adja’?ib wa ‘l-hikam; of the patriarchs and prophets, perhaps not by Ibn Iyâs; Nasîkh al-azhâr fi *adâ‘îd al-akhîr, a cosmography with specific reference to Egypt, written in 922/1517 and much used by 19th-century scholars; a little-known work of which only one manuscript is extant: Nuzhat al-umam fi ‘l-*adâ‘îd wa ‘l-hikam; extracts from Badî‘, entitled Dja’âshir al-sulûk; and Muntazam bâd al-dunyâ wa-lati’rîkh al-umam in three volumes (attribution uncertain, cf. C. Cahen, in REI, iii (1936), 358), these last two extant in one copy each in Istanbul.


IBN KABTûRNû, (KABTûRNû, KUBTûRNû or KURTûRNû), the name of three brothers, all Andalûsi men of letters. They were natives of Badajoz, where their family was said to be one of the oldest and most illustrious in the whole western part of al-Andalus. To judge by the name, this family is of Iberian origin; Dozy (Suppl., ii, 302) and Simonet (Glosario, 97) suggest that Kabtûrnû represents the classical Latin caput followed by the mediaeval Latin formo (‘I turn’); hence the tentative interpretation of E. Garcia Gómez, vuelvo la cabeza, a family name which need not astonish us since we know the equally curious Ibn Arfa’i Râsû.

Of the three brothers, Abu l-Hasan Muhammed b. Sa’d b. ‘Abd al-Âzîz is the least known. Apart from a brief notice in the Rûyât of Ibn Sa’d (no. xxxv, Arabic text, 30, Spanish tr., 163) and two verses reproduced in almost all the anthologies, nothing is known about him.

Abû Bakr ‘Abd al-Âzîz is the most eminent of the three brothers. He is held in high regard both as prose-writer and as poet, and it is often said that ‘Abd al-Maqîjd Ibn ‘Abdûn (d. 520/1126 or 529/1134) and he are the two greatest writers of the western part of al-Andalus. Yet the few specimens of his prose which we possess do not justify this claim. On the contrary, his poetry is artificial and cold, while his prose is pedantic and superficial. Very probably he owes his fame to his wealth and political influence in his capacity of secretary to ‘Umar al-Mutawakkil, petty king of Badajoz (464-88/1072-94). With his brothers he was later employed in the chancellery of the Almoravids. He died in the reign of ‘Ali b. Yusuf b. Tâghîin after 540/1126 (Ibn al-Abbâr, Tahmîa, no. 1743).

His brother Abû Muhammed Tâlîya was of even slighter talent and importance. He too was secretary in the chancellery and died before him (Ibn al-Abbâr, Tahmîa, no. 259).

In spite of the tragic circumstances in which they lived, the Banû Kabtûrnû enjoyed an easy and carefree existence, as if they were unaware of—or indifferent to—the tragic events of their time. Our sources portray the three brothers as irresolutely free men, leading a somewhat decadent dolce vita, scenes from which they describe in short verses of rococo style. This child-like vision of an unbroken life of pleasure has ever since stimulated the imagination of later poets and writers and has led them to repeat, over and over again, verses similar to those of the Banû Kabtûrnû.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources

**IBN AL-Kâdi**, Shûhâb al-Dîn A'bâd, 'L-'Abbâs, Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Sayd b. 'Abd al-Rahmân b. A'bâd 'l-Sâ'îya al-Mu'akhsân, a Moroccan geographer whose biographical works are highly regarded, was born in Fâs in 960/1553, of a famous family belonging to the large tribe of the Zanata [q.v.]. His father supervised his education and made him undertake serious study with the best teachers in the Maghrib, in particular with ghâyâb Abu 'l-Mâhsân Yûsuf al-Fâsî. After this he even won a certain renown as an expert on arithmetic and the division of inheritances. Being anxious to complete his education, Ibn al-Kâdî took advantage of his pilgrimage to Mecca to spend two years studying with the great doctors of the Muslim East. His return, in 968/1558, coincided with the accession of the Sa'did sultan Ahmad al-Mansûr [q.v.] with whom he became intimately acquainted. In 944/1538 he wished to return to the East by sea, but was captured by Christian pirates. After eleven months of painful experiences, almost certainly in Spain, his master ransomed him for 20,000 ounces. In gratitude, Ibn al-Kâdî dedicated all his works to his royal benefactor, in whose entourage he continued to live, apparently without any official duties. At some undetermined date he was appointed khâbî of Salâ (Salé), but was recalled for an unknown reason. He then finally settled in his native town and devoted himself to teaching. His biographers record that at the end of his life he was expounding the Sâhibî of al-Buthârî [q.v.] and that he had the honour to have as his disciple al-Makkarî [q.v.], the distinguished author of the Nafîh al-âyâ, the distinguished author of the Nafîh al-âyâ who compiled the important work, the distinguished author of the Nafîh al-âyâ which is regarded as the most widely known member of this family  (Brockelmann, S II, 25). Badr al-Din's son, Tâki al-Dîn Muhammad, wrote a biography of his father and a few other works which are mentioned in Brockelmann, S II, 37, S II, 25. Badr al-Dîn's son, Ta'ki al-Din Muhammad, is also attested as an author (Brockelmann, S II, 25).

2. His son, Bâd al-Dîn Muhammad, d. 874/1470, wrote a biography of his father and a few other works which are mentioned in Brockelmann, ii, 37, S II, 25. Badr al-Dîn's son, Ta'ki al-Din Muhammad, is also attested as an author (Brockelmann, S II, 25).

3. The uncle of no. 1, Yûsûf b. Muhammad b. Umár, d. 789/1387, made extracts from the Kitâb al-Maghâzî of Musâ b. 'Ukbâ [q.v.]; cf. E. Sachau, SFBer. Ak W., Phil.-hist. Kl., 1904, xi, 6; Brockelmann, I, 144. (J. Schacht)

**IBN KALAKIS**, Abu 'l-Fath (var. Futûb) Nasr (Allâh) b. 'Abd Allâh, an Arab poet, writer and letter-writer known by the familiar name of Ibn Kalâkis (or also al-Kâdi al-dâ'im). Born in 532/1137 in Alexandria, where he spent his childhood, he afterwards went to Cairo to study, and the sources record that he had Abu Tahir al-Silâfi [q.v.] as his ghâyâb. We do not know for what reason Ibn Kalâkis in about the middle of 1169 visited Sicily, where he lived until the end of the following year, but it may be conjectured that he went there at the invitation of certain friends who will be mentioned below.

Towards the end of 1169, or at the beginning of 1170, the poet was in the Yemen, at Aden and Zâbût, and also in Aydhâb on the Egyptian Red Sea coast, for reasons which may have been both commercial and political, and which have been widely used by later writers, particularly by al-Ífrâîn [q.v.] and al-Nâṣîrî [q.v.].

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references in the text: E. Lévi-Provençal, Les historiens des Chorfa, Paris 1922 (essential); Ibn Zaydân, Ibâd, al-álam al-dâ'im ... i, Rabat 1920, 336-8; 'Abd b. Idrâhîm, al-Ílam bi man halâ Marra-kush ... , ii, Fâs 1936, 93-6; 'Abd al-Sâlâm Ibn Sûdâ, Dâ'il mu'arrîth al-Maghrîb al-aštâ, Tetuan 1950 (particularly nos. 61, 62, 466, 490, 840, 1362, 1363); I. S. Allouche and A. Regragui, Catalogues des manuscrits arabes de Rabat, ii, Rabat 1958. (G. Derudder)
Ibn Kalâkis has left a record of his stay in certain towns in Sicily (Termini, Cefalù, Caronia, Fati, Oliveri—rather than "Lipari", as M. Amari has preferred to read, see *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia*, Catania 1933, i, 790—Malazzo, Messina and Syracusa). Occasionally in all his letters, but most distinctly in his letter to the sultan of the Dahlak Islands in the Red Sea, he expressed his desire to go back to Egypt, to which he was well disposed and which was his second home. Ibn al-Kalâkis' father, Abu 'I-Hār, also had connections in Sicily, which is why the poet mentions not only in *makaddimâ* as a description of the poet's travels in Sicily as well as of his sojourn with a patron of the period, the sultan 'Abd al-Rahmân, but also his brother 'Abd al-Hājjar (see M. Amari, *op. cit., passim*) to whom, as to his sons 'Abd al-Bakr, 'Ummar and Uthmân, the poet dedicated his *kasidas*.

It still remains to identify the other persons encountered at Palermo and mentioned not only in the work named above, but also in his *Dimân* (ed. Khalil Mu'târân, Cairo 1903; a more comprehensive ed. has been prepared in Paris), and above all in his unpublished collection of letters (Tarassul Ibn Kalâkis, MS of the Dâr al-Kutub in Cairo: al-Maktaba al-Taymûriyya, *Adab* no. 617). This consists of letters addressed to: (1) Djurdânnâ in al-Zahr al-bâsim (Kharidâ, i, 165, where it is so vocalized by the editors; in the *dimân*, it is چرَحْ), described as *wasir* to the "shâbik Şikilliyâ", which suggests a "Giordano" (a very common name in the Norman period), one of William's ministers, a name not, however, mentioned in that king's entourage; (2) Ghâtar b. Djâwhân or Dîshân (Tarassul, fol. 34), an eminent personage at the court of William; (3) al-Sadîd al-Şârî (ibid., fol. 47-8), which suggests the "Sedîcuctus" mentioned in M. Amari, *op. cit., iii*, 510 and n. 2; (4) Ibn Fâthî (ibid., fol. 43), who is described as a fâbih.

**Bibliography:** To the sources named by M. Amari, mention should be made of: (a) *Tankih al-abhadth li 'l-milal al-thâldth*, a preface. For the earlier part of the History, see C. Cahen, in *Arabic and Islamic studies in honor of Hamilton A. R. Gibb*, Leiden 1965, 156-67. (C. CAHEN)

**IBN AL-KALBI** [see *AL-KALBI*].

**IBN KAMÂL** [see *KEMALPASHA-ZADE*].

**IBN KAMMÔNA**, Sa'd b. Mansûr, oculist and philosopher, lived in Baghdaţ in the 12th/13th century, under pagan Mongol rule. His works, mostly manuals of philosophy and commentaries on Ibn Sinâ and Suhrâwardî, secured him a place in Islamic philosophical discussions.

A strong tendency toward rationalist deism pervades his *Tanbih al-abhadth li 'l-milal al-thâldth*, in which the author, who was a Jew, discusses religion and prophethood in general (drawing on Ibn Sinâ, al-'Ghazâlî, Maimonides, and Fâkhr al-Dîn al-Râzî), and devotes a separate chapter to each of the monotheistic faiths, treating the subject with a remarkable show of objectivity. Steinschneider considered the work "the most interesting tract of inter-religious polemics in Arabic". Most of it is devoted to Islam, and the cumulative effect of the discussion was hardly apt to please a Muslim. Written in 679/1280, the book served as a pretext for a mob outbreak against the author, who died shortly thereafter (683/1284-5).

The same qualities of calm discourse, a certain conscious pride in the capacity for adducing detachedly pro and contra arguments, an appeal to common sense and an appreciation of the essential good, to be found in various creeds are evident in his treatise on the differences between Rabbinic and Karaita Jews.

**Bibliography:** see *Examination of the inquiries into the three faiths*, ed. M. Perlmann (Un. of Calif. Publ. Near East. St. 1967). (M. PERLMANN)

**IBN KÂSI**, patronymic of the members of the Banû Kâsi family which, according to the *Jami' al-bulûk* of Ibn Hazm, is descended from a Visigothic count, Kasi; the latter gave his name to a long line of *muwallad* descendants settled in the regions lying between the Pyrenees and the valley of the Ebro; their superficial Islamization allowed them to preserve old connexions and even family ties with the noble houses of Vasconia. The most outstanding member of this family was Mûsâ b. Mûsâ Ibn Kâsi
who, from his fief at Tudela, declared war on 'Abd al-Rahmân II, forming an alliance with García Iniguez of Navarre; after a series of submissions and rebellions, he was officially acknowledged lord of Tudela. A rebellion by Almoravids of the Umayyad amir Muḥammad I, he led an expedition against Catalonia and, at the height of his power, succeeded in becoming known as the third king of Spain. As a protection against attacks from Asturias, he built the fortress of Albelda two leagues south of Logroño. He was attacked by Ordoño I, and was put to flight and severely wounded in the outskirts of Clavijo; he died shortly afterwards and was succeeded by his son Lope, who acknowledged the suzerainty of Ordoño I, himself dying soon after. His brothers, Muṭarrif and Isma‘îl, had themselves proclaimed at Tudela and Saragossa, while Muḥammad b. Lope, grandson of Mūsā b. Mūsā, yielded to the authority of Muḥammad I; appointed governor of Saragossa, he rebelled again and then, under pressure from the Tugjibîs of 'Abd al-Rahmân b. 'Abd al-'Azîz, submitted again to the authority of the latter, he was eventually killed, after having made repeated attacks on the capital of the Ethro which was occupied by the Tugjibîs. From his death onwards, the numerous descendants of Mūsâ b. Mūsâ Ibn Kasî, divided and in rivalry, grew increasingly weak and ended in obscurity, during the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmân III. A son of Muḥammad b. Lope, lord of Tudela, died in 309/923, the same year that his brother Muṭarrif was assassinated by his nephew Muḥammad, son of his brother 'Abd Allâh. A princess of the same lineage, Urракa, married Fruela II, and the other members of this turbulent family were led to Cordova to serve in the army of 'Abd al-Rahmân III or were converted to Christianity and frequented the courts of León and Navarre.


(Á. Huici Miranda)

IBN KASI, Abu l-‘Kāsim Ahmed b. Husayn, one of the many rebels who helped to precipitate the fall of the Almoravid dynasty in Spain, during the critical period which preceded the landing of the Almohad troops at Cadiz in 541/1146. In his lifetime as Ibn Barradjan before he had had time to put his plans into operation, he was severely wounded in the outskirts of Clavijo; he died shortly afterwards and was succeeded by his son Lope, who acknowledged the suzerainty of Ordoño I, himself dying soon after. His brothers, Muṭarrif and Isma‘îl, had themselves proclaimed at Tudela and Saragossa, while Muḥammad b. Lope, grandson of Mūsā b. Mūsā, yielded to the authority of Muḥammad I; appointed governor of Saragossa, he rebelled again and then, under pressure from the Tugjibîs of 'Abd al-Rahmân b. 'Abd al-'Azîz, submitted again to the authority of the latter, he was eventually killed, after having made repeated attacks on the capital of the Ethro which was occupied by the Tugjibîs. From his death onwards, the numerous descendants of Mūsâ b. Mūsā Ibn Kasî, divided and in rivalry, grew increasingly weak and ended in obscurity, during the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmân III. A son of Muḥammad b. Lope, lord of Tudela, died in 309/923, the same year that his brother Muṭarrif was assassinated by his nephew Muḥammad, son of his brother 'Abd Allâh. A princess of the same lineage, Urракa, married Fruela II, and the other members of this turbulent family were led to Cordova to serve in the army of 'Abd al-Rahmân III or were converted to Christianity and frequented the courts of León and Navarre.


(Á. Huici Miranda)

IBN KASI, Abu l-‘Kāsim Ahmed b. Husayn, one of the many rebels who helped to precipitate the fall of the Almoravid dynasty in Spain, during the critical period which preceded the landing of the Almohad troops at Cadiz in 541/1146. In his lifetime as Ibn Barradjan before he had had time to put his plans into operation, he was severely wounded in the outskirts of Clavijo; he died shortly afterwards and was succeeded by his son Lope, who acknowledged the suzerainty of Ordoño I, himself dying soon after. His brothers, Muṭarrif and Isma‘îl, had themselves proclaimed at Tudela and Saragossa, while Muḥammad b. Lope, grandson of Mūsā b. Mūsā, yielded to the authority of Muḥammad I; appointed governor of Saragossa, he rebelled again and then, under pressure from the Tugjibîs of 'Abd al-Rahmân b. 'Abd al-'Azîz, submitted again to the authority of the latter, he was eventually killed, after having made repeated attacks on the capital of the Ethro which was occupied by the Tugjibîs. From his death onwards, the numerous descendants of Mūsâ b. Mūsā Ibn Kasî, divided and in rivalry, grew increasingly weak and ended in obscurity, during the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmân III. A son of Muḥammad b. Lope, lord of Tudela, died in 309/923, the same year that his brother Muṭarrif was assassinated by his nephew Muḥammad, son of his brother 'Abd Allâh. A princess of the same lineage, Urракa, married Fruela II, and the other members of this turbulent family were led to Cordova to serve in the army of 'Abd al-Rahmân III or were converted to Christianity and frequented the courts of León and Navarre.


(Á. Huici Miranda)
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(Á. Huici Miranda)
IBN KASIM — IBN KATHIR

M. Asin Palacios, Paris 1933, 5; Ibn al-Khatib, A'mdl al-aHdm, ed. E. Levi-Provencal, Rabat 1934, 285 ff.; J. Bosch Vilà, Los almordvides, Terrassa 2000, 291 ff. (the author mentions very briefly, besides the works referred to above, also: Ibn Khaledun, Berrioles, ii, 184; Marrakushi, Mu'djib, tr. Fagnan, 182; Codera, Decadencia y desaparición de los almordvides en España, 33-52; Valdeavellano, Historia de España, 914-7; F. Nyra, Notes sur quelques fragments inédits de la correspondance d'Ibn al-Arif avec Ibn Barrajain, in Hespèrs, 1936, 211-21. (J. Schacht)

IBN AL-KASIM, Abu 'Abd Allah 'Abd al-Rahman b. Al-Kasim b. Kalid b. Dinada al-Utaki, the most prominent disciple of Malik b. Anas [q.v.], and considered the most reliable transmitter of Malik's opinions. He was a mawla affiliated by Muhammad. He was born in 128/746 or, more probably, in 132/749 in Ramla, and died in Cairo in 1306. He is reported to have studied with Malik for twenty years, and he was the main agent in spreading Malikite doctrine to Egypt and from there to North Africa and the Maghrib. A main work of the Malikite school, the Mudawwana, is based on the answers which Ibn al-Kasim gave, first, to Asad b. Farhat, or, later, to Sa'dun [q.v.]; the version of this last, properly called al-Mudawwana wa 'l-mukhtaliqa, because its author had not been able to complete its revision and editing before his death, gained public acclaim and is commonly referred to as the Mudawwana, and only a few fragments of the version of Asad b. Farhat, called Asadiyya, have survived. The Mudawwana of Sa'dun was often commented upon by later scholars. Ibn al-Kasim is also the author of one of the versions (ahdith) of al-Nasafi's Ghdyat al-ikhtisdr or Mukhtasar, referred to as the "seven readers" [see KIRA'A] of the Kur'an. His authorities were the Companion Abd al-Rahman al-Makhzumi, called Kunbul.

Both of these became connected with the Shafi'i Ibn Mujahid, who procured Ibn Kathir's recognition as a "canonical reader" (al-Subki, i, 102). Bazzi and Kunbul are referred to under the name of Harymiyani [al-Dani, Taysir, ed. Pretzel, 3]. Ibn Kathir had a definite influence on contemporary traditionists, Bajars as well as Kufans, such as Sufyan b. Uyayna, the two Hammâds, and the grammarians al-Khalî and al-Ashâfî. The Ba'ri reader Abu 'Amr b. 'Aliâ (in 700/1306) became one of the best-known historians and traditionists of Syria under the Bahri Mamlûk dynasty. Educated at Damascus, where he went to live with his elder brother in 700/1306, after the death of their father, he had as his main teacher, in fîh, the Shafi'i Burhan al-Din al-Fazari (in 729), but next fell strongly, and very early, under the influence of Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) and his school. In addition, through his marriage with the daughter of Diamal al-Din al-Mizzi (d. 742/1342) he became the son-in-law of one of the most famous traditionists of Syria.

His own career, as one of the Syrian 'ulamâ', was for long a modest one. Towards the end of the year 741/1341, after the death of Tankiz and before that of Muhammad b. Kalâwûn, Ibn Kathir took part in two enquiries which were held, under the presidency of the governor Aljunubghâ al-Nâsirî, to pass judgement on a zindik accused of incarnationism (bâliâ) [Bidâya, xiv, 189-90; E. Strauss, L'inquisition dans l'État mamlinek, in RDSO, xxv (1950), 16-7].

In Muhabbarr 740/May 1345, he was appointed khâfa in the mosque founded at Mâzik (in 729), but next fell strongly, and very early, under the influence of Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) and his school. In addition, through his marriage with the daughter of Diamal al-Din al-Mizzi (d. 742/1342) he became the son-in-law of one of the most famous traditionists of Syria. His own career, as one of the Syrian 'ulamâ', was for long a modest one. Towards the end of the year 741/1341, after the death of Tankiz and before that of Muhammad b. Kalâwûn, Ibn Kathir took part in two enquiries which were held, under the presidency of the governor Aljunubghâ al-Nâsirî, to pass judgement on a zindik accused of incarnationism (bâliâ) [Bidâya, xiv, 189-90; E. Strauss, L'inquisition dans l'État mamlinek, in RDSO, xxv (1950), 16-7].
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the governorship of Arghun Shâh (d. 750/1349), he succeeded his teacher al-Dhahabi, who had just died, as teacher of hadîth at the turba of Umm Sâlih and, according to some other sources, in 755/1354, for a very short time, the post of director of the Dar al-hadîth al-Aghrâfiyya after the death of the hâdîth Taqî al-Din al-Sulbî. In 752/1351, after the failure of the revolt of the amir Baybughâr Urûs, he was received at the Dâmâghîyya madrasâ by the caliph al-Mu'taḍâd (d. 762/1362-3), who arrived in Damascus, accompanied by the four hâdîth al-bu'dât of Egypt, to restore order there. Under the first governorship of Imam al-Sâlim Shâh (d. 766/April-May 1365, a very short time, the post of director of the Dar al-hadîth al-Aghrâfiyya was continued and completed, but the project was taken up again by Ibn Hâджar al-Áskâlânî. The latter states (al-Durâr al-kâmîna, i, 373) that Ibn Kâthîr had also made a collection of the hadîth quoted in the Tanbîh of al-Shirzâri (d. 752), a work which he himself had studied, at the beginning of his career, with al-Fazârî.

Ibn Hâджar al-Áskâlânî also reports that Ibn Kâthîr had begun work on a vast commentary on the Quran. His Tâfsîr (Cairo 1342/1923), essentially a philological work, is very elementary and for- shadows, in its style, that which al-Suyûtî wrote later. His K. Fâdîl al-Kûrân (Cairo 1348/1929) is a short manual consisting of a summary of the history of the Quran.

Ibn Kâthîr was also interested in jurisprudence. He had planned to write a vast treatise on fiqh based on the Quran and hadîth, but did not get further than the chapter on the Pilgrimage, in the section on 'ibâdât. He also alludes, in the Biddîa (xii, 124), to a commentary on the Tanbîh of al-Shirzâri. In his fatâwa, mentioned above, on the dîwân, he was inspired by the K. al-Sûfîsâ al-dharîsyya of Ibn Taymiyya. The Tanbîh al-kâfîsîyya are lost, but often mentioned in the obituaries of the Biddîa; they were continued and completed by Ibn Kâdî Shubba.

Bibliography: further to the references in the text: Shahrârî, vi, 231; Brockelmann, ii, 60-1, S II, 48-9; H. Laoust, Ibn Kathir historien, in Arabica, ii (1955), 42-98. (H. Laoust)

Ibn AL-KÂTTA'î, Ali b. Dâr al-Far b. Ali al-ShanTari, al-Shijâlî, is a philologist, historian, grammarian and lexicographer (we have very little information about his work as a poet), who was born in Sicily in 433/1041, at a time when the island was ravaged by civil war. He devoted himself to the study of lexicography and grammar under the direction of such scholars as Ibn al-Bîr [g.v.] who, according to the sources, made him fa- miliar with the Shîhâdat al-Djâwari [g.v.]. But, as soon as the Norman forces began their conquest of the island in 1061, Ibn al-Kâţtâ'î, together with a certain number of the Muslim elite, left Sicily. After a short stay in Andalusia he proceeded to Egypt, where he is known to have been at the beginning of the 6th/12th century.

On the subject of his life in his new home we have only a few items of information, which tell us that he was soon chosen to be tutor to the sons of the Fatimid wasir al-Afdal b. Badr al-Djâmîl [g.v.] and that he devoted himself to the teaching of prosody, grammar and lexicography; several distinguished pupils were educated at his school, among whom Abû Mûh. Abu Allâh b. Barrî [see IBN BARRî] is noteworthy. Ibn al-Kâţtâ'î died in Egypt in 515/1121 and was buried not far from the tomb of the imâm al-Shîhâdât.

Apart from a certain number of works named in a catalogue of the first Muslim traditionists, used the Tanbîhât of al-Mizzi and the work of al-Dhahabi. But his principal work in this field is his K. al-Djâmîm, an enormous compilation in which were listed, in alphabetical order of the Companions who had transmitted them, the traditions contained in the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal, the “Six Books” and some other less well-known works. In addition, Ibn Kâthîr summarized in his Mukhtasar (Cairo 1355/1357), the Muhammada n l-îlâm al-hadîth of Ibn al-Sâlim Shâh (d. 643/1245). He himself refers, in the Biddîa (xi, 24), to a commentary on the Shîhâdât of al-Bukhari which he was engaged; this commentary was not completed, but the project was taken up again by Ibn Hâджar al-Áskâlânî. The latter states (al-Durâr al-kâmîna, i, 373) that Ibn Kâthîr had also made a collection of the hadîth quoted in the Tanbîh of al-Shirzâri (d. 752), a work which he himself had studied, at the beginning of his career, with al-Fazârî.

Ibn Hâджar al-Áskâlânî also reports that Ibn Kâthîr had begun work on a vast commentary on the Quran. His Tâfsîr (Cairo 1342/1923), essentially a philological work, is very elementary and for- shadows, in its style, that which al-Suyûtî wrote later. His K. Fâdîl al-Kûrân (Cairo 1348/1929) is a short manual consisting of a summary of the history of the Quran.

Ibn Kâthîr was also interested in jurisprudence. He had planned to write a vast treatise on fiqh based on the Quran and hadîth, but did not get further than the chapter on the Pilgrimage, in the section on 'ibâdât. He also alludes, in the Biddîa (xii, 124), to a commentary on the Tanbîh of al-Shirzâri. In his fatâwa, mentioned above, on the dîwân, he was inspired by the K. al-Sûfîsâ al-dharîsyya of Ibn Taymiyya. The Tanbîh al-kâfîsîyya are lost, but often mentioned in the obituaries of the Biddîa; they were continued and completed by Ibn Kâdî Shubba.

Bibliography: further to the references in the text: Shahrârî, vi, 231; Brockelmann, ii, 60-1, S II, 48-9; H. Laoust, Ibn Kathir historien, in Arabica, ii (1955), 42-98. (H. Laoust)
the various sources but thought to be lost (a list of these will be found in U. Rizzitano, Notizie bio-bibliografiche, see Bibl.), two of his writings have partially survived: the Kitāb al-Durrat al-khālīna min ẓayd al-Dhakhrī (Ibn al-Dhakhrī, an anthology of Arab-Siculo-Persian poetry, of which there survive only extracts as a result of the activity of later compilers (see Notizie bio-bibliografiche, 275-80), and al-Maḥāl al-ʿasīrīyya. His other writings have been transmitted in their entirety, but almost all are unpublished: they are the Madīmuʿ min ẓīr al-Musalābī wa-khawāmīdihī (a short commentary on some verses of the poet of Sayf al-Dawla, see Bibl.), a group of five short treatises on metre (see Notizie bio-bibliografiche, 284-282), the Kitāb al-Afsāl, which was first noticed by E. Griffin (see Centenario della nascita di M. Amari, Palermo 1910, i, 431 fl. and from which we possess an edition (Haydarābād 1354), and lastly the unpublished Abnīyāt al-āsmaʿ (see Notizie bio-bibliografiche, 85-92, where the dihāga, the list of the characters and the conclusion are published).


IBN AL-KATTA, ʿĪsā b. Saʿīd al-Yarabūsī, Andalusian vizier of humble extraction but of Arab origin. Although he was the son of a simple schoolmaster, he succeeded in raising himself in the social scale thanks to al-Manṣūr [q.v.], who gave him important posts and even entrusted to him the command of an army sent to Morocco in 386/997 to bring it under the domination of the Umayyads. While he incurred the resentment of the Banū Sulaym (Ibn al-Washsha 3, 207), who gave rise to a love-story about Ibn Kays al-Rukayyāt and Kathira (Ibn al-Washsha 3, 207), he was extended to the family, even gave his youngest sister in marriage to the poet Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Faḍl b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Mūhammād b. al-Husayn b. ʿAlī al-Baghdādī, traditionist, ulim, and especially poet, of Baghdad, born in 476 or 479/1086, died 28 Ramadan 538/1040 August 1135. Although he was the author of medical works which have not survived, and also transmitted hadīths without incurring the reproof of critics, Ibn al-Katān is known chiefly for his vigorous satires which, as Goldāher says (Muh. St., ii, 60), "spared neither the caliph nor anyone else", for his muqāfāt and for his wit, as well as for his dealing with the later compilers (see ibid.). He was the first to use the term fīṣīn/muṣafāt/ṣīnʃuḥṣuṣ [ṣuḥṣuṣ] characteristic of the dābāt [see Rubāṭ], with the omission of the final foot, as often used by Bahāʾ al-Dīn Zubayr [q.v.].


IBN KAYS AL-RUKAYYĀT, ʿUbayd Allāh (not ʿAbd Allāh, which was the name of his brother) b. Kays b. Ṣuqayyak, Arab poet of the Umayyad period. He belonged to the Banū ʿAmir b. Luʿayy, one of the lesser clans of the Kuraysh. He was born at Mecca, perhaps in the twenties (the anecdote Ghārāhī, v, 158, 20 which points to 12/633 is not authentic) and grew up in the Hijāz. In 379/1087 after the battle of Siffin he moved with some of his kinsmen to al-Raḵḵa in the Dzāfra (Mesopotamia) amongst them ʿAbd al-Wahīd b. Abī Saʿīd, whose daughter Rukayya is the lady from whom together with some of her namesakes the poet took his strange surname (see Nīkēās, Zur Grammatik, 29). He remained in Mesopotamia for about 30 years, making, however, occasional journeys to the Hijāz. In 62/683 two sons of his brother ʿAbd Allāh and some other kinsmen of his were slain in the battle on the Ḥarra, and he mourned their loss (poems 40 and 41). Towards the end of the sixties, those of the Banū ʿAmir b. Luʿayy who dwelt in Mesopotamia became involved in the conflict between the Umayyads and the Zubayrids. When Harb b. ʿAbd al-Wahīd, the brother of Rukayya, killed one of the Banū Sulaym, ʿUmayr b. al-Ḥuǧbāl al-Sulāmī (d. 70/690) bade the Banū ʿAmir in the Wādī l-ʿAbrār in the neighbourhood of al-Raḵḵa; on this occasion Ibn Kays al-Rukayyāt was taken prisoner, but he was set free thanks to the intervention of two Sulāms (poem 43). He then moved with his kinsmen to Syria; but already in 77/695 we find him in the ʿIrāk on the side of Muṣāb b. al-Zubayr. He took part in the battle of Dayr al-Dāḥalik near Maskin, where Muṣāb fell (77/695). After the battle he fled to Kūfa and found shelter in the house of a lady hailing from the Khaṛṣaḏ, whom he calls in his poems Khaḥrās. This sojourn gave rise to a long story about Ibn Kays al-Rukayyāt and Khaḥrās (Ibn ʿAbī ʿAlī, al-Zubayr, vii, 54, 15). After a year he ventured to return to Medina and found in ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAṣfar and Abī Ṭālīb a generous patron. He now sang the praise of the Umayyads. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAṣfar interceded for him with ʿAbd al-Malik, and the caliph pardoned him, though he did not grant him his former annuity. So Ibn Kays al-Rukayyāt went to the court of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Marwān, the governor of Egypt, and...
composed panegyrics on him. In the dispute between the caliph and his brother 'Abd al-As'iz he supported the latter's claim to the throne (poems III, 9, 16 and XI, 12). The poet's death is unknown.

Though a considerable part of the nearly 1000 verses of Ibn Kays al-Ru'ayyât which have come down to us consists of panegyrics, yet he begins first and foremost to the erotic poets who flourished at his time in the Hijjâz. With 'Umar b. Abî Rabi'a, by whom he is otherwise easily surpassed, he has some traits in common; his style is lucid and fluent, and the latter's claim to the throne (poems III, 9, 16 and XI, 12). The poet's death is unknown.
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IBN AL-KAYSARANI (the nisba refers to Kaysariyya, Caesarea in Palestine; see Samani, Kitab al-Ansab, s.v. Kayyim, the father being the superintendent of the university. Ibn al-Kayyim refers to this nisba) was a specialist in traditions. He was born in Jerusalem in 448/1058, studied in Baghdad from 468/1075 onwards, and travelled widely in the eastern part of the Islamic world in order to collect traditions. Being an indefatigable walker, he made all his journeys in search of traditions on foot, and he refrained from asking for alms, accepting only what was offered to him, so that he often suffered hardship; he also earned money as a professional copyist of collections of traditions. He finally settled in Hamadhan where he built a house. He went to Jerusalem in order to take the shahada on what proved to be his last pilgrimage, and he died on the return journey in Baghdad in 507/1113.

Whilst the unequalled extent of his knowledge of traditions and his personal integrity are generally recognized, his reliability is judged variously by the critics. Al-Ansari al-Harawi [q.v.] is reported to have spoken well of him as a young man, and he was praised by Ibn Manda [q.v.], who related traditions from him, and by others. Other critics, however, such as Abu 'l-Fadl Muhammad b. Nasir al-Salami, Ibn 'Asakir [q.v.], and al-Samani [q.v.] mentions meeting him (Kitab al-Ansab, s.v. al-Kaysari); he was also knowledgeable in astronomy, geometry and arithmetic. Much of his poetry consisted of panegyrics of princes, in particular of the Wazirs and Mamluks. Ibn Shaddad, in his biographical dictionary, the autograph of his diwan in Aleppo, and he quotes some lines from his poetry; more extensive quotations are given by Yaqut, and several of his hadisas are quoted by Abu Shama [q.v. in the Kitab al-Rau'datayn. Only one copy (badly preserved) of his diwan seems to have survived (Cairo, iii, 111).

Bibliography: Ibn Khalil, s.v.; Yaqut, Ithbat, viii, 112-2; Ibn al-'Imad, Shadhardt, iv, 150; Brockelmann, I, 455. (J. Schacht)

IBN KAYYIM AL-DJAWIZIYYA, SHAMS AL-DIN IBN BAKR MUHAMMAD B. ABU BAKR AL-ZAR'INI, Hanball theologian and jurisconsult, born at Damascus on 7 Safar 691/20 January 1292 and died there in 751/1350. He was of humble origin, his father being the superintendent (kayyim) of the Jawiziyya madrasa, which served as a court of law for the Hanball school of thought. Ibn al-Kayyim's education was particularly wide and sound. There are mentioned, among his main teachers, the kadi Sulayman b. Hamza (d. 711/1312) and the shaykh Abu Bakr (d. 728/1328), son of the traditionist Ibn 'Abd al-Da'im, but in particular he was, from 733/1333, the most famous pupil of Ahmad Ibn Taymiyya, all of whose ideas he can be said to have absorbed and whose work he helped to popularize, while retaining his own personality. Well-versed, like his master, in all the main disciplines of the time—Kur'anic exegesis, hadith, usul al-fikh and jurisprudence—and like him an adversary of the monastic school (ittidadyya) which had arisen from the teaching of Ibn al-'Arabi (d. 638/1240), Ibn al-Kayyim was, unlike his master, much more strongly influenced by Sunnism.

He was interested particularly in the Manasil of al-Ansari (d. 485/1096), who enjoyed great prestige under the Mamluks. Much less of a polemicist than his master and much more a preacher ('adiz), Ibn al-Kayyim finally left behind him the justified reputation of a writer of great talent, whose eloquence contrasts with the incisive dryness of the succinct prose of his famous master.

In 726/1325, Ibn al-Kayyim was imprisoned in the citadel of Damascus, at the same time as Ibn Taymiyya, and was not released until 728/1328,
after the latter's death. In 731/1331-2, he made the Pilgrimage to Mecca; it ... always with only superficial emotion, as when he expresses, in terms which may be called romantic, his emotion in the

in

in

lism of Ibn Taymiyya encountered in the govern-
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outside Bâb Sharki and Bâb Tûma (Bidâya, xiv, 174). On 6 Safar 743/11 July 1342, he gave his inaugural lecture at the Sadrîyya madrassa, where he was to teach until his death (ibid., xiv, 202).

On two occasions he was in disagreement with Takî al-Dîn al-Subkî (d. 777/1378), the Shâfi'î chief kâdi of Damascus, on points of fîkî, without however becoming involved in serious quarrels.

In Muharram 746/4 May-2 June 1345, he had a disagreement with al-Subkî on the question of whether a race or a contest of shooting (mustâtâbaa), in which each of the two competitors puts down his stake, is permitted without the participation of a third competitor (known as mukhâliî) who himself takes part without contributing a stake and thus makes lawful an operation which otherwise might be regarded as constituting a game of chance (kumâda); expressing the ideas of Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn al-Kayyim maintained that the presence of this mukhâliî was not necessary (Bidâya, xiv, 216). However, when summoned by the Shâfi'î kâdi 'l-hudâî, he had to submit to the opinion of the majority.

A little later, in 750/1349, he was again in dis-

agreement with al-Subkî, for having given some fatawa on the problem of replediation (faldî) in conformity with the doctrine of Ibn Taymiyya (Bidâya, xiv, 235); the Bedouin amîr Sayf al-Dîn b. Fadî reconciled him with his adversary.

Ibn al-Kayyim died at Damascus on 23 Radjab 751/26 September 1350; he was buried beside his mother in the cemetery of Bâb Saghir. His son Djalîl al-Dîn al-Kayyim (d. 755/1355) succeeded him in his teaching at the Sadrîyya.

Ibn al-Kayyim’s career was modest, and was hampered by the opposition which the neo-Hanbalism of Ibn Taymiyya encountered in the governmental circles of the Mamlûk state. On 2 Radjab 757/15 February 1336, he delivered for the first time the khutba in the mosque of this city. Ibn Dîn al-Khaliîkhîn had recently founded in the gardens of the Chtûta outside Bâb Sharki and Bâb Totmâ (Bidâya, xiv, 174). In 6 Safar 743/11 July 1342, he gave his inaugural lecture at the Sa'driyya madrassa, where he was to teach until his death (ibid., xiv, 202).

Several Muslim scholars of the Mamlûk period were among Ibn Kayyim’s pupils or were in varying degrees influenced by him: among them were the Shâfi’î traditionist and historian Ibn Kâhir (d. 777/1377; cf. Bidâya, xiv, 234-5), Zayn al-Dîn Ibn Radjab (d. 795/1397), the last great representative of mediæval Hanbalism, and Ibn Radjab al-
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few of his inspiration from Eastern poets such as al-Shafii al-Ra’di, ʿAbd al-Muhsin al-Šūrī or Mīrār al-Daylamī, and probably also from al-Buhṭurī and al-Šanawbarsī, in the case of the last two he does not admit it (cf. H. Pères, *Poēsie andalousose*, 36). He in his turn influenced a series of Andalusian poets, beginning with his nephew Ibn al-Zakki, with whom, together with Ibn ʿAlī ʿAntabi, he in his turn competed, upon an occasion described by al-Maḵkārī (Analectes, ii, 424). He has been described as the creator of the “School of Levante”. Garcia Gómez states that the *khafadja* style continued until the end of the kingdom of Granada.


IBN KHAFIF, ABū ʿABBĀS ʿALĀʾ MUḤAMMAD AL-ŠARĪʿAṬ, also called al-Shafīʿī al-Kafrī or al-Šaykh al-Šarīʿaʾ, famous mystic of Shirāz, died 371/982 in his native town, it is said at a very great age (Yāḵūt, s.v. Šarīʿaʾ). His works (26 titles preserved in the *Shād al-Šaʿr, 42-3*) are lost, with the exception of some sentences transmitted mainly by al-Sulami, Abū Nuʿaym and al-Kuṣayrī, from a biography written by his disciple, the Hallādī “philosopher” Abū l-Ḥasan al-Daylāmi and later re-written and translated into Persian by Ibn Djuñyād, the author of the *Shād al-Šaʿr* (St)get-y Ibn Khafīfī, ed. A. Schimmel, with two professions of faith). But this work is more reliable for information on the life of the master than on his teaching.

According to al-Hudūrī (1465/1603) however, Ibn Khafīfī was the founder of an independent school of mysticism (Kafīfī, GMS, xvii, 247; cf. *Taḏkhirat al-ašʿāyī*, ii, 135). He had a lasting influence on the Kazerūnī movement (*Vita Kazeruni*, ed. F. Meyer, 1901, 1945, 17), and he figured in the mystic genealogy of Suhravardīyya (Deport and Coppolani, *Confessions religieuses musulmanes*, 534). As a result, the name of Ibn Khafīfī found a place in the life of many later mystics, beginning with the less occult influence of Hallādī, thus penetrating deeply into the mystical life of Fāris until just before the Mongol invasion.

The question arises as to whether the historical personality of Ibn Khafīfī was such as to justify his filling such an important role. It is known for certain that he was Žāhirī in *fiqh*, an ʿAshʿārī in *kalam*, and an anti-Ṣālīmī in mystical theology (L. Massignon, *Essais*, 345). More simply, the life and the thought of this illustrious Shīrāzī can be said in principle to divide themselves into two successive periods. The first is dominated by the two basic aspects of his life. It seems probable to suppose his thought to have developed in harmony with these two broad phases of his life, leading him towards increasingly intellectualist theses (Djuñyādī and semi-Hallādī), than to attribute to him an eclecticism as vague as it was persistent. There are various indications to corroborate this hypothesis: Ibn Khafīfī used in turn two initiatory *insād*, the one purely Shīrāzī with the names of Djuñyād al-Hadhdhāʾ (Sīn, 149, 178, 202) and of Abū ʿAmr al-Iṣṭākhīrī (Sīn, 33, 35, 87, 152), the other artificially linked to al-Djuñyādī (L. Massignon, *Essais*, 129, rejected by the Kazerūnīs, *op. cit., 25*); Ibn Khafīfī retracted at the reading of a dissertation of al-Djuñyādī (*Aff*, ed. Vadez, 3), he hesitated between the school of al-Djuñyādī and the teaching of his first Baghdādī master Ruwaym, a Žāhirī mystic of Malāmātīyya tendencies who had close links with Abū ʿAmr al-Iṣṭākhīrī but was on rather bad terms with al-Djuñyādī (I. Goldziher, *Die Zdhiriten*, 179; al-Sulami, op. cit., 462; al-ʿAffī, Malāmātīyya, 60; Taʿrīḥ Baghdād, viii, 43; cf. Shaddārī-nāma, 95-6).

The mystic theology of Ibn Khafīfī, worked out from actual experience but rapidly codified at a later stage in a cult which was essentially devotional and in which the two basic aspects of his life. It seems to have been governed by the following propositions: (1) The necessity of poverty (*fāhr*) and the pre-eminence of this poverty over wealth (“poverty” is an imitation of the Prophet, it is also “to rid oneself of one’s attributes”, *Taḏkhirat al-awlīyāʾ*, 131; hence it is like a negative realization of *sawādīda*, “unification of the Divine names and attributes with verification in the heart”, Abū Nuʿaym, x, 386). (2) The “poor man” is not *npsoc fucto a sāfī, any more than the sāfī is himself a waḥī. (3) The impression of the “moment” (ghalaba) is not enough to constitute ecstasy (*waḥīd*), just as the latter is an insufficient basis for sanctity (*mīlāyā*). (4) Sanctity is much more a condition, and one not clearly defined, than a transitory and unstable “state” (*ḥlr*). Certainly, in the eyes of Ibn Khafīfī the “station” is preferable to the “state” in the same way that “sobriety” is of more worth than “drunkenness”. It is difficult to say whether Ibn Khafīfī gave anywhere in his works a valid definition of this “sanctity” which he considered to be the true end of “poverty”. It has been defined for him by his Hallādī disciples or pseudo-disciples on the basis of their conceptions of *mālgh and makhābah*. Ibn Khafīfī contented himself with an incomplete
synthesis. This fact helps to explain both the universal fame of the master of Shiraz and the almost total disappearance of his work.

The basic text remains the edition of the Strati Ibn Khafif by Dr A. Schimmel (Ankara 1955, with introd. and bibl.). This text, however, unfortunately does not supersede the notices by the two historians of Shiraz: Abu l-'Abbâb Zârûk (d. 734/1333; Shirâz-nâmâ, ed. Bahman Karimi) and Ibn Djinayd al-Shirazi. (d. 791/1388, Shadd al-Tasr). For Ibn Khafif’s ‘Hallajîdsyon’ there may be consulted L. Massignon, Aabhar al-Hallâjî, Paris 1957, 38 and 81, also Vie et œuvres de Râbîib Bâbî, in Studia Orientalia Ioannis Pedersen ..., Paris 1955.

The life and doctrine of Ibn Khafif are part of a group of wider questions which have not yet sufficiently answered. These are: (1) The opposition between the Djinayidism of Bagdad and the practical mysticism of Persia and Khurâsân in the 3rd/9th century (the memory of Abû Yazid al-Bîjîmî, Malâtâmisyya, the insistence on ‘poverty’ and ‘sincerity”, fawwaa; for a summary of their doctrine, see Abû Nu’aym, x, 387). (2) This opposition was not unconnected with the growing Ahšârîism and Zâhirism: at the time of Ibn Khafif these were the two militant and opposing wings of Shafi’ism, particularly that of İrâq, with which the school of al-Djinayd finally became integrated. (3) It is only when these first two questions have been answered that Ibn Khafif’s rather ambiguous attitude to Hallâjism will be better understood, and with it perhaps the internal evolution of this doctrine, at least in Fârs.

Bibliography: in the text. (J. C. Vadet)

IBN KHAFIF [see Muḥammad b. Khafif].

IBN KHÂKÂN, name of several secretaries and viziers in the Hamdanid period.

(1) Ya’âvî b. Khâkân, secretary of Khurâsân origin, was in the service of al-Hasan b. S. (q.v.) under the caliphate of Ma’mûn and became, under al-Mutawakkil, secretary to the office for land-taxes, and then director of the qâ'idîm-court, when his son ‘Ubâyîd Allâh became vizier.

(2) Ubâyîd Allâh b. Ya’âvî was the first member of the family to become vizier. Patronized by the caliph al-Mutawakkil, who had appointed him as his private secretary, he succeeded in about 256/871 in gaining appointment to the office of vizier, which he held for some years and obtained important rights, notably those permitting him to nominate the main government officials and thus to eliminate any possible rivals. He was tutor to one of the princes; at the end of al-Mutawakkil’s reign he exercised a considerable influence and seems to have encouraged the caliph in his anti-‘Âlid policy. Having withdrawn from political life after the assassination of al-Mutawakkil, he was exiled to Bârka in 248/862, and did not return to Bagdad until 253/867. The accession of the caliph al-Mutamid led to his being appointed once again to the office of vizier, which he occupied from 256/870 until his death in 265/877.

(3) Muḥammad b. Ubâyîd Allâh, Abû ‘Ali, known as al-Khâkânî, became vizier in the reign of al-Mukhtar in Dhû ‘l-Hijjâd 299/July 912 and remained in office until Muharram 301/August 913. He succeeded Ibn al-Furat, whose officials he dismissed, and attempted to replenish the treasury by imposing severe fines on these discredited officials. He also took measures against the Shi’i elements in the population of Bagdad and attempted to satisfy the aims of the Muslim scholars, but his administration did not please the caliph’s entourage. After his dismissal, he was imprisoned once by ‘Ali b. ‘Isâ and a second time by Ibn al-Furat, who had returned to power in 304/917. He died in 312/924.

(4) ‘Abd Allâh b. Muḥammad, Abû l-Kâsim, son of the above, had been secretary during his father’s vizierate and succeeded Ibn al-Furat in Rabi’ II 312/June 924, but encountered serious internal difficulties with which he was incapable of dealing, so that he was dismissed in Râdî 313/November 925 on the insistence of the amîr Muḥîṣ; after having been imprisoned and paying a fine, he died in 314/926.

Bibliography: D. Sourdel, Vissiras, index; G. Lecomte, Ibn Qutayba, index; Abû Ya’âlî, Tabâhât al-Hamâdânî, i, 204. (D. Sourdei)

IBN KHALAWAYH, ‘Abû ‘Abd Allâh al-Hamâdânî b. Aḥmad (but Muḥammad in Shirwâyw’s History of Hamadân, see Kifî, İnâbâ, i, 325, 12). The exact year of his birth is not known but it must have been in the ninth decade of the 3rd century A.H., since he went in 314/926, while still young, to study in Bagdad, where he found eminent teachers. Among his teachers of the Kûrân was the head of the Kurân readers of Bagdad, Ibn Mudjdîd (d. 324/936) and he studied grammar and lexicography not only with the representatives of the Kufân school Ibn al-Anbârî (q.v.) and Abû ’Umar al-Zâhidî al-Mutarrîz Qâlâm Thalîb (d. 345/956), but also with the famous Baṣrân Ibn Durayd (q.v.) and the latter’s pupil al-Sîrâfî (q.v.), and also with Niftawayh, who was already a representative of the mixed school (Ḫalâta l-madhabbâyan, Frihîr, 81, bottom; in Brockelmann, S I, 184 listed under the Kûfân; d. 329/942). Consequently he was himself an eclectic. There is named as one of his teachers ‘Abd Allâh al-‘Aţţâr (Ṭabkât Bagdad, iii, 310 f.; Dhahabi, Tabâhirt al-huffâs, Râbîh, no. 40, where Ahmad is incorrectly given instead of Makhlîd; d. 331/942-3). Subâlî lists him among the Şâfi’îs (Tabâhât, ii, 212 f.); according to Ibn Ḥaḍîr, however, he was an İmâmî, who pretended to be a Sunnî only in the presence of Sayy al-Dawla (Lisân al-Mizân, Haydarâbâd 1360, ii, 167; cf. a deed in a postscript to Ibn Khâlawayh, i, 250). From Bagdad he went to Syria, and in Aleppo was admitted to the court of the Hamdânî Sayy al-Dawla (q.v.), who appointed him tutor to one of his sons. After Sayy al-Dawla’s death he remained in the service of the Hamdânîs. Kifî (İnâbâ, i, 326, lines 5 ff.) records from the Kitâb al-Ursâdîya by Muslim b. Muḥammad al-Lahdîjî that Ibn Khâlawayh visited the Yemen, and Ibn al-Djazari (Tabâhât al-kurra, ii, 237, bottom) also mentions the precise place, Dîmâr. He died in 370/980-1 in Aleppo.

Already during his lifetime Ibn Khâlawayh was famous. His reputation as an expert in all branches of ‘ilm and adâb brought to him many pupils from far and near. The sources mention explicitly the İrâkî fâsh and man of letters al-Mu’âmmâ b. Zâkiyya (d. 360/971). The reader of the Kurân Ibn Ghalbân (a native of Aleppo, d. 386/999) and al-Hasan b. Sulaymân al-Antâkî (d. 399/1008-9) as well as the traditionalist Ibn ‘Adî, known also as Ibn al-Kâṭîn (Brockelmann, i, 167; d. 360/971). He is reputed also to have been a poet of ability, Tha’âlîbî (Yatima, Damascus 1304, i, 76 f.) and Yîkût (Irshâd, iv, 6) providing a few brief specimens of his work. The disputation which he is reported to have had with al-Mutanabbi (q.v.) in the presence of Sayf
al-Dawla are said to have led to blows (Ibn Khallikan in his biography of ... the sole aim of the young Ibn Khaldun was to leave Tunis for Fez, then the most brilliant capital of the Muslim West.

This deals, in numerous but mainly short chapters, with subjects of Arabic morphology and lexicography. Its name Laysa comes from a stereotyped formula which begins almost every chapter: laysa fi balam al-arab ... illa ... The British Museum manuscript was published by H. Delaporte in Berlin, x (1893-4), 235-105, A.J.S.I., xiv (1898), 81-93, xv (1898-9), 32-41, 215-23, xviii (1901), 35-51; it contains 111 abwab and breaks off in the 111th bab. The text printed by Shinkiti, Cairo 1327 (76 pp.), following an unspecified addition of 77 further abwab.

According to Suyuti, Muzhir, nawa' 40 at the beginning, the Kitab Laysa consisted of three substantial volumes, and Ibn Khallikan refers to it as kitab habib; the existing printed text can therefore be only a part of the whole work. Of the fifty or so quotations contained in the Muzhir about a third do not appear in the Cairo printed edition. (2) Kitab I'tibab al-Khalidin Sura min al-Kur'an al-karim (printed with istigdala, basmala, suras i and 86-114), printed Cairo 1300/1941. (3) Kitab al-Badi' fi 'l-khadi', a handbook of Kur'an readings, canonical (the "Seven" and Ya'qub al-Hadrani, the ninth of the "Ten" readers) and non-canonical, see A. I. Arberry, Ignace Goldziher memorial volume, i, Budapest 1948, 183-90. (4) Muhktasar thawabah al-Kur'an min kitab al-Badi' li-imn Khaldun, an extract from no. 3, not made by the author himself, and containing only the non-canonical readings, ed. G. Bergstrasser, Cairo 1934 (Ibn Haldawi's Sammlung nichthanothischer Koranlesarten = Bibliotheca Islamica 7; with foreword by A. Jeffery); on this see A. Jeffery, marginalia to Bergstrasser's edition of Ibn Haldawi, Islamica Schlussheft = Abh. KM, xxiii/6, Leipzig 1938, 130-5. (5) Kitab al-Khadi', MS Istanbul Murad Molla 1985, see H. Ritter, in Isl., xvi (1928), 249 (it is possible that this is identical with the Hududis fi kher'di al-amma listed from information by P. Kraus in Brockelmann, S I, 94, 11 lines from bottom, I, 130, no. 10). (6) Shaik Makāfir Ibn Durayd, for meditation and study, ed. A. Jeffery, Cairo 1922, 331-43. (8) His recension of the Diwan of Abu Firas with introduction and commentary, ed. Sāmī Dāhmān, 3 vols., Beirut 1944. On his transmission of works by other authors, see Brockelmann, S I, 190.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, I, 130, S I, 190; also Khtīf, Inshā adhād 'āli anāb al-nabāh, Cairo 1360/1950, i, 324-7 (with further information at 324 ***): Ibn al-Dzārī, Ghitat al-nihdāyā fi tāhab khalid, i = Bibliotheca Islamica 8a, Cairo 1933, nos. 1083 and 1101 (p. 240); Ibn Ḥajlar, Līsān al-Miṣrī, Haydarābd 1330, ii, 267; see also H. Denoncourt's preface to his edition of the Kitab Laysa. [From a book by R. 'Abd al-Tawwāb, Lāh-n al-cāmūna wa 'l-tawwuzzul-lugāt, Cairo 1926, 184 f. (published after this article was in type) it appears that the K. Laysa, in its fragmentary form, has now been published again, by A. 'Abd al-Qhādir 'Attur, Cairo 1957; and furthermore that there is in Istanbul a MS (Şehit Ali Pasa 2143), a fragment of five ġamā' in 171 fol., which is six times as long as the section printed and of entirely different content.] (A. SPITALER)

IBN KHALDUN, WALT AL-DIN 'ABD AL-RAHMĀN

b. MUHAMMAD b. MUHAMMAD b. ABD BAKR MUHAMMAD b. AL-ḤASAN (732-84/1332-82), one of the strongest personalities of Arabo-Muslim culture in the period of its decline. He is generally regarded as a historian, sociologist and philosopher. Thus his life and work have already formed the subject of innumerable studies and given rise to the most varied and even the most contradictory interpretations.

1. Life. Ibn Khaldun's life may be divided into three parts, the first of which (20 years) was occupied by his childhood and education, the second (23 years) by the continuation of his studies and by political adventures, and the third (31 years) by his life as a scholar, teacher and magistrate. The first two periods were spent in the Muslim West and the third was divided between the Maghrib and Egypt.

At Tunis. Ibn Khaldun was born in Tunis, on 1 Ramaḍān 732/27 May 1332, in an Arab family which came originally from the Ḥaḍramawt and had been settled at Seville since the beginning of the Muslim conquest (Ibn Hazm, Dāmashara, ed. Lévi-Provençal, 430), playing there an important political role. The family then left Seville for Ceuta immediately before the Reconquista. From there they went to Ifrikiya and settled in Tunis during the reign of the Ḥafsīd Abū Zakariyyā (625-47/1228-49). Ibn Khaldun's great-grandfather, Abū Bākrr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, who wrote a treatise on Adab al-ḥālīb (see E. Lo renovated, in Arabica, ii (1925), 280-8), was put in charge of the finances during the reign of Abū Isḥāk (678-81/1279-83). The usurper Ibn Abī 'Umāra (681-2/1283-4) put an end to his career and to his life, having him strangled after confiscating his possessions and subjecting him to torture. His son, Muḥammad, also occupied various official positions, both at Bougie and Tunis, and died in 737/1337, after renouncing political life and the fall of Ibn al-Liblyān (717-71/1317-27). The latter's son, the father of our Ibn Khaldun, wisely avoided politics, leading the life of a fābih and man of letters (Ta'rīf, 10-15).

He was thus able to ensure that his son 'Abd al-Rahmān received a very thorough education. The latter also attended courses given by the most famous teachers of Tunis, to whom he devotion lengthly sections in his autobiography (Ta'rīf). He thus received a thorough grounding in the Arabic language and of fikr. The Marinid invasion (748-50/1347-9) resulted in the arrival in Tunis, in the sultan Abu 'l-Ḥasan, of a large number of theological and literary scholars. This widened the horizons of the young Ibn Khaldun, who was thus enabled, particularly under the supervision of al-Abīl, to learn about the philosophy and the main problems of Arabo-Muslim thought. He was however to undergo much suffering. The Marinid occupation ended in disorder and bloodshed, and in addition the terrible Black Death which ravaged the world in the middle of the century, coming from the East, claimed many victims in the country, among them Ibn Khaldun's parents. He was at this time 17 years of age and was cured of his life long memory of the horror of this event, which is reflected in many passages in his Ta'rīf and his Muhaddima. This was the first traumatic experience of his life, which was later to have an undoubtedly influence on the direction of his thought. In addition, the departure of the Marinid scholars left a great intellectual vacuum at Tunis, and it seems that at this time the sole aim of the young Ibn Khaldun was to leave Tunis for Fez, then the most brilliant capital of the Muslim West.
He states (Ta’rīf, 55) that he had a great thirst for learning. His elder brother, Muḥammad, dissuaded him from taking a post, but Ibn Khaldūn preferred not to take full advantage of the favours on offer. At the court of Fez. He was not yet 20 when, towards the end of 75/1350, the powerful chamberlain Ibn Tafrāğīn appointed him to the office of writer of the al-a‘āma (the ruler’s official signature) on behalf of the sultan Abū Iṣākh. He accepted, without, it seems (Ta’rīf, 562), the intention of remaining long in the post. The invasion of Ifriqiya by the amīr of Constantine, Abū Yazīd (753/1352), provided him with the desired opportunity. Undoubtedly, cover of the defeat, he parted company with his master, took refuge for a time at Ebba, then reached Tebessa, then Gafsa, before arriving at Biskra, where he spent the winter with his friends the Banū Muzni. Thus the second period of his life, which was both scholarly and adventurous, began with one of those changes of direction which were to recur on later occasions and which have been severely criticized by the majority of those who have made a study of his life and work. But it was in fact probably not a bad thing: intuitively, Ibn Khaldūn was refusing to be engulfed in an Ifriqiya which was then in the process of disintegration and whose court furthermore was far from providing an example of loyalty and good behaviour.

Meanwhile, the Marinid Abū ʿl-Ḥasan, after an unfortunate adventure, had been killed (755/1355), leaving the western territories of the Maghrib to his son Abū ʿl-Ḥānin, who in any case had not waited for his death before supplanting him in Fez. Once again the Marinid hegemony seemed to be consolidating itself. Abū ʿl-Ḥānin seized Tiemcen (753/1352) and reduced Bougie again to submission. From Biskra, Ibn Khaldūn offered him his services. On his journey he met the Marinid chamberlain Ibn Abī ʿAmr. Abī ʿAmr, appointed governor of Bougie, who invited him to his new residence, where he lived for some time (until the end of the winter of 754/1353-4), before being summoned to the court at Fez. He was officially part of the sultan’s literary circle (maḏḥilsuh al-simī) and soon afterwards also formed part of his secretariat (kībūbatuh), though without much enthusiasm it seems, for such a post was not in the nature of the office and that it was beneath their dignity. This remark reveals a far-reaching ambition in a young man of barely 23 years. Somewhat disappointed, he therefore continued to occupy himself mainly with his studies. “I devoted myself”, he writes (Ta’rīf, 59), “to reflection and to study, and to sitting at the feet of the great teachers, those of the Maghrib as well as those of Spain who were residing temporarily in Fez, and I benefited greatly from their teaching”. In brief, his desire for learning still took precedence over his political interests. Nevertheless, it may be that, taking advantage of the sultan’s illness, he took part in a plot aiming to liberate the former amīr of Bougie, Abū ʿAbd Allāh, and to re-install him in his former kingdom. He himself denies this and refers to intrigues, jealousy and malice (Ta’rīf, 67); he was certainly thrown into prison however, remaining there for two years (758-755/1357-8) until the death of Abū ʿl-Ḥānin. This was followed by disturbances, by clashes between the claimants to the throne, and by treachery and bloodshed. Ibn Khaldūn, now set free, took part in all this according to the custom of the time. Changes of loyalty were common and he was no exception and found himself appointed, in Shabān 760/July 1359, to the office of Secretary of the Chancellery (kībūbat al-sirr wa l-tarsīl) for the new sultan, Abū Sālim. In order the better to perform his rôle and consolidate his position, he even made the effort of becoming court-poet (al-khāṣṣī bi l-tāḥīrī, Ta’rīf, 70), and he quotes long extracts from his work as a panegyrist. But this was all wasted effort, since his fortune declined. Two years later he left the chancellery for a judicial post, the maṣālim. Then further disturbances resulted in the accession of a new sultan. Ibn Khaldūn changed his allegiance in time, and considered that he was unjustly deprived of any fruits of the victory. He did not hide his ill-disposition, and after many difficulties he obtained permission to withdraw to Granada (autumn 764/1362).

At the court of Granada. In Ramadan 760/August 1359, a palace revolt had driven Muḥammad b. al-ʿĀmmar from the throne, so that, in Muḥarram 761/December 1359, he had taken refuge in Fez with his famous vizier Ibn al-Khāṭib. There was formed at this time, between the latter and the young Ibn Khaldūn, a real friendship which, apart from inevitable spells of unpleasantness, was to withstand the test of time. In Dūmādā II 763/April 1362, Muḥammad b. al-ʿĀmmar regained his throne and Ibn al-Khāṭib his former rank. The friendship established at Fez ensured that Ibn Khaldūn, forced in his turn to flee to the other side of the Mediter- ranean, was received in Granada with the highest honours. At the end of 765/1365, he was even sent to Seville, charged with a delicate peace mission to Pedro the Cruel. This contact with the Christian world, then in the midst of a period of change, had an important influence on him. On his return, the Nasrid amīr showered favours on him (Ta’rīf, 85). Ibn Khaldūn then sent for his wife and children to come to Constantine. But Ibn al-Khāṭib felt some resentment at his part and the young friend and Ibn Khaldūn preferred not to take full advantage of his favoured position (spring 766/1365).

At the court of Bougie. It is true that at this time there arose a unique opportunity for him to satisfy his ambition. His friend, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad, with whom he had already been in a conspiracy at Fez, had in fact regained his kingdom of Bougie, and offered him the office of kāfīrī (chamberlain). But this was not at the time the most important office in the state, and appointed to the vizierate his younger brother Yahyā [see next article]. Ibn Khaldūn held at the same time posts as teacher of fiqh and as preacher. But this success was short-lived. In the following year, the amīr of Constantine, Abū ʿl-ʿAbbās, took the offensive and inflicted a crushing defeat on his cousin Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad, who was killed in the battle. Ibn Khaldūn, refusing suggestions that he should continue the struggle in support of one of the younger sons of the dead ruler, handed over the town to the conqueror (Shābān 767/May 1366) and himself entered his service. This was not to be for long, however. Ibn Khaldūn saw which way the wind was blowing: he resigned in time, and took refuge at first with the Dawawīda Arabs, then with his friends the Banū Muzni at Biskra, whereas his brother Yahyā was arrested. To the offer by the sultan Abū Hammūn, in a letter of 17 Raddāb 769/8 March 1368 (Ta’rīf, 102-3) of the office of kāfīrī at Tiemcen, he replied with a courteous refusal, sending him instead his brother Yahyā, who had in the meantime been set free. He explains his motives thus: “I was in fact cured of the temptation of office (ghnūyat al-mu‘ārelated scholarly matters. I therefore ceased to involve myself in the
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affairs of kings and devoted all my energies to study "(al-nahāʾ al-gharīb) and teaching" (Taʾrif, 103).

Thus at Ḑīskra he attempted to lead the life of a man of letters. He must have written much, much ornamented by rhetorical flourishes, with his friend Ibn al-Khāṭīb (Taʾrif, 103-30). However he could not resist intrigue. He gave his support, against Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās, to the alliance between the Ḥaṣṣād of Tunis and the ʿAbd al-Wādī Abū Ḥammū of Tlemcen. He next took it upon himself to raise support for the Marinid Abū Fāris. He was constantly on the move, attempting to form from the small tribal units a force capable of supporting a really great power. But on each occasion events upset his calculations. The claimants were simply too numerous, and this resulted in a new series of changes of front which were basically perhaps only his unsuccessful attempts to back the winner. But in the Muslim West of the 8th/14th century no winner existed. Furthermore his friends the Banū Mūamir were beginning to object to the suspicious activities of their guest. Ibn Khaldūn tried once again to escape the lure of politics. He took refuge in the rībāt of Abū Madyan, "preferring" he writes, "to live in retirement and devote myself exclusively to learning, if only I might be left in peace" (Taʾrif, 134). He was not left in peace, nor was he of a temperament to remain so for long. Thus, after some new setbacks in the central Maghrib, he met with failure in Fez (774/1372). Welcomed at first, he was later arrested, then released, and finally permitted to withdraw to Muslim Spain (spring 776/1375), where he wished "to settle permanently, withdraw from the world, and devote my life to learning (ḥāṣa al-bāḥr wa-l-ʾinsāb wa-l-ʾuṣūf al-ḥāsaṭ al-ʾālim)" (Taʾrif, 228). Yet again he was disappointed. He had become a political personality with a reputation which could not fail to arouse mistrust. He was henceforward condemned to offer his services for hire, and to be regarded with mixed feelings never entirely free from suspicion, whereas apparently his only ambition now was to be left in peace to work out the conclusions to be drawn from his tumultuous experience and to put his ideas in order.

At the castle of Ibn Salāmā. Practically excludes him from the political scene, his continued studious occupation allowed him to lead a quiet life. He was once again appointed to the office of Malik chief (245). He was welcomed at the head of the khākhākh of Baybars, the most important Sūfī convent in Egypt. Then, after fourteen years devoted exclusively to teaching, he was once again appointed to the office of khādi (15 Ramaḍān 802/21 May 1399). He was again dismissed (Muharram 803/August-September 1400), and some months later (Rabiʿ II 803/November-December 1400) he was obliged to accompany al-Nāṣir on his expedition to relieve Damascus, which was being threatened by Timūr-lang, already master of Aleppo. Left in the besieged town—and abandoned without warning by al-Nāṣir, who suspected that a plot was being hatched in Cairo during his absence—he played a certain part in the surrender of the town under a false promise of amān, and has provided a detailed account of his interviews with the Mongol leader (Taʾrif, 356-83). He may in fact have thought that he saved Timūr-lang the man of the century who possessed enough
his Mukaddima and his Tarif, but he wrote other works which have not all survived.

In about 1403, Ibn Khaldun was attemptcd, under the influence of al-Abili, to make a resume of the theolclico-philosophical "summa" of al-Razi entitled Kitab Muhasal afbar al-mutabaddimin wa 'I-muta'-

"asabiyya to re-unite the Muslim world and to give

akhhiriin min al-ulama' wa 'I-bukama' wa 'I-muta-

new direction to history (Ta'rif, 372, 382). Finally,

kallimin (Cairo 1905), an outline which is a con-

after writing for Timurlang a description of the

clearly—to be in its death-throes. His adventures

produce a climate of co-operation

Maghrib and having witnessed the horrors of the

during this period, which is between 752-65/1351-64, the date at which Ibn al-Khatib's ihdta was finished (to which we owe the following information), he wrote five works:

produce in prose and in verse, from the letters sent to him by

friends, and preserved in particular long passages, in

Ibn Khaldun's life has been judged variously, and

in general rather severely. There is certainly no doubt

that he behaved in a detached, self-interested,

haughty, ambitious and equivocal manner. He

himself does not attempt to hide this, and openly
describes in his Tarif his successive changes of

allegiance. He has been accused of fickleness and a

lack of patriotism. But for such judgements to be

strictly applicable presupposes the existence of the

idea of "allegiance" to a country, which was not the case.
The very concept scarcely existed and was not to
appear in a new kind of thinking until it was affected by

contact with Europe. The only treason was apostasy,
nor was loyalty understood except in the context of

relations between one man and another, and examples

of felony were provided daily by those of the

highest rank. Ibn Khaldun was, moreover, readily

pardoned by those who wished to use his services—

he was in turn the enemy and the servant, now of one

and now of another, in the same way that men were

thought to have been quickly forgotten even during the

author's lifetime. Ibn Khaldun does not even mention

them in his Ta'rif, and his Egyptian biographers do

not appear to have heard of them.

They seem moreover to have been of a traditional

theologico-philosophical type, including the arith-
metic which a fakih had to know. Nothing up to this
time indicated that Ibn Khaldun would go down to

posterity as the brilliant founder of the science of

history and of other disciplines. The flowering of his
genius took place at the castle of Ibn Salama, as the

result of the fusion of the traditional disciplines in

which he had been educated with the rich harvest of

political experience which, through a bitter series

of failures and impasses, had made him aware of the

meaning and deep significance ('abar) of history.

They then began, in the calm of the castle of Ibn

Salama, the work of analysing the passionate and
disturbing events which certainly has his

grandeurs but of which he had experienced mainly

the miseries. Ibn Khaldun really changed as a thinker:

the pedestrian fakih which he might after all have

been has become some of the most productive of the modern

humanities. The first draft of his Introduction

(Mukaddima)—which contains the essence of his

thought—to his universal history (Kitab al-'abar),

as well as large sections of this history itself, were

written between 776/1375 and 780/1379 during his

retirement. He later continued without ceasing,

until the end of his life, to re-write this basic work,

and especially the Mukaddima. The Ta'rif, an

autobiography which stops in Dhu 'l-Ka\'da 807/May

1405 (ed. al-Tanji, Cairo 1951), and the Shifa' al-
sad\'i, a treatise on mysticism written towards the end

of his life (ed. al-Tanji, Istanbul 1958; and ed.

I. A. Khalife, Beirut 1959), are minor works compared

with his masterpiece, and their main interest is in the

light they throw on it. It should be mentioned that

the problem of the authenticity of the Shifa' al-sadi,

so important for the history of Ibn Khaldun's

thought, has not yet been definitely solved.

The Ottoman historian Na'im (q.v.) (d. 1728/1716)

praises Ibn Khaldun in the introduction to his work
and gives a summary of his ideas. (The first translation into Turkish, of part of the Mukaddima, was made by Necip Süleyman al-Islam Pirî and Mehmed Efendi in 1143/1730 (see L. A. S. V. Ibn Khaldun, col. 740b); the most recent, complete translation is by Zakir Kadir Ugan, 2 vols., Istanbul 1954.) Yet it was in Europe that Ibn Khaldun was discovered and the importance of his Mukaddima realized: by d’Herbelot (Bibliothèque Orientale, 1697), by Silvestre d’Herbelot (Bibliotheque Orientale, 1697), by Silvestre de Sacy (Chezomatique arabe, 1806), by von Hammer-Purgstall (Über den Verfall des Islam ... , 1812) and especially by Quatremère, who, in 1806, produced the first complete edition of the Mukaddima—another edition of it was published in the same year in Cairo by Naṣr al-Hūrīnī, based on another manuscript containing in particular the dedication to the sultan Abū Fāris of Fez (296-9/1394-5) and by de Slane, who, some years afterwards, produced the first French translation of it (Les Prologèmes, Paris 1863-6). Since then there has been a continual series of editions and studies on it, in both the East and the West, a proof of the increasing interest in Ibn Khaldūn’s thought, and there have recently been so many of them that bibliographical works on them (by H. Pérès and W. J. Fischel) became necessary. The most recent translation, by F. Rosenthal (into English, 3 vols. New York-London 1958), has the advantage of having been made from the Istanbul manuscript (Alif Efendi 1936), which contains a note in Ibn Khaldun’s writing stating that it had been “scientifically revised” by the author. There should also be mentioned the Portuguese translation by Khoury, in 3 vols., São Paulo 1956-60; a French translation by V. Monteil is being published.

The ‘Ibar, the Universal History itself, naturally aroused less interest. The first to produce an edition and translation of extensive passages from the ‘Ibar was Noël Desvignes, under the title Histoire de l’Afrique sous la dynastie des Aghlabites et de la Sisie sous la domination musulmane, Paris 1841. Another partial translation was published some years later by de Slane under the title Histoire des Berbères et des dynasties musulmanes de l’Afrique Septentrionale (4 vols., Algiers 1852-6), followed by an edition of the passages translated (2 vols., Algiers 1862). Next appeared the complete主力 edition (7 vols., 1868), and since then there have followed also some partial translations. There has not yet appeared, however, a truly critical edition of either the Mukaddima or the ‘Ibar. The latest edition, that of Beirut (1956-9)—from which our references are taken—is a commercial one, which is however provided with useful indexes.

The criticism generally made of the ‘Ibar is that it did not fulfil the promises made in the Mukaddima. This is obvious, but it could not have been otherwise. No one man could write alone a universal history according to the demands of the Mukaddima. But it has more serious shortcomings: Ibn Khaldun at times demonstrates a surprising lack of learning, for example, concerning the Almohads and their doctrine. In addition, precise dates are rarely given; the chronological details throughout the work are too often contradictory, and one is obliged to prefer on many occasions those provided in other more humble and much more succinct works’ (R. Brunschwig, Hafṣidas, ii, 392). Nevertheless, the Kitāb al-‘Ibar, through its intelligent arrangement of facts and the detail and scope of the account, remains, in the opinion of the specialist who has made most use of it, an incomparable tool, particularly “for the two centuries nearest to our author, the 13th and the 14th” (R. Brunschwig, op. cit., ii, 393). It should also be added that this work, often disappointing on the history of the East, is generally valuable especially for the Muslim West, and in particular for the Berbers.

But Ibn Khaldun’s main work, of universal value, is the Mukaddima. In the author’s intention, and as the title indicates, it is an Introduction to the historian’s craft. Thus it is presented as an encyclopaedic synthesis of the methodological and cultural knowledge necessary to enable the historian to produce a truly scientific work. Initially, in fact, Ibn Khaldun was preoccupied with epistemology. Then gradually, meditating on the method and the matter of history, he was led, in full consciousness of what he was doing, to create what he refers to as his “new science” (‘ilm mustaḥab al-nuṣūh, 63), which itself turned out to contain more or less implicitly the starting points of several avenues of research leading to the philosophy of history, sociology, economics and yet other disciplines.

In his preface to the Introduction proper (Mukaddimat al-Mukaddima, 1-68), Ibn Khaldun begins by defining history—which he expands to include the study of the whole of the human past, including its social, economic and cultural aspects—defining its interest, denouncing the lack of curiosity and of method in his predecessors, and setting out the rules of good and sound criticism. This criticism is based essentially, apart from the examination of evidence, on the criterion of conformity with reality (ānān al-muḥābaha, 61-2), that is of the probability of the facts reported and their conformity to the nature of things, which is the same as the current of history and of its evolution. Hence the necessity of bringing to light the laws which determine the direction of this current. The scientific capability of throwing light on this phenomenon is, he says, that of ‘umrān, “a science which may be described as independent (‘ilm mustaḥbil bi-nafsh), which is defined by its object: human civilization (al-‘umrān al-baṣārī) and social facts as a whole” (62).

All that follows, that is the main part of the Mukaddima itself, is only the detailed exposition of this new and independent science which the author developed and which he develops in his argument, contrary to some opinions, according to a strict plan, the broad lines of which he states and clearly explains (68) before beginning his exposition. This exposition is divided into six long chapters which in turn are subdivided into many paragraphs of varying lengths and often mathematically arranged. Chapter 1: a general treatise on human society. In it Ibn Khaldun makes an outline study of the influence of environment on human nature, an ethnological and an anthropological study. Chapter 2: on the societies of rural and, generally speaking, fairly primitive, civilization (‘umrān badwai). Chapter 3: on the different forms of government, on states and institutions. Chapter 4: on the societies of urban civilization (‘umrān ḥadari), that of the most developed and sophisticated forms of civilization. Chapter 5: on industries and economic affairs in general. Chapter 6: on scholarship, literature and cultural matters in general.

This plan clearly shows that Ibn Khaldun in his Mukaddima was inclined to concentrate on social phenomena in general. The central point around which his observations are built and to which his researches are directed is the study of the aetiology of decline, that is to say the symptoms and the nature of the ills from which civilizations die. Hence
the Mukaddima is very closely linked with the political experiences of its author, who had been in fact very vividly aware that he was witnessing a tremendous change in the course of history, which is why he thought it necessary to write a summary of the past of humanity and to draw lessons (’ibar) from it. He remarks that at certain exceptional moments in history the upheavals are such that one has the impression of being present at “a new creation (ha’innahu khalq djadd)” at an actual renaissance (majdi ’aswabdah), and at (the emergence of) a new world (sir ‘ilm muhaddath). It is so at present (li-hddha ’l-had). Thus the need is felt for someone to make a record of the situation of humanity and of the world (53). This “new world”, as Ibn Khaldûn knew (866), was coming to birth in other lands; he also realized that the civilization to which he belonged was nearing its end. Although unable to avert the catastrophe, he was anxious at least to understand what was taking place, and therefore felt it necessary to analyse the processes of history.

His main tool in this work of analysis is observation. Fairly recently there has been stressed the realistic aspect of his thought. Ibn Khaldûn, who has a thorough knowledge of the sources on logic and makes use of it, particular of induction, greatly mistrusts speculative reasoning. He admits that reasoning is a tool, he only within, the framework of its natural limits, which are those of the investigation and the interpretation of what is real. He was much concerned about the problem of knowledge and it led him finally, after a radical criticism, to a refutation of philosophy. “In casting doubts on the adequacy of universal rationality and of individual reality, Ibn Khaldûn at the same time casts doubts on the whole structure of speculative philosophy as it then existed” (N. Nassar, La pensée réaliste d’Ibn Khaldûn, 66). Having thus calmly dismissed Arabo-Muslim philosophy, he chose, in order to explore reality and arrive at its meaning, a type of empiricism which has no hesitation in “having recourse to the categories of rational explanation which derive from philosophy”. In short, Ibn Khaldûn rejects the traditional speculation of the philosophers which gets bogged down in fruitless argument and controversy, only to replace it by another type of speculation, the steps of which are more certain and the results more fruitful since it is directly related to concrete facts.

This new positive speculation which he suggests and of which he provides an example in the Mukaddima is operated through a dialectical process which has been referred to in several studies (see in particular the recent works of Y. Lacoste and N. Nassar). He could not in fact penetrate to the heart of reality, describe the struggles and conflicts, the tensions and the successive failures of states and civilizations produced by their internal dissensions without encountering, and calling attention to, the process of dialectic, especially since he had encountered logic in his earlier years and since the ideas of contradiction, anathesis, opposition, the complementariness of opposites, of ambiguity, of complexity and of confusion had long been familiar to the Muslim thinking in which he had been educated. They are thus often evoked as operative concepts permitting understanding and explanation. In surmounting the contradictions dialectically, and in attempting to explain them and hence to resolve them, Ibn Khaldûn’s view is that of the dialectic development of the destiny of man, and at a system of history which is retrospectively intelligible, rational and necessary. His famous cyclic schema of historical interpretation, which is itself not particularly original, must be included, in order for its true meaning to be seen, in this general view.

The wealth of the ideas provided in the Mukaddima has enabled several specialists to find in it the early beginnings of a number of disciplines which have become independent sciences only very recently. There is of course no argument about Ibn Khaldûn’s “contribution to sociology as a historian. Y. Lacoste writes: “If Theydides is the inventor of history, Ibn Khaldûn introduces history as a science”. But he has been regarded also as a philosopher, and it is surprising in particular to discover in his Mukaddima a very elaborate system of sociology. His “new science”, his ‘im al-umrân, the discovery of which dazzled even himself, is basically, strictly speaking, nothing but a system of sociology,—conceived it is true as an auxiliary science to history. He considers that the basic causes of historical evolution are in fact to be sought in the economic and social structures. He therefore set himself to analyse them, elaborating as he did so a certain number of new operative concepts, the most pregnant of which is incontestably that of ‘asabîyya [q.v.]. It should be mentioned that this concept of ‘asabîyya, and that of ‘umrân, have often been interpreted, particularly in recent years, in the spirit of dialectical materialism. But, in spite of the undoubted similarities, it would be difficult to regard Ibn Khaldûn as a forerunner of materialism. Moreover the explanation he gives is not exclusively a socio-economic one but also psychological. “The Prolegomena do not contain only a general sociology but also a very detailed and subtle social psychology which may be divided into political psychology, economic psychology, ethical psychology and general psychology. The intermingled and closely linked elements of this social psychology and this general sociology form a whole complex which it is difficult to disentangle” (N. Nassar, op. cit., 178).

There have been identified also, in this complex, economic doctrines sufficiently detailed to justify a study devoted to them, and a philosophy of history to which M. Mahdi has devoted an important work. It also provides ethnographic, anthropological and demographic information of real value.

Thus the atypical figure of Ibn Khaldûn in Arabo-Muslim culture has been unanimously considered, since his discovery in Europe, as that of an authentic genius, “un penseur génial et aberrant” (Brunschvig, op. cit., ii, 391), whose Mukaddima represents “one of the sources of the sociological thought of the 19th and 20th”. Certainly a “solitary genius”, he does not belong to any definite current of Arabo-Muslim
thought, since his works are in fact the product of a multitude of agonizing enquiries. His thinking represents a radical change, which unfortunately remained as unproductive as his political misadventures. "Just as he had no forerunners among Arabic writers, so he had no successors or emulators in this idiom until the contemporary period. Although he had a certain influence in Egypt on some writers of the end of the Middle Ages, it can be stated that, in his native Barbary, neither his *Mukaddima* nor his personal teaching left any permanent mark. And indeed the systematic lack of comprehension and the recension of his thought, the paucity of genius encountered among his own people forms one of the most moving dramas, one of the saddest and most significant pages in the history of Muslim culture" (R. Brunschvig, *op. cit.*, ii, 391).


IBN KHALDÜN, ABU ZAKARIYYA' YAHYA, brother of the above, was born in Tunis about 734/1333, died at Tlemcen in Ramadan 780/December 1378-January 1379. Like his brother and probably with him, he devoted himself industriously to study in his native town and was intimate with all the important scholars of his time in the Hafsid capital.

To judge from his book (on which see below), he seems to have had a special preference for poetry and belles lettres. We know very little of his personality; the references are scattered in various sources, especially 'Abd al-Rahmân's autobiography and that portion of the *Kitâb al-Thur* which deals with the history of the Berbers. This last book gives a detailed account of the murder of Yahyâ in Tlemcen; Yahyâ himself gives a few details of his career in his *Bughyat al-ruwâdîd*.

Yahyâ's political life did not begin until 757/1356, when he was with his brother (who was soon afterwards imprisoned) at the court of Abî Sâlim, sultan of Fez, and was admitted to the court of the Hafsid amirs, from Tlemcen back to Bougie. He accompanied these two princes in place of his brother, as chamberlain to one of them, the *amir* 'Abd Allâh. As the latter, in spite of a long siege, could not regain Bougie, he sent Yahyâ to Abî Hâmûnî II, king of Tlemcen, to ask for his assistance (764/1362). Yahyâ found a kindly reception in Tlemcen and his request was granted. After the Mawlid festival, which he attended there and commemorated in a poem, he went back to his master to bring him to the 'Abd al-Wâdîid court on 8 Dümâdîd II 764/26 March 1363. Both returned to Bougie with an expeditionary force sent by Abî Hâmûnî.

In 767/1365-6, the Hafsid *amir* of Constantine, after taking Bougie, imprisoned Yahyâ in Bona and confiscated his property; he escaped soon after and returned to Biskra to Ibn Mumlû and his brother. It was probably at this time that he made the pilgrimage to the tomb of 'Ukba, which he describes in his *Bughyat al-ruwâdîd*. In 769/1367 he returned from Biskra to Tlemcen at Abî Hâmûnî's request, arrived there in Radjab 769/February 1368, and was appointed *Kâhit al-indâqât*. When he learned that Tlemcen was threatened by the Marïids, he forgot
the kindness shown him by Abu Hammû and left him (early 772/1370-1) to enter the service of the Mardinid sultan, ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, and afterwards of his successor Muḥammad al-Sâʿîd. It was only after the capture of Fâs al-Djadid by Sultan Abu ʿl-ʿAbbâs in 775/1373 that Yahyâ returned to Tlemcen, where Abû Hammû again welcomed him and gave him his former secretarial office. He soon won the king’s confidence again but thereby aroused the jealousy of the other court officials, and notably of Abû Hammû’s eldest son and probable successor, ʿAbd al-Thânhî (II). The latter, with a few hired assassins, fell upon Yahyâ as he was leaving the palace one night in Râmaḍân 780/1378 and murdered him. When Abû Hammû learned that his son had been the instigator of the crime, he did not have the courage to take steps against the murderers.

Although Yahyâ’s political career was shorter and less brilliant than that of his brother, yet it gave him the opportunity to write a historical work of great learning, the Bughyat al-ruwwâd fi ḥālir al-mulâk min Bani ʿAbd al-Wâd. It was much used by Brosserol and Bargès in their works on Tlemcen and A. Bel published the Arabic text with French translation under the title Histoire des Bens ʿAbd al-Wâd, rois de Tlemcen (2 vols., Algiers 1904-13). His history of the kingdom of Tlemcen is particularly important for its information on the long and often brilliant reign of Abû Hammû II, whose secretary and trusted adviser the writer was. In this capacity he was no doubt able to consult original political documents and he even quotes some in full in his book. Although the book neither covers so wide a field as that of his brother ʿAbd al-Râhmân nor shows such a lofty point of view or critical spirit, it is far superior in literary value. Yahyâ reveals in it not only literary but also poetical skill, his elegant style is often elevated and his narrative is adorned with quotations from the best ancient Arab writers. He not only gives us a picture of the political history of the central Maghrib kingdom, but he also preserves for us in his work poems by contemporary court poets and gives information about scholars of his time and about the poetical meetings at the court of Tlemcen — information hardly to be found elsewhere. He affording a poetical survey of the intellectual life of the ʿAbd al-Wâdi capital in the 8th/14th century.

Bibliography: further to works mentioned in the text: Bargès, Complément de l’histoire des Bens Zeytân, Paris 1887, 205-17. (A. Bel)

IBN KHALLAD, Abû ʿAllî Muḥammad b. ʿAbdal-Bâṣîk, a Muʿtazilî theologian. After a slow start, he became the most distinguished disciple of Abû Hâshîm (d. 321/1333; see Al-Djurâb?). First in al-ʾAskar and then in Baghdad. He is the author of a Kitâb al-Uṣûl and a Kitâb al-Shârûk; he was also a man of letters and of general culture (adab wa-maʿrûf). He did not live to an old age, and therefore seems to have died before the middle of the 4th/10th century. Two of his disciples, who also studied under Abû Hâshîm and in their turn were teachers of the kitâb ʿAbd al-Djâbâr, were Abû ʿAllî Abû Ḥusayn b. Abî ʿAllî and Abû ʿAllî Abû ʿAṣîrî. From the latter (mentioned by Ibn al-Murtâdâ, see below) it is probable that the Shârûk al-Uṣûl al-ḥamsa of the kitâb ʿAbd al-Djâbâr is a revision and completion of the (unfinished) Kitâb al-Shârûk of Ibn Khallâd. The same work was commented upon and supplemented by the Zaydî imâm al-Nâtlîq bi-l-Haqq (d. 242/1053; Brockelmann, S I, 697f.; F. Voorhoeve, Handlist, 407). In the official tinâd of the Muʿtazilî doctrine, Ibn Khallâd appears as the political authority of Abû ʿAllî Abû Ḥusayn, who is in his turn the authority of the kitâb ʿAbd al-Djâbâr. The record of details of his doctrine (see M. Horten, Die philosophischen Probleme der spekulativen Theologie im Islam, 1910, index, s.v. Ibn Hallâd) confirms his doctrinal position between Abû Hâshîm and ʿAbd al-Djâbâr.


IBN KHALLIKÂN, Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Ibrâhîm Abû ʿl-ʿAbbâs Shaṁ al-Dîn al-Barmaḵî, Arabian biographer, b. 119 b. II Râbiʾ II 68/22 September 1211 at Irbil in a respectable family that claimed descent from the Barmakids. At the age of two, he lost his father, who was muwâdî in the Muṣâafarrîyya college founded by the Begteginid [q.v.] Muṣâfar al-Dîn Göktûrî (see Ibn Khallîkân, no. 558). He began his studies under his father’s successor Shâraf al-Dîn al-Irûfî (ibid., no. 44); he then continued them from 626/1229 in Aleppo under Ibn Shâdîd (ibid., no. 854) and Ibn Yaḥyâ (ibid., no. 842). After Ibn Shâdîd’s death in 632/1235 he went to Ibn al-Salâḥ (ibid., no. 422) in Damascus. He also visited Mosul several times and became acquainted with the historian Ibn al-Aṣghîr (d. 539/1243) and with Kamâl al-Dîn Ibn Yûnûs (Subkî, Tabâbât al-Shâfiʿîyya, v, 158 ff.). In 635 or 636 he went to Egypt and was in 645/1249 at the latest appointed deputy to the kâdî l-kâddî of Egypt Kâfî and his deputy. In 648/1250 he became kâdî of Irbil and a general amnesty was announced. Yet Ibn Khallîkân was again appointed kâdî l-kâddî of Syria and in 677/1278 was received in Damascus with great honours. But new troubles lay ahead. When Kâlûwân ascended the throne, the governor of Damascus Sunkûr al-Aṣghâr rose in rebellion and was suppressed by Ibn Khallîkân. The troops of Kâlûwân entered Damascus in 679/1280, and a general amnesty was announced. Yet Ibn Khallîkân was arrested and accused of having given a fatwâ which Sunkûr could use as a justification for his revolt; but three weeks later he was released and re-installed as kâdî l-kâddî by an immediate order of the Sultan. At the beginning of the next year (680/1281) Kâlûwân visited Damascus; three days later Ibn Khallîkân was dismissed. He died on...
It is not known how long he occupied this post. In 688/1293, the traveller al-Abdari, who was passing through Tlemcen and who had a great admiration for him, composed a poem in praise of him. Two years later, Tlemcen was invaded by the Marinid Abu Ya'qub Yusuf (685-706/1286-1307) and the siege lasted a hundred months, until the besieger was assassinated. Although the exact date and the manner are unknown, it was during this siege that Ibn Khams was invited by his native town, following an attempt on his life by those in power who accused him of being a supporter of a surrender of the city. This at least is what he himself insinuates in two of his poems. He went to Ceuta, at that time governed by Abu Talib Abd Allah b. Mub. b. Ahmad al-Azafi and his brother Abu al-Hadi; there he attempted to establish himself as a teacher, but his attempt failed, his own pupils, instigated by a rival named Abu l-Hasan Ali b. Ali l-Rabi, having baffled him from the start by hurling at him embarrassing grammatical questions. He went to Algier, then to Malaga and finally, in 703/1304, to Granada. Everywhere he earned his living by teaching and by writing poems in which he gives himself the ‘pleasure of praising’ the great. The ruler of Granada at this time was Muhammad III, known as al-Mahdi (707-1302-9), whose vizier, Ibn al-Hakim Mub. b. Abd al-Rabman b. Ibrahim (660-706/1226-1308), was an important personality of the period and by way of being a patron. Returning from a long voyage in the east, the latter had passed through Tlemcen where he had met Ibn Khams. At Granada his court was attended by scholars and men of letters; he invited Ibn Khams to join it, thus assuring him at last an easy life, in return of course for laudatory poems. In 706/1306, Ibn Khams returned to Malaga on a visit, then to Almora where the general Ibn Kumagha, a subordinate of Ibn al-Hakim, had welcomed him. He loved to travel—‘I am’, he said ‘like the blood; I put myself in motion every spring’. He never forgot Tlemcen, and dreamed of returning there. But, one morning, on the feast of the breaking of the fast in the year 708/1309, he was surprised in his dwelling at Granada by a riot resulting from the coup d’état provoked by Abu l-Duyugh b. Muhammad, who seized power (708-13/1309-14); a certain ‘Ali b. Naṣr, called al-Abkam (= the dumb), killed him with a lance. The reason for the murder was his connexion with Ibn al-Hakim, who was killed on the same day.

The biographers of Ibn Khams describe him as a scholar, philosopher, sage, astrologer, alchemist, heresiographer, and litterateur. But there is no positive evidence for these attributes and all that is certain is that he was a poet. All that have survived of any works he may have written are poems. They are said to have been collected by a certain badii Abu Abd Allah Mub. b. Ibrahim al-Hadrami, who has not been further identified, in a collection entitled al-Durr al-naṣif fi ḡyr Ibn Khams, of which nothing more is known. The poems of Ibn Khams are nevertheless accessible, if not entirely, at least in large part. They are scattered throughout the works of al-Abdari, Yahya b. Khaldun, Ibn al-Kadi and al-Maqqar, who reproduces Ibn al-Khaṭib. Ibn Mansur was able to collect of them sixteen hasidas, totalling more than 610 verses, ten of them each consisting of more than 30 verses and two reaching 80 verses each.

We find in them the traditional themes: madh, kifli, laili, sometimes preceded by nasib. He praises the Banu Zayyani of Tlemcen, the traveller
Ibn Rūshayd and especially the vizier Ibn al-Hākim, who has protected the poet and confounded his enemies, and who has power, courage, generosity, etc. ... He directs his satire against the Banū Yaghmūr (sic), who have attempted to have him assassinated and who are thus responsible for his exile far from his own small country, bruised by enemies, and who has power, courage, generosity, etc. ... He prides himself on his illustrious ancestry: Mudjahşi, Nābahal, Hīmyar, Sakāsik, etc.

Apart from this, his poems are embroidered with proper names and unusual words, revealing a depth of culture which it is surprising to find in a native of 7th/13th century Tlemcen of modest circumstances. His works are composed against a background of the stories of Arab, Persian and Greco-Roman antiquity: Hermes, Socrates, al-Fārābī, al-Subrawardi, Sayf b. Dhi Yazač, 'Amr b. Hind, Nu'mān, Ir'mu' al-Rāys and many others form a gallery of the famous. In addition, his guiding principle as regards form is summarized in a verse: "He who does not chew over obscure (ḥāğık) language does not taste the savour of the art of good expression (baldgha)". This strange precept was not merely a theoretical one, and some of his poems are impossible to understand without a good dictionary. This is probably the reason why he has formerly been classed, along with Shīnārī, Ta'hibba Sharrān and Sula'yk b. 'Āmir, among the "stallions" (fūḥāl) of Arabic poetry.

other authors mainly repetitions: Abu Ahmad al-Yafi, Mir'at al-dinan, Haydarabad 1338, iii, 381-2; Ibn al-Imad, Shahrastani, Cairo 1530, iv, 236; Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Qashshab, ed. M. Yâkîn, references given above; etc. See references in Kifî, Inbâh, ii, 99, d. 1.

IBN AL-KHASIB, Ahmad b. AL-KHASIB and Ahmad b. Ubayd Allâh [see al-Khidib].

IBN AL-KHASIB, Abu 'Ali Ahmad b. Ismâ'îl b. Ibrahim b. al-Khäsib al-Anbârî, kâtib and man of letters of the 3rd/9th century, called Nattaqa and known also, as his grandson Ahmad in his own particular aptitudes, he succeeded in acquiring Ubayd Allâh b. 'Abd Allâh b. Tahir (d. 300/913); but this may have been the son of Ubayd Allâh (d. 301/914); however, no further details are available on this person, who has nevertheless a permanent place in Arabic epistolography (see e.g., A. Z. Sa'afwat, Qanharat rasâ'il 'arab, iv, 362-4). Ibn al-Nadîm (Cairo ed., 180) and, after him, YaÏkût (Udâbâ', ii, 227-30) attribute particularly to Nattaqa a voluminous collection of letters, a K. al-Tabîhâ, a K. Tabâdâl al-kâtibî, a K. Sifât al-nafs and a collection of private letters; Ibn al-Nadîm states that the majority of his letters are ikrhânâ-yâd and notes that he had carried on a correspondence with Ibn al-Mu'tazî. He was also well known as a poet, and several lines of his have survived.

Bibliography: in the article; see also Husri, Zahr, 113 (correcting balâha to Nattaqa). (Ed.)

IBN AL-KHASIB, Abu Bakr al-Hasan b. Al-Khäsib, astrologer who lived in the 2nd/8th century, in the circle of the Barmakids (cf. in Ibn al-Kifî the mention of a Kâtib al-Mawdhar dedicated to Ya'qûb b. Khâlid). He was known in Europe under the name of "Alcasin filius Alkasit" (cf. colophon of MS 1032; Suppl. to Bugisha, 276-7; copied Ya'kîn). Going beyond the apparently scientific reserve affected by Ptolemy in his Tetrabiblon (opus quadripartitum), he enjoyed speculating on the compatibility and incompatibility of the planets, signs and houses of the Zodiac, and "lots". He also used haylagijjhejeg. He was also bold enough to predict the duration of states and dynasties (lakhût sinî l-ilâm, an idea of Zurvanite or Indian origin). He earned thus the wrath of his biographer Ibn al-Kifî, who complains of having been misled by the falseness of these prophecies, based on the absolute confidence which Ibn al-Khäsib placed in the geographical dominance of the sign of Gemini over Egypt. He thus was a man of resource, with an ample supply of prescriptions of all kinds, whose enormous repertoire probably gained him the goodwill of his patrons and later the interested approbation of foreign civilizations. The work which earned him the most lasting success was the Muğhî fi 'l-maûlûd, De nativitasibus, an extract from a sort of astrological encyclopedia to which he had given the Persian name of Kâr-i mîhâr ("The Practice of the Prince")? The text of this work is preserved in a collection of astrological collections of the Escorial, in Latin translation in the manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale mentioned above and in the two Sessa editions published in Venice in 1492 and 1501. Ibn al-Khäsib's translator was the Jewish scholar Plato of Tivoli, whose manuscript was the basis for the works of Sessa. Two centuries later, the learned librarian of the Elector of Saxony, Johannes Millius, drew attention to and wrote a commentary on the works of Alubather. The De nativitasibus was from then on inseparable from the Centiloquium of the pseudo-Hermes Trismegistus, with which Sessa linked it in a single volume (Millius, Memoria bibliothecae venetiae suis Designatio manuscriptorum, 199). At the end of his career, as at the beginning, Alubather's works formed an integral part of Hermetic literature.

Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the article, see Fihrist, 272; Ibn al-Kifî, ed. Khândjî, Cairo, 114; Brockelmann, I., 221, S. 1, 594.

IBN AL-KHÂTÎB, Abû 'Abd Allâh Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh b. Sa'îd b. 'Abd Allâh b. Sa'îd b. 'Ali b. Ahmad al-Salmâni, vizier and historian of Granada, who bore the laqab of Lîsân al-Dîn and Dhu 'l-wâzâ'aratîn, apart from those by which he was designated after his death. Of Arab descent through the sub-tribe of the Salmân, a clan of the Murâd of the Yemen, he came from a family which was established in Syria and which arrived in the Iberian peninsula in the 2nd/8th century, took up residence in Cordova, and then moved successively to Toledo, Loja and Granada. At first the family was known by the name Banû Wâriz, but after Sa'dî al-Salmânî, with the name of Dhu 'l-wâzâ'aratîn. He was educated in Granada where his father had settled in order to enter the service of the sultan Abu 'l-Walîd Ismâ'îl. He had numerous eminent teachers who are listed by his biographers and, thanks to their instruction and to his own particular aptitudes, he succeeded in acquiring a vast fund of knowledge which later enabled him to win distinction in various branches of learning and to write many works, whose titles number more than 60. After his father's death in the battle of Salado or Tarifa on 7 Dîumâdâ I 741/30 October 1340, his talents and learning enabled him to enter the service of the sultan Abu al-Hâdîjâ Yûsuf b. Ismâ'îl and to serve under the administrative and technical direction of the vizier Abu al-Hâsan 'Ali b. al-Djâyâb; when the latter died of the plague in the middle of Shawwâl 749/med-January 1349, Ibn Khâtîb was appointed to the office of kâtib il-îshqa, head of the royal chancellery, with the title of vizier; he retained this office in the reign of Muhammad V al-Ghanî bi-l'îlâm who raised his rank, and it was then that he assumed the title of Dhu 'l-wâzâ'aratayn. Upon Muhammad V's deposition (760/1360-9), Ibn al-Khâtîb's fortune changed for some years; the
bādīb Rīdwa n, the protector of Ibn Khatīb, who had enjoyed greater influence and authority in that sovereign's reign before his fall, had been assassinated, and it was only as a result of the intervention of his friend Ibn Masrūq, secretary of the Marinid sultan Abū Sālim, that he regained his freedom and was permitted to go to Morocco, accompanying the dethroned sovereign into exile. He travelled throughout the territory of the Marinids and finally settled in Salé where he acquired estates and wrote some of his works (see a. M. al-Abbādī, Mālik al-'Ālam, Liān Ibn al-Khatīb fi 'l-Mağrib, in Ḥesābīrī, xli (1959), 247-53). When Muhammad V was restored to the throne in Djiūmādā II 763/March-April 1362, Ibn al-Khatīb returned to Granada where he was restored to the office of vizier and became the chief dignitary of the court. But some years later, finding himself the victim of intrigues and fearing the worst, he seized the opportunity provided by a tour of inspection of fortresses in the western part of the kingdom of Granada to cross over to Ceuta and, from there, to Tiemen (773/1371-2), where he was very favourably received by the sultan Abū Fāris 'Abd al-'Azīz; through the short reign of his son and successor Abū Zayyān Muhammad al-Sa'īd (a minor), he was safe from the demands of Muhammad V that he should be sent to Granada for trial, for he had been unjustly accused of heresy, among other crimes, as a result of the calumnies of his influential rivals in Granada, especially the kādī al-Nubāḥī and the vizier Ibn Zamrak. When Muhammad b. 'Abd al-'Azīz was dethroned, Abū 'l-'Adbāb Ahmad b. Abī Sālim was proclaimed his successor; then for a short time, through the hostility of one of his enemies, Sulaymān b. Dāwdūd, who held important offices at the Marinid court, Ibn al-Khatīb experienced the hardiest days of his life. Cast into prison, he was brought to trial, through the influence of Ibn Zamrak, who had succeeded him as chief minister of Granada and who had elected to be his accuser, before a private court set up for this purpose, and, although no conclusive sentence seems to have been pronounced in spite of the wishes of those who were in favour of his execution, he was put to death at the instigation of Sulaymān b. Dāwūd, who was imprisoned in the prison of the town and the biographies of celebrated personages, who were born or lived in Granada or who visited it, with most interesting historical notes, in some cases unique; only a number of incomplete editions have appeared: Cairo 1315/1901-2, 2 vols., very imperfect; Cairo 1955, one vol. by 'Abd Allāh 'Inān (on this ed. and the surviving ms. of the Ḥiṣa, see, in addition to the editor's introd., MIDE, iii (1950), 324-8). (2) al-Lamha al-badriyya fi 'l-dawla al-nası'iyā (Casiri has given long extracts from this, as well as from the Ḥiṣa, together with a Latin transl., in his Bibliotheca, ii, 71 ff., 177-246, 246-319. A fairly acceptable edition of the Lamha was published in Cairo in 1347/1928-9; i. s. Allouche translated some chapters from it in his article La vie économique et sociale à Grenade au XIVe siècle, in ME, d'hist. et d'archéol., Hommage à G. Marçais, Algiers 1957, 7-12.) This work of Ibn al-Khatīb presents a panorama of the civilization of Granada, with biographies of the Nasrid sovereigns, from approximately 628 to 765/1230 to 1363. (3) A'ālām al-'ālām fi-man būtīyā habīb al-ish'tīlām min mulūk al-islām, one of the last works written by Ibn al-Khatīb, in 774 and 776/1372-4 (partial ed. by h. h. 'Abd al-Wāḥhāb, in Centenario M. Amari, ii (1910), 456-72 (trans. r. Castrillo, El Afirca del Norte en el A'ālām al-'Aλamα de Ibn al-Jaθb, Madrid, 1906-7).
1958) and E. Lévi-Provençal, Histoire de l'Espagne musulmane extraite du Kitab 'Amdal al-Ilams, Rabat 1934; Beirut 1956; partial ed. by A. M. al-Khattab, T. M. al-Kattani, al-Maghrib al-Tabrî, fi l-Asr al-wasit, Casablanca 1964]. This is an unfinished history of Islam, the first part of which is devoted to the East, the second to Muslim Spain, and the third to North Africa and Sicily.

**Bibliography:** in addition to the works mentioned in the text and the references given there, the following should also be noted: M. M. Antuna, ‘Ibnu al-‘Adl wa ‘l-dawâr fi fi ‘l-wasâyîd wa ‘l-jiwjâm; study and Spanish trans. of the text, of a historical character, is al-Andalus, al-andaloussî, 1958, no. 1826); study and comm. on Rimd A, 2, 195; Littré, xii (1931), 1-32. In his Nayl al-tibbîhâd (Cairo 1350), 72, Ahmad Bâbâ gives the title of another work of Ibn Khâtima, on some questions of grammar, Ilâhâl al-‘âlî bi ‘l-kiss, of which nothing further is known.

The National Library of Madrid (ms. 511 gg. 3-50 Cat. Guillén Robles) possesses a poem of Ibn al-Khattâb, which is also included in the Al-Andalus, 73, 331-3; G. S. Colin, Quelques poètes arabes d’Occident au XIVe siècle, in Hesperis, 1931, 342; M. Antuna, Abenjdtima de Almeria y su tratado de la peste, in Religión y Cultura, Madrid, Oct. 1928. (S. GIBERT)

**IBN KHÂTTAB [see al-Khattâb].**

**IBN KHAYR al-ISBHILî, Abû Bakr Muham-$$^3$$d B. Khayr e ‘Umar B. KHALfA al-LâMÔnî al-ÁMÂWî, philologist and traditionist of Seville, where he was born in 1021/1108. He became imâm of the mosque at Cordova, and died in that city in 575/1179. Ibn Khayr, who studied under many teachers in different regions of al-Andalus, owes his fame to the catalogue (fahrasa [g.v.]) of the works which he had read and of the teachers who had given him their iđîzâ at Seville, Cordova, Almeria, Malaga, Granada, etc. This work, called Fahrasa mà rawâ’ih ân shuyuqihâ-ki min al-dawâ’în al-muṣâ’ân na filÎ “al-wm wa-awâd” al-mâ’âsirî, was published in Saragossa in 184-5 by J. Ribera y Tarragó (4 vols. with maps). Ibn Khayr gives the title Index librorum de diversis scientiarum ordinibus quos a magistris didicit. After an introduction studded with hadîth, the author enumerates the works he has studied on Kur’ânic sciences (readings, abrogating and abrogated verses, commentaries), goes on to hadîth, to which he devotes much space, together with the siyâr and the anâdil, then to Mâlikî fıkî. Next come grammar, lexicography, adab, poetry. Finally, he lists the fahrâsas which preceded his own. For each discipline he quotes the names of his masters, classifying them by region, but gives hardly any biographical information on them. This catalogue is a most important document for the study of the works known and taught in the author’s day in Muslim Spain (see H. Pérez, Poesía andalusí, 188). Ibn Khayr, in his turn had a great many pupils, a list of whom occupied, it is said, ten thirty-page notebooks.

**Bibliography:** in addition to the works referred to: Ibn al-Khatib, Ihdâ, Cairo 1939, i, 114-29; Makîrî, Naqf al-šûb, Cairo 1364/1949, viii, 139-48; idem, Azhâr al-riyâdî, Cairo 1358-59, 1940-2, i, 23, 250, ii, 254, 259, 302, 346, 395; Ibn al-Kâdi, Durrat al-hâjî, Rabat 1934, i, no. 126; Ibn Khayr, Tahâfût al-‘aql, Cairo 1350, 72; Djazarî, Khayyâ al-nihâya fi jabâbat al-kârâd, Paris 1932, i, 78; ‘Umarî, Masâ’il al-abâsî fi mamâlîk al-amsâr, Paris, no. 2327, xvii, fol. 210; Brockelmann, II, 259, SII, 396; Pons Boigues, Ensayo, 331-3; G. S. Colin, Quelques poètes arabes d’Occident au XIVe siècle, in Hesperis, 1931, 342; M. Antuna, Abenjdtima de Almeria y su tratado de la peste, in Religión y Cultura, Madrid, Oct. 1928. (S. GIBERT)
grammatician, a native of Samarqand who lived in Basra and Baghdad. In Baghdad he is said to have quarreled over grammatical matters with al-Zadijjij (ed. 316/928) and quarrelled with Abu 'Abd al-Farisi (ed. 376/985). Among his pupils are mentioned Abu 'Abd al-Kasim al-Zadijjij and Abu 'Ali al-Farisi. The latter, in a reply to Sayyf al-Dawla, denied having tried to denigrate Ibn al-Khayyat (see Yâkut); and from this we learn also that at a certain period of his life the grammarians became afflicted by complete deafness. But Yâkut also depicts Ibn al-Khayyat as endowed with a splendid physique and as being a pleasant companion. He died at Baghdad in 376/985.

Apart from the K. Ma'âni 'l-Kur'dân, all the works attributed to Ibn al-Khayyat are concerned with Arabic grammar: al-Nahw al-kabîr, al-Ma'dijis fi 'l-nahw, al-Mu'assas fi 'l-nahw. Since the time of the Fihrist (77 and 81), this grammarians has been classed minman hâllatâ 'l-maghabbayan, "among those who combine the two systems" of grammar: those of Basra and of Kufa. But this should not be misconstrued: it means that, while using the Basran method on certain points, he adopted certain Kûfan view-points, but not that he adopted a mixed grammatical system, since, properly speaking, there did not exist an eclectic grammatical system of grammar at Baghdad.

Biography: Ibn al-Khayyat is not mentioned in Brockelmann. All the references given in Kâbîlaha, i., 23, as 'Abd al-Illah b. Muhammad al-Mada'ini, are mentioned in U. Rizzitano, Arab poet who lived for 80 years. He was born in Basra, and it would appear that he was educated and also taught exclusively in his native city, not travelling to other cities as was then customary. This is indicated by the fact that al-Khâjib al-Baghdadi does not mention him in his History of Baghdad, nor does any other chronicler or biographer refer to any journey that he undertook; furthermore, most of his teachers were of Basri origin or had resided in Basra. He came of a well-educated family; his grandfather, who bore the same name, and also his father, were authorities in Tradition. Several men of outstanding culture were among his teachers, such as Yazdî b. 'Abd al-Razzîq, Sufîyân b. 'Uyayna, Muhammad b. Dja'far Ghundar, Highâm al-Kalbi, 'Ali b. Muhammad al-Mada'înî, etc., but he was closest to Yazdî b. Zuray'î (q.v.), who is described by Ibn Sa'd as a worthy man with 'Uthmânî tendencies. These tendencies are apparent, to some extent, in Ibn Khayyat's works.

On the whole Ibn Khayyat is regarded by scholars of traditions as honourable, straightforward and trustworthy. Among his many disciples were al-Bukhârî, 'Abd Allâh b. Ahmad, Ibn Hanbal and Bakî b. Makhîl.

According to Ibn al-Nadîm, he was the author of four books: Al-Tawrîkh, Tabakât al-Kurraj, Tawrîkh al-Zamânâ, wa 'l-nûrân wa 'l-nurdân wa 'l-samân, and Kubb Âji'da al-Kurraj wa 'l-adabîn wa 'l-istihlâm. It would appear that the Tabakât al-Kurraj mentioned by Ibn al-Nadîm is identical with the book which has survived under the title of Tabakât Kha'îsa b. Khayyat (the unique copy of this book is now in al-Zâhiriyya Library, Damascus). Al-Tawrîkh has also survived, in a copy found in Morocco (the only copy so far known). In a single volume of 168 fols., it was copied in Muslim Spain in 477/1084.

The author commences his book by defining the word tawrîkh. After discussing the birth of the Prophet he covers the period from the Hidjra to the year 235/846, thus ignoring the Meccan period of the Prophet's life. The importance of the work lies not only in the fact that it is the oldest complete Islamic survey of events which has reached us, but also in the materials it contains and the way in which it was written. The author gives special attention to the Umayyad Caliphate of Damascus and to Muslim foreign affairs, in particular to the extension of the Islamic Empire. He usually narrates each event from two points of view, local and official. He pays little attention to Islamic internal affairs, but he does deal with such decisive events as the death of 'Uthmân, the war between 'All and Mu'awiyah, the battle of al-Harra, the Kharijî movements, etc.

This book is a very important document for the study of Islamic administration in its early years, as the author, at the end of his account of each Caliph's reign, enumerates all the statesmen, generals and senior officials who held office under him. As for the biographical al-Tabâdîl, it too is the oldest complete book of its kind to have survived; Ibn Sa'd, though earlier, is incomplete. The unique
copy was made by one of the author’s disciples, probably during the author’s lifetime. It consists of 97 folios, written in a fine hand between hiṣāf and mawṣīḥ. Age and mishandling have made it very difficult to read. It contains the biographies of approximately 3375 men and women who were cited as authorities for Islamic traditions during the first 236 years of Islam. It is divided into two unequal parts, a very large one devoted to the men and a smaller to the women.

Ibn Khayyat composed his book in a different way from his contemporary and fellow-citizen Ibn Sa’d. He begins by enumerating the men who were authorities in tradition and lived in Medina, commencing with the Prophet, then the members of Kuraysh, group by group according to their pedigree and their relation to the Prophet; then the members of the other Arab tribes. He then takes the Muslim cities and centres and deals with them in a similar manner. The author’s biographical accounts are very brief but the significance of the book lies in the fact of its completeness and the close attention which the author pays to genealogy: he enumerates every Arab tribe, group and family who had migrated at the rise of Islam and names their place of settlement. Such information is most valuable for the study of the Islamic movement, the great Arab migration of the 1st/7th century and the history of the Umayyad Caliphate, because of the vital role played by the tribes under this dynasty. The book is of at least equal importance for the study of Islamic dogma, culture and society.

Both texts were edited, independently, by Suhayl Zakkar (Damascus 1967) and by Akram al-Umari (Baghdad 1967).

Bibliography: Ibn Sa’d, Tabakāt, vii, Beirut 1955, 258; al-Bakhtārī, al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir, Haydaraḏb 1360-76, 844; Ibn Abī Ḥāfīzm al-Rāzī, al-Dżarb wa l-laṭā’il, Haydarābd 1360-73, i, 378; Fihrist, 232; Ibn Khallikān, Wafaydt al-a‘jāmūn, i, 172; Ibn Ṭāl‘i, al-Kāmil, MS Zahiriyah, Damascus, fol. 125; Ibn Ḥaḍjar, Taḥdīb al-Taḥdīb, Haydarābd 1325-7, iii, 160-1; Dihāhabi, Ḥuffās, Haydarābd 1375-7, 436, 945, 973, 1405; Ṣiyar al-lum al-nubāla‘, MS Istanbul, Ahmad III, vii, fol. 126-b; Ibn Taqribībd, Cairo, li, 303; Ibn al-Naḍīm, al-Fihrist, fol. 123; Ibn Hādiār, ad-Dihr wa ‘l-maldī, edited from the unique manuscript by I. A. Khalīfī (Beirut 1964); it is presumably to this work that al-Ma‘arrī (q.v.) is alluding in his Risālat al-Ghurān when he speaks of the “class of singers” (tabābāl al-muqānhīn). In this book he treats of music and musicians, borrowing the basic technical vocabulary from Persian and giving allegedly historical information (which al-İsfahānī considered to be unacceptable). Al-Ma‘ṣūdī reproduces five pages from the text of a dissertation on the same subject given by Ibn Khurradadhbih in the presence of the caliph al-Mu‘tadīd. These have been edited by al-‘Azāzī under the title K. al-Lahw wa l-ma‘lādī. De Goeje translated this title as "Le livre du jeu et des instruments de musique" (The book of playing and of musical instruments). 7. K. al-Djjamārah (var. DIUMHAR) ansāb al-Furs wa l-nawabī (var. nawafîl) (= The book of the principal genealogies of the Persians and of the transplanted population). 8. K. al-Ta’rījh, regarded by al-Ma‘ṣūdī as "the best constructed and most exhaustive 'work of his kind yet done in Persia" (in Ibn al-Naḍīm’s list). These two works are frequently cited by al-Ṭaḥṣīlī and, no. 8 is cited once by Ibn Shaddād. 9. K. al-Masālid wa l-ma‘mālīk (= The book of itineraries and kingdoms), which made his reputation, often copied or used as a model for imitation and twice edited and translated into French in full, and once in part only; it has been the subject of a controversy that is still unresolved in regard to the date of its composition and the authenticity of the version which has survived; finally, in regard to its scientific value, it has given rise to contradictory appreciations by the early Arab writers and by modern orientalists.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, 1, 255-6; S 1, 404; Tabari, iii and passim; al-Ma‘ṣūdī, Murādī, i, 72, vii, 87, (Cairo ed., 1367/1956, i, 14, iv, 240, v; Aḡbānī, passim; Fihrist, 149 (Cairo ed., 1348/1929, 212); Ṣaḥībī, Qurān akhbār mutāl al-Furs (= History of the Kings of the Persians), Paris 1900, passim; Ma‘arrī, Risālāt al-Ghurān, Cairo 1950, 465; Ibn Shaddād, al-Aʿlāḏ al-lahw wa l-umara‘ al-Shām wa l-Dijāri (Ibn Shaddād’s description of Damascus), Damascus 1956, 25; C. Barbier de Meynard, in J.A, v (1865); BGA, vi, 1895; J. Marquart, Ostasien, Osteuropäische und östasi-
the epitome of Ibn Maktûm (d. 749/1348) is evidently identical with the history of Cairo mentioned above. Other titles indicate individual biographies (of Ibn Rashîk, Abu ’l-Hasan ibn al-Kiftî), the history of scholarship (the Shâykh of al-Kindî), a supplement to the Anṣâb of al-Baladhurî, etc.

**Bibliography:** Kutubi, Fawdî, Cairo 1951, ii, 191-3; Yaḥyâ, Muṣ’djam al-adabâb, Cairo, xv, 175-204 = Irḫâd, ed. Margollovitch, v, 477-94; idem, Muṣ’djam al-bulûdîn, iv, 152; Ibn Abî Us𝘢ybi’ā, ‘Uṣān an-adâb, index; Barhebraeus, Târîḵ al-adwâr al-dawli, ed. F. Bühler, ii, 417-19; Suyyūṭî, Bughya, Cairo 1326, 359; idem, Ḥusn al-mudâdârâ, Cairo 1321, i, 265; Ibn al-Ḥimâd, Shaḫārârî, v, 236; Aḍâfâl, al-Ṭalîs’ al-sa’dî, Cairo 1333, 237 f.; Ibn Taghhrîbîrî, Nus’ūm, vi, Cairo 1355, 361; A. Müller in Actes du 8ème Congrès Intern. des Orientalistes, Section i, Leiden 1890, 15-36; Brockelmann, i, 396 f., i, 599; R. Sellheim, in Oriens, viii (1953), 34 f.

---

**IBN KILLIS,** Abu ’l-Faradî Yaḥyâ b. Yūsūf, famous Fāṭimid vizier of the caliph al-ʿAzîz (q.v.). He was by origin a Jew, born in Baghdad in 318/930. He went with his father to Syria and settled at Ramla, becoming an agent for various merchants; but, according to one tradition, having appropriated their money and being unable to repay it, he fled to Egypt, where he entered the service of Kâfur Rashîk, Abu Saʿd al-Ṣirâfî, the vizier and adviser of Salâdîn (Salâdîn). During the years which he spent as a student there he was already collecting the material for his later works. He undertook only reluctantly, but which brought him the honorific title of al-Ṣâdî al-ʿAţîr (the illustrious vizier). He was by origin a Jew, born in Baghdad in 318/930. He entered the service of al-Muḥammad ibn Kâfur (q.v.), who thought highly of him and whose complete confidence he gained by enabling him to appropriate various inheritances which, if he were a Muslim, ought to be vizier, Ibn Killis aspired to the vizierate, embraced Islam in 356/967 and devoted himself to the cause of scholarship, for during these years he gave shelter in Aleppo to Yaḥyâ, who had fled from the Mongols, and gave him much help in the compilation of his great geographical dictionary. Dismissed at his own request in 628/1230, Ibn al-Kiftî was able to devote a few years to his own studies until he was appointed vizier by al-Malik al-ʿAzîz in 633/1236. He remained in this office until his death in 646/1248.

Of the 26 works of Ibn al-Kiftî of which the titles are known only two survive: (1) The Kitâb al-fawādî ilā-nimâma bi-ahkâb al-hubâmâ, usually referred to simply as Târîḵ al-hubâmâ, which exists in an epitome by al-Zawzawî (written in 647/1249), ed. J. Lipper, Leipzig 1903; it contains 414 biographies of physicians, philosophers and astronomers with many statements from Greek writers which have not survived in the original; (2) Indah al-mulûd li-ḥadîth anhâb al-nabât, parts i-iii ed. by Msh. Abu ’l-Fadl Ibrâhîm, Cairo 1365-74, which contains about a thousand biographies of scholars. Of the posthumous Aḥkâb al-Muḥammadin min il-ghwâra‘ there exist only fragments in Ms. Paris arab. 3335. The remaining titles are mainly of historical works: a history of Cairo until the reign of Shâb al-Dîn, a history of the Seljûqs, of the Mirdâsîs, of the Bûyûks, of Maḥmûd b. Sabuktakhin, of the Maghrib, of the Yemen; a comprehensive Târîḵ al-Kiftî in
Ibn Killis's foreign policy was expressed in the advice which he gave before he died to al-‘Aziz: to undertake nothing against the Byzantines so long as they themselves did not attack, to be satisfied with a vague acknowledgement of vassalage from the Hamdānids of Aleppo, but not to spare Mufarridj b. al-Diārrāb, the chief of the Ṣayyū Arabs of Palestine [see Diārrāhīdī]. He carried it out successfully but not without resorting to intrigue, to deception and even to attempts at assassination. He re-took Damascus from the Turk Alptakin, ally of the Fatimids, which he had seized in 371/982, and which he had given to the vizier al-Hakim because the latter was a favourite of the caliph in Egypt. He also gave the vizier of Damascus a corps of picked troops (the regiment which bore his name), and that he taught it in lectures al-Risāla al-wazirīyya, which he is said to have given on various occasions (references in Ibn Ishaq, ed. S. Munajjidj, Cairo 1962, 185-92, 235-6; Makrīzī, Khīṭāb, Būlibī ed., i, 439, ii, 5-6, 226, 341; idem, Iltīsā al-humūfā, ed. Shāyāyāl, 196, 198-9, 275, 279, 296; Quatremèere, Vie du calife fat. Meozi-lādīn-Allāh, in J.A, 3rd series, nos. 2 and 3; Wüstenfeld, Gesch. d. Fatimiden-Chalifen, 50-1, 133 ff.; idem, Die Statthalter von Ägypten, . . .; R. Gottheil, A Fatwa on the appointment of Dhimmis to office, in Festschrift goldzihner, 222; G. Wiet, L’Égypte arabe (Histoire de la nation égyptien.), iv, 1937, 149-50, 188, 192, 194; W. Björkman, Beitrag zur Gesch. der Staatskanzlei im islam. Ägypten, 1928, 19, 28, 64; W. J. Fischel, Jews in the economic and political life of medieval Islam, London 1937, 45-68. See also Hasan Ibrahim Ḥasan, Ta’rīḫ al-daula al-fātimīyya, Cairo 1958, 270-2, 298-300, 426-7, 536-7, 632-1 and index; Muhammad Kāmil Husayn, Fi adab Misr al-fātimīyya, Cairo 1950, 54-9, 174-6 and index. (M. Canard)

IBN AL-KIRRIYYA, ABU SULAYMAN AYYUB B. ZAYD, of the Zayd Manāt (al-Kirriyya was probably the name of his mother or of one of his grandmothers), is presented as an illiterate Bedouin whose eloquence was worthy of this; but the Egyptian populace did not believe him, and was either beheaded because he had had put to death the tenant of the lands which the vizier owned in the region of Damascus and had seized these lands) to leave Damascus [for details, see al-‘Aziz]. But Ibn Killis prevented the caliph from getting too deeply engaged in northern Syria.

In political policy, the favour which Ibn Killis enjoyed suffered only one eclipse of some months (373-4), the reasons for which were perhaps the caliph’s anger after the poisoning of Alptakin, or disturbances caused by a famine in Egypt. He soon recovered all his offices and his immense riches. Moreover Ibn Killis did not fail to flatter his master, as witness the episode of the cherries which he had reported however to have joined the party of Ibn Killis when this party was defeated in a race, a fact of which the vizier’s enemies and those of the dynasty. On his death, at the end of 380/February 991, al-‘Aziz, who led the funeral prayer for him, wept and showed great grief. The Christian Yabāy b. Sa‘d states that Ibn Killis was worthy of this; but the Egyptian populace focused on his eloquence more on his great favour to the Christians and to the Jews.

At the end of the reign of amir Muhammad I and throughout that of his successor 'Abd Allâh, the unity of the Umayyad emirate of Cordova was on the point of being destroyed. The disorderliness and incessant revolts of the Arab and Berber lords in the provinces made it possible for Alfonso III of Leon to extend his conquests from strategic bases at Colombra, Astorga, León and Amaya; in 280/893 he rebuilt the fortress of Zamora, and the garrison made continual raids on the Berbers in the vicinity. Moreover, the Banû Kasti in Aragon, Ibn Marwân in Extremadura and above all Ibn Hâfsûn [q.v.] in the mountainous region near Ronda were striving to break away from the central authority. At the same time, towards the borders of León, where the Berbers were more numerous, there came a stream of mystics and fanatics, while the doctrines of the Mû'tazilis were being introduced from the East and the philosopher Ibn Masarra [q.v.] was expounding his metaphysical ideas in the Sierra of Cordova. Amidst such disturbances in both the spiritual and political spheres, various adventurers, either zealots or impostors, made their appearance, declaring themselves the enemies of the régime; they found enthusiastic support among the Berbers of the mountainous zone in the centre of the peninsula. One of these figures, who, in the traditional manner, prepared to censure social behaviour and morality at the very time when the Fâtimid da'wa was spreading the Ismâ'î doctrine in North Africa, was the Andalusian missionary Abu 'Ali al-Sarrâj who, under pretext of preaching the holy war, worked against the régime, cunningly disguised as a Muslim ascetic. Dressed in coarse homespun, wearing rope sandals and riding a donkey, he travelled all over the country. In this disguise, "he worked actively to bring to fruition a projected alliance which had been planned in 283/898 between the Banû Kasti of Aragon and 'Umar b. Hâfsûn"; he did not succeed in carrying through his project [q.v.]; but, later, he was able to persuade the Umayyad prince Abû 'Abd Allâh mû'tawïya, a devotee of astrology who did not conceal his aspirations to the throne, to come out in open revolt. Ibn Sarrâj presented him as the reforming Mahdi, and the two of them traversed the district of Los Pedroches (Fâbûs-al-Balûtî) and the Sierra of Almâdîn (Djilal-al-Barânîs), where they were received with enthusiasm by the Berbers to whom they preached the holy war against Zamora. Ibn al-Kitî's displays of conjuring increased the number of his supporters (whom the Arab sources put at over 60,000), and this fanatical horde, before whom he had promised the seven walls of Zamora would crumble, approached the fortress. While al-Sarrâj prudently withdrew, Ibn al-Kitî invited Alfonso III to embrace Islam if he did not wish to be exterminated with all his men; Alfonso indignantly took up his position on the right bank of the Duero and, after a combat which according to Arabic sources was favourable to Ibn al-Kitî, siege was laid to Zamora. But the Berber leader Nafza, being disillusioned, left Ibn al-Kitî together with all his troops, and his departure provoked new desperations. After some indecisive skirmishes, Ibn al-Kitî, finding himself abandoned by almost all his followers, launched a desperate attack on the enemy and was killed, on 20 Rajab 288/10 July 901. For a long time his head remained hanging from the top of one of the gates of Zamora. "This tragi-comical expedition was no more than an isolated episode in the annals of the lower and central Marches" at the end of the 9th century and at the beginning of the 10th/10th, and its only repercussion is the expedition said to have been undertaken in the same year by the future Ordoño III, son of Alfonso III, who, setting out from Viseo, crossed the Tagus and then the Guadiana to reach the region of Seville, where he sacked and burned one of the mystic abodes of the Marches. A.G. Noury, "Les montagnes de la Cordoue" (in Rezo, no. 14, 1921, p. 9); L. Krüger, "Zum Beginn des Kreuzzugs" (in Archiv für Geschichtswissenschaft, co, 1922, p. 53). Bibliography: E. Levi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., i, 382-3; Dozy, Hist. Mus. Esp., ii, 132-4; Ibn al-Abâr, Hûla, 91-2; Sampiero, re-ed. Huici, in Cr. lat. de la Reconquista, i, 269; Croat, Chron. Léonaises, ii, 33; Mas'ûdî, Murâdîj, i, 263 (description of Zamora reproduced by Makkari, Analectes, i, 223). (A. Hucî Miranda)

Ibn Kûtûrûn [see ibn katûrûn].

Ibn Kudâmâ al-MaÕdîsî, Muwaffâk al-Dîn Abû Muhammad 'Abd Allâh b. Ahmad b. Muhammad, Hanbali ascetic, jurist, consultant and traditionalist theologian. He was born in Dammâlî, near Jerusalem (Bayt al-Maûdîs, whence his ethnic name) in Sha'bân 541/Jan.-Feb. 1147, and died in Damascus on 5 or 6 Dîmuânâl II 620/6 or 7 July 1223.

In 551/1156, the Banû Kuddâma moved from Dammâlî to take up residence in Damascus. The chroniclers explain this exodus as caused by the bad treatment the Muslims were receiving at the hands of the Franks.

From the sources available to us at the present time it is possible to reconstruct two main branches of this large family from the 5th/11th to the 10th/16th centuries. At the head of one branch is Muwaffâk al-Dîn's father, the Shâhîy al-Maûdîs B. Muhammad b. Kudâmâ (491-558/1097-1162), the preacher (khâ'îrîj) of Dammâlî, a man known for his asceticism, for whom a mosque was built in Damascus (Nû'aymî, Darîs, ii, 354). On his brother Yusûf, who stands at the head of the other branch, the sources seem to be silent; but he is the ancestor of Yusuf b. 'Abd al-Hâdî (849-909/1436-1503), whose autobiograph, certifies of pilgrimage, is related to be seen on the margins and in the colophons of many of the manuscripts of the Zâhirîyya library in Damascus. The most numerous sub-branch of this family is by far that of Muwaffâk al-Dîn's brother, the ascetic Shâykh Abû 'Umâr (528-607/1133-1210). Regarding the other brother, 'Ubayd Allâh, our sources are silent, though other members of this sub-branch are known: the son Ahmad (573-613/1177-1216), the latter's two grandsons 'Abd al-Hâdî (641-687/1243-1288) and 'Ubayd Allâh (655-684/1255-1285), and the latter's grandson 'Abd Allâh (d. 803/1400).

The smallest sub-branch of all is that of Muwaffâk al-Dîn Ibn Kudâmâ, whose three sons died in his lifetime and who was survived by his grandson 'Abd al-Maûdîsî (605-643/1208-1245).

Muwaffâk al-Dîn received the first phase of his education in Damascus where he studied the Kûrân and bâdîlî. He made his first visit to Baghdad in 561 in the company of his maternal cousin, a well-known Hanbali traditionalist, 'Abd al-Ghanî al-Maûdîsî (541-600/1146-1203), also originally from Dammâlî, a member of a certain family tracing their origin back to a certain 'Ulûr b. Râfî. Arriving at Baghdad they were received by the leading Hanbali of the day, the celebrated mystic 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Dîlî [q.v.]. Their discipleship was cut short by the latter's death.
Brief though it may have been, this experience must have had its influence on the young Muwaффak al-Din, who was to receive a special place in his heart for mystics and mysticism. This is attested to by the present author regards as his condoning of Ibn 'Akkil's [g.v.] veneration for the great mystic al-Hallâj [g.v.]; and in a silsila preserved in a manuscript in the Zähiriyya library of Damascus (see Maghînî, 18, fol. 254b), Muwaффak al-Din figures as having received the khirka from 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Djâli and passed it on to another Hallâj, his cousin Ibrahim b. 'Abd al-Wâhid (543-614/1148-1217), brother of the above mentioned 'Abd al-Ghânî. On the other hand, Muwaффak al-Din did not condone what he believed to be the excessive rationalism of Ibn 'Akkil, against whom he wrote Ta'brîm al-nazar fi kutub ahl al-kalâm (see G. Makdisi, Ibn Qudamâ's censure of speculative theology, London 1962).

Muwaффak al-Din's first sojourn in Baghdad lasted four years. He is known to have visited it again in 567 and 574, making his pilgrimage to Mecca in the previous year 572, and finally settling in Damascus in 575. He left Damascus once again in 583 to take part in Saladin's expedition against the Franks, particularly in the conquest of Jerusalem, which occurred that year.

Muwaффak al-Din is known especially for his works and ideas, see Brockelmann, I, 398, SI, 26x68, which was much used by later writers and is probably the most famous was al-Kumayt (c. in Marrakush: 9. Abu Muhammad Abd Allah al-Wanaghîli, the blind, d. 779/1378; 4. Abu Muhammad al-Khatib, d. 776/1374); (c) in Marrakush: 9. Abu Muhammad Ibrâhîm al-Zukandari, d. 768/1367; (d) in Tlemcen: 10. Abu Abu 'Ibn al-Maghniyya, Cairo n.d., 155-62; F. Bustânî, Dâ'irat al-ma'dîrî, iii, 482-3. (Ch. Pellat)

IBN KUNFUDH, Abu l-'ABBAS AHMAD b. HASSAN (incorrect var. 'HASAWI), Abu l-'ABBAS AHMAD (c. in Marrakush: 9. Abu Muhammad Abd Allah al-Wanaghîli, the blind, d. 779/1378; 4. Abu Muhammad al-Khatib, d. 776/1374); (c) in Marrakush: 9. Abu Muhammad Ibrâhîm al-Zukandari, d. 768/1367; (d) in Tlemcen: 10. Abu Abu 'Ibn al-Maghniyya, Cairo n.d., 155-62; F. Bustânî, Dâ'irat al-ma'dîrî, iii, 482-3. (Ch. Pellat)
Abd Allah Muhammad b. Yafca, d. 771/1369; u. Abu Abd Allah Muhammad b. Afmad b. Marzuk, d. 780/1379; (6) in Tunis: 14. Abu l-Hasan Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Batarni (var. al-Batrunci, and al-Batwii), d. 793/1390; (5) in Casablanca: 19. Abu Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Jibril b. Abu Bakr, ... of the 26 titles contained in this list, at the present time, roughly speaking, we know only the following: (1) Bushyal al-farid min al-bisah wa l-farad, which is probably the same as the Mufaddal al-wad al-mabadi fi l-farad or again the Shaf'a al-manhaj al-mansur wa l-farad and which, according to M. Ben Cheneb, is said to exist in a private (?) library; (2) al-Faridiya fi l-mabadi; (3) al-Mafadha al-saniyya fi l-khidr al-abada-riyya, the source of Ahmad Baba, Nayl al-Ishadiyya, Fas ed., 394, Cairo ed., 70 and passim; (4) Sharaf al-talib min al-mabadi (see ms. in al-Faridiya, 74-7); (5) Tafsir al-matadhib fi ta'dil al-kawakib, ms. Rabat 512 bis; (6) Uns al-jabr wa l-aha, a biography of the Andalusian mystic Abu Madyan and his admirers; ms. Rabat, 385, Cairo, vi, 344 v. 45; ed. M. al-Fasi and A. Faure, Rabat 1965; (7) Sharaf al-talib min al-mabadi, a commentary on the Talhis al-mabadi al-bisah of Ibn al-Banna [q.v.], ms. Rabat 532 bis.

We believe that M. Hadj-Sadok attributes to him other works whose titles do not appear on his own list; (8) Takhil al-manhaj fi takmil al-madari, a commentary on (5) above; ms. Rabat 512 bis. (9) Sharaf urdjudat Ibn l-Ridadi [q.v.], ms. Rabat 466, 457, 512 bis; (10) Br. Mus. 977a. On the other hand, a number of mss have been discovered (see Introd. al-Faridiya), in particular: (10) Urdjudat fi l-tabis; (11) Tafsir al-matadhib li-khidr al-sharif min ibsal al-wad; (12) Tashil al-matadhib fi ta'dil al-kawakib; (13) Sirad al-talibat fi ilm al-talibat.

The remainder are now considered to be lost: (a) Alamad al-naqdah fi mabadi, al-issaliak; (b) Anekur al-salada fi usal al-salada; (c) Baas al-rumuz al-bisaha fi sharik urad al-khadariyya; (d) Hitiyat al-talib fi bayan Alifyat Ibn Malik; (e) Idadi al-ma'sini fi bayan al-mahani; (f) l-Ibrakimiyya fi mabadi. (f) l-Ibrakimiyya fi mabadi. (g) l-Kunfudhiyya fi ihli al-adilal fa-lafaqiyah; (h) l-Lubab fi l-khidr al-talibat; (i) Tashil al-talib fi usal al-ashay Ibn l-Ridadi; (j) Tashil al-talib fi sharik l-talibat; (k) Tashil al-talibat fi sharik l-risala; (l) Tashil al-talibat fi sharik l-Dimul al-khafadji (var. Brocklemann, i, 462); (m) Tashil al-talibat fi l-talibat al-salma; (n) Waktu al-mawakib wa-saniyati al-munakib. Bibliography: Ibn al-Kahd, Djiahvats al-


IBN KUTFAYBA, Abu Muhammad 'Abd Allah b. Muslim al-Dinawari (soe add al-Köfi, which refers to his place of birth, and al-Mawazi, which is probably the ethnic name of his father), one of the great Sunni polygraphs of the 3rd/9th century, being both a theologian and a writer of adab. He seems to have been descended, in the second or third generation, from an Arabized Iranian family from Khorasan which was connected on the female side with the Bahlis of Basra and may have come to Irak in the wake of the Abbasid armies during the second half of the 2nd/8th century. He was born at Kufa in 213/828, but little is known of his childhood and adolescence. At the most we are able to compile a list of his teachers which, on careful examination, provides much information on his education. Among the most important of them we find men who owe their reputations generally to their attachment to the Sunna, either as theologians, traditionalists or philologists, or usually as all three. The biographers and critics have produced long lists of them, but a few names should be mentioned here. The three persons who had the greatest influence on the young Ibn Kutayba are undoubtedly l-Isaib b. l-Ibrâhîm b. l-Ibarâhîm b. l-Ammâr b. l-Abd l-Hamid b. l-Abâd al-Siddîsî, a Sunni theologian, a disciple of Ibn Hanbal and protégé of the Tâhiris of Nisâbûr, where he appears to have spent most of his life, Abû Hâtim Sahl b. Muhammad al-Siddîsî (d. ca. 250/864), Sunni philologist and traditionalist and a master of everybody who in Irak was interested in philology and tradition, and finally al-Abbâs b. l-Farâji b. l-Râfiî (d. 257/872), one of the leaders of philological studies in Irak, transmitter of the works of al-'Asma, Abû Ubayda and other pioneers of the 2nd/8th century.

Very few details are available of Ibn Kutayba's career, but a comparison of information from different sources allows the following tentative reconstruction: after the change in ideology accepted by al-Mutawakkil and his chief henchmen from 232/846 onwards, Ibn Kutayba found himself without a patron. He seems to have been descended, in the second or third generation, from an Arabized Iranian family from Khorasan which was connected on the female side with the Bahlis of Basra and may have come to Irak in the wake of the Abbasid armies during the second half of the 2nd/8th century.
236/851. He seems to have remained in this office until 257/871, when he may have stayed for a short time in Basra until the sacking of this town by the Zandj, in Shawwal 257/871. He seems to have remained in this office until 256/870, when he may have stayed for a short time as inspector of Basra until his death in 276/889. Ibn Kutayba's son, Ahmad, appears to have been his chief disciple. He is certainly responsible, as is his son 'Abd al-Wahid, for the transmission to Egypt, indirectly to the West—especially through the intermediary of 'Abd al-Kamil—of the greater part of the works of Abū al-Muḥammad. In al-Andalus, the direct transmission of Ibn Kutayba's work was ensured by the famous Kāsim b. 'Abdābrahām, who had come to study in Baghdad in 274/887. Among the eastern disciples, 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Sukkāri (d. 323/935) seems to have played a particularly important part, his name being found at the head of numerous manuscripts. But Ibn Kutayba should also be mentioned: Abu Ṭūl Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh b. Dījār, Ibn Durustawāyah [q.v.], and 'Ibrāhīm b. Muhammad b. 'Ayyūb al-Sā'īdī (d. 313/925), in addition to other minor disciples.

It can be stated that, with the exception of two titles, all the authentic works of Ibn Kutayba as at present known have been published. We list them here, giving for each the most useful edition and a brief description of the contents:

(1) K. Adab al-kāthīb (ed. Grünert, Leiden 1900), manual of philology for the use of secretaries, with a famous introduction which may be regarded as a politico-cultural profession of faith.

(2) K. al-Amālī (ed. Pellat-Hamidullah, Ḥaydarabād 1375/1956), treatise on practical astronomy and meteorology.

(3) K. al-Šā'ābī (ed. Kurd 'Allī, in Rasā'īl al-Būlahāq, Cairo 1325/1946, 344-77), treatise in the anti-Shi'i tradition on the relative merits of the Arabs, the Persians, and the inhabitants of Khurāsān.


(5) K. al-Īhtīlāf fi l-īlāf wa l-rādā' al-sūl l-Dhāliyya wa l-Muḥabbība (ed. Muhammad Zāhid al-Kawhārī, Cairo 1340), a theological pamphlet refuting the position of the Muḥabbība on attributes and that of the Mu'tazilis with Dhāliyya tendencies on the pronunciation of the Kurān.
Bukhālī. About the remainder one can only guess. Finally, it is not without interest to note that Ibn Kutayba's "theological" work and to pass in silence over his religious ideas. It seems clear however that at some stage Ibn Kutayba put his literary talents at the service of the enterprise of the restoration of Sunnism which was undertaken by al-Mutawakkil and his chief helpers. This meant that a number of his works were intended to expound a politico-religious doctrine which we might expect would take its place in the ideological line of the Sunna then coming into being, and particularly that represented by Ibn Hanbal and Isḥāq b. Rāhawayh.

Nevertheless, Ibn Kutayba, who admits to having been tempted in his youth by the quasi-rationalist ideologies which were in vogue at the time, was at times somewhat troubled by the dogmatic intransigence of the upholders of Tradition. Although his theology is fairly clearly "Hanbali", his attitude concerning the Kurān is orthodox, he is much less categorical on the problem of lafs (q.v.), which he states does not prevent membership of the Sunnī community; although his attitude concerning the Companions is that which remained in later times the touchstone of the Sunna, he nevertheless retained a deep and reverent respect for the family and descendants of the Prophet, so far as they were politically neutral. Even his opinions about the "national groups" (Shābīsibya) seem much more subtle than hath hitherto been admitted: whether he is writing of ethnic or of religious groups, one is led to think that he tends to gather together peacefully around the reigning dynasty those among them whom he considers it possible to win over politically. Culturally and stylistically the other hand, his method of exposition, of which he nowhere gives a systematic definition —certainly seems steadfastly to despise the rational or intellectual criteria held for example among the Ş̣̄̆fiʿis and the Ḥanafīs. The Kurān and the Sunna remain for him the two fundamental bases of doctrine; the third is idrād, of which his conception is perhaps nearer to that of Mālik than of Ibn Hanbal. The Ḥanafī raʿy and the Ş̣̄̆̆fiʿi ʿaṣyā are fiercely demolished in the Muhk̄̄h̄alīf, as are all their equivalents (naṣar, ʿabī, istiḥsān, etc.).

Thus all the religious, political and literary work of Ibn Kutayba combines to make him an eminent representative, if not the exclusive spokesman, of the aḥr al-Sunna waʾl-Dīmārā, who in fact from this period were the party of the "Abbasid dynasty which had already abandoned the Muṭtala'i ideology, and particularly in the Shīʿīs and al-Farābī, whereas in a more general way, in philology and especially in poetry, he does not hesitate to depart from the usually accepted views.

What has been said above on his religious position end of the 3rd/9th century, nothing has been found in Ibn Kutayba's philological work, or at least in what now survives, which could provide us with a point of view. Although he in effect contrasts them with the "Baṣrān", he regularly refers to those who were later to be attached to the "School of Kūfā" as "Baṣ̄hādīs", and the synthesis of which so much has been made is no more than a genuine eclecticism which never claimed to form a school.

All that can be said is that Ibn Kutayba in fact joins certain reputedly Kufi tendencies to others considered to be Baṣrān. His position may be summarized by stating that in grammar he remains on the whole a supporter of the norm, i.e., "Baṣrān", in spite of his attachment to the teaching of al-Kīṣāʾī and of al-Farābī, whereas in a more general way, in philology and especially in poetry, he does not hesitate to depart from the usually accepted views, an attitude considered to be "Kūfī".

Ibn Kutayba's writing on poetry is found mainly in two works: the K. Maʾādin li-šīʿr, a long anthology of poetic themes, and the K. al-Ş̣̄̆hīr waʾl-ş̣̄̆ʿawār, a mainly chronologically arranged anthology. It is possible that other works, now lost, were also on poetry. Thus there is frequently a K. Usyʿīn al-ş̣̄̆ḥīr of which nothing is known. It is usual (see Gaufroy-Demobynes, op. cit.) to attribute these to his youth, before he entered upon the introduction to the K. al-Ş̣̄̆hīr waʾl-ş̣̄̆ʿawār. It is true that it appears as a "veritable manuel de néo-classicisme" (R. Blache, HLA, i, 140) in the sense that it exhorts writers to "create antique verses on new thoughts" and contributes some original ideas on the ideal poetic technique. But one has no hesitation in saying that this text, though of some interest for the evidence it contains, is nevertheless grossly overrated as a treatise on style. Close inspection reveals that its few main ideas have nothing at all to do with poetic style. They concern in fact a great problem of cultural ethos, of the quarrel of Ancients and Moderns, and in addition an important problem of historical method, that of the documentary value of a literary work in the strict sense. There is nothing in this which truly concerns Ibn Kutayba. He composed no poetry at all himself, he continues to be regarded as a writer of prose.

Nevertheless, he must be regarded as an innovator, in the sense that he devotes in his anthologies, and particularly in the Shīʿī, at least as much space to the "modern" as to the "ancient" poets. Thus he professes a great admiration for writers such as Bashshār and Abū Nuwās, to mention only the greatest. In addition he has the merit of mentioning poets of whom otherwise almost nothing is known. Ibn Kutayba's reputation, especially in the West, is based mainly on his ability as a writer of adab. His adāb, which comprises an ethos and a culture in which are united all the intellectual currents of the Abbasid society at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century, and which displays an intent to popularize, at least for a certain literate public, is in this sense a kind of humanism. But it would be wrong, in the light of the eclectic professions of faith in the introductions of the Usyʿīn and the Adāb al-kūfī, to regard it as a secularist or even simply as a secular humanism, as some have tended to do in the West. What has been said above on his religious position and his attitude as defender of the Sunna clearly proves that in his mind there is no difference in kind between the religious and the secular aspect of his educational work.

Ibn Kutayba's culture amalgamates in several
ways the four great cultural trends of his period: the Arabic trend proper, which consists of the "Arabic" sciences, i.e., the religious sciences properly so-called, the sciences, the religious sciences properly so-called, and "historical" sciences; the Indo-Iranian current, which contributes a certain administrative culture and a certain conception of the social relations in a developed society; the Judaeo-Christian trend, which adds a certain spiritual ferment; and, in a lesser degree, the Hellenistic trend which contributes the taste for logic and experimental knowledge.

Similarly Ibn Kutayba's ethic brings together the great cultural trends as conveyed by these different cultures: the proud and pitiless ethic of the desert, that of the virile and sober qualities of the pre-Islamic mursawa, the civilized and opportunistic ethic of the Persian tradition, the spiritual and mystic ethic of the three revealed religions. Nevertheless, one seeks in vain in the resulting synthesis for any influence of Aristotelian or Platonic ethics, they being too clearly incompatible with the developing Sunni ideal.

It is usual to consider the style of a compiler as a mirror of his personality. In the case of Ibn Kutayba it is far more complicated. He was a man of the nascent Sunna. It is not surprising if, among the responsible people of his time, Ibn Kutayba, the "secular" and the "religious", which are however distinguished only for the purpose of explanation, reflect a double personality: with a mind open to all the current intellectual ideas, which he attempted to spread by an exaggerated respect for the norms of grammatical and rhetoric, see BALAGHA and AL-MAS'AMI WASIYYA.

(G. Lecomte)
Ibn al-Kutiyya was thus a mawlid of the Umayyads and a descendant of the Visigothic nobility. Born in Seville, he settled in Cordova after studying in his native town and in the capital of al-Andalus, under such famous teachers as Hasan b. 'Abd Allâh al-Zubayri, Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Aymân, Muhammad b. 'Umar b. Lubbâa and Kâsim b. Ašâbâ. He lectured in Cordova and had several pupils, some of them well-known, especially the kādi Abu 'l-Hamzâ Khalaf b. 'Âsâl al-Washki and the kâdi al-Maksur wa 'l-mamdud, who held the office of chief justice during the life-time of Ibn al-Kutiyya. He died in Cordova, in old age, on Tuesday 23 Rabi' i 1367/1176 November 977.

Of his various works, among which was his Kitâb al-Mahsâr wa 'l-mamâd, the only ones to have survived are: (1) Kitâb Tašrîf al-af'lâl, published by I. Guidi (i libri dei verbi di ... Ibn al-Qutiliya, Leiden 1894) and re-edited recently by 'Ali Fawda under the title al-Aflatîl, Cairo 1953. (2) Ta'rîkht al-Hâdîbân wa al-Ansâb, a history of the conquest of the Iberian peninsula and of the emirate to the end of the reign of the amir 'Abd Allâh; the Arabic text, prepared from ms. Paris 706 by Gayangos, Saavedra and Codera, was printed in 1888, but it was published only by J. Ribera, with a Spanish trans. and a helpful introduction, under the title Historia de la conquista de Espana de Abenal- qadim wa 'l-mahsûr, Madrid 1926. Earlier, A. Cherbonneau had brought out an incomplete French trans. (Histoire de la conquête de l'Espagne par les Musulmans, in J.A, i (1853), 458-85 and viii (1856), 428-527); O. Houdas published the first part of the Arabic text with a French trans. (Histoire de la conquête de l'Andalousie, in Recueil de textes ... publié avec la collaboration de l'Académie Orientales, i, Paris 1889, 219-80); E. Fagnan also published a trans. of some fragments in his Extrait, 195 ff. The Ta'rîkh was re-edited recently by 'Abd Allâh Anîs al-Tabbâ, Beirut n.d. (1955).

The chronicle of Ibn al-Kuitiya was dictated in the second half of the 4th/10th century and was written down by one of his pupils; it consists of a series of detached notes taken down from dictation, and it is possible that there existed various recensions or copies made by other pupils; a hypothesis of this kind is supported by the fact that the incomplete edition of the Ta'rîkh fath al-Ansâb published in Cairo contains many variants (see Mub. Ibn 'Azzâz, Une edition parcell poco conocida de la “Historia de Ibn al-Qutiliya”, in al-Ansâb, xvii (1952), 233-7). This chronicle, which could not have been disseminated before the 5th/11th century, has a special value for the history of al-Andalus in the 3rd/9th century, since it contains traditions, anecdotes, observations and personal impressions, not to be found in any other authors, on specific aspects of life at the Cordovan court and of certain personages. However, it provides, in its first part particularly, only some what scanty, imprecise and uncertain information.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Faradî, Ta'rîkh 'ulamâ' al-Ansâb, no. 1356; Dabîî, Buğyât al-mudâhim, no. 223; Ibn Khallîkûn, Bûlûk, ii, 336 (de Slane, iii, 179); Thâriqat Fath al-Andalus, v. 1, 412; al-Bâth b. Khâlîk, Mâhâf, Istambul 1932, p. 48; Suyûtî, Buğyât, 84; Dozy, Hist. de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, titubeil al-Bayano 'l-Mogib, Leiden 1848-51, i, 28-30 (still useful); Wüstenfeld, Geschichtsbeschreib, no. 141; Pons Boigues, Ensayo, no. 45; Brockelmann, i, 150, S I, 232; Muhammad Ben Cheneb, Él. sur les personnages menismes dans l'état du Cheikh 'Abd al-Qâdir al-Fâsi, no. 231; Sánchez Gayangos, Saavedra and Codera, was printed in Cairo 1953. (2) Ibn Hadjar. His travels, not very extensive ones, brought him to Damascus, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Mecca. His professional career was not outstanding. He held only shortlived teaching appointments, for instance, in the Baybarsiyâ and in the madrasa al-Djiddawi. Equally shortlived stipends from influential friends, consisting in one instance of a monthly allowance of 800, and in another of 2000 dirhams, helped him to support his large family. But his scholarly prestige was great, and it seems that his writings and his legal advisory works yielded enough income for his needs. He had close Sufi connexions and, in the great debate about mysticism, took a stand favorable to Ibn al-'Arabî and Ibn al-Fârid. Death came to him on the night of Wednesday-Thursday, 4 Rabi' II 879/17-18 August 1474.

His literary production, begun in his nineteenth year, was voluminous, approaching, it would seem, that of Wednesday-Thursday, 4 Rabi' II 879/17-18 August 1474.

His literary production, begun in his nineteenth year, was voluminous, approaching, it would seem, that of another of 2000 dirhams, helped him to support his large family. But his scholarly prestige was great, and it seems that his writings and his legal advisory works yielded enough income for his needs. He had close Sufi connexions and, in the great debate about mysticism, took a stand favorable to Ibn al-'Arabî and Ibn al-Fârid. Death came to him on the night of Wednesday-Thursday, 4 Rabi' II 879/17-18 August 1474.
IBN KUTLÜBUGHA — IBN KUZMAN

Very little is known of the life of Ibn Kuzman. He himself merely mentions (ṣaḏl al no. 38, stanza 9) that he was not yet born at the time of the famous battle of al-Zallaka (479/1086). The only certain fact is that he died at Cordova on the penultimate day of Ramadan 553/October 1160 (see Ibn al-Khatīb, Ḥalālo, MS Esccorial, fol. 54).

Ibn Kuzman lived in a difficult time for poets. From 498/1096, the Almoravid Yusuf b. Tashfin had done away with the last “party kings” (mulak aljavāli) with their luxurious courts and their entourage of paid poets. Only the Ḥādis, in distant Saragossa, succeeded in maintaining precariously the tradition of the patron princes until 503/1110. The new masters of the country, sultans, viceroys, and governors, were Berber-speakers from the Sahara, who must have been unable to understand the subtleties of Arabic poetry (cf. Dozy, Hist. Mus. Esp. ii, 127, 135). It is doubtful, for example, how far the governor of eastern Spain, Ibn Tifarīt, of the Saharan tribe of the Massufa (d. 510/1116-7), could have appreciated the panegyrics which were addressed to him at Valencia by Ibn Khafadja.

Thus the only remaining persons to whom poets could turn for patronage were the members of the Hispano-Arab urban aristocracy, rich and powerful noblemen who held in rotation the office of chief magistrate (ṣādī al-dawla). Their liberality, however, did not always match their wealth. One of them, Muhammad Ibn Hamdun, was so miserly as to be the laughing stock of the famous philosopher, physician, and musicologist, Ibn Bāḍrīja (q.v.).
IBN KUZMÀN

(sadjal no. 84, stanza 1) to Seville, where there lived two of his chief patrons: Abu 'l-cAla3 Ibn Sa'd, who was intendant of finance there. It was at the house of the latter that Ibn Kuzman met the poetess Nazhm with whom he had a famous altercation (see al-Makkarl, Analectes, ii, 636). He may also have travelled to Jaen (no. 21, stanza 14). Thus the area of his travels in Muslim Spain was relatively restricted. He himself admits that he had never seen the sea (no. 145, stanza 10) but it is not clear from which period of his life this poem dates. He certainly mentions, in a comparison, the Gibralfaro which dominates Malaga (no. 142, stanza 3), but he may have known of it only by hearsay.

According to his own description, Ibn Kuzman was tall, with blue eyes and a red beard. Other sources describe him as having a squat and being very ugly; in this connexion there is related a comic anecdote which had already been told as applying to al-Djihiz (cf. Ch. Pellat, Le milieu basrien et la formation de Djihiz, 59).

Like those to whom he dedicated his sadjals, he must have had a good knowledge of the Romance dialect current in the south of Muslim Spain. He quotes from it not only isolated words, but also short phrases. Nor was he entirely ignorant of the Berber spoken by the immigrants from the Sahara: certain poems dedicated to Almoravid dignitaries have words from this language inserted in them—these words moreover are those which conquered peoples most readily borrow from their conquerors.

Ibn Kuzman was in no sense a troubadour singing of courtly love, that 'isbâl al-mursawa which he in fact derides. Like Abu Nuwâs and François Villon, he led the life of a needy bohemian, a reckless toper, and an epicene rake (shâli', shî, lawwàf). His licentious conduct caused him to be continually censured by his contemporaries, the fafâhs, who were particularly fomentors of disorder. In revolt against the Almoravids, he had himself proclaimed amîr al-musîlimin in 539/1145, but his reign was brief. In spite of the support of the king of Castile, he was unable to resist either the Almoravids or the Almohads.

Ibn Kuzman died in 555/1160, while Cordova was being besieged by Muhammad b. Sa'd Ibn Mardenîh, who was attempting to take the town from the Almohads.

In spite of his dissolute life, Ibn Kuzman seems to have reached a relatively advanced age. His first sadjal to which a definite date can be given (no. 83), an elegy on the death of Abu 'l-Kâsin Ibn Hamdîn was written in 521/1127. In verses in classical Arabic, he depsects himself as walking in a bent position "as if he were searching for his youth in the dust" (Analectes, ii, 437). If we are to take seriously what he says in his sadjal no. 147, the poet, towards the end of a not very exemplary life, reformed to the sense of "evil spirit, misfortune", and appears each time in contrast with sa'îd.

Thus the important part of his work consists of muwashshahs, a sort of lyric song (no. 143; affâfî; no. 11, st. 9: awâdî). Only one is known: Ahmad, a traditionist who died at Malaga shortly after 600/1204.

Works. Ibn Kuzman describes himself as a prose writer and a poet in the classical style as well as a composer of muwashshâhs [v.g.] and of sadjals. Of his prose there is known only the preface to the Diwân, in rhyming prose. Very few of his classical verses have survived and these do not show any remarkable talent. Only one of his muwashshâhs has been preserved (cf. Hoenerbach, 94).

Thus the important part of his work consists of his sadjals. There existed at one time a large collection (diwân kabîr) of these, possessed and used by al-Álî (cf. Hoenerbach, 68), but now apparently lost. Another (abridged?) diwân, entitled Isbât al-aghîrâd fî wafî al-a'dâd, was put together by the
author for an obscure friend of his, Ibrahim al-Washki, the only existing manuscript of which was discovered in the Geniza of Fustat. The 149 *sadqas* which are preserved in the *Dîwan* in its present form may be divided into two categories: those with a dedication and those without. Those without are fewer (27) and in general shorter: 5 or 6 stanzas, and, in this detail, are close to the norm of the *muwashshah*. They are the poems which S. M. Stern (Studies... , 385) rightly calls "muwashshah-like *sadqas*"; their themes are solely drinking or love.

The poems with dedications are of greatly varying length, most of them having from 5 to 9 stanzas. But they include some very long ones: 42 stanzas (no. 9), 40 stanzas (no. 38), and also some very short ones: 3 stanzas (no. 47), dedicated to the governor Tâghfin "since the Almoravids did not like prolixity." These poems with dedications are of bipartite structure, like the classical *basida*, but are divided into stanzas with varying rhymes and written in dialectic Arabic in metres which are often non-classical. Thus they have been described as "ballades". The first part is a light introduction (*ghassâl, taghâssâl*) which follows the old *nashâl*. The favourite themes for these are wine and love, also their common provider: money. The second is a panegyrical (madlâ, madâkh) of the person to whom the poem is dedicated and from whom the poet expects a generous reward. Between these two essential sections there is a brief "transition" (*dûhûl, bâurûd, takhâlûs*); it is in his ingenious choice of this link-passage that the poet's talent appears.

The panegyrics, often exaggerated, are not of great interest; they contain praise of beauty, of learning and above all of the generosity of the person to whom they are dedicated. Sometimes the author adds to them a personal *fakhr* in which he describes himself as the prince, and even the father, of the genre of the *sadâl* and complains of his plagiarizers.

On the other hand, the humorous introductions form the most original and interesting part of Ibn Kûzmân's work. They amount to vignettes describing scenes from the public and private lives of the inhabitants of the city, abounding in valuable details on houses, furniture, costume, food, etc. These vivid and often comic scenes are full of vivacity, variety and realism, interspersed with racy and amusing details which reveal extraordinary powers of observation and expression: drunken quarrels, preparations for a feast day (which provides the poet with the opportunity to complain of his chronic penury), rejoicing at a carnival, the consultation of a fortune-teller, romantic adventures and altercations with deceived husbands. The poet himself often appears on the scene, in a humorous part, without always trying to give himself a favourable role. Licentiousness is freely mingled with burlesque, but very rarely descends to real obscenity.

Unfortunately these sociological documents are not always very easy to understand, for the poet's impetuous and lively style, the incisive brevity of his phrases, the vivacity of his narration and the abruptness with which he jumps from one theme to another, all combine to make accurate translation difficult. Furthermore, allusions are made in these passages to popular characters of the time and to beliefs and customs of which no mention is found elsewhere. Also, it is in these "jets" that there appear most of the terms peculiar to the local dialects, either not to be found in dictionaries or deformed by Eastern copyists. It should also be mentioned that the Eastern anthologists who have included fragments or whole poems by Ibn Kûzmân have limited these to passages on drinking or love, *i.e.*, to the parts which contain the most clichés and the vocabulary of which belongs to the common stock of Arabic, with even a classical tendency. The real reason for their neglect of the descriptive sections, which are nevertheless those more representative of the poet's talent, is probably their inability to understand the really local vocabulary used in them.

Ibn Kûzmân, being essentially a townsman, provides no description of nature in its wild state. He had only unpleasant memories of his journeys from Cordova to Granada, accomplished in precarious and sometimes perilous conditions across the sierras and their ravines where he saw more bramble-bushes and oleanders than sweet-basil (no. 73, st. 5). As with the other poets of Spain (with the exception of his contemporary Ibn Khafadhâja), the nature which he likes and describes is that which he had the opportunity to enjoy during pleasure trips to the country (*nasâysh*), in the pleasure gardens (*mânâzik*) which his patrons owned on the outskirts of the large towns and cities, where he had to relax in spring and in autumn. The poet likes to describe the happy frolics of gay young drinkers and pretty girls, singing, dancing and swimming in an enchanting setting beside a fresh stream or a pool among flowers or in the shade of elm-trees full of singing birds. Poem no. 79, in which he reveals his knowledge of astronomy in a detailed description of the night sky of Andalusia, is exceptional.

His descriptions of battles against the Christians (nos. 38, 40, 47, 86, 102) are very vivid, but they seem to be based solely on imagination, since it is almost certain that he was not present at any but merely formed a part of the crowd at the triumphal reception (*bûrûs*) of the victorious troops.

This essentially humorous poet wrote also a rather touching elegy (no. 83, repeated in part in no. 38, stanzas 37 and 38) on the death of one of his chief Cordovan patrons, Abu 'l-Kâsim Ahmad Ibn Hamdîn, in 525/1127. One curious thing is that Ibn Kûzmân does not appear to have used the genre of satire, for which he would appear to have been so well-fitted; and his attacks on the *fäkhs*, his relentless critics, were always discreet and prudent.

The importance attached by writers of *muwashshahs* to the ascriptive selection of the cadence (or refrain) on which they subsequently constructed their poem is well known. This cadence became the poem's finale, its "sally" (*Sp. salida*), its "going-out" (*Ar. khârâdja*) and at the same time its "pivot" or centre (*markaz*), providing, as it did, both the metrical pattern for the whole poem and the rhyme which was repeated at the end of every verse. In this matter, Ibn Kûzmân did not attempt to be original. None of his "finales" is in the Romance language; some of them consist of a popular proverb. On three occasions, and without always mentioning his source, he has merely borrowed "finales" in dialect from his contemporary and compatriot Ibn Balîl, the famous author of *muwashshahs* (d. 540/1145).

It certainly seems, however, that the re-use of famous "finales", written in these "pivot" lines of the Romance, was a current practice among the poets of Spain, Jewish as well as Muslim. To borrow a
"finale" from a famous poet and reconstruct on it a new muwashshah or zadjal was regarded as an exercise in virtuosity and has nothing to do with plagiarism: it was a West-Andalusi. The structure and the metre of the zadjals of Ibn Kuzmán will be studied in the article ZADJAL.

The language used by Ibn Kuzmán in his zadjals is the Arabic dialect of southern Spain as it was spoken by the educated people of his time, that is to say with a vocabulary much enriched with borrowings from the classical language, but always observed of grammatical inflections (t'khb). In the ʿAfīl al-ḥālī, ʿSaḥī al-Dīn al-Hillī accused Ibn Kuzmán of straying too often from the pure Spanish dialect. But this Mesopotamian critic, living two centuries after Ibn Kuzmán, cannot have had any serious knowledge of the peculiarities of that idiom. The writer of this article has demonstrated elsewhere that practically all of these criticisms were unjustified. It is true that Ibn Kuzmán may be accused of having misused some initial hāmaz (hamzat al-ḥālī) in order to suit the metre, but this is a poetical licence used also by poets writing in the classical language. He may have made more frequent use of the conjunction fa- and the particle baḥ that the common people did. It should be remembered, however, that his zadjals were intended primarily for literate persons.

Ibn Kuzmán’s own estimate of his talent has been ratified by posterity. Both Eastern and Western Arabic-speaking peoples have pronounced him unsurpassed as a writer of zadjals. His works have become accepted as models of perfection in this genre, to such an extent that, for centuries, the Eastern composers of zadjals made it a rule to write in an approximation of the Spanish dialect.

Ibn Kuzmán’s powerful originality has never been equaled. No other poet has covered such a rich range of metrical combinations. Only his successor and compatriot, Madghalls, has been compared to him by the critics, and this was in order to put Ibn Kuzmán on a level with al-Mutanabbi in his choice of themes (maʿnā) and to raise Madghalls to that of Abū Tammān in matters of expression (lahf) (al-Mašršk, Anaqayet, ii, 190). But Ibn Kuzmán is regarded as being in the tradition of the Eastern poets writing in the classical language: Abū Nuwās, Ibn al-Muṭṭaf, Ibn al-Ḥaḍīd, Ibn Suṭṭakara, etc., who had the ability to shine even when not using well-worn themes.

Just as there are two strong points of view on the question of whether strophic poems (maqārah) and zadjals originated in the east or the west, so there are two conflicting opinions on the origin of the name of the eponymous ancestor, Kuzmán.

Some have regarded it as a transcription of the Spanish proper name Guzmán (the Arabic ḥāf being here merely the current form of transcription of the phoneme g), itself of Germanic origin. Ibn Kuzmán might, therefore, have been of Germanic ancestry (Visigothic perhaps), and the portrait which he had provided of himself would seem to confirm this hypothesis: tall, with blue eyes and red beard. Furthermore, the proper name Kuzmán is extremely rare in Arabic onomastics; it was, however, borne by a character in history, an ansārī, who died from wounds received at the battle of Uhud (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1423; Ibn Ḥīṣām, ii, 578; TA, under the radicals KZM). It is not clear why Lerchum und Simonet suggest that Ibn Kuzmán was of Jewish descent (Creostomátia arabico-española, 536). The question is not, however, of great interest. In the time of Ibn Kuzmán the old "Arab" families of Muslim Spain had interbred extensively with Iberian, Latin, Germanic, Berber, Jewish, and even Negro elements.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Malik al-Marrakushi, in his Kitāb al-Dhaly wa l-takmila, adds to the poet's name the ethnic name of al-Zuhri, which is that of many Spanish Muslims. This ethnic name is derived from the name of one of the main clans of the tribe of Kuraysh: the Zuhra. But we would perhaps not be justified in assuming a Kurayshī origin from this single piece of evidence. It is in fact very uncertain, since the nisba may not be a real one but merely a fictitious one, transmitted by a master to his freedman (walaʾwsm). It may be that there is a connection between this Christian name and that of the Sevillian family of the Banū Zuhr. Certainly of the four persons to whom the Diwan is dedicated, two are the Sevillian Abu l-ʿĀla Zuhr and Ibn al-Kurāshī al-Zuhrī.

In his Thāb al-ḥamāma (cf. ed. Bercher, Algiers 1949, 300-1, in which the translation is incorrect), Ibn Ḥazm mentions an Ibn Kuzmán, a kāhīb who died from his unrequited passion for a beautiful young man of Cordova, Aslam b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. This Aslam was the second of the chief kādšū of Abū al-Rahmān III al-Nāṣir, who succeeded in 3009/10. In 314/926, Aslam was dismissed from office because of illness and died in 315/927 (cf. al-Dabbī, no. 571; Ibn Ḥīṣām, ii, 193). This Ibn Kuzmán, who died of love, might be an ancestor of Ṭisā (l).

Ibn Bashkūwāl (no. 149) mentions an Ahmad b. Ibrahim b. Ibn Kuzmán, of Toledo, who died circa 490/1097. He does not seem to have been an ancestor of the Cordovan family.

IBN AL-LABBÁD [see 'Abd al-Abbád al-Baghdádí].

IBN AL-LABBÁNA, 'Abd Bārī Muḥammad b. 'Iṣā al-Dání, Andalusian poet of the 5th/11th century, born in Denia, whence his nisba al-Dání, by which he is often called; but he is much better known under the name of Ibn al-Lubbána "son of the dairy-woman", his mother having been, as is stated by Ibn Bassám (Dhakhíra, III, apud Ibn Saʿd, Muḥrib, ed. Sh. Ẓayf, II, 409), a seller of milk. It is known that one of his brothers, 'Abd al-ʿAzīz, was also a poet, but he gave up this career to devote himself to commerce.

Little is known of the life of Ibn al-Lubbána; it probably however resembled that of many poets of the time, who sought an important personage to whom they might address poetic eulogies. He tried his fortune at the court of al-Muʾtaṣim of Almeria, the refuge of many poets, and at those of al-Maʾmūn of Toledo and al-Muttaqakkil of Badajoz, and addressed panegyrics to these princelings; the sources contain literary anecdotes on his (probably brief) sojourns in these towns, but his chief patron, to whom he was to remain attached for the rest of his life, was al-Muʾtaṣim Ibn 'Abbád [q.v.], ruler of Seville. Fairly numerous accounts of Ibn al-Lubbána's stay at this court show that he was treated with familiarity by the ruler and his sons, for whom he felt a loyal affection and to whom he dedicated eulogistic poems which have the mark of sincerity. In 484/1093, when al-Muʾtaṣim al-Labbána was deposed by the Almoravids, Ibn al-Lubbána—"one of the few Arabic poets possessing the 'gift of tears'", as García Gómez has put it—spoke, with a deep and moving sadness, of the departure of the ship which took the ruler and his family into exile. Ibn Lubbána's devotion to his former master did not end with this event: he continued to write in praise of the poet-king and went to visit him in his African exile in Aghmat.

After the death of al-Muʾtaṣim, Ibn al-Labbána went to Bougie, where he visited ʿIzz al-Dawla, a son of al-Muʾtaṣim, and described his visit in a pathetic way (al-Makkari, Analectes, II, 250). He next went, in 489/1096, to Majorca, where he wrote in praise of the ruler, Mubāṣṣal b. Sulaymān, but those poems do not bear comparison with those which he had dedicated to al-Muʾtaṣim, as is stated by al-Maʾkṣarī (op. cit., II, 609). A series of intrigues troubled the final years of his life, and he died in Majorca in 507/1113.

Although according to Ibn al-Abbār (Takmilā, no. 511) his work was collected in a divān, no copy of this has survived and his poems now survive only in anthologies. Of his other works, that all is known are the titles and the subjects, all relating to the Banū ʿAbbād.

All the criticals and the anthropologists agree in praising the excellent poetic gifts of Ibn al-Lubbána and the beauty of his poems, but his universal fame in Arabic literature is due to his loyalty to the ruler of Seville, which he retained until his death; Ibn al-İmmām, the author of Simḥ al-Dīwan, calls him for this reason "the Simḥal of the poets" (apud Ibn Saʿd, Muḥrib, II, 412) and all who write of him praise this quality.

Ibn al-Labbána was also the author of muwaṣṣalāt; one of those which have survived ends with a very fine bcharājī in Romance.

Bibliography: Further to the sources mentioned above, see the bibli. to al-Muʾṭamīd and 'Abbādīus; see also Dubbi, Bughya, no. 215; Ibn Dihyā, Muḥrib, Cairo ed. 1954, 178-9; Ibn Khābān, Kaḥāb, Būlāk 1283, 245-52; Pons Boeiques, Espanyol, 172-5; E. García Gómez, Qasidas ed Andalucía, Madrid 1940, 83-93. On Ibn Lubbána as a writer of muwaṣṣalāt, see also García Gómez, Romances de la Al-Andalus, Madrid 1965, 283-8; idem, in al-Andalus, xxvii (1962), 72-3, 75-9; S. M. Stern, in Arabica, ii (1955), 60.

IBN ṬAMĪY, 'Umar b. Ṭamīya b. Ḥudayr al-Taymi, of the Taym b. 'Abd Manāt, an Arāb poet of the 1st/7th century. Al-Dīḥāṣ emphasizes his skill in composing poems in nasrāj and ṣağīdas, and Ibn Sallān shows him in the Canon, fourth "class" of Islamic poets, but he has escaped oblivion chiefly owing to the inventives that he exchanged with Dirār [q.v.]; these fragments of hīdāyār are in part preserved in the Nābāṭī and in various anthologies, which for the most part ignore his other compositions; his rivalry with Dirār appears basically to have been of a literary character, indeed simply a quarrel between poets each convinced of his own talent, but it soon degenerated and passed from the individual to the tribal level. Ibn Ṭamīya is said to have died at Ahwāz, the date being unknown.

Bibliography: Dīḥāṣ, Bayān and Hayawān, indexes; Ibn Kutayba, Shīr, ed. De Goeje, 428-9; Ibn Sallān, Tabābāl, 533-72, 499-504 and index; Aḥmān,INDEX: Nābiyyā, 487-91, 907; Friḥīṣ, 225; Marzubān, Muwaṣṣalāt, 127; idem, Muṣḥām, 478; Baghdādī, Khtisna, Cairo ed., II, 259-62; Ibn Rāṣḥik, Umda, i, 123; Vākūt, vi, 60; Tallin, Letteratura, 92, 97.

IBN LĀḤIYA, 'Abd Allāh b. Lāḥiya b. Ῥeba, Egyptian traditionist and judge (b. ca. 96/688-90, d. Sunday, 15 Rabī I 174/1 August 790, or 12 Rmādi II 174/6 November 790). The few known facts about his life are that he was appointed judge in 155/772 with a monthly salary of thirty dinār, the appointment being the first direct appointment of a chief judge of Egypt by a caliph instead of the provincial governor; that he held the judgeship for over nine years; and that his "books"—that is, primarily, his scholarly notebooks and materials—perished all or to a large part in a conflagration that destroyed his house in 169 or rather in 170/776. We are told that he considered unbelievers those who preferred the createdness of the Kurān, and that he was ardently pro-Shī'a. His father, Lāḥiya, is said to have died in 100/Rabī I 718-19, and his brother, Ḥašīb, is mentioned as having transmitted traditions, in Shāhīlāw 145/December 762-January 763. Ḥašīb's son, Lāḥiya, was acting governor ala ʾ-l-salāfī for some time in 898/805 and judge of Egypt from the beginning of Qaḥbān 196/April 812 to his death in Dhul-ʾKāda 204/April-May 820, with an interruption lasting about one year in 1299/November 813-August or September 814.

'Abd Allāh b. Lāḥiya is believed to have been the author of published (written) works. He transmitted the history of the Prophet's raids. He may have been one of the authors of some traditional and historical texts preserved in papyrus. Much of the material of 'Abd al-Ḥakām's [q.v.] "Conquest of Egypt", especially the Prophetic traditions cited there, and of al-Kindi's "Governors and judges of Egypt" as well as other Egyptian local histories has passed through him. For all his authorities, he reliability as a transmitter of traditions was dubious.

IBN LĀḤIYA: al-Bukhari, Taḥrīr, i, 182 f.; Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Futūḥ, ed. C. C. Torrey, 244, 246, index 334 f.; Ibn Kutayba, Muṣḥān, ed. Th. ʿUkāy, Cairo, 505, 624; Yaḥūb b. Suyūn, Taḥrīr, letter E5.2
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IBN LANKAK (the son of the little lame man), *Abū ʿl-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahman Ibn Ṣafīr Ibn Ṭabīb, and with Muḥammad b. Ṣafīr, who was his pupil and it is significant that in his commentary on the *Mwāllāha* of Imruʿ al-Kays, he cites Bundār eleven times (and al-ʾAṣmāʿi only twice); in particular, one of the two traditions on the genealogy of the poet is given according to Bundār (see *ZA*, xxix, 1914, 2), iii, 27 f.; similarly *ZA*, xvi (1902), 12. Al-Muṭawakkil (232-46/847-61) often gave audience to this scholar of Arab matters; al-Mubarrad, who had only recently left Basra, was introduced by him to this caliph, which (if the account is authentic) greatly contributed to his advancement.

According to Yāḥyā (*Maʿṣūm*, vii, 143), Bundār lived to a great age, but the dates of his birth and death are unknown. Nevertheless, what has been said here suffices to establish his place in literary history. The *Fīrās* (83) mentions four works by Bundār; there may be mentioned the *K. Ma′dīnī l-ṣuʿārāʾ* and the *K. Dārfr* al-*luqāfa* for lexicography. None has survived.
Bibliography: in the text. The Fihrist (83) and Yākūt, Muğjam al-Waḍābi, viii, 128-34 (= Irshād, ii, 390-3) are the two important sources; Suyūtī (Bayyana 1798) quotes the Fihrist in part, for the name.

(FL. Hirsch)

IBN LUYN [Spanish León ?], Ābu ‘Uṯmān Sa‘d b. Ābu Dī‘āfar Āhmād b. ‘Ībārīm al-Tūrīnī, Andalusian scholar, poet and mystic, born in Almeria in 681/1282 in a family from Lorca. He was one of the most learned men of his time and acquired a mastery of all branches of learning, although he hardly ever left his native Almeria, where he died during a plague epidemic in 750/1352. Deeply religious, he remained celibate, practised asceticism and, being naturally shy, he avoided people and saw only a few friends and pupils, among whom should be mentioned two important persons: Ibn Khātīma (q.v.) and Ibn al-Khaṭīf (q.v.). He succeeded in forming a splendid library, the best in Almeria in his time, and not content with merely acquiring manuscripts, he sought to compare them and to make editions in order to establish a correct text.

His production was very large, but the greater part of it was not original since it consists of compilations on hadīth, medicine, the sharing of inheritances, prosody, agriculture, etc. He was fond of writing summaries of important works, which he often wrote in verse. Almost all his work, which consisted of more than a hundred titles, is lost, and the part of it which has survived is practically all unpublished. Of especial interest is the urduj uṣūl entitled Kitāb Ibdā al-maḍāla wa-iḥkād al-radījāba fi uṣūl iḥkāt al-fīliṣā (cf. art. FILAHA, ii, 902a) of which an edition and translation was promised some years ago by J. Eguaras.

Ibn Luyun was an expert on poetical matters, but himself a mediocre poet, as one of his pupils, al-Hadrani, admits. A large part of one of his poetical works, the Kitāb Naṣiḥ al-aḥbāb wa-sahābih al-ādhāb, was included in a collection by al-Maḳkārī (Naḥf, Cairo ed. 1367/1949, viii, 58-80), who also reproduces (viii, 89-108) extracts from two other works, all in a sententious style and comparable to the modern orientalists (on this question, see S. M. Stern, Muhammad ibn ‘Ubāda al-Qazzāt, in Al-Andalus, xv (1950), 79 ff.).

Bibliography: In addition to the sources given in the article: Humaydī, Dīḏawat al-maḥābīb, no. 662; Dabbi, Buḥya, no. 1223; Ibn Bassām, Dabkha, i/2, 2-12; Abu ‘l-Walīd al-Himyari, ‘Alai-Baṣīrī, ‘Alai-rābi, ed. H. Pèrs, Rabat 1940, index; Ibn Khāḳān, Muḥammad al-nasīḥ, Cairo 1320, 95; Pons Boigues, Ensayo, 110-1; H. Pèrs, Poesie andalouse, Paris 1963, index. On his ši‘ī tendencies, see M. ‘All Makki, al-Taḥayyūr fī ‘l-Andalus, in Revista del Instituto Egipto de Estudios Islámicos en Madrid, ii (1954), 141-2. As a writer of muwaṣṣāhaḥ he appears in all the works and studies on this genre.

(F. DE LA GRANJA)

IBN MAḌA', Āḥmad b. ‘Ābd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Sa‘d b. Ḥārīt b. Āṣim al-Lakhmī, Andalusian fakih and grammarian of the 6th/10th century, who is given indiscriminately the kunya of Abu ‘l-Ābāb, Abu Dī‘āfar and Abu ‘l-Kāsim. Born into a famous Cordovan family in 523/1129, he studied grammar at Seville with Ibn al-Rammání and hadīṯ at Ceuta with the kāfīḥ ‘Īyāḍ. He was kādi at Fes and at Bougie, until the Almohad caliph Yūsuf b. ‘Ābd al-Muʿmin appointed him kādi ‘l-‘Ajīmāʾa, an office which he retained under his son and successor Yaḥyū b. Yūsuf.

In spite of his wide education in all branches of learning, he limited his scholarly activity to the study of Arabic grammar, a subject on which he composed three works, only one of which has survived, the Kitāb al-Raḍū ta‘lā ‘l-nuḥāb, published in 754/1354. This book illustrates the clarity of thought and independence of judgement of Ibn Maḍa', who truly deserves the title of imām fī ‘l-naḥāb, which was given to him by his biographer al-Dabīb (Buḥya, no. 605), or of imām al-naḥwīyyin, which was twice applied to him by Ibn Dihya (Buḥya, Cairo 1554, 91, 284). This work, written by Ibn Maḍa' towards the end of his life (he died in 592/1195 at Seville), "is a violent, reasoned and eloquent attack on the complicated, obscure, casuistic and artificial theories of traditional Arabic grammar as it had been formulated by the great schools of the East" (E. Garcia Gómez). At the same time it calls for the building up of a new grammar, simpler and more clear, and based on the true facts of the language. Ibn Maḍa' s work, until recently not known to survive, has aroused a great interest in scholarly

(F. DE LA GRANJA)
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circles in the East because of the problems it poses and the solutions which it indicates, (taysir al-lugha). Each scholar is engaged in seeking a method of al-Sunan, (apud I AL-KAZWINI, author of the Kitdb al-Kutub al-khamsa, al-thamar, al-Sitta, by al-Diamma'ili (d. 600/1204) in his Kitdb Tahdhib al-Tahdhib; [q.v.]). Few commentaries were devoted to it by al-Amam, in Haydarabad in 1328: al-Kurani, al-Thamar, 46 f. In the Maghrib it was never recognized. Ibn Madia travelled in search of traditions and learned them from many authorities in 'Irak, Syria, Hijaz and Egypt. His Kitdb al-Sunan contains some 4000 traditions in about 150 chapters. It was criticized, because it contains many weak (dasif) traditions; it was even said that all traditions in it which do not belong to an illustrious family of navigators. His father and grandfather were both mu'allims ('master of navigation'), C. G. Ferrand, Instructions nautiques, ii, 182-3) by profession, and were well-known as experts of the Red Sea. They wrote treatises on navigation. Ibn Madjid improved and made additions to the urdjuza (piece of poetry in the radjias metre) entitled al-Hijaziyya written by his father (al-Fawaid, fol. 78a-b). This family tradition of navigational activity was kept up by the grandson, who seems to have surpassed both his father and his grandfather as to the field. It was during his lifetime that Ibn Madjid acquired the reputation of an expert navigator of the Indian Ocean. Siddi 'Ali Reis (q.v.), the Turkish navigator (d. 970/1562), in the Preface to his work "The Ocean" (al-Muhiti), says that during his sojourn at Baqra, he had collected the works of Ibn Madjid, namely Kitab al-Fawaid and Hawayat al-isbidsr, and some works of Sulaymân al-Mahi (written in the first half of the 10th/16th century) and had studied them thoroughly for, in his opinion, it was exceedingly difficult to navigate the Indian Ocean without them (see G. Ferrand in El', iv, 353). No wonder that Ibn Madjid gave himself the proud title of "the Fourth after the Three" (i.e., Muhammad b. Shâdân, Sahl b. Abân and Layyih b. Khâlin, see below) (al-Fawaid, f. 4b), or "the Successor of the Lions", or "the Lion of the Sea in fury" (Hawaiya, f. 88b). Ibn Madjid was an author of great merit, who wrote both in prose and verse. Of his known works those that have been published by G. Ferrand in the series Instructions nautiques et Routieres arabes et portugais des xve et xvi siecles, in vols. i and ii, Paris 1921-3 and 1925, are as follows:

(1) Kitâb al-Fawaid fi wasil 'im al-bahr wa 'l-basid (dated 859/1450). This prose work covers, among other subjects, the twenty-eight lunar mansions, the stars corresponding to the thirty-eight rhumbs (khannas) of the compass, the sea-routes of the Indian Ocean, the latitudes of a number of harbours, the landmarks (alâmâd) formed by birds and the outlines of coasts, the landfalls of the west coast of India, the ten large islands of the Indian Ocean (the "island" of Arabia, Madagascarsumatra, Java, Tahiti, Brazil, Zanzibar, Zendjbar, Gawan and Socotra), a survey of the coastal regions of Asia and Africa, monsoons favourable for the voyage and a description of the Red Sea with details of anchorages, shallows and reefs.

(2) Hawayat al-khattiisir fi wasil 'ilm al-bahr (dated 866/1462). The work deals with the signs of proximity of land, the lunar mansions and rhumbs, Arabian, Coptic, Byzantine and Persian years, bâghi (the elevation of the polar star in relation to its minimal height above the horizon, see Shumovsky, op. cit. in bibl., 154), the moons of the bâghi, the months in which the stars appear, the fixed character of their latitudes and their disappearance, the sea-routes along the coast of India up to Sumatra, China and Taiwan and those along the coasts of various islands of the Indian Ocean, the latitudes of the harbours of the encircling ocean (al-Makd), currents of the deep seas and nautical astronomy.

(3) al-Urdjuza called al-Mu'arrabba (dated 890/1485) deals with the navigation of the Gulf of Aden.

(4) Kitâb al-Islâm fi dijami at-dunyä (dated 859/1458) is devoted to the kâdis and deals with the direction of the Ka'ba for the purposes of prayer.

(5) Urdjuza bar al-Abâr fi Khâlid Fâris (not dated) deals with navigation along the Arabian coast and the islands.

(6) Urdjuza fi kismat al-djamma 'alâ...
Banât Naṣâh (dated 900/1494-5) deals with the constellation Ursa. (7) Urdiuza called Kanz al-Makdimah wa nadjat al-madjhuba wa 'l-arâdî, (undated, but from the context it appears that it was written before 894/1489) deals with the celestial sphere, the signs of the zodiac, the stars, etc. (8) Urdiuza fi 'l-natakhdt li-Barr al-Hind wa Barr al-ʻArab (not dated) deals with the landfalls on the western coast of India and the coast of Arabia from 25° N. to 60° N. (9) Urdiuza called Mimmiyât al-abâdî, dealing with certain northern stars. (10) Urdiuza Mukhammas, dealing with certain northern stars. (11) Urdiuza on the Byzantine months, rhyming in nãn. It is undated, but from the context it seems that it was written before 1475 or 1489. (12) Urdiuza called Daribat al-ardîb, undated, deals with the use of certain stars in navigation and with general instructions for navigators. (13) Urdiuza dedicated to the caliph 'Ali b. Abi Talib. It was written before 1475 or 1489, and deals with the lunar mansions, their exact positions in the sky, forms and numbers, etc. (14) al-ʻAsâda al-Makhiyya, not dated, deals with the sea-routes from Djidda to Cape Fartak, Cuticat, Dabul, Konkan, Gujdarat, Al-Atwâb, Hormuz and other places. (15) Urdiuza called Nâdirat al-ʻabdî on al-âdâb, Dabâbân and al-layyuk. (16) al-ʻAsâda al-Bâdîyya called al-Dhâhâbiyya (dated 10 Dhû l-Hijjah 882/21 March 1747), deals with the investigation of the reefs, great depths, signs indicating land such as birds and winds, landfalls on capes during monsoons, etc. (17) Urdiuza called al-Fâhka, not dated but written before 880/1475, deals with the observation of the Frog. (18) al-Šalîqa, not dated, deals with the observation of the constellation Canopus and the star Arcturus. (19) Nine short sections (fâsî) in prose, not dated: (a) and (b) deal with the mawâakhirâ; (c) with the landings by tawâbi (one tawâb = 1° 36' 25") of the dijâh (the Pole Star) on the coast of Gujdarat; (d) with the soundings of Gujdarat; (e) with the landings by tawâbi of the dijâh; (f) with landings; (g) with the soundings around Bâb al-Mandab; (h) with the soundings of Gujdarat by 10⁄34 tâbâ's of the dijâh; (i) with knowing the revolution of the Pole Star on leaving the capes of Arabia (60° N.). (20) al-Fâhka called al-Sabîyya, divided into seven sections based on the stars; it contains branches of nautical lore. (21) ʻAsâda without title or date, written before 1475, 1478 or 1489. (22) al-ʻAsâda called al-Hâliyya, not dated but written before 1475, 1478, or 1489. It deals with the stars that are useful for landfalls, with a description of the landfall points and with the coast from Djîd to Daybal.

In his Kitâb al-Fawâ'îd, Ibn Mâjdîd mentions the titles and cites verses from thirteen of his other works, which are not known to survive (for further details, see G. Ferrand, Instructions nautiques, iii, 298-221; cf. E.P., iv, 363-4).

Three urdjuzas of Ibn Mâjdîd were published by T. A. Shumovsky under the title Kûhât Râhâmân-nâgâdî al-mâkhâla [sic], Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences, U.S.R., Moscow-Leningrad 1957. They are based on the unique manuscript in the Library of the Oriental Institute. The texts are accompanied by Russian translations and valuable notes and commentaries by Shumovsky. There is a map showing the ports and harbours mentioned by Ibn Mâjdîd in his works. Of the three urdjuzas, the first is called al-Sâfîliyya (ff. 83a-96a) (on Sofala, on the east coast of Africa) and deals with the knowledge of the mahâdîs (day's journey by sea) and astronomical calculations from Malabar, Konkan, Gujdarât, Sind, al-Atwâb up to Somalia, and from there to the region of al-Sawârî (east coast of Africa), Zanjâbîl, Sofâla, Madagascar and its islands. It also deals with various other aspects of navigation and with the inhabitants, kings, monsoons, etc. of those regions. This urdjuza also devotes some pages towards the end to the Franks and the Portuguese navigators of the Indian Ocean. It is undated. The second urdjuza, entitled al-Mâshâbiyya (ff. 97b-104a, on Malacca), deals with the islands and ports north of Ceylon, the Andamans and Nicobars, Java and Sumatra, Siam, Malacca, and other gulfs and islands of these regions, up to Formosa, China and the Pacific Ocean. The third is called al-Tâ'îyya. It describes the sea-routes and calculations from Djîd to Aden (ff. 104b-105b).

Sources of his knowledge. Ibn Mâjdîd was as much interested in the theoretical aspects of navigation as he was in its practical side. The knowledge and experience that he inherited from his forefathers was enriched by his own personal experience of forty years or so. Furthermore, there is little doubt that he was a well-read man and was familiar with ancient Arabic poetry and literature and with works on history and other subjects. He made a particular study and use of the existing works on navigation, astronomy and geography. He considered the study of astronomy and geography as a pre-requisite for anyone who wished to become efficient in navigation, and hence recommended the following works to navigators and sea-captains who wished to become masters of the subject: Kitâb al-Mabûdî wa 'l-ďâdîl (Kitâb al-Mabûdî wa 'l-ďâdîl fi 'l-mâhâdî) by Abî 'All al-Hasan b. ʻUmâr al-Mârâkûshî al-Mâghribî (d. 660/1262); Kitâb al-Ṭâjîdat (swar al-arkâs al-ğhâsîa) by Abî ʻAbd al-Rahmân al-Sâfî (d. 376/986); al-Ḏâhâbîs al-Mâkhâliyya (7); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dînawarî (d. 828/1420); the book of (Abd b. Daʾûd) Abû Ḥanîf...
east coast of Africa, to the south of Sofala, turned towards the east instead of the west, and extended latitudinally as far east as China, leaving only a narrow passage between the African continent and the islands of the southern hemisphere. For centuries, this theory was accepted and hindered the progress of navigation in southern Africa. Again the terra incognita of the Indian Ocean and the Atlantic, south of the Mountains of the Moon. This fairly long channel, according to him, lay between Sofala and the cape called "al-Ra'sun" (Sarât al-Ma'mûra 'alâ l-Bîrûnî, 62-3; this cape could be no other than the region of the Agulhas currents of modern maps). Ibn Sa'id (d. 672/1274) placed the junction of the two seas (the Indian Ocean and the Atlantic) at Long. 117° 30' and Lat. 16° oo' where the sea was called "Sea of Ruin" or "Sea of Suhayl" and it also marked the end of the Mount of Regret (Nadâma) stretching between Long. 109° oo' and 117° 30' along the coast of Africa (this place, according to M. Reinaud, was the Cape of Good Hope, Geographie d'Aboulafia, p. cccxxvi). However, Ibn Madjid was the first Arab navigator to describe in more positive terms the coast of Africa south of Sofala. He seems to have acquired the information about the existence of a madkhâl (place of entry, from the Atlantic into the Indian Ocean) from the Portuguese (al-Suflîyya, ff. 93a, 94a), but he must also have been acquainted with al-Bîrûnî's ideas on the subject through Abu 'l-Fidill's Ta'kirim al-bulâdân, which he had consulted. Thus, Ibn Madjid believed that there existed a madkhâl which separated the African continent from the terra incognita in the southern hemisphere. Describing the coast of Africa, he says that when you reach the land of Sofala and the "gulfs", the island of al-Kumr (Madagascar) "passes by" to your left, and the island to your right (i.e., the coast of Africa as the ship sailed south) turns away towards the west and the north. This is the place where the "Darkness" (the region from which he was coming). From there, the land turns to the "land of al-Kâtîm" (Kanem). When you pass Kanem, you come to "the land of al-Wâtâhî" (Oases) near al-Maghârib (Maghrib) which begins at al-Ma'sâ. Leaving this behind, you arrive at Asîfi and finally Ceuta, at the entrance of the Mediterranean Sea (al-Fawdâdî, f. 64). It is obvious that Ibn Madjid conceived of Africa as being much smaller than it actually is, for according to his account the east coast of Africa turns sharply westward and emerges at Kanem (south of the land of the "Black People", i.e., Ghana, etc.) and from there it reaches Morocco.

Ibn Madjid surveys the coastal regions of the earth (dawrat al-ar'd, actually the landmass of Asia and Africa) systematically, beginning from southern Arabia. His survey of the sea-coasts of the Indian Ocean is much more detailed than that of the Mediterranean or the Caspian regions, for he did not have personal knowledge of the latter. He then describes the ten large islands of the Indian Ocean (see above) (al-Fawdâdî, ff. 67a-70b).

He does not refer to the terra incognita of the southern hemisphere, which indicates that he did not believe in it. His knowledge of astronomy was mainly derived from the works and astronomical tables of Ptolemy, al-Bâttânî,ILTER Beg, 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Sîfî and others, and he incorporates their theories and astronomical concepts in his works. Ibn Madjid's contribution lies mainly in the field of navigation. G. Ferrand rightly describes the Kitâb al-Fawdâdî as a "compendium of the known knowledge of theoretical and practical navigation". "We must regard it", he says, "as a kind of synthesis of nautical science of the latter years of the Middle Ages. Ibn Madjid is at the same time the earliest of modern writers on nautical science. The description of the Red Sea, for example, has never been passed or even examined since. Apart from the inevitable errors in latitude, by any of the writers of nautical guides for sailing boats. The information given on the monsoons, local winds, routes and latitudes for crossing the whole Indian Ocean is as precise and detailed as could be expected at this period" (EI', iv, 365). Most of the place-names given by Ibn Madjid in his works have almost their modern forms and hence are easily identifiable.

There is little doubt that Ibn Madjid used sea-charts and several instruments of navigation. But it is doubtful if he was the inventor of the compass (according to Nafis Ahmad, the Arabs were the inventors of this instrument, Muslim contribution to geography, 64). However, Ibn Madjid claims to have fixed the needle (al-maghdârat) itself on the case (al-Fawdâdî, f. 40b). He considered the compass used by the Arabs for navigation in the Indian Ocean much superior to the one used by the Egyptians and the Maghribis (North Africans) for the compass of the former was divided into thirty-two sections, whereas that of the latter was divided into only sixteen. Moreover, the latter only knew the use of the compass and were not capable of using the Arab boats whereas "we could easily navigate their boats" (al-Fawdâdî, f. 27). The Arab and the Portuguese instruments were probably equal in quality and accuracy but Ibn Madjid had shown the Portuguese an instrument which they had not seen before (G. Ferrand, EI', iv, 365 l.). Ibn Madjid's name however became legendary in later centuries and entered navigational lore. Sailors remembered him as Shaykh Madjid, the inventor of the mariners' compass, and recited the Fâtihâ in his memory when they embarked on certain seas (G. Ferrand, Instructions nautiques, iii, 227-8).

Ibn Madjid and the Portuguese. Ibn Madjid was fully aware of the several attempts made by the Portuguese to enter the Indian Ocean through what he calls the madkhâl (i.e., via the Cape of Good Hope) and also of their raids along the east coast of Africa. He says that in 900/1495 the Franks (i.e., the Europeans) arrived at the coast of Sofala, passing through the madkhâl that lies between it and al-Maghârib (North Africa) and the existence of which was proved by "the experienced ones" (the Portuguese). The Portuguese, he says, then went to India. Later, they returned to al-Zanjî (Zanzibar) and then went back via the same "passage of the Franks". In 906/1501, they again went to India, purchasing houses there, and settled down, making friends with the "Samri" kings (the Zamorins of Kerala) (al-Suflîyya, f. 94a). In his extant works, Ibn Madjid does not record the fact of his having guided Vasco da Gama from Malindi (east coast of Africa) to Calicut (Kerala). This fact is, however, proved by the contemporary Arabic and Portuguese sources. The Portuguese sources refer to him as "Malemo Cânaqua" (Castanheda and Goes) or "Malemo Câna" (Barros), both representing Ma'ullim Kunaka (i.e.,

Al-Ḥasan b. Mājual b. al-Darrāwān was a secretary of Christian origin and recently converted to Islam, who served the caliph al-Mutawakkl and became vizier under al-Mu'tamid, for the first time in 263/872, then in 264-5/878-9, and was dismissed from the government on the insistence of the regent al-Muwaḍḍa. He seems to have been exiled to Egypt, where he was at first welcomed by Ibn Tūlūn, then sent to Antioch, where he seems to have died in 269/882 in obscure circumstances.

Sulaymān b. al-Ḥasan, son of the above, was twice vizier under the caliph al-Muqtadīr, in 318-9/936-7 and 324/939-40, then during the amirate of Badjīm in 328-9/940-1, but was remarkably small for his iniquity.

Ṣādūq b. Mājual, secretary and vizier of Christian origin and recently converted to Islam, has been sometimes considered, without adequate proof, as the brother of al-Ḥasan b. Mājual. He belonged in fact to a different and quite inconspicuous family. He distinguished himself in the service of the regent al-Muwaḍḍa between 265/878 and 272/885, playing the role of vizier, even though he did not hold the title, and providing sufficient support for the prince in his military undertakings. He received, in 269/882, the honorific title of *al-Abbās b. al-Muwaḍḍa*, and his name appears on coins minted in *Jamāl*. But it is probable that he seems to have been connected with the activities of his brother Ṣāḥib, who, having remained a Christian, tried to obtain certain privileges for his fellow-Christians. He died in 276/889.

---
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**IBN MAḤŪZ** [see *UBAYD ALLĀH B. BASHĪR*]

**IBN MAKKĪ, name of several secretaries or viziers of the Abbāsīd period, who did not however all belong to the same family.**

---


**D. Sourdel**

---

**IBN MĀḤĀN, ‘ALĪ B. ISĀ B. MĀḤĀN, governor and military leader of the Abbāsīd period, who appears first as commander of the caliph’s guard and secretary to the army during the caliphate of al-Maḥdī [q.v.]. He remained commander of the guard under Hārūn al-Rašīd, who, in 180/796, appointed him as governor of Kūṭhāsān, in spite of opposition from Yabūy al-Barmakī. It is said that he then followed a policy of oppressing the people, which was probably the cause of the revolt of Rāfī’s b. al-Layth; this obliged the caliph to lead an expedition himself into this province in 192/808. On the death of Hārūn al-Rašīd, ‘Alī b. ISĀ [q.v.] gave his support to al-Amin [q.v.], and was put in charge of the army which was sent against the troops of al-Maḥdī in 196/812: his army was routed, and ‘Alī himself was killed in the battle.
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**IBN MAJHĀL, name of several secretaries or viziers of the Abbāsīd period, who did not however all belong to the same family.**

---


**D. Sourdel**

---

**IBN MAḤĀN, ʿALĪ B. ISĀ B. MAḤĀN, governor and military leader of the Abbāsīd period, who appears first as commander of the caliph’s guard and secretary to the army during the caliphate of al-Maḥdī [q.v.]. He remained commander of the guard under Hārūn al-Rašīd, who, in 180/796, appointed him as governor of Kūṭhāsān, in spite of opposition from Yabūy al-Barmakī. It is said that he then followed a policy of oppressing the people, which was probably the cause of the revolt of Rāfī’s b. al-Layth; this obliged the caliph to lead an expedition himself into this province in 192/808. On the death of Hārūn al-Rašīd, ‘Alī b. ISĀ [q.v.] gave his support to al-Amin [q.v.], and was put in charge of the army which was sent against the troops of al-Maḥdī in 196/812: his army was routed, and ‘Alī himself was killed in the battle.

---

**Biography:** D. Sourdel, *Visirat*, index.
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---
The only work attributed to Ibn Makki is the unpublished Tathfrif al-lisdn wa-talkih al-d&andn, which was composed with the aim of providing treatises produced by the specialists in the lbah al-ldn, as the study of which might perhaps reveal traces of the maghrbi dialect spoken in Sicily at the time of the author, i.e., the first half of the 5th/11th century. The muhaddima, which contains the reflexions of a philologist aware of the precarious situation of the Arabic language threatened as it was with corruption and adulteration through the constant effects of the ahd, is followed by the 50 chapters of the text, which has been the subject of three refutations and a commentary. On these, and for everything else concerning the author, the Tathfrif, the sources, etc. there may be consulted U. Rizzitano, Il “Tathfrif al-lisdn wa-talkih al-d&andn” di Abù Hafs ‘Umar b. Makki, in Studia Orientalia, Cairo 1956, 193-213 (to the two manuscripts mentioned on p. 207 should be added a third preserved in a library in Saudi Arabia of which only the title and the author are given in RIMA, i, 2 (1954), 154, n. 23).

(1) The earliest was Abıl-Hasan b. ‘Ali b. Da‘far al-Ijzi, the vizier of the Buyid Djalal al-Dawla (416-35/1035-44). He himself bore the honorific titles of Sa‘d al-Dawla and Yamin al-Dawla. They were not however sufficient to ensure his authority, and still less that of his master. The power of both was sapped by the raids of the Bedouins, both Arab and Kurdish, whose camps were outside the gates of the capital, by the turbulence of the Turkish guard, and by the continual intrigues which the caliph al-Kaddir (381-422/991-1031), with the support of a large group of jurists and of men of letters of traditional outlook (among them the famous al-Mawardi), pursed on behalf of the Sunni party. All of these were in the 5th/11th century. It is very probable that this happened because of the contradiction between Ibn al-Djawzi and Ibn al-Athir, in his famous biographical circles, who were much attached to traditionists and to the latter himself, who was to make such a remarkable contribution to the science of Traditions (Ibn al-Athir, ix, 281).

(2) The career of Abu ‘l-Kasim Hibat Allah was hardly more fortunate than that of his brother. Although the chronology of his vizierate is not very certain because of the contradictions between Ibn al-Djawzi and Ibn al-Athir, at least its chief events are known. Born in 365/976, he was appointed vizier in 423/1032, but was dismissed in the following year in favour of his rival, a convinced Shi‘i, Abu Sa‘d b. Muhammad al-Husayn b. ‘Abd al-Rahim. Restored to office shortly afterwards, he appears to have been vizier intermittently until 426/1035. Ibn al-Athir moreover considers that the vizierate of 424 was his fifth, while the data in the first chapter with a mutiny of the Turkish militia, that the same office was held in 423/1031 by a certain Abu Ishak al-Sahih. Hibat Allah’s career ended in 430/1038, after more than two years in captivity at Hit in the hands of the ‘Umayyid Karwâb b. al-Mukallad, the faithful ally of Djalal al-Dawla (Ibn Khaldûn, Itbar, iii, 450), who had become his gaoler on the latter’s orders and whose family always maintained Shi‘i sympathies (Ibn Khaldûn, ibid., 161) (see al-Basâshî, Karwâsh, Kuraysh, ‘Ukaylids).

The fate of the House of the Banû Makkl seems to have been to pledge loyalty in turn to both the rival parties, the Shi‘i and the Sunni, though inclining more and more towards the latter. This policy began by neglecting the sunna on fundamental points of economic life (illegal taxation of markets, measures contrary to the Kur‘anic prohibition of usury, ribâ) and it worked in favour of the Jewish element, which lived very amicably with the Shi‘i artisans of the House of Karkh quittance. (Ibn al-Athir, ix, 282).

However, the final disgrace of Hibat Allah seems to have been due to a sudden access of energy on the part of Djalal al-Dawla, who from then on, through dynastic interests, became reconciled with Abu Kâlidjâr and had decided to ally himself with the ‘Ukaylids and Mayzad Bedouin amis rather than suffer the pretensions and insolence of the Sunni party (Ibn Khâchîr, Bidâya, sub anno 428). It should be added that Hibat Allâh brought up his son ‘Ali in the best Sunni traditions and the latter very soon became famous in the science of Traditions (Ibn al-Athir, ix, 281).

Biography: on the vizierate of the Banû Makkl, see Ibn al-Djawzi, Munastâm, viii, 21, 60 (mentions al-Hasan but not Hibat Allâh), followed in part by Ka‘bula, Mun‘âm, iv, 25; Ibn al-Athir, ix, 287, 293-4, 296, 302, 307; Ibn Khâldûn, ‘Ibar, iii, 446, 447, in general based on Ibn al-Athir; Ibn Khâchîr, Bidâya, ed. Sa‘da, xii, 40, merely mentions Djalal al-Dawla’s change of policy in 428/1037. (3) Hibat Allâh’s son, ‘Ali, was one of the most famous exponents of hadîth and of ‘ilm al-ridâl. He was born in 422/1032 at ‘Ukbârâ. His teachers included such famous traditionists as Ibn Bishram (Broekelmann, S I, 281; Ibn al-Djawzi, Munastâm, viii, 18), the informant of the Hanbalî al-Kharî‘î (Broekelmann, S I, 250), Abu ‘l-Tayyib al-Ta‘barî (Ibn al-‘Imâm, Shadhrâdî, ii, 281), one of the masters of the famous Shafi‘î mystic al-Khushayri. He was on excellent terms with ‘Îbrâhîm b. Isbâk al-Habbâl (al-Dhâhabi, Tadhkira, iii, 382) to whom al-Sarrâdî al-Kâ‘î? (Broekelmann, S I, 594) owed a large part of his collection of mystico-profane love tales. He was also connected with the great master of Hanbalî hadîth, Muhammad b. Nâsîr, with al-‘Atîlî, the informant of al-Khatib al-Baghdadi [q.v.], not to mention the latter himself, who was to make such a remarkable contribution to the science of Traditions in the 5th/11th century. It is very probable that this Ibn Mâkûlî had close relations with half-Hanballî and half-Shafi‘î circles, who were much attached to traditionists and grouped around the vizier Ibn al-Musîma [q.v.] and the caliph al-Kâ‘îm [q.v.] of all these were in favour of a restoration of the authority of the caliph at the same time as they were working for the final dispossess of the heretic Bûyids, to whom paradoxically the family of Ibn Mâkûlî owed its fortune. ‘Ali gained fame by the production of a Râjî ‘Iyân al-makhâtîf wa ‘l-mu‘tâlif min asmâ‘ al-ridâl, on the onomastic of hadîth. In it he used the works of ‘Abd al-Ghani al-‘Arî (Broekelmann, S I, 281) and of al-Dârâjânî (ibid., I, 165), greatly esteemed in Hanballî and mystic circles. This work was used by al-Nawawî, one of the greatest authors of the Shafi‘î school, in his famous biographical dictionary (Broekelmann, S I, 680). The example of Ibn Mâkûlî would seem to indicate that the descendants of the most illustrious families found the best refuge, in the troubled period of the 5th/11th
century, in the practice and the study of the traditional disciplines of Islam. It was through them, at least in the eyes of the rigorists of the entourage of the caliph, that the real power seemed to be maintained.

**Bibliography:** in addition to the sources mentioned, see Brockelmann, S I, 602; F. Bustamani, *DM*, iv, 15. (J. C. Vadet)

**IBN MALAK** [see FIRISHTE-OGHLU].

**IBN MALIK**, ABU `ABD ALLAH DIA'AMAL AL-DIN MUHAMMAD B. `ABD ALLAH B. MALIK AL-TAHAYYAT (the name given by al-Makkiari, ii, 421; for his reasons see 427, lines 13-6), Arab grammarian. He was born in Jaen in 600 or 603/1204-5, according to the most generally accepted date, and was at first a Malikite. Al-Makkiari (ii, 421) gives the names of four of his teachers in his native town; to them may be added that of Abū `Ali Umar al-Shalawbini, in Seville. Very soon he left for the Near East (where he became a Shafi`i), and we find him in Aleppo, Hamat and Damascus. According to Ibn al-Dia`izari (ii, 180), he went first to Damascus where he studied, then stayed in Aleppo and afterwards in Hamat, and returned to Damascus where he settled. His journey to Cairo, which is not mentioned by Ibn al-Dia`izari, perhaps occurred some time before his death, which took place in Damascus on 12 Shawbân 672/22 February 1274.

In Damascus, Ibn Malik was a pupil of Abu `l-Hasan al-Safawi and other masters (see Ibn al-Dia`izari, ii, 180); in Aleppo, he studied under Ibn Ya`ish and his disciple Ibn Amur, and for a time taught `arabiyya; he composed a Šarh to al-Mukaddima al-Di`asiiyya (al-Kitti, Inbâh al-rusâl, Cairo 1371/1952, ii, 333). In Hamat also he taught `arabiyya for a time. But it is not clear whether he was a pupil of Ibn al-Hâjiq in Damascus. The sources consulted record only his remark about Ibn Malik's and his Di`asiiyya, which contains 2757 verses (rā`ds), a sequel to that work, with translation, notes and a supplement on morphology to the A Ifiyya, published by A. Goguyer as a sequel to that work, with translation, notes and memorization in those Arab countries where learning in grammar in the Alfiyya; this he owed to his philological knowledge, which was certainly very great, but also in large measure to a fact which in itself remains of secondary importance, his versification of Arabic grammar in the Alfiyya; rhyme was indeed an aid to memorization in those Arab countries where learning by heart was the usual method of instruction; for the verse was always obscure and often unintelligible" (Howell, *Ar. Gr.*, Preface XXVI), offered a choice of material to a host of commentators. Interest in grammar was revived.

From the point of view of grammatical method, Ibn Malik represents a new state of mind: from the start, Arab grammarians had sought for shawwâd, witnesses, to establish the authentic `arabiyya, in ancient poetry and Kur`ânic prose and not in hadith. Now Ibn Malik regarded hadith as conclusive, and made use of it, as did his contemporary Ra`di al-Din al-Astarabaghi. The initiator of this practice seems to have been Ibn Kharuf, who died in Aleppo at the beginning of the 7th/13th century (on this whole question, see `Abd al-Kâdir al-Baghdadi, *Khatîb al-adâb*, Böllâk 1290, i, 3-8 and J. Fück, *`Arabiyya*, 123-4, French tr. 189-90). One can understand the great interest Ibn Malik took in hadith: he collaborated with Shâraf al-Din Abu `l-Hasan `Ali al-Yanâni (d. 701/1301-2), for the edition of the Šâhib al-dhâhârî (Fück, in ZDMG, xxii (1913), 31-2), which led him to deal with difficult passages in a special work, number 7 in the following list (see also Brockelmann, I', 359-63 and S I, 532-7).

1. Tâshil al-fawâ`id wa-tahimîl al-ma`âsidîs (Fâs 1323), a résumé of an earlier work no longer surviving, al-fawâ`id fi `l-nahw, "a manual of grammar, the conciseness of which verges on obscurity" (Ben Cheneb, in E', sv. Ibn Malik). The Tâshil had a great reputation; there are at least 29 commentaries, by the author, by Abu Hayyân and by Ibn `Akil, among others, in manuscript.

2. al-Kâfiyya al-shafi`iya, a treatise on grammar in 2757 verses (râ`ds), according to Brockelmann (I', 363), with a commentary by the author, al-Wâfiyya, in manuscript.

3. al-Khalasa al-`afisyya or simply al-`Afisyya, a résumé of the preceding work in about a thousand verses (râ`ds), in imitation of al-Durra al-`afisyya of Abû Zakariyya; Ya`bîya b. Mu`tî according to al-Ma`kki (ii, 431) (cf. `Afisyya, verse 5). Al-`Aqlisi (quoted ibid.) denies that he wrote for his son Ta`ki al-Din Muhammed known as al-Asad, as al-`Ashâfi`i related, following al-Dhahabi (cf. al-Wâfiyya, ii, 206); he says that it was written for the hâlî `Şajar al-Din Hibat Allah b. `Abd al-Rahîm known as Ibn al-Ba`dî, in manuscript (see Ibn al-Sha`fawî, ii, 181). The famous `Afisyya exists in manuscript in a great many libraries and has been printed frequently. S. de Sacy published an edition with a commentary (Paris-London 1833) and reproduced and translated eight chapters from it in his *Anthologie grammaticale*, Paris 1829, 134-44 and 315-47; Arabic text and French translation by L. Fünt (Constantine 1869), by A. Goguyer (Beirut 1888) which adds the L`âmiyyat al-`afis`î; Italian translation and commentary by E. Vitto (Beirut 1898). The `Afisyya has been the subject of at least 43 commentaries; it will be sufficient to list the following:—that of Ibn Malik's son, Badr al-Din Muhammed, al-Durra al-mu`âdida, Beirut 1312, Cairo 1342; that of Abû Hayyân al-Andalusi, manhâj al-salikâ, published by S. Glazer, New Haven 1947; that of Ibn `Akil, which can be said to be a classic, ed. Fr. Dieterici, Leipzig 1851, German tr., Berlin 1852, and in the East in the very convenient ed. of Muhyi al-Din Mub. `Abd al-Hamid (6th. ed., Cairo 1370/1951); for the commentaries of Djâmil al-Din Ibn Hishâm, al-Makkûdî, al-Ushmûnî, al-Suyûtî and Da`ûlân, see nos. 3, 10, 12, 15 and 35 of Brockelmann (S I, 523-5).

4. L`âmiyyat al-`afis`î or al-`Afisyya fi `amâynat al-`afis`î, in 1144 verses (râ`ds), a complement on morphology to the `Afisyya, published by A. Goguyer as a sequel to that work, with translation, notes and
glossary of technical terms for both works; the Commentary of Badr al-Din Muḥ. was published by Kellgren (Helsingfor 1854), by Kellgren and Volck (St. Petersburg 1856) and by Volck (Leipzig 1866); the Lāmiyya has been printed several times in the East in collections; moreover other commentaries exist (see Brockelmann, I, 362 and S I 256).

5. HandlerContext al-mawdūd ̵t ʿl-maṣḥūr ̵t ʿl-mamādā, a versification in 162 verses (taṣfīl) of almost all the words of the same form terminating with alif maṣḥūr or alif mamādā and of different meaning, with a short commentary; ed. Cairo 1857 by Ibrāhīm al-Вāṣiṣ, then in 1839.

6. HandlerContext al-lām bi-thālāth (mushātāth) al-halām, a versification (in raqīṣ) of the words with triple vocalization and of different meaning, a work dedicated to al-Malik al-Nāṣr, grandson of Shallāl al-Dīn (ed. Cairo 1329, together with the preceding work). See Brockelmann’s no. XII for other similar works.

7. HandlerContext šahāsīd al-tauwīl ̵t wa ʿl-taṣfīl li-muṣḥaḥūt al-Ṣāḥib, a grammatical discussion of difficult passages from the Ṣāḥib of al-Bukhārī (Allāhābād 1319); in manuscript in Damascus under the title al-Tauwīl fi ʿrāb al-Bukhārī (Brockelmann, S I, 262, emend to ‘Um. 17 no. 101).—The following works exist only in manuscript:

8. HandlerContext Umīdat al-khāṣṣ wa-Sūdalat al-lāfīs, a résumé of sources, with a fairly long commentary by the author (Brockelmann, I, 365, IV, should read: Berlin 6531 and 6632).


10. HandlerContext al-Tuṭīd al ̵t ʿl-faṣr baṣīn al-zāʾ wa ʿl-dād, a versification in 62 verses (baṣīr) of words pronounced with šāʾ or dād, with a short commentary by the author (an extract from this work appears in the Muzhir, iii, 283-6, followed by two appendices, one fīmā yuḥāl bi-dād wa-šāʾ, the other fīmā yuḥāl bi-šāʾ wa-šāʾ).

11. K. al-ʿArūd, on Arabic prosody; only one MS, Escur. 330, 6, 4.

12. A summary of grammar, the Šabb al-manṣūm, of morphology (iṣāfī), the Ḥiṣāṣ al-ṭaʿtwīf (Brockelmann, nos. V, VI, and VII, and different short works, placed by the author in nos. XIII to XXVIII) (S I, 527). Versifications of words with grammatical or lexicographical peculiarities have been included by al-Suyūṭī in the Muzhir, ii, 113, 114, 115, 224; note 279-82, the 49 verses (kāmil) containing the verbs having a šāʾ or a dād without distinction as the 3rd radical consonant (printed in a Māṣīmī’a, Cairo 1306).

Several works of Ibn Mālīk, mentioned by his biographers, have not yet been reported in manuscript, in particular al-Muḥaddasa al-asādiyya (composed for his son known as al-Asād).

Bibliography: Makkari, Naṣf al-Thī, Cairo 1359/1949, ii, 427-33, has brought together almost all the items of information; Saḍaf, al-Waṭīf bi ʿl-waṣayaṭ [Bibl. Isc. 6c], iii, 359-64, important; Shamal al-Dīn Ibn al-Dīzan, ʿIṣāṣ al-mukhtala fi ṣawad al-kuraib, ii, 180-1, ed. Bergstrasser 1352/1933 (anastatic reprint, Baghdad, ii, 180-1, important for chronological data; Suyūṭī, Bughya, 53-7, repeats, adds little; the others mostly repeat or are useful for the date of Ibn Mālīk’s birth or his genealogy: Ibn ʿAṣḥār al-Kutūbī, Faṣdī al-waṣayaṭ, Cairo 1951, i, 452-4; Subēḥ, Ṣulhāt al-ḥafṣiyya al-hūrā, Cairo 1324, v, 28-9; Ibn Kādī Subhū, Ṣulhāt al-nuḥāt wa ʿl-muḥaddasa, Damascus (Zahiriyā Taḥṣīl 438), 54-6; Ibn ʿIbīdī, Muzhir al-Muḥaddasa, Cairo 1351, v, 339; other references will also be found in ‘U. R. ʿAlīṣhāla, Muḥṣīm al-muḥaddasa, Damascus 1379/1960, x, 234.

European works: Brockelmann, I, 359-63, S I, 521-7; in the short biographical notice, emend Baʿalbak, substitute Aṭṭōp, on the subject of Ibn Yaʿṣīh; M. S. Howell, Arabic Grammar, Preface, XIX-XXI (Allahabad 1883). (H. FLEISCH)

IBN MĀLĪK B. ʿABĪ ʿL-FĀḍĪL AL-YAMĀNĪ, MUḤMAḤĀD, a Sunni jurisconsult and minor historian of Yemen, best known for his derogatory tract against the Ismāʿīlīs in Yemen so as to warn others about them. The Kaḥṣ became the primary source concerning the history of the sect for all later SUNNI historians of Yemen, including al-Khāṣṣādī. The pamphlet has been printed twice (1939 and 1955) in Cairo from the manuscript preserved in the library of the small Egyptian town of Sawhāḏī. Another copy, with the title Risāla, is to be found in the University of Leiden library (Or. 6349).—Neither the author nor the book is mentioned by Brockelmann. All the information concerning Ibn Mālīk contained in al-Dīzan’s Sulhā and al-Khāṣṣādī’s Kaḥṣa, the two greatest biographical dictionaries of Yemen, is derived exclusively from the Kaḥṣ.

(F. L. GEDDES)

IBN MĀLKA [see ABU ʿL-BĀRAḴĀTES].

IBN MAMMĀṬĪ, name of three highly-placed officials of the same Coptic family from Asyūṭ who flourished under the later Fatimid and early Ayyūbid period. The first of the line was ABU ʿL-MĀLĪ, who became secretary and general intendent of the Diwān under Badr al-Dīzāmī during the reign of the Fatimid caliph al-Muṣṭanzi (427-32/1035-44). He was a popular administrator, and was eulogized by the poets of his time. He managed to retain his faith and his position until his death at an unknown date towards the turn of the century.

The second was his son, AL-MUḤADHDHAB ABU ʿL-MĀLĪ ṢAKARĪYĪ, who succeeded his father as secretary of the Diwān al-Dīzāmī during the decline of the Fatimid rule in Egypt. He apparently remained in office until the reign of the last caliph al-ʿAzīd (555-67/1160-71), during the critical transition between Fatimid and Ayyūbid rule when the Sunni Shīrkhūn assumed the vizierate of Shīʿī Egypt and brought his nephew Shallāl al-Dīn (Saladin) in his train. The ascent of Shīrkhūn to power was precipitated by the imminent danger of an invasion of Egypt by the crusaders under Amalric, the Latin king of Jerusalem. At that time, the situation of the Copts was worsened by the growing hatred shown by Muslims towards Christians as a result of the Second Crusade. Shīrkhūn, theizuṭ al-Kalīm, issued a new wave of persecution and al-Muḥadhdhāb, finding his position in jeopardy, embraced Islam and remained in power until his death, probably in the year 578/1182.

His son, the third and most famous of the line, took his place as head of the Diwān al-Dīzāmī and was later promoted to the secretariaship of all the other Diwāns during the sultanates of both Saladin (564-9/1169-93) and al-ʿAzīz (589-5/1193-98). His
full name, according to al-Makrizi, was Al-As'ad b. Muhaddhab b. Zakariyya. His fame was based not only on the fact that he took charge of all the diwans but also on his literary productivity, both as a writer and as a poet. At least twenty-three poets are listed under his name, though most of them are lost. He verified the life of Saladin and Kitab wa-Dinuma [q.e.]. He remained there until his death in 606/1209.

The surname Mammati is explained in the sources by Abu l-Mallah's gifts of food to the poor during a period of famine. However, it is possible that it is merely a corruption of the Coptic "Mahometti", i.e., "Muhammadan", since the family embraced Islam; this implies that the name must have appeared only in the lifetime of the second of the line.

Perhaps the most enduring contribution of Al-As'ad b. Mammati was his work entitled Kitab Kawadin al-Dawad wa'in, which, on al-Makrizi's authority, is said to have been composed for the sultan al-Aziz in four volumes. Amongst other items, he included in it a complete record of all Egyptian townships with their taxable acreage for the khadarji. The portions of the work including that confidential information have been lost, but the list of all inhabited towns and villages survives in numerous manuscripts. The value of the work is enhanced by other rare information on agricultural and irrigation systems, the mint and the weights and measures services, the Tiraz [q.e.] weaving centres, shipbuilding for the Ayyubid arsenal, alum and nitre, forests and animals, the science of surveying, together with some mathematics and geometry, and a whole host of interesting data. Yet perhaps the most valuable part of the book remains in the first and fullest mediaeval cadaster (edab) of all the inhabited sites of Egypt [see KAWK.]

Al-As'ad's self-inflicted exile with his family and his death in relative poverty ended the glory of his dynasty, of which we hear no more in subsequent ages.

**Bibliography:** A. S. Atiya (ed.), Kitab Kawadin al-Dawad wa'in, Cairo 1943; Yākūt, Uṣūl, v/3, 515-516; Ibn Khallikān, 99-101; al-'Aynī, 'Ibād al-Dawād, Ms. photostats, Cairo Library no. 1584, ii, 320; Mammati, Khiṣ, ii, 160-1; al-Yayyūfī, Uṣūn al-muhaddara, Cairo 1939, i, 325; T. A., iii, 543. See also for MSS, Brockelmann, I, 335 and S I, 573; Wüstenfeld, Geschichtsschreiber, no. 295, 206-7; I. Ţ. Krakoŭski, Iz. Soc.?, iii, 329-33; Atiya, op. cit., 32-40. (A. S. Atiya)

**IBN MANDA**, a famous Işahān family of kadīs scholars and historians which was active for nearly three centuries. Descended from a Sassanian official, Djahārūbgah, said to have become a Muslim at nearly the time of the Conquest, the man after whom the family was named was Ibrāhīm (Manda) b. al-Walid b. Sanda b. Buṭṭa b. ustāndar b. Fērōzān b. Djahārūbgah. His death is placed during the caliphate of al-Mu'tasim (Abū Nu'aym, History of Iṣahn, ed. S. Dederer, i, 178; al-Dhahabi, Tadhkirat al-mu'āf, Hāydarābd 1335-4, iii, 222). His son, Abū Zakariyyā b. Yābūy, is counted the first prominent member of the family.

He travelled to Baghdad in 406/1015-6, and he visited Wasit, Mecca, Nisabur, Hamadhan, and so on. He started teaching at the age of sixty-two. He remained there until his death in 606/1209.

Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Iṣaḥāk, who was born in 30/952, his travels are said to have spanned a period of thirty years. They took him to such places as Marw, Bukhārā, Egypt, Taḥrībulus, and Mecca. He visited Nisābūr for the first time in 395/995-6, and again in 354 or 355/965-6. He married late in life and had four sons, 'Abd Allāh, 'Abd al-Rahmān, 'Abd al-Wahāb, and the little known 'Abd al-Raḥām. He died on 30 Dūḥ 'L-Kaḍa' 395/957 September 1005 (rather than in 996). His publications concerned history, biography, and ḥadīth. He wrote on the history of the Prophet and, like his grandson, Yābūy b. 'Abd al-Wahāb, a History of Iṣahān. Of his works there survives his commentaries on certain verses of the Kur'ān and some Prophetical traditions, under the title of al-Radd 'ala l-Tawārikh (yya) (Ms. Istanbul Topkapısaray, Revan Köşk 530, fols. 56b-66b), but it may be noted that his son, 'Abd al-Raḥmān, is credited with a similar if, apparently, different work. Further, al-Tawārikh wa-ma'rīfat asmā Allāh, preserved in Damascus; parts of his Mar'īfat al-sahābā, also in Damascus (cf. Y. al-Ṭish, Fihrist maqāřāf Dār al-Kutub al-Zāhiriyah, Damascus 1366/1947, 171 f.). His relationship to the Tāwārikh al-mustakhradh of his son, 'Abd al-Raḥmān, remains to be investigated; a treatise on "The men around Muḥammad who lived 120 years" (Cairo, Taymūr, tārīkh 677, 695), but a work of the same title is ascribed to his grandson; Fath al-bāb fi l-kunā wa-l-akāb (Berlin 9917), which may be identical with al-Asmā' wa-l-kunā cited repeatedly in the Tāwārikh Baghdād, although the few excerpts from the Fath published by S. Dederer (dissertation, Upsala 1927) do not suffice to establish the identity, al-Asmā' wa-l-kunā, of the names and surnames of Ibn Ḥanbal (Ms. Chester Beatty 5165 [2]); Ta'mīyat al-maṣāḥīh, on the authorities of al-Būghārī's Sāḥib (Ms. Chester Beatty 4411, 5165 [1]); and a list of transmitters on the authority of Shubba b. al-Haqqādā, incorporated by al-Dhahabi in his Tāwārikh al-Islām, Cairo 1307-8, vi, 195-200. 'Abd Allāh, the younger of his two sons, 'Asghār's ascension of Abū Ḥanifa's Masnad, cf. the MS in Djakarta described by P. S. van Ronkel, Suppli. to the Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the Museum of the Batavia Society of Arts and Sciences, Batavia-The Hague 1913, 41-4.


Muhammad's son Abu l-Kāsim 'Abd al-Raḥmān, was born in 38/991-2, or in 383. He travelled to Baghdad in 406/1015-6, and he visited Wāṣṭa, Mecca, Nisābūr, Hamadhan, and so on. He started teaching
in 407/1016-7 and was the author of many works, among them, it seems, a History of Mecca. He is said to be the author of the History of Mecca, a work which is evidently neither Arab nor Berber. According to Dozy, this name is a corruption of Martinez, whilst by Samani, iv, 31).


IBN MANZOR, Muhammad b. Mukarram b. ‘Ali b. Ahmad al-An`asri b. al-Ishghi b. al-Mi`raj al-Dim Abul l-Fadl, author of the famous dictionary al-Dim, was born in 568/1171-2. Ibn Mukarram, was born in Ramadan 630/June-July 1233 and died in Shaban 711/December 1311-January 1312. He claimed descent from Ruwayf b. Thabit, who had been after 48/668 governor of Tripolis in North Africa. According to Ibn Hadjar, Ibn Mukarram was hadi of Tripolis and "all his life" employed in the din al-inshah; so he is perhaps identical with Muhammad b. Mukarram, one of the kuttab al-inshah under Kalkashandi (see W. Bjorkman, Beitrage zur Geschichte der Staatskanzlei im mittelalterlichen Agypten, Hamburg 1926, index). Ibn Mukarram was fond of epitomizing voluminous works of earlier authors, e.g., the Aghani (Brockelmann, I, 226; Ibn ‘Asakir’s Ta’rikh Dimashq (Brockelmann, I, 331; S I, 562), Samani’s Dhayl Ta’rikh Bagdad (part XI is preserved in Ibn Mukarram’s autograph in Leiden, MS arab. no. 1023), the Diwans al-musfradat of Ibn Baytar (see A. Taimur, in RAAD, iii, 361). His Lisat al-‘Arab too (completed in 689/1290; printed Bulak 1300-8 and 1349-1350) is based on five earlier dictionaries, viz. Azhari’s Tahdhib al-luga, Ibn Sida’s Mukham, Dzhawari’s Kams (whom he followed in arranging the roots according to the third radical), Ibn Barri’s glosses to the Kams, and Dhahabi’s Nakha. He is on the whole exact in copying these works, but often omits the authorities mentioned therein, whilst Ibn Murtagh, who in his Tajdi al-‘Arus draws frequently upon the Lisat, often supplements the authorities omitted by Ibn Mukarram.

His Nihd ar-asbar si ‘l-layli wa ‘l-nahar, a short treatise on day and night, the stars and the zodiac, was printed in Istanbul 1268.


IBN MARDANISH, Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Sa‘d b. Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Tujibi, mentioned in the Christian chronicles under the name Rey Lobo or Lope, was a Spanish Muslim leader who was active in political and military affairs in the Iberian Peninsula during the last decades of the Almoravid empire, made himself master of Valencia and Murcia, and for 25 years contended with the new North African rulers, the Almohads, for the territories in the centre of al-Andalus. In regard to his name Ibn Mardanish, various theories have been advanced concerning his origin, which is evidently neither Arab nor Berber. According to Dozy, this name is a corruption of Martinez, whilst
Codera supposes that it derives from Mardonius, one of his Byzantine ancestors. Both theories are improbable, as also is that proposed by Ibn Khallikan.

IBN MARYAM, Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Ahmad, North African hagiographer of the 11th/16th century (d. 1014/1605). Less is known of his life than of his literary output. He compiled a catalogue of local saints, al-Bustân fi dhâbî al-awliyâ' wa l-`ulamâ`, which deals mainly with those who had lived or studied at Tlemcen, the ancient capital of the Zanata. He was interested also in the neighbouring towns of Oran and Nedroma, as well as in the basically Berber cantons of the Djablea Tessala and the Trara, and, further towards Eastern Morocco, in the country of the Ghumara, the valley of the Sus, and, in a general way, in the Moroccan Atlas. The chronological details scattered through the work (e.g., at p. 45) do not permit its subject-matter to be traced to an earlier date than the 9th/15th century. Tlemcen was then the intellectual and religious metropolis of Barbary, whose influence reached as far as Fez (224) and Meknès (65). Tunisians (75) and even scholars from the Orient (190) were also drawn to Tlemcen. Because of the persistent struggle against the infidel, the Islamization and Arabization of the country were intensified. All races contributed to this and by the most diverse methods. The saints of Ibn Maryam, fierce and determined fighters, presented an idea of Islam well adapted to the mentality of the masses. Their devotion was intense (nights of prayer accompanied by conversions and various wonders), their frequent and marvellous miracles are reminiscent of the Fioretti: thus, e.g., the saints understood the language of animals. Their charity, reserved for Believers only, was inexhaustible. They practised unceasing internal prayer (dhâbî). They had naturally the gift of being present everywhere, especially for the Pilgrimage, and they communicated with spirits, evil as well as good. Whenever necessary, they made amulets (fyîz), coming to the help of their co-religionists by means of white magic. Always ready to protect the oppressed and to redress wrong, they were nevertheless prejudiced against the Bedouin invaders of Arab origin, who had been settled for three centuries on their soil (the term “Arab” is used only for the Bedouins, 75).

These men of miracles did not, however, neglect the learning and the practice of pious works which were inseparable from Malikî orthodoxy, and they devoted studied effort to it. Ibn al-Marzûk, for instance, knew the works of Ibn al-Hadjib and the early transmitters of Malik, Ibn al-Kasim and al-Asbagh. They often excelled in the science of law and in the apportioning of inheritance (fardâ'id). The most scholarly of them were theologians in law (usuli), rhetoricians andlogicians (38, 44). They knew the works of Ibn al-Hâdjib and the early transmitters of Malik, Ibn al-Kâsîm and al-Asbagh. They thought highly also of oriental scholars such as al-Damiri (Brockelmann, SII, 401) or even the Šâhîf al-Buñîkî, or, later, Šâhîf al-Wâhîh b. Šârâ`u (`confirmed by al-Nabhânî, Karâmaât al-awliyâ`, Cairo ed., ii, 420). These simple men, of whom Ibn Maryam gives a moving description, were both missionaries and visionaries, passing effortlessly from ordinary daily tasks to the most exalted piety.


IBN AL-MARZÜBÂN [see Muhammad b. Khalaf b. al-Marzûbân].

IBN MARZÙK, Shams al-Dîn Abû `Abd Allâh Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Abî Bakr b. Marzûk al-`Aḍîfis al-Tîlimsâni, known as al- rádâ (the grandfather), al-râ`b (the
Genealogical table of the principal Marazika

Marazik (end of 5th/11th century)
  - Abu Bakr, servant of Abu Madyan
  - Muhammad I
  - Muhammad II (629-81/1231-82)

Ahmad I (668-741/1228-1304)
  - Muhammad IV = al-Djadd, al-Ra’i’s, al-Khaliq (711-82/1311-79)

Ahmad II
  - Muhammad VI = al-Hafid (760-842/1364-1438)

Haifa
  - Muhammad VII = al-Kaff (824-901/1420-95)

Ahmad III
  - Muhammad VIII (d. 918/1511)

Al-Makkari

Muhammad VII (824-901/1420-95) was known as al-Kaff (the blind). He too is remembered as a traditionist and a famous preacher. Al-Makkari was proud to have him as his maternal grandfather.

Ahmad III, son of the above, who died shortly after him, was also a famous khaṭīb; he is known as Hafid al-Hafid.

Muhammad VIII, another grandson of the Hafid, but through his daughter Haifa, died in 918/1511. He is the last representative of this family of scholars on which any information is available.

The best known of the Marazika is, without question, Shams al-Din Muhammad IV. A contemporary of Ibn al-Khaliq [q.v.], who refers to himself as his disciple and who always showed him great respect, of the two brothers Ibn Khaldun [q.v.], who disliked him, of al-Makkar (the ancestor of the famous scholar of that name), of Shari’i al-Tilmans (q.v.) and of many others, he was certainly the member of this family who, by his strong personality, the roles he played and the positions he occupied, brought it fame and drew to it from this period on the attention of the biographers and historians. His career, like those of several of his contemporaries, was full of incident: travels throughout the Muslim world in search of knowledge and of honours, intrigues among the great, high politico-religious responsibilities, repeated spells in prison, favour and disgrace, etc.

At the age of two according to some, seven according to others, he was taken by his father Ahmad I to the East where he received, during periods spent at Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem, Hebron, Alexandria and Cairo, the basis of his education. He was given the title khaṭīb early, at the age of nineteen, when, in 729/1329 or 730/1330, he delivered, without preparation, his first sermon in the mosque. He is the last representative of this family of scholars on which any information is available.

The best known of the Marazika is, without question, Shams al-Din Muhammad IV. A contemporary of Ibn al-Khaliq [q.v.], who refers to himself as his disciple and who always showed him great respect, of the two brothers Ibn Khaldun [q.v.], who disliked him, of al-Makkar (the ancestor of the famous scholar of that name), of Shari’i al-Tilmans (q.v.) and of many others, he was certainly the member of this family who, by his strong personality, the roles he played and the positions he occupied, brought it fame and drew to it from this period on the attention of the biographers and historians. His career, like those of several of his contemporaries, was full of incident: travels throughout the Muslim world in search of knowledge and of honours, intrigues among the great, high politico-religious responsibilities, repeated spells in prison, favour and disgrace, etc.

At the age of two according to some, seven according to others, he was taken by his father Ahmad I to the East where he received, during periods spent at Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem, Hebron, Alexandria and Cairo, the basis of his education. He was given the title khaṭīb early, at the age of nineteen, when, in 729/1329 or 730/1330, he delivered, without preparation, his first sermon in the mosque. He is the last representative of this family of scholars on which any information is available.
of the latter he was present notably at the disaster of Tarifa (741/1340); after this he travelled to Castile to the peace treaty and the liberation of the prisoners of war, among whom was the prince Abu 'Umar Tāshfīn, Abu 'l-Hasan's own son.

On returning from this mission, he went to Constantine, where news reached him of another disaster suffered by the unfortunate Abu 'l-Hasan, that of al-Kayrawān. He then returned to Fās in a convoy of important persons, high officials and foreign dignitaries accompanying Abu 'l-Hasan's wife, who was rejoining her son Abu 'Inān [g.v.], who had just deposed his father and placed himself on his throne. Ibn Marzūk did not stay for long at the court of the young sultan. He returned to Tlemcen, then in the hands of the Zayyānid, Abū Sa'īd ʿUmmān b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, supported by his brother Abū Thābit as suʔīm. Soon he was charged by Abū Sa'īd to go and make contact with Abu 'l-Hasan, who was in Algiers and preparing to lay siege to Tlemcen. Abū Thābit and the notables of the Banū Zayyānīn, disapproving of the principle of this mission, had him arrested en route. He was brought back to Tlemcen and imprisoned in a mūbadāb [underground prison]. His sentence was later commuted to exile in Andalusia; this brought him into contact with Abu 'l-Hāḍirīdī and ʿAmamudāna, who had known him personally, who advise the Tarifa incident. This appointed him khaṭīb of the-al-Hamra mosque. There he formed a friendship with another exile, Abū Sulīm, brother of the sultan Abū ʿInān.

In 754/1353, Abū ʿInān recalled him to Fās and made him a court official. He sent him in 758/1357 to Tunis to ask on his behalf for the hand of the daughter of Abū Yābāy in his marriage. This mission ended in failure, where added to other causes for his ill-humour, aroused the sultan's wrath, and for the second time Ibn Marzūk found himself in a mūbadāb. He remained there for six months, being released, thanks to the intercessions of many people, only when he was near to death.

The death of Abū ʿInān in 759/1358 produced a crisis which finally destroyed the dynasty. His throne was disputed by several claimants, sons and brothers of his half-brother Thābit and Thābit's brother Abū Sulīm, the friend of Ibn Marzūk's exile. The latter unhappily did all he could to help him to seize power and after a year of manoeuvres they gained the throne, the one to reign and the other to govern. Ibn Marzūk was now at the summit of his career, and immediately he was surrounded by envy. The courtiers watched for an opportunity to act and, in 762/1361, Abū Sulīm was murdered and Ibn Marzūk was consigned to the mūbadāb for the third time. He regained his liberty only after two years, in 764/1363. He then hastened to embark for Tunis, where the sultan Abū ʿIsāk (751-70/1350-68) and his vizier Ibn Tafragīn appointed him khaṭīb of the al-Sāmānīn mosque. He remained there for seven years.

In 767/1367, following a palace revolution, he was removed from this office. He hesitated for two years and then in 773/1372 decided to set sail for Alexandria; thence he went to Cairo, where the sultan Thābit b. ʿHasān (764-78/1363-76) gave him employment as a judge and a teacher. He was simultaneously khaṭīb, khaṭīb and teacher in the three mosques of Sālāb al-Dīn: ʿAhdār Sharghī, Sarghat-māshīyya and Kāmbiyā. Thus the end of his life was spent in an atmosphere of calm and respect, and sheltered from want, after he had "preached on forty-eight pulpits of the Dār al-Islām". On his death, he was buried (a supreme honour) between Ibn al-Kāsim and Aghbāb in the cemetery at Cairo.

He himself compiled the list of his masters, who were many (more than 250), in his book Uḏḍāl al-mustawfīs. They included judges, preachers, imāms, genealogists, traditionists, historians, men of letters, mystics and at least three women, whose lessons he had attended in mosques or with whom he had had only had meetings at Medina, Mecca, Cairo, Alexandria, Baḥb, Jerusalem, Hebron, Damascus, Tripoli, Kairuān, Tunis, Zāh, Bougie, Tlemcen, and in Andalusia, etc. His disciples were even more numerous, and include such famous names as Ibn al-Khāṭīb, Ibn Zamrāk, Ibn ʿKunūfūd, al-Shābīlī[qq.v.], etc.

Of those of his works which survive, none is today printed in its entirety. They exist either as very rare manuscripts dispersed among various libraries or are to be found as extracts published in studies and editions of other writers. His known works are:

(1) al-Musnad al-sāhil al-hasan fī maḏḏīr sīrān Abī ʿAlī Ḥasan, MS Eṣorial 1666; extracts published with Fr. tr. by E. Lévi-Provençal in Hespéris, v (1923); chapter tr. by R. Blachère in Memorial Henri Bassot; source for Nāṣrī, Istīkhāsā.

(2) al-Tafrīf (see below). The al-Hamra mosque. There he formed a friendship with another exile, Abū Sulīm, brother of the sultan Abū ʿInān. In 754/1353, Abū ʿInān recalled him to Fās and made him a court official. He sent him in 758/1357 to Tunis to ask on his behalf for the hand of the daughter of Abū Yābāy in his marriage. This mission ended in failure, where added to other causes for his ill-humour, aroused the sultan's wrath, and for the second time Ibn Marzūk found himself in a mūbadāb. He remained there for six months, being released, thanks to the intercessions of many people, only when he was near to death.

The death of Abū ʿInān in 759/1358 produced a crisis which finally destroyed the dynasty. His throne was disputed by several claimants, sons and brothers of his half-brother Thābit and Thābit's brother Abū Sulīm, the friend of Ibn Marzūk's exile. The latter unhappily did all he could to help him to seize power and after a year of manoeuvres they gained the throne, the one to reign and the other to govern. Ibn Marzūk was now at the summit of his career, and immediately he was surrounded by envy. The courtiers watched for an opportunity to act and, in 762/1361, Abū Sulīm was murdered and Ibn Marzūk was consigned to the mūbadāb for the third time. He regained his liberty only after two years, in 764/1363. He then hastened to embark for Tunis, where the sultan Abū ʿIsāk (751-70/1350-68) and his vizier Ibn Tafragīn appointed him khaṭīb of the al-Sāmānīn mosque. He remained there for seven years.

In 767/1367, following a palace revolution, he was removed from this office. He hesitated for two years and then in 773/1372 decided to set sail for Alexandria; thence he went to Cairo, where the sultan Thābit b. ʿHasān (764-78/1363-76) gave him employment as a judge and a teacher. He was simultaneously khaṭīb, khaṭīb and teacher in the three mosques of Sālāb al-Dīn: ʿAhdār Sharghī, Sarghat-māshīyya and Kāmbiyā. Thus the end of his life was spent in an atmosphere of calm and respect, and sheltered from want, after he had "preached on
BI'N MARZOK — IBN MASARRA
bi-'bn Khaldun, ed. Tandjl, Cairo 1380/1951, 49-54; Ibn Ḥaddad, al-Durar al-kadimīa fi al-awāl qāma, Haydarābd 1349/1930, ii, 360, no. 92; Ibn Khālid al-Wahābi, Tārīkh al-ḥāmidīn, n.d., 86; H. P. Wadsworth, 78; Ibn al-Āzhār, Rawdāt al-nisār fī dawlat Bani Marīn, ed. with Fr. Fr. Gh. Bouali and G. Marçais, Paris 1917, 197; Suyuti, Bugyāt al-walā'ī, Cairo 1326, 16; idem, Huṣn al-maḥḍarā fī aḥkām al-Mīr wa-l-Kāhirā, Cairo 1299, ii, 104; Ibn al-Kādī, Dayādat al-ithbāt fī man ḥall min al-ʿām madīnīt Fās, Pes. 1309, 120-4; Ahmad Bābā, Nāṣiru l-ḥašāḥ fī tawāṣṣil al-Dīdāh, the manuscript is not known; it may have been at the time when, in his place of retreat on the mountain 300/912, when his biographers show him surrounded by disciples, probably on his return from the East.

According to Ibn al-Dawdari, from 539/1144-5, initial success, he was obliged to go to Upper Egypt, where he must have known a disciple of Djuñayd, Abu ʿAlī al-Aṣāf, who preached a much less esoteric doctrine than Ibn Maṣarrā, wrote a book against him refuting his ideas. The young Muhammad became his pupil and taught his doctrines had to take many precautions. He reserved initiation into the use of symbols for a more intimate group of disciples.

The young Muhammad became his pupil and received from him a theological education as well as training in asceticism. It can easily be imagined that in these circumstances Ibn Masarra acquired at quite an early age the habit of leading a secret life, withdrawn from the world, among initiates with whom he conversed by allusions and symbols.

To increase the number of his forces. Pursued by the troops of Ibn al-Salār, he was overtaken at Dalas in the province of Bahnasa (Yāḵût, ii, 501) and was defeated and killed on 19 Shawwāl 544/19 February 1150, his head being taken to Cairo. He had been vizier for only about fifty days.

It is not clear what connexion there was between him and Maḥmūd b. Maṣāl al-Lukkī who, at the beginning of the reign of al-Mustallī, gave his support to Nizār and, after the defeat of Nizār’s party, fled to the Maghrib; there is also an Ibn Maṣāl the diploma for whose appointment to the governorship of Alexandria was drawn up, at a date not given, by al-Kādī al-Fāḍil (al-Kalkashangi, Suḥḥ, x, 374-80).


IBN MASARRA, MUḤAMMAD B. ʿABD ALLĀH B. MAṢĀL AL-DIJĀBALI, Andalusian philosopher and mystic, born at Cordova in 29/887 and died in 319/934 in a hermitage on the Sierra near this town, to which he had retired long before. He lived during a period in which Muslim Spain suffered a veritable inquisition conducted by the Malīkī ḥubāba. His father, ʿAbd Allāh, who may have been of Christian descent, was a Muʿtazilī and in order to teach his doctrines had to take many precautions. The young Muhammad became his pupil and received from him a theological education as well as training in asceticism. It can easily be imagined that in these circumstances Ibn Masarra acquired at quite an early age the habit of leading a secret life, withdrawn from the world, among initiates with whom he conversed by allusions and symbols.

In 286/899, ʿAbd Allāh died in Mecca, where he had taken refuge from his creditors. Little is known of Ibn Masarra’s life between this date and about 300/912, when his biographers show him surrounded by disciples, probably on his return from the East. But already in this period he had left many of these matters which enabled him to enter a military career in Cairo, no details of which are known. According to Ibn al-Dawdārī, from 539/1144-5, during the reign of al-Hāfiz, he was entrusted with the direction of affairs without being given the title of vizier (nāṣir li-ʿl-ʿumār, nāṣir li-ʿl-maṣāḥih), this caliph having appointed no vizier since 333/1143. After the death of al-Hāfiz, in 544/1149, his successor al-Ẓāfīr chose Ibn Maṣāl as vizier (this was the last time that a vizier was appointed in this manner by a Fāṭimid caliph), and gave him the titles of al-sayyid al-adjall al-mufaḍḍal (or al-ʾāḥāl) and amīr al-dawāḥiṣ, that is of commander-in-chief. According to Usāma he was then an old man. He restored order after the quarrels between the Blacks and the Raybānīs in the army. But the governor of Alexandria was his contemporary Nahrāḏjari, a mystic with pantheistic tendencies who died there in 330/941; and he must have known a disciple of Dhuṇayd, Ahmad b. Ḥabīb, who had written a short work denouncing his errors, and Ibn Masarra had thought it prudent to leave for the East. Asīn Palacios thinks that the famous mystic and ascetic Dhu ‘l-Nūn al-Mijrī (d. 245/860) was still remembered as an example. Ibn Masarra could also have met in Mecca his contemporary Nahrāḏjari, a mystic with pantheistic tendencies who died there in 330/941: and he must have known a disciple of Dīnayd, Abū Saʿīd Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Ziyād b. al-ʿArabī (died at Mecca in 341/952). This orthodox mystic, who preached a much less esoteric doctrine than Ibn Masarra, wrote a book against him refuting his ideas.

The exact date of Ibn Masarra’s return to Spain is not known; it may have been at the time when, during his accession, ʿAbd al-Rahmān III introduced a more tolerant policy in order to pacify the people (300/912). In his place of retreat on the mountain of Cordova, he seems to have taught a fairly large public, insisting on the importance of the ascetic life and disguising his thought on matters where his doctrine might have proved disturbing. He reserved initiation into the use of symbols for a more intimate group of disciples.
Ibn Masarra was attacked particularly after the promulgation of his works. The titles of two of them are known: the Kitāb al-Tahāra and the Kitāb al-Huwāf, but none of them have survived. He died, worn out by work and by the austerity of his life, without having had to undergo any physical suffering for his doctrine.

(1) The doctrine of the pseudo-Empedocles. Sa`id al-Andalusī, in his Tabābāt al-umam, reproduced by al-Kīfī in his Ta`rīkh al-ballām, compared his views to those of the pseudo-Empedocles. It was probably for having devoted too much attention to this philosophy that he was suspected of sandaba, and it may be considered as the core of his thinking. Although he was a Mu`tazillī, it should not be forgotten that one essential aspect of this theology was attributed to Empedocles: "He was the first to apprehend the union between the meanings of the attributes of God: all lead to a unique reality" (al-Kīfī, 16).

From these statements it is possible to form an idea of what Ibn Masarra's doctrine was. The philosophy of the pseudo-Empedocles has been set out by al-Shahrastānī, al-Shahrazūrī (Rawḍa, Leiden MS 1888, 13r-14r; extracts given by Asin Palacios), Ibn Abī Uṣaybi`a (Tabābāt al-`aibāb), and al-Kīfī (15-16).

The mind, which inquires into philosophy is illuminated by it with a divine light. It contains a mystic conception of the truth: it comes itself to the aid of whoever seeks to acquire it. Indeed, philosophy produces in the soul the desire to depart from this world, in a spiritual rihā; for the soul does not belong here but is imprisoned in the body; being a spiritual thing, it comes under the influence of the principle of pure love, whereas the body, like all corporeal things, is subject to the action of discord (here we find the two opposing principles which are the two poles of the philosophy of the authentic Empedocles). But, joined as it is to the body, the soul is in an intermediate (mutawassit) position; using it as a starting point, it is possible to understand the two limits of reality. But in order to understand the soul itself, it is necessary for man himself to have a pure soul (jahira = ẓawāar, without blemish), which is born in Masarra's thought with the union of the soul and body (sawwara). The knowledge of truth is the result not only of the use of the appropriate faculty, it is the expression of the ontological level attained by the being of the person who knows it: it is in fact the old idea that like is known by like. Hence the need for a principle of asceticism. The order of being is parallel to that of knowing and even penetrates it. This is a theme of Plotinus: the soul is simple, with an absolute simplicity which is comparable to that of light (mūr) opposed to fire (mār), or to lux (dīṣya) opposed to lumem (daw).

The individual soul is a part of the universal soul (cf. Plotinus, Enneads, iv, 3, 1). It is derived from a fairly complex system of "processions". At the summit is the Prime Being (al-`Abī), from which all emanations, or manifestations, are derived by the Creator (al-`Abī), who is eternally his own Being-Himself (lam yata` wawsyata`a): he is pure Knowledge, pure Will, Generosity, etc. He is the absolute Cause (sīla fakāh), but not through a sort of pre-existing will; the effect is subordinated to the cause and comes about after it (laht al-sīla wa ba`dahā); it has no essential co-existence with it (ma`yYahoo b`i `l-ghāl). The Creator is the cause of all causes. His first effect (ma`yYahoo) is the 'Unsur, which Asin Palacios translates as primary Matter: it is the Source of the potential being and of the multiplication of beings, although itself simple and intelligible (cf. the system of the Khwān al-Salāf, in which primary Matter is also placed among the intelligible emanations, but on the last degree after the Soul). The second effect of the prime Cause, produced through the intermediary of the 'Unsur, is the Intellect (`Aql); the third, through the intermediary of the first two, is the Soul. All these emanations are simple (bāsāw`), After them come Universal Nature (al-Tāb`a al-khuliyya) and the bodies; the purely spiritual souls are derived from the rinds and raising them into the spiritual body of the lower nature. The instruments of this action (TCO Troietv) without having within itself the multiplicity which it creates); the Intellect acts in the same way on the Soul, and the Soul on Universal Nature. In this nature manifested in this world there then emerge, by a process which is not defined, "rinds" or bodies (fa-hasalat frushur), which resemble neither the Soul nor the Intellect, but which enclose a "pulp" (lubb or spirit. Here al-Shahrastānī's exposition is far from clear. In a first text he seems to mean that the "pulp" forms are derived by the last generation of the forms in the lowest degree of nature; these would be the corporeal forms. The Intellect "looks" at the purely spiritual forms which resemble them in (a`hara) the "pulp". As a result of this "look", there spread on the bodies (f`alayhā) noble, beautiful and brilliant forms which are the individual souls, parts of the Universal Soul and not effects emanating from it, that is to say ontologically distinct from the forms which are effects of fasaw. They are directed by the Intellect and, through them, it sorts out (tawmi) the "pulp", separating them from the rinds and raising them into the spiritual world to which they belong. We have therefore a sort of recovery by the Intellect of all the realities of a spiritual and intelligible nature which inhabit the body of the lower nature. The instruments of this recovery are the individual souls, which in this way receive a mission to rescue the forms. The corporeal forms or pulps are enclosed within the bodies; the purely spiritual souls are on the bodies. But in a second text it is stated that the vegetative soul is the rind of the animal soul, which in its turn the rind of the dianoetic soul (al-nafs al-manfīyya), and the rind of the poetical soul (sāliyya); conversely, that which is above is the pulp of what is immediately below it, so that pulp and rind have a relative value and the intermediate souls (animal, dianoetic) may be considered as rinds or as pulps according to the relationship in which they are
considered. There is thus a hierarchy of souls which fit inside one another so as to enclose themselves all within the primary matter of the material body (secondary matter). Only the noetic soul has the possibility of叛逆within the prison of the material body (secondary matter). Here it is not a question of either rebellion or of the seduction of the souls, but of a cosmic salvation. The tradition in the second text is that of the philosophers of nature and of the physicians. The third tradition is connected with the religious gnostics, perhaps with the Manichaean gnostics, and is better adapted to Islam: the conception of the prophet and of his role presages the doctrine of al-Fârâbî. The rational soul is misled by the rebellion of the lower souls and, in spite of its spirituality, is unable to escape by its own efforts. Thus texts 2 and 3 are complementary. Text 1 retains a separate character. But another difficulty arises: the theology of the pseudo-Aristotle (Dieterici, p. 10 of the Arabic text) attributes to Empedocles the idea that souls fell in this world as the result of a sin committed during their first stay. It is true that Empedocles referred to himself as an inspired prophet who had come down to earth to escape the divine wrath (Katharmoi, fragment 115), who had become a Master, capable by his learning of extricating souls from the "earthly envelope" (έξωκάλυπτον, fragment 148 = high?). In al-Shahrastânî, on the other hand, it seems that the fault is that of rational souls slain). Bound to the animal and vegetable, that is corporeal, powers. The incarnation is considered here as the reason for the sin, but there as the punishment of a sin, in a sense which recalls certain Hindu points of view.

Finally, the authentic Empedoclean doctrine of Love (mababba) which unites (ivâlî) and Hate (gâlaba) which separates (akhlûfî) is joined to this system. These are the two principles which go to make up the primary Matter, which marks spiritual beings with the seal of pure Love and corporeal beings with that of Hate. In the composite beings, the proportion of Love and of Hate illustrates their degree of spirituality or of materiality. It should be pointed out that the cyclic rhythm of the cosmos which in Empedocles results from the interaction of these two principles is absent in the pseudo-Empedocles. Here gâlaba, in spite of its name, is less a factor of war and hostility, which appears wrongly placed at the level of the first emanation, than the simple fact of the multiplication and division issuing from the One in a Platonic perspective.

As for Empedocles, E. Breher had already pointed out that the connexion between the Phusis and the Katharmoi is not very clear. But in the pseudo-Empedocles, a completely unorganized compilation, the incoherence is still greater if one is to believe the presentation of al-Shahrastânî. It is not known whether Ibn Masarra was equally incoherent, or whether he attempted to produce a more harmonious synthesis. He may have made use of this many-faceted system in order not to arouse the suspicions of the orthodox. From the extent to which he inspired Ibn al-'Arabi, it may be supposed that he produced at least the beginnings of an organized system. Nevertheless prudence is necessary when attempting to reconstruct, as Asin Palacios has done, Ibn Masarra's thought by reading the doctrine of a text not very long ago considered pseudo-Empedocles into the brief passages in which Ibn Hazm and Ibn al-SÂ`ûf refer to this thought.

(2) Passages from Ibn Hazm. (a) Fisâl (iv, 198): "Ibn Masarra was in agreement with the Mu'tazilis on kâdâr. He stated that the knowledge of God and His power are two created temporal productions (mâhdisâ'atun makhbâ'atun) and that God has two types of knowledge: the one which He created in the universe and by which He alone knows the knowledge of the universal realities which cannot be grasped by the perception of the senses (= ghabâb), for example the fact that there will exist infidels and believers; the second type of knowledge is that of individual truths, the knowledge of vision (ghahâda), for example which God has of the unfaithfulness of Zayd and of the faith of 'Amr ... Ibn Masarra recalls the Word of God: "Îhîm al-gâhîb wa l-sâ'îhâda (Kur'an VI, 73; XlII, 9; XXXII, 6). But this does not mean what he thinks. In fact, the obvious meaning of this text is that God knows what you do even if you hide it from Him. He knows that which you cannot perceive of what was, or shall be. The reason which led Ibn Masarra to support this thesis is that he really pushed the principles of the Mu'tazlis to their extreme conclusions. For there existed among them those who say that God knows continually that a certain person will never believe and that another will never be unfaithful; and who then give man the power to make the Word of their Lord lie, and to make null and cancelled that which has never ceased to exist. This is an abominable contradiction!"

(b) Fisâl (ii, 126): "Disahm b. Şâfîwân, Iklâm b. al-Hâkâm (or Ibn Masarra) ... states that God's knowledge is something other than God, that is it is produced in time and created''.

The first of these texts is centred on the idea of kâdâr, and of human freedom: in order to safeguard it, it is necessary that man's acts should not be the object of an eternal knowledge which would determine them right down to each individual detail. The ascetic life demands the liberty of the faithful, at least at the beginning, and even although the ecstasy of the mystic must one day reveal that it is God Who does all. The problem of God's knowledge of individual and contingent facts occupied Mu'tazil thinking (cf. al-Ashârî, Mabâdîîî al-Islâmiyyîm). The majority of these theologians admitted, with various shades of opinion, that God never ceased to know things before they existed. An exception should perhaps be made for Iklâm b. 'Amr al-Fuwâlî al-Shâbîdânu. It is thus easy to understand why Ibn Hazm points out that Ibn Masarra pushed the Kadar doctrine of the Mu'tazilis to its ultimate conclusions, by removing its contradiction. Thus we cannot support Asin Palacios when he attributes to Ibn Masarra on this point the thesis which was later to be that of Avicenna. He writes: "Avicenna, like Ibn Masarra ... states that God knows individual
beings as such, _intentione secunda_, that is to say in so far as they are included in their universal causes (76, n. 1). Ibn Masarra's thought rather to be related to that of Christian theologians such as Fonseca and Molina: the knowledge of which he speaks here is the _scientia media_, or _scientia visionis_ that Leibnitz, taking the same attitude as Avicenna and those Mu'tazilis whose inconsequence Ibn Masarra intended to point out, was to describe as _scientia pure empirica_, which is it impossible to imagine.

The second text is entirely in the tradition of Plotinus and of the pseudo-Empedocles. God, the first principle, cannot possess knowledge, for this would introduce in Him multiplicity. It is the Intellect which knows, with an intelligible and universal knowledge (the knowledge of the _ghayb_ in the first text). It is not clear whether the _scientia media_ is added simply as a necessary element in order to safeguard freedom, or whether it is an integral part of Ibn Masarra's pseudo-Empedoclean system. It may be that the first knowledge derives from the _'Alī_ and the second from the universal Soul. In Ibn al-'Arabi, the divine _ahadiyya_ does not recognize the individual believer who prays; he must therefore address himself to the _Rubūbiyya_. The _Rubūbiyya_ could be considered as corresponding to the universal Soul which sends the prophets, and, through them, the Law addressed to individual men, in which God reveals himself as Lord.

(c) In a third text, Ibn Hazm states that he obtained from a disciple of Ibn Masarra, Isma'il b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ru'aynī, the following opinion of his master: "The Throne is what rules the world (al- _muḥādab_ li 'l- _ālam_); and God is too great for there to be attributed to Him the act of actually doing something". By "thing" ( _ghayb_ ) should be understood a reality of the material world. Asín Palacios attempted to identify the Throne, in this context, as the first emanation, the _'Unsur_ of the pseudo-Empedocles. All the same, for Ibn al-'Arabi from whom he quotes, the Throne is the universal body. The matter remains doubtful.

(3) Passages from _al-Futūhāt al-Makhlīyya_ of Ibn al-'Arabi. (a) On the _'Arūq_. After a quotation from the Kur'ān (LXIX, 17), God, as in the book of the Throne, writes: "It has been reported to us as coming from Ibn Masarra, one of the greatest masters of the mystic way in knowledge, states and revelation, that the Throne which is carried is in fact the divine Kingship ( _Mulk_ )". That which follows may also be considered as the opinion of Ibn Masarra: "The _Mulk_ is reduced to the following: Body, Spirit, Nourishment ( _ghābāl_), Degree ( _mārtaba_). Adam and Isrā'īl are in charge of the Forms ( _suwar_); Gabriel and Muḥammad of the Spirits; Michael and Ibrāhīm of the means of subsistence ( _arsāḥ_); Mālik and Riḍwān of the Promise and of the Threat ( _Wa'd_ and _Wa'id_ )... The bearers of the Throne are those who are in charge of its government. They thus govern an elemental form or a nourishment for the elemental form, and a palpable degree which rules the elemental form and a spirit which rules the luminous form, and a nourishment for the elemental form and the nourishment of the sciences and of the knowledge for the Spirits, and a palpable degree which is made from learning". The reason why everything is doubled is that, according to _ḥādi_, there are four "bearers" for the life here below and four for the life after the Resurrection. It seems that in Ibn al-'Arabi it is a case not of two worlds, ontologically separate, but of two aspects of the same life such as the life of the body and the life of the spirit in the mystic light. This having been said, the developments which follow, even though they are inspired by some of Ibn Masarra's ideas, derive entirely from Ibn al-'Arabi's thought, and it is almost impossible to find in them anything which indicates the doctrine of his predecessor. It would be equally arbitrary to look for similarities with the philosophy of the pseudo-Empedocles. Ibn al-'Arabi's system is much more complex: he gives an important place to angelology; he gives a meaning to the Pen ( _balām_ ) and to the Tablet ( _lawḥ_ ), also to the _Kursī_. Nevertheless, at least in order to show side by side both the possibilities of concordance and their weaknesses the following table is (see p. 872) inserted.

It may therefore be considered, without having actual proof, that Ibn Masarra's doctrine belonged somewhere between the theories of the pseudo-Empedocles and those of Ibn al-'Arabi, modifying the still very metaphysical and speculative cosmology of the former in the direction of the mystical cosmology of the latter.

(b) The second text mentions Ibn Masarra only in connexion with an image, a "visualization" as H. Corbin puts it ( _L'Imagination créatrice dans le Soufisme d'Ibn 'Arabi_, 179). Ibn al-'Arabi writes: "... like the temple which is built on five columns there is a raised roof which covers the temple, and walls in which there is no door. Thus there is absolutely no means of entry for anyone. But on the outside stands a column attached to the wall. The intuitive mysteries touch it as they kiss and touch the Black Stone...". The rest of the passage is certainly an amplification by Ibn al-'Arabi. Asín Palacios considered that the five columns might be the five emanations of the pseudo-Empedocles. But this is impossible to accept, since this image is the symbol, visualized mystically, of the absolute divine Unity, the _Ahadiyya_: it is evoked in the chapter of the _Futūhāt_ devoted to the _tansih al-Tawbah_ which is expressed in God by this formula: _tanazza_ _'an_ _tansih hull munazzah_. The temple cannot therefore signify the emanations. Moreover, the description is clear: the temple is made of walls which form a part of this closed building; they do not support it from the outside. The roof, and probably also the wall, covers them entirely. This is the divine mystery. It is therefore not surprising that we are not told what the five columns mean. It may be that the only significance of the number five is the fact that it is an odd number: "God loves the uneven", says a _ḥādi_, and Ibn al-'Arabi recalls that this is the expression of his _Fardiyya_ and of his _Ahadiyya_, providing a further commentary on verse 7 of Sūra LVIII: God comes to add Himself to every odd number of creatures, as a fourth or sixth, in order to make it even, for He jealously guards His own unevenseness as a unique and incomunicable attribute. H. Corbin in fact, and rightly, is interested only in the even number which "alone is able to translate to us the Invisible". It is a matter of mysticism, not of cosmology.

After the description of the _Bayt_, Ibn al-'Arabi writes: "_wa-bad nababbā 'ašā Ḟāliḥa 'inu Masarra"_. The demonstrative _fāliḥa_ could refer to the Temple, to the image, or to the general fact of visualization, of the visualizing intuition ( _ḥāfṣ_ _suwar_). The expression _nababbā 'ašā_, which means "draw attention to", points rather to the second hypothesis. Ibn Masarra
### Ibn al-'Arabi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Cause</th>
<th>God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Unṣūr (forms)</td>
<td>'Amd (Cloud)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Akī (forms)</td>
<td>'Ākī, Kalam, Lawḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafs kūliyya (forms)</td>
<td>Nafs kūliyya (luminous forms and angels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal nature (forms)</td>
<td>Universal nature (luminous forms and angels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taghūt</strong></td>
<td><strong>World of pure light</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Throne (Universal body)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Throne (Universal body)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kursī (in the hollow of the Throne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spheres (in the hollow of the Kursī) (corporeal forms and angels surrounding the Throne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nourishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirits (arwāḥ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material bodies (mingled light) or elementary forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ibn Masarra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual redeeming souls, parts of the Universal Soul sent by the 'Ākī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeeming souls of the Prophets, sent by the Universal Soul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Pulps' (spirits); souls led astray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Rinds' (material bodies or the most material elements of beings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pseudo-Emepdocles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universal nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nafs kūliyya (forms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal nature (forms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taghūt</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | **Taghūt** |
| | **World of pure light** |
| | **Throne (Universal body)** |
| | Kursī (in the hollow of the Throne) |
| | Spheres (in the hollow of the Kursī) |
| | Nourishment |
| | Spirits (arwāḥ) |
| | Material bodies (mingled light) or elementary forms |
| | Darkness |

---
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**IBN MĀSAWAYH, Abū Zakariyyā' Yūhanānī, famous physician of the 3rd/9th century, died in 243/857. His career was begun under al-Rashid and lasted until the reign of al-Muktafi. He contributed to the translation of Greek scientific works which provided material for the famous bahāʾ al-bīhkhā [q.v.].** But Ibn Māsawayh was known particularly in his capacity as court physician, attending the high society which surrounded the caliph. His patients regarded him in particular as a specialist on diet. He lacked neither patrons nor wealth: he approached ʿIBRĀḤIM b. al-Maḥdī, the unsuccessful claimant to the caliphate, who was interested in Greek science as well as in Arabic poetry. He was introduced also to the sons of al-Raṣḥīd, among them Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās Muḥammad. The extent and the rapidity of his rise to fame did not go without criticism. It seems probable that he owed it to the powerful family of the Burḥīṭyāshīb, which supplied four generations of physicians to the court of the caliphs (Ibn Māsawayh's father was said to have been an assistant to Burḥīṭyāshīb at Dīnūdsābūr). The career of Ibn Māsawayh, who became the friend and counselor of the great as well as their physician, showed striking similarities to those of his influential protectors: all of them were convinced Nestorians, who did not abandon their religion when they were at the caliph's court. These Nestorians, in spite of the differences of creed which separated them from Byzantium, could easily keep in touch with Greek learning; they possessed the "16" treatises of Galen as put together by the Alexandrians, and even show a desire to penetrate beyond the commentators to the original teaching of the master (perhaps because of the disputes between the Jacobites of Alexandria and the Nestorians of the former Persian empire). Also, in addition to the Hellenic origins of their science and to its Christian contributions, they came under the influence also of the school of Dīnūdsābūr [q.v.], an outpost of Hellenism in the Persian empire and one of the centres of that eastern syncretism which united the practical prescriptions of the East with the mystical speculation of ancient Greek paganism. This syncretism also aimed to unite, in one single group, disciplines as different as astrology, alchemy and medicine, in the name of the supremacy attributed to the pseudo-Plato, derived from the Timaeus or from the false Democritus of Abdera, under which masqueraded the lucubrations of Bolus.
of Mendes (cf. maxims quoted at the beginning of De complessionibus; see Thordike). In this science, as full of fantasy as it was of empiricism and practical observation of the objects with which Ibn Masawayh became acquainted, pharmacy tends to take precedence over purely medical research. The remedy, like the malady, is ordained by providence, in the very order of nature. The knowledge of the four "qualities", to which is added that of the properties and the natures as well as the procedures prescribed by the art, enables the physician to penetrate the secret of universal harmony. This harmony acts on the human body through the medium of the humours, which themselves derive from the qualities. Pharmacy takes into account not only the temperaments but also the "seasons" which, thanks to the qualities, have a clearly perceptible affinity with the humours. The somewhat superstitious idea of an "art", which alone is capable of directing the behaviour of the properties, and that of a cosmic development, of which man is merely a reflexion, was that which inspired the two Arabic works of Ibn Masawayh which have survived under his name: al-Nawādir al-tibbiyya, a collection of medical aphorisms, and the Kitāb al-Azhima, a sort of description of the various seasons of the year, based on the twin theories of the humours and the "qualities". His Latin works are much longer, and it seems that "Mesue" was held in high esteem in the West. As late as the 9th/10th century, one Petrus Gulosius, a physician of Amalfi, stated that to read him was as instructive as it was pleasant (1474). Although Leclerc and others have sometimes hesitated on the ground of the testimony of Leo Africanus (in an unidentified passage; this may be a confusion with Constantine Africanus) to identify Ibn Masawayh with the Mesue of the Latin texts, and although, in spite of similarities, it has sometimes been considered that there was an elder and a younger Mesue, it may be said that on the whole the Arabic texts preserve what may be called the philosophical part of the author's production, whereas the Western readers were interested mainly in the teaching of Ibn Māsawīh as an eminent medical practitioner. Before them, al-Rāzī, in his Continens, had already extensively commented on the Kitāb al-humaydi, which contains (in many passages, especially for practical criticism of those fighters who were too greedy for plunder (al-Tabari, i, 1330 and 1395). After these two battles and until the death of the Prophet very little is heard of him among the triumphs of life in Medina and the large numbers of new converts to Islam. It is likely that Ibn Māsawīh built up at that time, through his personal influence, a number of firm friendships. They were probably made among the Ansār, the converts from distant provinces or the zealots of humble origin. Tradition names an important Anṣārī, Sa'd b. Mu'āsh, the leader of the Aths who had joined the Prophet; the Yemeni Abū Mūsā al-Asghāri, and his constant companions Mīkād, Āmmār b. Yāsīr, Hūdāyfa b. al-Yāmān, Abū Dharr, Abu 'l-Dardā' and Salmān al-Fārisī (al-Sakhāwī, 345; Isāba, s.v.). On the Prophet's death, Ibn Māsawīh came more into the foreground. His help was needed during the revolt of the Arab tribes encamped around Medina (al-Tabari, i, 1367). He took part, during the reign of the son of Abū Bakr in the battle of Uhud (year 3), where he was entrusted with guarding the foot (ibid.,
After the conquest of 'Irāq, he received, according to Sayf b. 'Umar, some land in the district (6/657, ibid., 2370). He was present at the founding of Kufa by his patron Sa'd b. Abi Wakkās, but returned shortly afterwards to Syria, where he was entrusted with a military and diplomatic mission to Hims (ibid., 2392). When he returned to 'Irāq, following the armies which were fighting on the two fronts, he very soon ensured the link between the new Arab colony of Kūfa and the central government at Medina (ibid., 2393). In 21/642 he settled permanently at Kufa, in the quarter of the Ḥūqayyls (Tabari, iv, 460; al-Walid b. al-Ćāhīr reports that he chose to live in preference to that of the Kurayyīls (al-Ćabarī, i, 2842) to which his Zuhri patrons could perhaps have given him admittance. He nevertheless served as lieutenant to his companion 'Ammār b. Yāsir (ibid., 2637, 2645 and 2647).

Throughout this phase of his life, which marked the zenith of his political career, his duties were those of an administrator, an ambassador, and a missionary, which is quite in accordance with the high opinion which was held of his shrewdness, his learning and above all of his integrity. But once the important conquests were over he became less necessary. In particular he was the object of the scorn of the Muhādīrūn, Kurayyīls of noble birth who had formerly emigrated, like him, from Mecca to Medina. Sa'd b. Abi Wakkās publicly criticized his financial administration, because of his parsimony (ibid., 2812). In the year 29, he criticized the new governor of Kūfa, al-Walid b. Ťukba, whose scandalously pagan behaviour shocked him and led him to protest (ibid., 2842). In the year 30 there appeared the first signs of a break with the caliph 'Uthmān (ibid., 2835). He then fell into disgrace, in circumstances of which little is known. A public scene ensued between Ibn Mas'ūd and the caliph, who had him ill-treated. It is not known whether he died in Medina, under a sort of house arrest, or at Kūfa (Ibn Ḥanbal, no. 4432), where his teaching was highly esteemed (in the year 32/652-3); al-Ćabarī favours the first report, while the Ḥanbālī Ibn Kaṭhīr, the mystic Munawwī and the Isābīa favour the second. It is difficult to reconstruct Ibn Mas'ūd's teaching because of the unreliability and the tendentious nature of the sources. There are many differences between the recensions of the hadith: (1) Kūfānic reading. There are two points, not though well established and subject to controversy, on which Ibn Mas'ūd's version appears to differ from the majority of 'Uthmānī text: the order of the sūras and some variants in the readings. On the first point, which would be by far the more important if sufficient details were available, information is found in the Fīhrīst. Th. Nöldeke (Geschichte d. Q., ii, 15, 48, 113, 144, 163) and R. Blachère (Introduction au Coran, 174-5) reached the same conclusions: there is nothing, or very little, in these variants which has not been systematically introduced or which could be of great importance for the study of the religious ideas of the 1st century. In particular, the order adopted by Ibn Mas'ūd is far from being a historical one, since, if the details in the Fīhrīst are correct and if the recension we possess of Ibn Mas'ūd is authentic, he neglected to make use of the close knowledge which he as a faithful Companion possessed of the biography of Muhammad and of the particular circumstances accompanying each revelation (cf. the chronological list of al-Ya'kūbī, which may be based on 'Uthmān reminiscences, i, 24). This may have been due to a lack of a sense of sequence, to negligence, to literary prejudice or to the intentional falsification of a document which had a 'Shīa bias, to the advantage of Sunnism. The question, for lack of datable documents, is of course insoluble; and until now it has not been possible to verify the reliability of the statements in its external form, the Kūfānic corpus of Ibn Mas'ūd (cf. A. Jeffery, Materials for the history of the text of the Qur'ān, 20-113; E. Beck, in Orientalia, xxi (1956), 352-83, xxvii (1959), 186-205, 230-56). The variant readings preserved by Ibn Khāla- wayh (Muhāhasa fī šayrār bāb al-dhātī, see as examples, ii, verses 24, 48, 91, 102, 108, 126, 177, 220, 222; iii, 7, 105, 137, etc.) concern only points of detail. At the most, on reading this work, we may credit Ibn Mas'ūd with a sort of prosiness, a fairly free use of the grammatical forms of Arabic, and a certain taste for juridical definitions, which sometimes lead him to seek for supplementary statements of meaning. But nothing of all this, if political opinions were not involved, could cause any very serious harm to the received text of 'Uthmān, or even justify the fanatical attachment which Ibn Mas'ūd's supporters had to his system. Nöldeke goes so far as to doubt, for chronological reasons, whether Ibn Mas'ūd was really as opposed to the promulgation of 'Uthmān's text as is stated in the sources. But even if we assume Ibn Mas'ūd to have been in agreement with 'Uthmān on the essentials of the Kūfānic message, it is not certain that he was so on the commentary which should be given on it.
(3) Qur'anic exegesis. It is particularly in this field that there can be attributed to Ibn Mas'ud some cautious Shī'ī tendencies. There is no doubt that Ibn Mas'ud's way of thinking must have been modified, clearly related to that which prevailed among the Aḥl al-bayt than to the aristocratic mentality of ʿUṯmān's entourage. Reference is made to Ibn Mas'ud's favourite passages, those which he probably developed most fully in his teaching: for example, verse 40 of sūra V, which is regarded by the Shī'īs as confirming the dignity of the ināmūn as supreme "witnesses" and lieutenants of God (al-Kulīn, 271). It goes without saying that Ibn Mas'ud, as an exegete, was fairly strongly criticized by al-Ṭabarī, more closely related to that which prevailed among the Wezāmis. He often classes Ibn Mas'ud with Murra al-Ash'arī in an indeterminate category to which ṭafsīr gives the broad name of "Companions of the Prophet". In reality, this division is not that which in which Ibn 'Abbas was artificially included. Even more cautiously, Ibn Mas'ud is separated from his pupil Masrūk, who, like him, was often questioned on the realities of the next world. Naturally, Ibn Mas'ud's witness is indispensable for commentary on the sūrat al-Kahf (XVIII), with its account of the Seven Sleepers, the most important eschatological passage (Ṭafsīr, xvi, 23, 58). From these few details it may be seen fairly clearly what was the basis for Ibn Mas'ud's reputation among those who, during his lifetime, were his pupils and followers in exegesis. As a specialist in tašrīḥ (allegorical or interpretative commentary) he foresaw (and even the Sunnis admit this) the dissensions which were to rend the Muslim community (Iṣdhā). Having been a witness of the occasions when the Prophet had been inspired and of the immediate consequences of this inspiration, he was in possession of important secrets on the latter end of things and of mankind (cf. a popular form of exegesis with a magical use of sūras in Ibn Ḥanbal, no. 4004).

Thus there emerges, from sources which may fairly be regarded as impartial concerning him, a clear picture of Ibn Mas'ud's personality. Unshakeable in his loyalty to the Prophet and his family, he found it difficult to suffer the intrigues of the Meccan aristocracy, in which those who seemed to have admitted him completely into their tribe. By nature the friend of the lowly and the humble, he was probably the supporter of a more inward, mystical and more Shī'ī type of Islam, as seems to be indicated by the surprising harmony which is apparent between the texts which appeared under his name and the vicissitudes of his life. His conduct, his hādhīḥ and his exegesis are certainly those of a man who, as al-Munāwī has said, placed more hope on the next world than on that which he saw reflected in his contemporaries.
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BIBLIOGRAPHY. Abu l-Ḥasan Yāḥyā b. ʿIsā b. ʿIsā, Al-Matruh, Abu l-Ḥasan Yāḥyā b. ʿIsā b. ʿIsā, Al-Matruh. Al-Matruh, was born on 8 Ṣaʿdī 592/July 1196 at Asyūt, which he left while still young for Kūf. This town was at that time one of the most important cultural centres of Egypt, and it was probably there that Ibn Matruh continued, or began, his education. It was there also that he met the poet Bahāʾ al-Dīn Zubayr (q.v.), who became his friend, and that he began to write his famous collection of ḥadīṯ under the name of Madīj al-Dīn al-Lanṭī, the governor of the town, to whom he dedicated two poems which show his lack of experience. It is said that Madīj al-Dīn appointed the young poet to an administrative post but that he did not remain in it for long.

Seeking a more propitious atmosphere, Ibn Matruh set out for Cairo in about 626/1229 and was presented to al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb, who was representing his father at the Ayyūbī court in Egypt. In 629/1231, Ibn Matruh accompanied al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb when he was appointed by his father commander-in-chief of the army which was to conquer Mesopotamia and fight against the Mongols and the ʿAbbasīd caliph. He remained continuously with him, taking part in the military and political struggles and travelling between the conquered towns of Syria and Mesopotamia.

After the death of al-Malik al-Kāmil (655/1258), the rivalry between the Ayyūbī rulers increased and Ibn Matruh could not avoid taking part in the struggles. It was to uphold the point of view of al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb, under whom he was inspector-general of the army, that he returned to Cairo in 637/1239 with Ibn al-Ḥjawāzī, the envoy of the ʿAbbasīd caliph, to restore agreement between the Ayyūbī princes. His stay there was brief and he very soon returned to Syria.

In 639/1241, Ibn Matruh was again in Egypt. Al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb, who had become sultan of Cairo, appointed him treasurer of the city. This appointment was the beginning of a series of high official posts at the sultan's court. In 643/1245, when al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb gained control of Damascus, he appointed Ibn Matruh as vizier of the town. During this period Ibn Matruh enjoyed great prosperity and the esteem of his entourage. But when al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb went to Damascus in 646/1248, he relieved Ibn Matruh of the office which he held and sent him with the troops to Hims. At this time Ibn Matruh fell from favour. Scarcely had these troops arrived in Hims when they received orders from the sultan to return to Egypt to defend it against the Crusaders who were preparing to attack Damietta. Al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb, now seriously ill, also returned to Egypt and Ibn Matruh followed him.

After the death of al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb (15 Shāban 647/23 November 1249), Ibn Matruh retired to his own home, where he composed a number of short penitential poems. He died in Cairo at the beginning of Shābān 649/end of October 1251. Ibn Khallīkān was present at his burial.

The diwān of Ibn Matruh was published in Istanbul in 1298; the edition, a mediocre one, contains about 806 lines.

His work consists mainly of eulogistic and of erotic poems, which do not generally reach the level of exalted poetry. His political and official duties prevented his devoting himself entirely to his art. Nevertheless, in some of his best poems his abilities as a poet are apparent.
The text discusses the life of Moses Maimonides, a Jewish philosopher and physician, and his contributions to the fields of law, medicine, and philosophy. Maimonides was born in Muslim Spain and later moved to the Muslim East. He is known for his work on the interpretation of Judaism, the *Guide for the Perplexed*, and his legal treatises, such as *Mishneh Torah*. The text also mentions his education, his influence on Islamic and Jewish thought, and his role as a physician in the Muslim world.
still barely freed from the surrounding paganism, is nevertheless the most perfect that can exist and must remain in force eternally. Such, without any doubt, are the main themes reduced to their simplest expression in the "Guide". It must be emphasized, however, that, by the method of composition of this book and the contradictions in it that he has deliberately allowed to remain, as well as by various allusions, Maimonides sought to make the enlightened reader understand that his own true opinions were far from coinciding with what a superficial reader would suppose. There are thus strong reasons for believing that he did not reject the thesis of the eternity of the world (indeed he openly maintains its perpetuity) and that, in the final count, God was identified, in his belief, with the law of nature, and therefore with a certain necessity (but, it is true, an intelligent and not a blind necessity). The strictly negative attitude from which he never departed in regard to astrology, the occult sciences and non-philosophic mysticism equally testify to his basic rationalism. It is certain, moreover, as can be seen from his "Code of Laws" and his "Treatise on the resurrection", that he tended to minimize the traditional eschatology of Judaism and that he taught unequivocally the eternal survival of the soul alone and the wholly spiritual character of punishment in the after-life. In the soul, it is, somewhat like Ibn Rushd (q.v.), his contemporary and in several respects his counterpart among Muslim thinkers, he thought that intellectual souls, separated from their bodies and justified here below by the constant exercise of practical and dianoetic values, would be united in the after-life with the Active intellect; this is tantamount to a denial, with varying qualifications, of the individual immortality of the soul professed in common by the three great monotheistic religions. In both these philosophers, however, these radical views co-existed, without any sign of internal conflict, along with a sincere adherence to their respective religious laws, which they regarded as the best conceivable formula for regulating men's social lives and creating the climate in which the common man could live in peace, under a code of conduct in which the philosopher, co-operating in the maintenance of this discipline and himself submitting to it in the scrupulous observance of its rites, could harmoniously unite the life of contemplation with the life of action. But it is not surprising that these views should have seemed too bold, or even scandalously heterodox, and we know that the Muslim scholar 'Abd al-Latif al-Baghdadi (q.v.), who knew Maimonides in Cairo, stated bluntly that the latter had written an heretical book for his co-religionists. Despite the precautions taken to prevent the "Guide" being circulated outside the Jewish community, there were at least partial and abridged transcriptions of it in Arabic script which, at the very least, were circulated among Christian intellectual circles in Egypt. On the other hand, there are almost no traces of any use of the "Guide" by Muslim scholars, and nothing is known as to the identity of the "Tibriz" who commented on the twenty-five propositions taken from Aristotle and placed at the beginning of the second part; this commentary has incidentally survived only in the Hebrew version.

As we have said, Moses Maimonides drew his greatest inspiration from al-Fārābī, but one can also detect al-Ghazālī (Tuḫāfūt) and Ibn Bāḍīḍa. His knowledge of the work of Ibn Rushd (whom he held in great esteem) was incomplete, and for the most part was acquired too late to be utilised in the writing of the "Guide"—

One final point: in regard to Islam, Maimonides adopted (and this is in no way original) an attitude at once of total refusal to admit the prophetic inspiration of that religion's founder, and also of a certain subtly qualified sympathy for the strict monotheism which characterizes it; evidently he rejected the attempts to discover passages in the Bible announcing the coming of the Prophet of the Arabs, just as he bitterly reproached the Muslims for suspecting the integrity of the scriptural text [see Aḥl al-Kītāb and Tahrīf].

Bibliography: Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ā, 'Usayn al-ansābī, ii, 117; Ibn al-Kīṭīfī, Ta'rīkh al-buḫāmā', 317-9; M. Steinschneider, Die arabische Literatur der Juden, Berlin 1902, 199-221 (for the Hebrew versions, idem, Die Hebräischen Übersetzungen des Mittellaters..., Berlin 1893, passages indicated in the index, p. 1, 1060, s.v. Maimonides); Broekelmann 1, 644-66, S, 893-4; add Shahr asma' al-sībār (Explanation of the names of drugs), edited with translation and commentary by M. Meyerhof, in MIE, xii (1940); the main part of the bibliography down to 1950 is given in G. Vajda, Jüdische Philosophie (Bibliographische Einführungen in das Studium der Philosophie, 19), Berne 1950, 20-4; the principal sources of information in particular those of I. Halkin, A history of midieval Jewish philosophy, Philadelphia 1916 (reprinted several times), J. Guttmann, Die Philosophie des Judentums, Munich 1933 (English trans., Philosophies of Judaism, London 1964) and G. Vajda, Introduction à la pensée juive du moyen âge, Paris 1947, include a chapter on Moses Maimonides; of a complete bibliography arranged according to subjects, by Jacob I. Dienstag, the only part to have appeared is Moses Maimonides, A topical bibliography, in Studies in Bibliography and Folklore, vi, Cincinnati 1966, 12-29 of the Hebrew part of the fascicule,—Texts published since 1950: Moses Maimonides' Epistle to Yemen. The Arabic Original and the Three Hebrew Versions edited... by Abraham S. Halkin and an English Translation, with an introduction (particularly important for the relationship of Maimonides' thought with Greek philosophy and Arab philosophy) by the translator. Of recent articles on Maimonides' thought, we mention only A. Altmann, Essence and Existence in Maimonides, in Bull. of the John Rylands Library, xxxv (1953), 294-315; M. Fakhry, The antinomy of the eternity of the world in Averroes, Maimonides and Aquinas, in Le Musée, xvi (1953), 139-55; some points of detail on Maimonides' biography: B. Lewis, Maimonides, Lionheart and Saladin, in Erets-Israel, vii (1963), 70-5; on the circulation of the Guide: G. Vajda, Un abrégé chrétien du "Guide des Égards", in JA, 1960, 115-36; idem, in JA, 1965, 43-50; finally, see S. W. Baron, A social and religious History of the Jews, vii, New York 1938, 249-52 and 259-62; M. Mohagheh, Maimonides against Galen/Radd-i Ibn Maimon and Avicenna's Ghaybat (Tuḫāfūt) and Ibn Bāḍīḍa, in Aḥl al-Kītāb and Tahrīf, kādā-i adabyāt va-ūlāmī-i insānī, xv (1967). Maimonides' Arabic has been the subject, among
IBN MAYYĀDA, ABU SHARĀḤIL (or SHURĀḤIL) AL-RAṂMĀḤ B. ABBĀD (Yazīd in Ibn al-Muʿādhhdhal b. Abī Sulma) AL-MURRI, of the Banū Murra b. Ḥadhramawt, is a Bedouin poet who lived in the Ḥijāz and in Najd from the reign of Hishām b. Abī Sulma to the time of the early ʿAbbasids; he produced a eulogy of the Khalif Walid b. Yazīd (125-6/743-4), to whom he paid his first panegyric. His love poetry, of the Madīfr, Ḥidādī, Ḥādī, Ṣamī, Ṣamīḥ, is praised by the critics; it is in general praised by the critics; it is in particular, one of which a few verses survive. His thirty-five compositions the model for his successors. The poet however claimed to have been Persian, boasting of belonging both to the line of the Chosroes and to the Arabs, his father being a descendant, through his grandmother, of Zuhayr ibn Khathīr and Nashīt, both of Persian origin. It is said that he was well-groomed. His poetry consists chiefly of nasīḥ, ḥijāzī, and madīḥ. His love poetry, of the Bedouin type and considered by Ibn Sharāḥil (ed. and tr. Pellat, 27) as superior to that of al-Kumayy, Nūṣayb or al-Ṭīrmāmāḥ, is addressed to several women, both free and slave, but especially to one called Umm Ḫaḍbar, who was finally married by her father to a Syrian. It was she who was the cause of an exchange of epigrams, nasāḥād, between Ibn Mayyāda and another poet, Ḥākam b. Ṭaḥṣīl b. Khudrī, but the ḥijāzī of al-Rammāḥ alludes also to other persons; it is said, moreover, that he was inclined to malice and enjoyed exchanging insults with those with whom he came into contact, without however descending to scurrilities.

Ibn Mayyāda’s poetry was long esteemed first to the Umayyad governor of Mecca, ʿAbd al-Wabīb b. Sulaymān. ʿAbd al-Malik, and especially to al-Walīd b. Yazīd (125-6/743-4), to whom he paid several visits; a poem much praised by the critics is a bāʿṣyya in which he lauds the generosity of the caliph, who had rewarded him with a hundred camels and a slave to look after them, a ḍāʾīrīya and a horse. On the death of al-Walīd, he wrote his funeral eulogy in a márṭiyya of which a few verses survive. His relations with the Umayyads did not prevent him from addressing his praises to the ʿAbbāsids, particularly since under the former he had been beaten for having in one verse given the family of the Prophet precedence over the Banū Marwān; thus he produced a eulogy of the ʿAbbāsids governor of Medina, Dīṣfār b. Sulaymān, and even attempted to gain the favour of al-Ḥanābal, but he did not renew the attempt, since the caliph had not the same interest in poetry as al-Walīd b. Yazīd.

He is accused of frequent lapses (ṣabat) in his poetry, but it is in general praised by the critics; several poems have been set to music, and the philologists cite a number of his verses as ẓawāqīd, Ibn Mayyāda being considered as one of the last of the classical poets, of those who "set the seal on" poetry.


IBN MAYYĀDA — IBN AL-MUʿĀDHHDHAL

IBN MISDJAH, SAʿĪD ABU ʿĪSĀ OR ABU ʿUṬMĀN, one of the great singers of the early Ḥijāzī school of Arabian music, was born in Mecca and died there in the reign of Walīd I (86-96/705-15). He was a half-breed of African descent (masāʾil adawwā). He was inclined to malice and enjoyed exchanging insults with those with whom he came into contact, without however descending to scurrilities. His love poetry, of the Madīfr, was born in Mecca and died there in the reign of Walīd I (86-96/705-15). He was a half-breed of African descent (masāʾil adawwā). He was inclined to malice and enjoyed exchanging insults with those with whom he came into contact, without however descending to scurrilities. His love poetry, of the Madīfr, but his ḥīdādī of al-Rammāḥ alludes also to other persons; it is said, moreover, that he was inclined to malice and enjoyed exchanging insults with those with whom he came into contact, without however descending to scurrilities. His love poetry, of the Madīfr, but his ḥīdādī of al-Rammāḥ alludes also to other persons; it is said, moreover, that he was inclined to malice and enjoyed exchanging insults with those with whom he came into contact, without however descending to scurrilities. His love poetry, of the Madīfr, but his ḥīdādī of al-Rammāḥ alludes also to other persons; it is said, moreover, that he was inclined to malice and enjoyed exchanging insults with those with whom he came into contact, without however descending to scurrilities. His love poetry, of the Madīfr, but his ḥīdādī of al-Rammāḥ alludes also to other persons; it is said, moreover, that he was inclined to malice and enjoyed exchanging insults with those with whom he came into contact, without however descending to scurrilities. His love poetry, of the Madīfr, but his ẓawāqīd, of Arabic music, was born in Mecca and died there in the reign of Walīd I (86-96/705-15). He was a half-breed of African descent (masāʾil adawwā). He was inclined to malice and enjoyed exchanging insults with those with whom he came into contact, without however descending to scurrilities. His love poetry, of the Madīfr,

Bibliography: Aḥkām, index and especially ii, 276-84 (based mainly on the Aḥkām Saʿīd b. Misḏijāḥ by ʿIṣāk b. al-Mawṣillī, see Aḥkām, xiv, 11, 26 and Ḥifīrīṣ, 141, 3); a Kūbī ʿIṣāḥ Misḏijāḥ by Abī Ayyūb al-Madīnī is mentioned in Fīhrīṣ, 148, 6. H. G. Farmer, A history of Arabian music, 69 t., 77 f. (J. W. Fück).
`Abd al-Šamad's brothers Ahmad, `Isa and `Abd Allah also rank as poets, but their output was very scanty, according to Ibn al-Nadim (ibid.), the first mention of `Abd al-Šamad, Ahmad and al-Mu'adhhdhal, followed the classical tradition, and some of his poems have been preserved, but he impresses mainly by his eloquence and his piety, which was in contrast to the moral laxity of `Abd al-Šamad; he appears to have enjoyed a certain renown in a milieu that was far removed from poetry: indeed, while the Aghdnl [q.v.], his piety, which was in contrast to the moral laxity of `Abd al-Šamad, whom al-Marzubanl [op. cit.] considered him as the poet (Zahr, 9-10; F. Bustani, Dirat al-ma'drif, i, 90; Husri, 'Umda, i, 175, 200, 259, 312; Ibn al-Shādīlārī, Hamāsīa, 91, 198, 224, 241; Ps.-Djahiz, al-Maḥbūsī wa l-maṣūdi, 383; Ibn 'Abd Rabbiḥ, 'Ibīd, Cairo 1940, ii, 144, 218, iii, 244, vii, 53; Ibn Rasīlī, 'Umda, i, 90; Ṣahrī, Zahr, 651-6; idem, Dījam, 310; Sirāfī, Nakhs-yusiniz, 33-5; `Askārī, Sinā'atayn, 231, 234, 455; idem, Diwān al-maṭāmīn, index; Thālālī, Thāmār al-bulbūl, 217; Āmidī, Muwāsāna, Istambul 1287, 136; Kutubī, Fawdh, i, 575; Nuwayrī, Nikāyā, iii, 90; Ghazzūlī, Mādīnī, i, 9-10; F. Bustānī, Dīvrat al-maṭārīf, iv, 52; Ch. Fellat, Mu'een, 168; idem, Ibn al-Mu'adhhdhal wa-ṣahrūr (forthcoming). (Ch. Fellat)

IBN AL-MU'ALLIM [see al-Muufīd].

IBN AL-MUBĀRĀK. `Abd Allāh b. `Abd al-Rajmān al-Ḥansālī (188 or 1175-1241 or 737-781/797), a merchant who combined his business a love of learning. He travelled widely, studying under many authorities, including Abū Ḥanīfa. Besides his large collection of traditions (20,000 according to Ibn Mu'īn), his interests included matters legal, religious and literary. He said that he heard traditions from 4,000 ṣayyids and transmitted from 1,000. Muslim has some of his traditions in his Saḥīh. Ibn al-Mubārak studied fihā with Sufyān al-Thawrī and Mālik b. Anās, whose Muwaṭṭa' he transmitted. He was a pious man, devoted to ascetic practices. He made the Pilgrimage and engaged in ḥajjāt in alternate years. He died at Hit on the Euphrates after an expedition.

Bibliography:

In addition to the sources mentioned in the text: Sūlī, AWRī, section on the poets, ed. J. Heyworth Dunne, Cairo 1934, index; Ibn al-Nadīm (ibid.), al-Mu'adhhdhal, 346; Ibn al-Djjālārī, Waraka, index; Mubarrad, Kāmi'īn, index; Kāli, Amālī, index; Ibn Abī 'Awn, Taqaghīhā, 79, 58, 59, 76, 91, 95, 175, 200, 221, 259, 312; Ibn al-Shādīlārī, Hamāsīa, 91, 198, 224, 241; Ps.-Djahiz, al-Maḥbūsī wa l-maṣūdi, 383; Ibn 'Abd Rabbiḥ, 'Ibīd, Cairo 1940, ii, 144, 218, iii, 244, vii, 53; Ibn Rasīlī, 'Umda, i, 90; Ṣahrī, Zahr, 651-6; idem, Dījam, 310; Sirāfī, Nakhs-yusiniz, 33-5; `Askārī, Sinā'atayn, 231, 234, 455; idem, Diwān al-maṭāmīn, index; Thālālī, Thāmār al-bulbūl, 217; Āmidī, Muwāsāna, Istambul 1287, 136; Kutubī, Fawdh, i, 575; Nuwayrī, Nikāyā, iii, 90; Ghazzūlī, Mādīnī, i, 9-10; F. Bustānī, Dīvrat al-maṭārīf, iv, 52; Ch. Fellat, Mu'een, 168; idem, Ibn al-Mu'adhhdhal wa-ṣahrūr (forthcoming). (Ch. Fellat)

IBN AL-MU'ALLIM [see al-Muufīd].
shortly afterwards he was created Director of Finance ('amli al-khardd) for Damascus and Urdunn and went to Damascus (for a poem of his praise of the city, see Yākūt, iii, 243). In 247/861 he took over the same office in Egypt; he introduced a number of new taxes (muhāda) such as one on cattle fodder (muhūs) as well as a monopoly on caustic soda (C. H. Becker, Beiträge, 144 ff.; cf. A. Grohmann, Aperçu..., 74 ff., discussing the papyrological evidence). Hence he became the most hated director of finances for centuries, but the most powerful man of his time in Egypt. When in Ramadan 254/September-October 868 Aḥmad b. Tūlūn entered al-Fustāṣ as the newly appointed governor, Aḥmad b. al-Mudabbir attempted to win him over by bribing him with valuable gifts, but in vain as Ibn Tūlūn rejected them. The struggle for power that now began between the two rivals was fought out in Egypt as well as at the court of Sāmarrā. Aḥmad b. Tūlūn emerged triumphant; he was able to overthrow Aḥmad b. al-Mudabbir, to imprison him, and to confiscate his wealth. In 258/872, at the latest, he was set free and transferred back to Syria as director of finances for Damascus, Urdunn and Palestine. When Aḥmad b. Tūlūn occupied Damascus, in 264/877, Ibn al-Mudabbir was after a short time again arrested (Ibn 'Asākir, ii, 62), sentenced to pay a muṣ̄ādara of 600,000 dirhams, sent to Egypt and kept in prison until his death. According to the Fihrist Aḥmad b. al-Mudabbir was the author of an unfortunately lost K. al-Mujālāsa wa l-muṣ̄ādara; some of his poems and anecdotes concerning him have been preserved in the Akhūn, the Murūǧi, the Taʾrīḫ Dimashq, etc.

(2) Abū Isḥāq (Abū Yusuf) ʿIbrāhīm (d. Shawwāl 279/December 892-January 893) was in favour with the caliph al-Mutawakkil and numbered among his boon companions (mudāmāb), so that he exercised great influence over the caliph and the affairs of state. The waṣīr ʿUbayd Allāh b. Khākān overthrew him, probably together with his brother Aḥmad, in about 240/855. ʿIbrāhīm was thrown into prison, where he remained for the next years; the circumstances of his liberation are not known. Some time later he was appointed tax-collector of the province of Akhwas, and it was probably while holding that position, brought to Basra, and put into prison there. He escaped by breaking through the prison wall, an exploit mentioned by al-Masʿūdī, ed. M. Kurd, ed. M. Kurd (Ibrahim only); Ibn al-Aṣākir, index; Yaʿkūbī, ii, 516, 599, 614.5; Aḥmad b. al-Mudabbir, ed. I. 103 f. 326 f. (Ibrahim); G. Gabrielli, Nota bibliografica, in Rand. Lit., xxii (1912), 373.

IBN MUDJĀHID, AḤMA D B. MŪṢĪ Ṣ. AL-TAʿRĪṢ ABū BAKR AL-TAMMĪ (245/859-324/936), was born in Bagdad and seems to have spent his life there. He is noted for his study of the various Kurʾān readings, for the large number of pupils who attended his classes, and for writing the first book on the seven Kurʾān readings. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī calls him a reliable authority (thāla maʿman), and quotes a statement made in 286/899 by the grammarians Aḥmad b. Yahyā to the effect that at that time no one knew more about the Kurʾān than Abū Bakr Ibn Mūḍāḫīḥ. Commentaries on his book about the seven readings were written by AbūʾAūlā (Al-Fārīsî (d. 377/987) in three volumes, and by Ibn Khālawayh (d. 370/980). ʿHādīdī Khālīfā (d. 1067/1657) says he possessed both of these and the text. The Fihrist ends its short notice by naming a number of books written by Ibn Mūḍāḫīḥ. As a result of his representations he was influential in persuading the authorities to proscribe the Kurʾān versions of Ibn Masʿūd, Abūyā b. Kaʿb and Abū ʿAlī b. Ṭālib. Bibliography: Fihrist, 31; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Taʾrīḫ Bagdadī, v, 144-8 (no. 2580); al-Dīzawī, Ghāybat al-maḥyā (Bibl. isl. vil.) iii, 139 (no. 663); ʿHādīdī Khālīfā, ed. Fliigel, no. 2004; Ibn al-Balāq, al-Maṣāḥif, vii, 118 f. (Abū ʿAlī); Al-Aghāna, La passion d’al-Hallāj, i, 240-45; G. Bergsträsser and O. Pretzl, Geschichte des Qorans, iii, 210-13; Brockelmann, i, 203, s. i, 328. (J. Robson)

IBN AL-MUDJĀWIR, DIJĀMĀL (NĀḤĪM) AL-DIN ABū L-FATH YÚSūF b. YAʿKĪB MŪHMĀD AL-DHAYBĀNĪ AL-DIMASPīR, reputed author of Taʾrīḫ al-Mustāwhir (or al-Mustānisīr), an important source for the geography, history, and customs of western and southern Arabia in the early part of the 7th/12th century. Yūsūf b. Yaʿkīb, a native of Damascus said to have been of Persian descent, was born in 601/1204-5 and died in 690/1291. The brief biographical notices of him give little information on his career. The author of Taʾrīḫ al-Mustāwhir does not tell enough about himself to satisfy our curiosity. He was in India in 618, but he does not say how he got there or what he was doing there. At the end of 618/1222 he sailed from India to Aden. He visited Zabīd at least three times, in 619, 624, and 626; he was in Mecca in 621 and in Djuḍḍa both before and after the destruction of the tomb of Eve in that year. The only other place in Arabia he mentions having been in is the port of Ghulāfika in the Yemen. At no point does the author say what his business or pleasure in Arabia was. The latest date in the
narrative is Dhu 'l-Hijja 626/1229. Internal evidence indicates that the work was composed not long thereafter.

The usually accepted identification of Yusuf b. Ya'qūb b. Muhammad Ibn al-Mujawir al-Dimashqī as the author of the book would appear rational, were it not for a single sentence, on page 252 of O. Löfgren's edition (1951-4), in which the author speaks of "my father Muhammad b. Mas'ūd b. 'All b. Ahmad Ibn al-Mujawir al-Baghdādi al-Naysābūrī. A number of years before this edition came out, M. Jawād, who had noticed this sentence in the Paris MS of the work, disputed the attribution of authorship to Yusuf b. Ya'qūb. Jawād also remarked that it was hard to believe that such a book could have been written by a man in his early twenties, who for the remaining sixty-odd years of his life had nothing more to set forth on the subject. To Jawād's reservations may be added the fact that Ibn al-Imām in his obituary of Yusuf b. Ya'qūb says that he had a special interest in the history of Baghdad, but makes no reference to a corresponding interest in Arabia. Ibn Taghribirdi describes Yusuf b. Ya'qūb simply as a transmitter of hadīths.

Abū (Bā) Makhrama (d. 947/1540), whose writings on southern Arabia have also been edited by Löfgren, cites Ta'rikh al-Mustabsir a number of times, but he never names the miscellaneous information as the author; his standard reference is to "al-Mustabsir in his history". (There is no information on the life of Ibn al-Mujawir in Löfgren's 260 pages of biographies for southern Arabia by Abū Makhrama, al-Djanadi (d. 732/1332), and al-Ahdal (d. 855/1451)).

Ta'rikh al-Mustabsir, despite its title, is not so much a history as a collection of itineraries and a potpourri of miscellaneous information on the towns and tribes of western and southern Arabia and the life of the people there. Fragmentary historical data of some value are given on the later Ayyūbīds in Arabia, the early Rashīds of the Yamān, and the Katāūd Sharīfs, who had established themselves in Mecca just before the author's appearance on the scene. Much more space is allotted to routes between cities, with the length of each stage given in parasangs (farsakhs). The geographical material begins in the north with the environs of Medina, though there is no description of the Prophet's city itself. Details on Djudda, Zabid, and Aden are particularly copious, and stylized maps of all three, as well as similar maps of various other places, are provided. The southern coast of Arabia is treated more extensively than in most Arab geographers, as far around as al-Khāṭīb, Muskāt (Maskat), and Shūbār on the Gulf of 'Umrān. The only site in the Persian Gulf dealt with in great detail is the island of Kāys (Kīsh). The book closes with a short paragraph on al-Bāhrāyin, which was said to have 360 villages, with all but one being Imāmī (Twelver Shi'ī). The figure 360 for this small island is manifestly absurd.

The book contains an abundance of fascinating lore on Islamic sects, marriage customs, slavery, weights and measures, coins, cloth, wine, agriculture, shipping, and customs duties. Legends about the Hindu monkey-god Hanuman seem to put Aden in the place of Ceylon. Some of the stories are no doubt apocryphal, but many have an air of authenticity. The author derived much of his information from informants on the spot, both Bedouins and townspeople. He drew to a considerable extent on the works of earlier writers, such as al-Fārisī, the historian of Mecca, 'Umrā, the historian of Zabīl, and the geographer Ibn Hawūqal, who are sometimes quoted without acknowledgment.

The author of Ta'rikh al-Mustabsir obviously knew a great deal about western and southern Arabia. At the same time, his ignorance of the rest of the Arabian Peninsula was abysmal, as is indicated by his repeating the report he heard from a Jewish goldsmith in Aden about the Saturday River (Nahr al-Sābit) just beyond the Ḥijāz, a river of sand that flowed strongly for one day out of each week, on the other side of which lived a hundred million Jews descended from those who had fled from Khaybar and Wādi al-Kurā in the time of the Prophet. The author also retails with a straight face in half a dozen places information of a historical or geographical nature revealed to him in dreams (he is more precise in dating his dreams than in dating almost anything else in the book). The author demonstrates his accomplishments as a poet by quoting snatches of his own verses in Arabic and Persian.

The work was first brought to the attention of the Western world by A. Sprenger, who relied on it heavily for his exposition of routes in Arabia. F. Hunter in his book on Aden included a translation by S. B. Miles of a long passage in Ta'rikh al-Mustabsir. C. de Landberg printed a number of excerpts from the Arabic text with translations in French. O. Löfgren made a translation of material on Aden. Before editing the complete work, Löfgren published the section devoted to Aden in his Arabische Texte (1936), which should still be consulted for its elaborate notes.

The two candidates for the authorship of Ta'rikh al-Mustabsir are not the only men on record bearing the name Ibn al-Mujawir. Another was Nadim al-Din Abu 'l-Fath Yusuf b. al-Hasayn Ibn al-Mujawir al-Shirāzī, whose father had come to Damascus from Shirāz. As a teacher of boys in Damascus, Yusuf attracted the attention of Saladin, who appointed him tutor to his son al-`Azīz Uḥmān. When al-`Azīz became sovereign of Egypt, he made Yusuf his vizier. This Yusuf died in 601, the year of the birth of Yusuf b. Ya'qūb Ibn al-Mujawir. The family of Banū 'l-Mujawir in Damascus was said to have received its name from an ancestor who preferred residing in Mecca (Muhammad b. Isādūn)ara) to the earthly paradise of the Syrian capital.


IBN MUFARRIGH, Abū `Uthmān Yāzn b. Ziyād b. Rābī`a b. Mufarrigh al-Himyarī, minor poet of Beta in the 1st/7th century. There are doubts about his Himyaric origin, and it is possible that his ancestor Mufarrigh was a slave. Ibn Mufar-
righ's date of birth is not known, and the earliest traditions about him tell of his romantic attachment to a Persian woman, Abi Abl in approximately the years 36-40/657-66. Later he was attached to 'Ubayd Allah b. Abi Bakra [q.v.]. and Sa'id b. 'Uthman b. Affân, but his career took a completely different direction from the time when he decided to follow 'Abbâd b. Ziyâd [q.v.] to Sijjîstân, in 54/674; their relations very soon became embittered, and the poet spent some time in prison; after his release he fled to Damascus, where he spent some time in prison again, and was released only on the intervention of the Yemenis of Damascus. Yazîd b. Mu'awiya finally granted him his favour and, after obtaining the pardon of 'Ubayd Allah b. Ziyâd, he was permitted to return to Kirkûn. In 64/684, on the death of Yazîd, Ibn Mufarrigh returned to his native town, from which 'Ubayd Allah had been driven out, thus taking an easy revenge. He died in 59/689, during the 'Abd Allah b. Ziyad's career that took a completely different direction from the time when he decided to follow 'Abbâd b. Ziyâd [q.v.], who found an original way of punishing him: after forcing him to swallow a purgative, he had him mounted on a donkey to which he had tied a sow and a cat, and this grotesque procession was made to proceed through the streets of the town. Ibn Mufarrigh was then sent back to 'Abbâd, who put him into prison again, and was released only on the intervention of the Yemenis of Damascus. Yazîd b. Mu'awiya had been somewhat embroidered by legend, his life was nevertheless full of incident and this is reflected in the poems which have survived. Although he was probably originally destined to lead the uneventful existence of a provincial poet, whose chief preoccupation would be to secure for himself the bounty of the local aristocracy, he became, through the pressure of unforeseen circumstances, a sort of polymathic poet whose works, more valuable for their content than for their form, owe their partial preservation to the attacks which they contain against the family of Ziyâd and, indirectly, against the Umayyads. This opposition, which was the result of the bad treatment he received rather than of a systematic hostility, is nevertheless the sign of a belligerent temperament, which is more evident in the poems' descendants to take sides in an even more definite fashion; in fact his son Muhammad was to become a Khârijî, and his grandson, Ismâ'îl, became notorious as a Shi'i poet under the name of al-Sayyîd al-Himyarî [q.v.].

The Divan of Ibn Mufarrigh does not seem to have been assembled, and there remain of his work only about 300 verses scattered in works of adab, grammar and lexicography (for he is cited as an authority, particularly on the use of khabîd for al-ladî, in fragment xxxi, 1, and on the name of his mule, 'Adas). The love poems of his youth and the panegyrics of the invectives launched against his enemies on the other hand contain some original expressions which delighted the population of Başra, which was hostile to 'Ubayd Allah b. Ziyâd; they contain also three hemistichs in Persian, which prove that this language was well known in Başra. Finally it should be mentioned that al-Aṣma'î is said to have accused him of having invented the biography and the poems attributed to the Tubba' [q.v.]; but nothing certain is known about this.


IBN MUFLIH, SHAMS AL-DIN ABU 'ABD ALLAH MUHAMMAD B. MUFLIH AL-MARDISHI, Hanbali juristconsult who stands at the head of a large family of jurisconsults, the last of whom to die in the first half of the 11th/17th century. Shams al-Din married the daughter of the Hanbali Kâdi 'l-kudât Djâmî al-Din al-Mardâwî (700/1301-1369) and, according to his biographers, had seven children from this marriage, both boys and girls. The genealogy which emerges from the biographical sources available to us shows that he had five sons and that the family died out in 1038/1628 (or 1035) with Shihâb al-Dîn Ahmad, who lived to be 99 years of age and whose son 'Abd al-Latif (d. 1036/1626, or 1035) died during the lifetime of the father. (For father and son, see Şattî, Muhhâsar tabâbât al-kâmîbîsî, Damascus 1339/1921, 2 vols., index; for the latter's grandson is the last known Burhan al-Dîn, entitled al-Maksad al-arshad fi tāriqat al-ṣâbîb, has been preserved in manuscript (Berlin 4399) and his Kitâb al-Furû', 3 vols., 1339/1921 is one of the most important Hanbali works for the establishment of the true legal doctrine of Ahmad b. Hanbal. After a life of writing and teaching in Damascus in three Hanbali madrasas, al-Djâwîzîyî, al-Šâhîbîyâ and al-Ūmâriyî, he died in 765/1362.

The sâbîbîyâ and al-šâhîbîyâ names among the descendants of Shams al-Din is likely to lead to confusion, especially as regards those named Burhân al-Dîn Ibrîhîmî, of whom there are five.

Burhân al-Dîn Ibrîhîmî, who died in 803/1400, is the son of Shams al-Dîn and has the additional 'âbab of Tâkî al-Dîn. He held the post of kâdi 'l-kudât and wrote a history of the Hanbali school, Tabâbât asbâb al-Imâm Ahmad, the greater part of which is said to have been destroyed in a fire. This is not the work used extensively by Nu'aymi in his Dâris fi ta'rikh al-madârisî. (On him, see Ibn al-Imâd, Shadhartâ, vii, 22-3). This Burhân al-Dîn had a grandson (great-grandson of Shams al-Dîn) of the same name, who died in 917/1511 (see Shadhartâ, vii, 77). A third Burhân al-Dîn was the grandson of Shams al-Dîn and died in 876/1471 (see Shadhartâ, vii, 321). Another great-grandson of Shams al-Dîn was also a kâdi 'l-kudât like his ancestor, the first Burhân al-Dîn, and like him he wrote a history of the Hanbali school, entitled al-Mâsbad al-arqad fi târiqat asbâb Ahmad, used extensively by Nu'aymi in his Dâris (see Shadhartâ, vii, 328-9; for Nu'aymi, see Bibliography). The latter's grandson is the last known Burhân al-Dîn Ibrîhîmî and died in 966/1561. One of the last Ibn Muflihs, Akâm al-Dîn Muham- mad ibn Muhammad al-Mardâwî (926/1520-969/1562) who dealt with historical tracts dealing with Damascus and Cairo,
including an abridgment of Abū Shāma’s *Akbhār al-dawlatayn* (see *Shāfi‘ī, Mukhtāsr, 93-5*).


**Ibn Mufrih, Abu l-Khattāb ‘Abd Allah b. Muhammad Husayn b. ‘Ali, uncle of al-Mansur, whose brother Sulayman protesting in vain to the caliph at the murder of their mother, its criticism of religions and its defence of religious but by political and personal causes. Ibn al-Mukaffa is said to have been ordered by his patrons to draft the text of the *aman* which the caliph al-Mu‘āwīya had consented to grant to their brother ‘Abd Allāh b. ʿAli, who had revolted; and the secretary had performed this task with such zeal, hemming in with such binding commitments and such solemn oaths the promise of pardon to the rebel which the caliph himself was to sign, that it aroused the resentment of the suspicious al-Mu‘āwīya. He gave orders for the removal of this presumptuous secretary, and the new governor of Baṣra, Sufyān b. Mu‘āwiyah al-Mukhail, who himself had longstanding personal grievances against Ibn al-Mukaffa, took this opportunity to exact the most cruel vengeance: Ibn al-Mukaffa was taken to the governor’s palace and put to death under appalling torture, his patrons ʿĪsā and Sulaymān protesting in vain to the caliph at the murder of their mother). It seems that a son of his, Muḥammad was, later one of the caliph’s secretaries, and it is to him that should be attributed the versions (from Greek or Syriac into Arabic) of certain books of logic of Aristotle (or rather of ancient commentaries on these books) traditionally connected with the more famous name of his father.

Though he died at the age of thirty-six, Ibn al-Mukaffa left behind him a considerable quantity of translations, and original works, only part of which has survived, and even that in a form that is somewhat uncertain. We consider first his version of the *Kułla wa Dimma* (q.v.), the celebrated collection of Indian fables going back to the *Pantlantana* and the *Tantrākhyāyaka,* which this writer turned into Arabic from the Pahlavi version made in the time of Chosroes Anōḵgarwān. Without dwelling on the history of this well-known work, of which the Arabic version of Ibn al-Mukaffa is said to have been the link in its migration to the West, we merely recall that we possess no reliable and authentic text of this version, such as must have been when fresh from the pen of this its first translator, and it appears to be impossible that it can ever be successfully reconstructed: the earliest manuscripts available (that of Aya Soya of the 7th/8th century, reproduced by the *Azāzīk at least what part was the work of the Arabic version of Ibn al-Mukaffa in its entirety. Attempts have been made to discover at least what part was the work of the Arabic version of Ibn al-Mukaffa. The translator in his treatment of the material, and in the additions and modifications that he may have introduced into the Pahlavi text (of which we can form some idea, thanks to the ancient Syriac version of the 6th century A.D. which has been preserved); it has been claimed that the hand of Ibn al-Mukaffa may be seen particularly in the celebrated autobiography of Dūrūz (the translator from Sanscrit into Pahlavi) placed at the beginning of the work, with its criticism of religious and its defence of
human reason. A passage from al-Blrunl (India, 76) indeed leads one to attribute to the Arabic translation of the Indian Adab kabir (excluding that Ibn al-Mukaffa as of the other two works, is attributed in the ancient Iran, and recur in almost identical form in the name of their translator. These passages deal with the dynastic, military and social history of ancient Iran, and recur in almost identical form in other historians such as Eutychius (Sa'id b. al-Bi'tris) and al-Tabari who, together with Ibn Kutayba, drew from a common source. This source, in all probability the versions of Ibn al-Mukaffa, thus reveals itself as the principal means of translation to the Arabes of the epic, history and institutions of Iran which were subsequently to be the subject of many elaborations and developments, all more or less the work of the imagination, in later authors (al-Mas'udi, al-Tha'labi, etc.); while the same material passed directly from these ancient works in Pahlavi, through versions in neo-Persian, to Puslax's epic, history and famous letter of Tansar which too is included by Ibn Tayfur (d. 280/893) in his anthology Ktib al-Mantharb wa 'l-mansjam) is of the very greatest importance, although the personal and stylistic nature of his contribution is very difficult to evaluate. Ibn al-Mukaffa as here addresses himself to a caliph who is not named but who without doubt is al-Mansur, submitting to him a whole series of reflections on certain political religious and social problems arising from his time and milieu, and examined by the writer with a breadth and originality of mind that are very remarkable. The treatment of the military elite of Khurasân and their relations with the caliph, the choice of high officials and courtiers, the position of the 'Irâkis and Syriacs at the start of the 'Abbasid dynasty, juridical and administrative discrepancies among the schools and the different milieus of Muslim society. This subordination of the shari'a to the political authority, advocated by Ibn al-Mukaffa, was not to be realized, and the development of Muslim law followed the opposite path of 'iqâma, in theory shielded from any intervention by the sulân, in practice led to fiqh being fixed, out of touch with living reality. But even so, it is very remarkable that a contrary process should have been envisaged by this isolated voice, whether it be through the personal convictions of Ibn al-Mukaffa, or whether, as has been supposed, he lent his pen to the programs of others. The fact remains that these proposals so boldly advanced must have impressed themselves on the caliph's attention, and perhaps may even have offended his autocratic susceptibilities. It has even been suggested (Sourdel) that this pamphlet, although conceived and presented in a spirit of profound loyalty, may have contributed to the
disgrace and lamentable end of the writer. However that may be, the Adab habir and the Risāla fi 'l-Saḥāba are the most reliable items of evidence to enable us to form a judgement about the style of Ibn al-Muḳaffa—a supple and elegant style, although still marked by a certain archaic dryness: these two texts remain among the most fascinating innovations in Arabic prose adab, in the classical period, along with the rasā'il of 'Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Yaḥyā and other earlier ḥuṭṭāb.

One highly individual aspect of the spiritual interests of this great writer is, finally, revealed by the fragments (if they are authentic, as we believe) of a religious work, a Manichæan apologia, preserved in the refutation made a century later by the Zaydis imām al-Ḳasīm b. Ibrahim, in a treatise published by M. Guidi. We were already familiar with the charges brought against Ibn al-Muḳaffa of having attempted to make an "imitation" of the sacred Book of Islam: the work refuted by al-Ḳasīm appears rather, in our view, to be an attack on Muhammad, the Kurān and Islam in the name of another faith, namely the Manichæan faith which several of the friends of Ibn al-Muḳaffa had adopted and of which the writer himself was suspected. The cosmogony and mythology of the religion of Mani were indeed explicated upon in this work, but what above all is characteristic of it is the rationalistic criticism of fideism in general, such as emerges in one of the longer passages quoted by al-Ḳasīm (26-7 of the text) and presents a striking analogy with certain passages from the autobiography of Burzē in Kalīla wa-Dimma. The contradiction between this rationalism and adherence to the Manichæan faith can be resolved by regarding the rational and philosophical basis of the latter, beneath its colourful mythology, as a powerful aesthetic effort to provide a satisfactory solution to the mystery of the human condition and the universe. Yet we are aware of the problems that remain unanswered in this respect, in view of the obscurity that cloaks the spiritual evolution of Ibn al-Muḳaffa, the uncertain chronology of his writings, and even the authenticity of certain of them.

Although surrounded by these various reservations necessitated by the state of our knowledge, the figure of this writer appears before us as one of the most brilliant at the opening of the classical age of Arabic literature. Himself of non-Arab blood, Ibn al-Muḳaffa must have profoundly appreciated the cultural values of the Iranian civilization from which he sprang, and have endeavoured to make them known to the Arab world which had conquered his native land and relegated the religion of his fathers to a subsidiary position. In this sense, he can be regarded as a precursor of the Shū'ūbiyya [q.v.], although no polemical writing of his has survived on the subject of the superiority of the Shū'ūb, or, more specifically, of the Iranians and Indians, over the Arabs. He did in fact demonstrate this superiority, by revealing to the Arabs the treasures of India and Persia, and by himself following a refined and cultivated way of life (as several anecdotes relate), which incidentally characterized the whole new Persian élite of the early 'Abbasid period. But what sets him apart from the real Shū'ūbiyya is his love for the conquerors' language, which the Shū'ūbiyya themselves used in their anti-Arab polemics, but without making any impassioned study of it and without achieving the mastery over it that this mosaic from Fārs displayed so successfully. His works, both as translator and original writer, soon became classic in the great 'Abbasid civilization and, by their form as well as their subject-matter, exerted an influence that cannot be exaggerated on the cultural interests and ideals of the succeeding generations. Today, it is even possible to speak of an Ibn al-Muḳaffa myth which has dominated the renaissance of neo-Arabic literature. Even when stripped of this myth, the figure of this Persian, the master and almost the Demiurge of the language of the Kurān on the eve of its most astonishing flowering, retains a position of the very highest eminence in the literary history of Arabism.

Bibliography: The best modern editions of the text of Kalīla wa-Dimma are those of Cheikho, Beirut 1905 (2nd ed. 1923), and of 'A. 'Azīz, Cairo 1941. French translation by A. Miquel, Paris 1957, Russian by Kračkovskij and Kuzmin, Moscow-Leningrad 1934, Italian by M. M. Moreno, San Remo 1910. The surviving translations of Iranian material have been studied by Th. Nöldeke (Das iranische Nationalpos in Gr. Ir. Ph., ii, 170 ff., and in Geschichte der Perser und Araber) and by K. Inostreantev, Persidskaya literatura v pervie veka Islama, in Mémoires de l'Acad. des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg, 8th ser., vii (reprinted in the volume Sasanidskie Etiudi, St. Petersburg 1909) (see further Hamāsa ii). The Adab habir has been published by M. Kurd 'All in his Rasā'il al-bulugāt, Cairo 1923, and A. Zeki, Alexandria 1932, and in other modern editions of no critical value (tr. Rescher, in MSOS As. (1927), 35-82). The Risāla fi 'l-Saḥāba is published by Kurd 'All in the Rasā'il mentioned above. The anti-Manichæan refutation of al-Ḳasīm, with the fragments of the apologia of Ibn al-Muḳaffa, is published by M. Guidi, La lotta fra l'Islam e il Manicheismo, Rome 1927.


F. Gabrieli

IBN AL-MUḳAFFA, SEVERUS (Sawirs), his name before he became a monk being Abu (l)-Bighr. It is not known why he was called Ibn al-Muḳaffa ("son of the cripple"). He gave up his occupation as a clerk (kdtib), which for a Copt was an important step towards promotion in a career in the administration, in order to become a monk. No biography of him exists. It is however known that he was appointed by the patriarch Anbā Makkāra (932-52 A.D.) to be bishop of Ashmunayn, most probably before he had reached his fifteenth year (the age
Severus's History of the Patriarchs is an indispensable source for the history of Egypt, of the Egyptian national church, of the Abyssinian church and of Christianity in Nubia. This chronicle also adds many details and precise data to the source material for the political, social and economic history of Egypt. Some sections of the book have been many times published or used (e.g., by Renaudot, Seybold, and Evet). The latest and most careful edition of the book, with English translation, is being undertaken by A. S. Atiya, Jassa 'Abd al-Malīsh and O. H. E. Burmester.

Severus's works consist of 20 or 25 titles, which are listed by Brockelmann and, in more detail, by Graf, see Bibliography; it should however be noted that neither was able to take account of all the manuscripts existing in Egypt.


IBN MUKARRAM (see IBN MANZUR).

IBN MUKLA, ABU 'ALI MUHAMMAD b. 'ALI, vizier of the 'Abbadid period. Born in Baghdad in 272/885-6, he began his career as a collector of land-taxes in Fārs, then was given an important post as secretary in the central administration when Ibn al-Furat [q.v.] became vizier in 296/908; he was in fact in charge of the opening and the despatch of official letters. He also collaborated closely with Ibn al-Furat during the latter's second vizierate (from 304/917 to 306/919), but he never had anything to do with the administrative staff during Ibn al-Furat's third vizierate. However 'Ali b. 'Isā [q.v.], during his second vizierate (305-316/917-28), appointed him to take charge of the diwan of public estates. It was then that, having succeeded in attaching himself to the chamberlain Naṣr and in gaining his good opinion, he managed in 316/928 to get himself appointed to the vizierate, which he retained until 318/930. Although he was certainly dealing well with the financial difficulties which arose at this time, he was nevertheless unable to put an end to the rivalries between military leaders, and his vizierate saw the abortive palace revolution of 317/929, in the course of which al-Mu'zdīd was temporarily replaced by his brother. Ibn Mukla continued as vizier, but was obliged to act on the advice of 'Ali b. 'Isā, who was moreover put specially in charge of the jurisdiction of the masālim court, and his inability to free himself from the tutelage of the commander-in-chief Mu'nis led to his fall.

Ibn Mukla was re-appointed to the vizierate by al-Kāhir and was in charge of the government again for about six months (320-932-3). But the situation was very unsettled, and he encountered the opposition of the caliph; his intrigues, aimed at deposing al-Kāhir, failed, and he was obliged to flee. Some months later however, he succeeded in getting the caliph imprisoned and deposed; this was his third vizierate, which lasted from 322/934 to 324/936 during the reign of the new caliph al-Raḍī. In spite of his cunning, the vizier did not succeed in imposing his authority on the Ḥamdānī amirs of al-Mawši, or on the governor of Wāṣīt, Ibn Rāḍīq, and was unable to arrest the economic and financial crisis. His disgrace really marked the end of the independent...
rule of the caliphs: some months afterwards there was appointed the first amir al-umara* [q.v.]. Ibn Mukla’s efforts had produced no result, unless it was in the domain of religion, where he gave effective support to the Sunni reaction which took place after the end of the caliphate of al-Muktadir.

When Ibn Rā’il was appointed as amir al-umara*, Ibn Mukla’s possessions had been confiscated, together with those of his son, who had worked efficiently as his assistant during his second vizierate. As a protest, he intrigued against the new amir al-umara? with the words “Judgement belongs to God, O ‘Ali, and not to thee and thy companions”, succeeded in wounding “All on the crown of his head, after which he attempted to flee, but was soon thrown to the ground by a Hamdān, whom he regarded as being in error; spurred by an ardent desire to avenge their mother had become suspicious on seeing him unlace his silken band. Thus it was Ibn Muldiam only who, with the words “All replied that he saw Ibn Muldiam himself being killed with this sword and that he judged him to be the most evil of men.

The details given so far are a summary of the traditions related by al-Ṭabarí; in the other sources are found additional details and variants from which interesting observations may be made.

The conspiracy and the names of the conspirators. According to the Istīlab (48x) only, the plan to kill ‘All was conceived by a Khāridjī survivor of al-Nahrawān. Some verses by the poet al-Nādjaši (al-Baladhuri, 585v) praise Mu‘awiyya for initiating Ibn Muldiam to commit this crime. The murderer of ‘All, known under the patronymic of Ibn Muldiam, was in fact called ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Amr b. Muldiam b. ‘Abd Allah b. Bakr (according to al-Ṭabarí, 3468; al-Baladhuri, 576v; Ibn Kathir, 325); several nisbas are attributed to him: al-Ḥimyarī, al-Ḥimyarī, and al-Kindī since he was a connexion (kašif) of the Banū Ḥimyāl of Kinda (Ibn Sa’d, 33; al-Baladhuri, 577v; Ibn al-Ṭahir, Usd, 36) or perhaps of the Banū Ḥanifa of Kinda (Ibn Kathir, 325), and even al-Mṣrī (Ibn Kathir only, ibid.); al-Masūdī (426) adds al-Tujībī (the Tujīb being a clan of Murād), a nisba which the Istīlab (48x, followed by Ibn Shahrāshub, 93) transforms into al-Taḏjūbī, explaining that Taḏjūb was a branch of Ḥimyar which had been absorbed by Murād; this source adds a further nisba: al-Sakūnī. Al-Burak was a nickname: the real name of the conspirator who offered to kill Mu‘awiyya was al-Haḍīdī b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ubayd Allāh, or b. Bakr (according to al-Baladhuri, 576v and 577v) and his second nisba was al-Ṣaḥī. According to other sources he was a Persian, since they refer to him as Zādawayh or Zadhawayh (al-Mubarrad, 544, 549, 552; al-Masūdī, 427); al-Ṭamīmī al-Ṣaḥīlī (Ibn Kathir, 325); al-Dinawarī (227) alone refers to this conspirator by the name of al-Nazzāl b. ‘Amr. The third conspirator, the one who wished to kill ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, according to Ibn Sa’d (33) was the son of Bukray (instead of Bakr) and, according to the Usd (36), he was called ‘Umar b. Bukray: his second nisba was al-Saḥī. According to other sources he was a Persian, since they refer to him as Ḥathawayh or Ḥadhawayh (al-Mubarrad, 553; al-Baladhuri, 576v, to “Dḥ̣ḥdḥḥaẉỵḥ” adds *Amr*, a mawla of the Banu ‘Anbar b. ‘Amr b. Tamīm (al-Baladhuri, 578 r-v)., specifies: mawla of the Banu Ḥāritha b. Ka‘b Ibn al-‘Anbar); al-Dinawarī differs from all the other sources in calling him ‘Abd Allāh Mālik al-Saṣ̣āỵḥī; the second name is of the Khāridjī (al-Baladhuri, fol. 584v), but which is certainly false (al-Mubarrad, 549), states that all three of the conspirators were sons of Muldiam and were called ‘Abd al-Rahmān, Kays and Yaṣīd, that their father Muldiam had forbidden them to commit the crime, but that their mother had encouraged them to do it. The conclusion to be drawn from all these variants

*al-Sourdel*
is that in general the differences are very slight and may often be explained as variant readings in Arabic sources, and therefore may therefore be recognized as the existence of a fairly precise historical tradition with regard to these fanatics.

'Ali's foreknowledge of his fate. 'Ali had known for a long time that he would be killed, since the Prophet had told him this, or he had himself had a premonition of it (Ibn Sa'd, 22; al-Baladhuri, 582r). Several authors, on the basis of numerous traditions, state that Muhammad (or 'Ali) had revealed that his death was destined with blood flowing from his head (Ibn Sa'd, 21, 22, 23; al-Baladhuri, 582 r and v; al-Mubarrad, 544, 579v; al-Mas'udi, 440; al-Iṣfahānī, Makātīl, 31; Ibn Shahrāshūb, 93, etc.). Another tradition with several variations explains that, according to Muhammad, the most evil man among the ancients was he who had killed the camel of the prophet Sālih (cf. Qur'an, XCI, 11-12 and XXVI, 155-7) and among his contemporaries, he who would kill his Sālih; in general it is the latter who speaks of the "most evil of men" (Ibn Sa'd, 22, 23 etc.). The characteristic themes of these two types of traditions (the blood-stained and the most evil of men) are sometimes fused into one single account (e.g., Ibn Sa'd, 21; al-Mu'īdī, 23; Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd, 42). The night preceding the attempt, 'Ali declared that his destiny was about to be fulfilled, and when he left his house in the morning, geese followed him, cackling; he then said that they were the weepers for his funeral (al-Masʿūdī, 431; al-Yaʿqūbī, 252; al-Mu'īdī, 15). It is chiefly the Shi'ī authors who stress the fact that 'Ali knew of his approaching fate but did not wish to send another Muslim to lead the prayer at the mosque as he was advised to do, and that he finally went to meet his destiny reciting verses on how death is not to be feared (al-Mu'īdī, 15; Ibn Shahrāshūb, 93).

He was able to predict even more: he guessed Ibn Muldjam's attitude to him and knew in advance that he would be his murderer (al-Yaʿqūbī, 257; al-Mu'īdī, 13) or "the most evil of men"; twice or thrice he repulsed Ibn Muldjam, who wished to pay him a visit, and the third time his visit was prevented by a minor difference in the date of his visit (al-Mu'īdī, 22; al-Baladhuri, 582 r; Makātīl, 31). That the latter's beard would be stained with blood flowing from his head (Ibn Sa'd, 22, 23; al-Baladhuri, 578r, al-Akhdar was her brother who was killed at al-Nahrawān) b. Shidjna in the Makātīl (32), in al-Mufid (16), Ibn Shahrāshūb (94); or Sabīkha (sic) b. 'Ali b. 'Amīr b. al-Ṭalābā b. Sa'd b. Dīhil b. Taym al-Ribāb (Usd, 36; Ibn Sa'd, 23; 'Adī instead of 'Ali). Only al-Mas'ūdī (427) states that Katāmār's brother died at the moment of his death, which was decided by destiny (al-Baladhuri, 582r). Katāmār. Given the number of sources which mention her, there seems no doubt of the existence of this woman and her belonging to the Taym al-Ribāb; the variants concern mainly the name of her father and some secondary details. Instead of al-Shidjna (or Shidjna, as in Ibn Sa'd, 23, and in a tradition collected by al-Baladhuri, 578r), we find al-Kalama in al-Baladhuri (576 v) and al-Mubarrad (549); to be read perhaps Ullafa, since Ibn Durayd, al-Ṭalābā, ed. Wustenfeld, 214 f., states that she was the sister of Hīlāl and al-Mustawrid, the future Khāridjī rebels; or al-ʿAkhḍar (but according to al-Baladhuri, 578r, al-Akhdar was her brother who was killed at al-Nahrawān) b. Shidjna in the Makātīl (32), in al-Mufid (16), Ibn Shahrāshūb (94); or Sabīkha (sic) b. 'Ali b. 'Amīr b. al-Ṭalābā b. Sa'd b. Dīhil b. Taym al-Ribāb (Usd, 36; Ibn Sa'd, 23).

The Shi'īs, who have to find an explanation for the crime committed against 'Ali, relate that Katāmār prepared special food (drugged?) for the conspirators and that Wādān received a sum of money from an agent of 'Amīr b. al-Āṣ (Ibn Shahrāshūb, 95).

Al-ʿAṣ b. Ṭabīs b. Kays [q.v.] and the conspiracy. Several sources imply that this man was aware of the plot; Ibn Muldjam is said to have spent the preceding night in consultation with him in a corner of the Great Mosque; when dawn approached, he spoke to Ibn Muldjam a phrase which Ḥudjir b. 'Adī [q.v.] interpreted as an allusion to a plot; he then intended to warn the caliph, but he arrived too late. The majority of the sources give the ambiguous phrase "The dawn has risen for thee" but the Shi'ī authors or those of Shi'ī sympathies give it as a clear encouragement to Ibn Muldjam: "Deliverance, deliverance! The dawn has risen for thee." Makātīl, 33; al-Mu'īdī, 17; Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd, 43). Variants are that the conversation between Ibn Muldjam and al-ʿĀṣ was simply a friendly talk, or the name of a desert place which was the meeting-place of the conspirators; or a description of al-ʿĀṣ as a man who was always looking for adventures or the like; or al-ʿĀṣ as a man who wished to give him gifts (Ibn Sa'd, 22; al-Baladhuri, 582v; Usd, 35); he merely replied to it in a poem that the Murād planned to kill him, whereas he wished to give him gifts (Ibn Sa'd, 22; al-Baladhuri, 582v; Makātīl, 31) and indeed did so (Iṣṭiṣāb, 484). Thus relations between 'Ali and Ibn Muldjam were strained; nevertheless the caliph took no measures against his enemy (Ibn Sa'd, 22; "Would you kill one who has not yet killed me?"); not even when he was warned of the plot by a member of the Murād (Ibn Sa'd, 22) or by someone who had heard a reference to it from Ibn Muldjam himself (al-Baladhuri, 579v; al-Ṭabarī, 3459-60; al-Mubarrad, 549, 555; cf. al-Dinawārī, 228); he merely replied that every man was guarded by two angels until the moment of his death, which was decided by destiny (al-Baladhuri, 582r).

Kaṭāmār. Since Ibn Malik's accomplices and their fates. Instead of 17 Ramāḍān, various dates are given as that fixed for the murder of 'Ali: Imāma (254 f.) gives 20 Ramāḍān, al-Mubarrad (549) 27 Ramāḍān, al-Mas'ūdī (427) 17 or 21, the Makātīl (33) 19 or 17 (cf. also al-Baladhuri, 578 v), but according to al-Mufid (16) the latter date is to be preferred. Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd (43) adds that, since the conspirators believed that their deed was an offering to God and that God prefers an offering made at a time which is blessed, the 19 was chosen (the night of the 19th being that of al-kamār [see Ramāḍān]). Furthermore,
the day of 'Ali's death is not precisely known either, varying between 11 and 21 Ramadan (see Caetani, §§ 97-8). He died two or three days after the attack (al-Mubarrad, 551, etc.). Shabbih was the son of Nagida (instead of Badjara) and his nisbas were al-Ashdqi, al-Hurruri (al-Mas'udi, 428; Ibn Kathir, 326). One tradition states that it was Ibn Badjara who wounded 'Ali, but this is false (al-Baladhuri, 584r); in fact his sword missed its mark, after which he fled. It was only later that the governor al-Mughra (q.v.) arrested him and killed him, because he had become a seditious element operating in the district of Kufa; he terrorized people, questioning them about their religious opinions in the manner of the Azaqis (al-Baladhuri, 579 r). Wardan was the son of Muljailid (Mafrdtil, 32; al-Mufid, 16; Ibn Abi 'l-Hadid, 43); according to al-Mas'udi (427), he was called Muljaihil b. Wardan. Al-Dinawari mentions neither Shabbih nor Wardan. Al-Baladhuri relates a tradition in which Wardan is not mentioned (576 v) and another in which he is mentioned, together with the episode of the cousin who killed him (579 r). According to some sources (al-Mas'udi, 433; Mafrdtil, 35, and the Shi'ite authors who in general follow it: al-Mufid, 17, etc.), it was Shabbih and not Wardan who, returning home, was killed by a cousin or a brother, whereas Wardan escaped. There are divergent versions on the question of who seized Ibn Muljailid after the attempt: according to al-Mubarrad (549, 550 and cf. al-Baladhuri, 579 r, al-Mas'udi, 432, Mafrdtil, 35, etc.), it was al-Mughra b. Nawfal b. al-Harith b. 'Abd al-Mu'talib (and not the Hadramawti Abu Admād) and, according to al-Ya'kubī (252), Kusam b. al-'Abbās; Ibn Muljailid is said then to have shouted: "O 'Ali, deliver me from thy dog!"

The punishment of Ibn Muljailid. The sources describe 'Ali as always scrupulous in the application of the holy law, and, in the case of Ibn Muljailid, they are more or less unanimous in insisting on the fact that he ordered the strict observance of the lex talionis; nevertheless, some of them are at variance when they prepared to cut out his tongue because, though remaining still alive, he would no longer be able to mention God (Ibn Sa'd, 26; al-Dinawari, 280; al-Mubarrad, 551 f.; al-Mas'udi, 434 f.; Usdā, 37 f.; Ibn Kathir, 330, doubts the authenticity of the information on the torture, evidently because it contradicts the recommendations given by 'Ali). None of the sources casts doubt on Ibn Muljailid's religious fervour; on the contrary, those which describe his physical aspect do not omit to add that his forehead showed the marks of frequent prostrations for prayer (e.g. al-Baladhuri, 583v; Ibn Kathir, 326, etc.).

Verses inserted in the narrative. These verses are sometimes anonymous, sometimes attributed to Ibn Muljailid, and sometimes to well-known poets. They appear in the sources with variants and additions and even different attributions. There should be noted those of the Khariji Ibn Abi Maysā, which praise the murder of Ibn Muljailid and Ibn Taghribirdi (i, 119) and others (e.g. Usdā, 35) add that 'Ali recommended that the punishment should not be excessive. Umm Kuljum, the daughter of 'Ali, plays a certain role after the murder: she quarrelled with Ibn Muljailid; for example, she reproached him for having killed the Commander of the Faithful and Ibn Muljailid replied: "No, thy father!" (al-Baladhuri, 580r, 583v; al-Mubarrad, 551; Mafrdtil, 36; al-Mufid 18; Ibn Abi 'l-Hadid, 44, etc.). After the discussion with 'Ali, Ibn Muljailid was taken to prison; the people followed him, biting him like wild beasts and heaping reproaches on him; he did not reply (Mafrdtil, 36 f.; al-Mufid, 18; Ibn Abi 'l-Hadid on the other hand reports the verses which he recited, on leaving 'Ali, boasting of his action). The accounts of Ibn Muljailid's death, which according to al-Mubarrad (551) were fairly numerous, may in fact be reduced to two: Ibn Muljailid proposed to al-Hasan that when he became caliph he should set him free to go to Syria and there kill Mu'awiyah, if he had not already done so, the next day and return and give himself up to the caliph. Al-Hasan refused and killed Ibn Muljailid; the corpse was burned (in al-Tabari, 3464, a brief account; in the Mafrdtil, 41, with more details; see also al-Mufid, 18; Ibn Kathir, 330; Ibn Abi 'l-Hadid, 46; Ya'qubī, 254, states that al-Hasan killed Ibn Muljailid with his own hand; cf. also al-Baladhuri, 584r). The second version is that al-Husayn, Ibn Hanafiyya (q.v.) and 'Abd Allâh b. Dja'mar (q.v.) asked al-Hasan for permission to take their revenge and, having obtained it, it was this 'Abd Allâd, the nephew of 'Ali, who subjected Ibn Muljailid to a series of mutilations and tortures. The unfortunate Ibn Muljailid bore these sufferings with great courage and only complained when they prepared to cut out his tongue, because, though remaining still alive, he would no longer be able to mention God (Ibn Sa'd, 26; al-Dinawari, 280; al-Mubarrad, 551 f.; al-Mas'udi, 434 f.; Usdā, 37 f.; Ibn Kathir, 330, doubts the authenticity of the information on the torture, evidently because it contradicts the recommendations given by 'Ali). None of the sources casts doubt on Ibn Muljailid's religious fervour; on the contrary, those which describe his physical aspect do not omit to add that his forehead showed the marks of frequent prostrations for prayer (e.g. al-Baladhuri, 583v; Ibn Kathir, 326, etc.).

The attempts on the lives of Mu'awiyah and 'Amr b. al-Ask. The other conspirators kept their word, but one of them succeeded only in wounding Mu'awiyah, and the other killed in error, instead of the governor of Egypt, one of his officials. Without entering into details, we mention here the opinion of Caetani (Annali, 40 A.H., § 96; cf. Lammens, Études sur le règne du calife Omayyade Mu'awiyah I, Bruxelles 1909-10, 389), who attributes the triple attempt by the Kharijis: he considers that this is a legend created by tradition to prevent people thinking that, in the opinion of contemporary observers, 'Ali was the worst of the Muslim leaders, and to suggest that Mu'awiyah and 'Amr b. al-Ask also deserved to be killed; thus there were grouped together several independent incidents which occurred at different dates. It may be objected to this idea, while retaining Caetani's line of argument, that the authors of the
crime were merely some fanatical Kharidjis and that the traditionists were eventually interested in presenting the Kharidjis as persons to be despised for their 'opinion' concerning one as worthy of admiration as 'All, and thus not to diminish their admiration as Amr their victims as well. It may moreover be observed that a conspiracy like that of the three Kharidjis should not be out their attempts on the same day, it is possible that when they met at Mecca they fixed the date for their panegyric, and that if they did not rid the Muslims of all three persons simultaneously, they would open the way for the ambitions of the one, or ones, who survived and who would be masters of the situation—as did in fact happen with Mu'awiyah after the death of 'Ali. Bibliography: Tabari, i, 3456-61, 3464 f., 3466 f.; Ibn Sa'd, Tabakab, iii/1, 214-261; Baladhi, Ansar, MS Paris, fol. 576v-577v, 578r-579r (attacks on Mu'awiyah and 'Amr b. al-`As: 577r, 577v-578v); [Ps.-]Ibn Kutayba, al-`Imama wa'l-siyasa, ed. Muḥammad al-Rāfī, Cairo 1320/1904, i, 253-7 (this source adds nothing of importance); Dinawarī, al-`Ākhbār al-`iwdl, ed. Guirgass, 227-30 (not very precise information); Ya`qūbī, Taʾrīkh, ed. Houtsma, ii, 251-2, 254; Muḥarrab, Kāmil, 531 f., 569-582 (attacks on Mu'awiyah and 'Amr: 552 f.); Mādī, Mu`ādī, iv, 426-434 f., 438 (attacks on Mu'awiyah and 'Amr: 436-438); Abu l-`Faraj l-`Isfahānī, Maḥālī al-Tabābiyyin, ed. Saqr, Cairo 1368/1949, 29-38, 41; al-Sayyih al-Mufīd, al-`Irāḥd, Nadjāf 1320/1904, 12-8; Ibn `Abd al-Barr, Ṣafāt, Haydārābād 1316-9, 481-4, no. 2015; Ibn Badrīn, Sharḥ Kāsīdat Ibn `Abdān, ed. Dozy, Leiden 1846, 161 f.; Ibn al-`Aqlīr, al-Mustafīr, 326-8, 359, 331 (attacks on Mu'awiyah and 'Amr: 330 f.); idem, Usd al-ghdba, Cairo 1280-6, iv, 34-8 (this source is based on Ibn Sa'd); Ibn Abī l-Hadīl, Sharḥ Ṣafāt al-`Irāḥd, Cairo 1320, ii, 42-4, 45-6 (this author follows mainly the Maḥālī; Ibn Kathīr, Bidāyā, vii, 325-30; Ibn Taqfihibīrī, Nudūm, i, 119-20 (follows Ibn Sa'd); Ibn Ḥāǧār, Taḥdīb, vii, 334-9; al-Mustafīr, Kāmil `um-mulmūl; Ibn Ḥayyān, Taḥdīb, Cairo 1320, i, 153, 157, 398, 410-3 (both on 'Aqlīr's following the letters of Tawḥīd al-khamis, Cairo 1302, ii, 312-5; Muḥāṣīn al-Aynī, Ayn al-qīra, i/3 (Damascus, 1366/1947), 57-65 (this author has taken his notices from Tabari, Ibn al-Āthīr, the Maḥālī, Muḥāṣīn and the Ṣafāt and notes the divergences, but without quotations); L. Caezari, Annales d'Islam, Milan 1955-26, 40 A.H. §§ 32-98 (§§ 34, 35, 45, 63, and 94 contain quotations representing second-hand sources); G. Levi Della Vida, Il califato di Ali secondo il Kitāb al-Asrār di al-Qalībārī, in RSO, vi/2 (1913), 503-7; F. Buhī, 'All as Prætentund and Kaib, Copenhagen 1921, 92-6. (L. Veqca Vaglieri)

IBN MUNADHIR, MUHAMMAD, satirical poet, a native of 'Adan, who went to Baṣrah for his education, settled there and passed a. number of years of the Banū Subay b. Yarbūb (Tamīn). He spent a devout and studious youth, following the courses of the best teachers of Baṣrah, from whom he learnt grammar, Kur`ānic "readings", lexicography, ḥaḍīth, etc., but on the death of his friend 'Abd al-Muqaddam b. 'Abd al-Wahhab b. Ṣaḥḥaf (for whom he wrote a much-admired funeral oration), his attitude changed completely; applying their point of doctrine concerning the Ṭaḥkīr al-munkar, the Muṭāzilis were obliged to forbid him entry to the mosque, into which he threw scorpions and put ink in the water reserved by the fountains. He inveighed against the philologists, the fundamental spitefulness which led him to attack the honour of his fellow-citizens, and his impious conduct caused him to be accused of sandabah and expelled from Baṣrah; he took refuge in Mecca, where he died in poverty, probably in 198/813.

The praises which he addressed to al-Mahdī and to Hārūn al-Rašīd earned him some rewards, but his panegyrics brought him a second reproach after they fell into disgrace. According to Abu l-`Atāṭhāṣa ya[.], his poetry was of little value, while Abān al-Lāḥi[.], a son admitted that he had a certain talent for funeral orations, but his success was chiefly in satire, thanks to his lively and malicious wit. He attempted to imitate Abī l-Bayḍāʾ b. Zayy[.], and on his own admission, wrote very slowly. Bibliography: Diḥās, Bayān, Ḥayawān, Buhās, index/ex.; Ibn Kuttaiba, Shīrāz, 555-5; idem, `Uyun al-`aḥādīr, i, 63, 246, iii, 138; Ibn al-Muṭāsib, Tabakab, 49-53; Muḥarrab, Kāmil, 747 f.; Aḥsain, xvii, 7-30 (Beirut ed., xviii, 103-42); Ṣūl, `Aṣrāb, ed. Šāwī, 32-3; Ḳaṭḥīb Bābdādā, vii, 433; Marzubānī, Muḥarrab, 295-6; `Askārī, Sīnā`ayin, index; `Aslānī, Līsīn al-Mīsīr, v, 390-3, vi, 488; Yākūt, `Udāba, xix, 55; 560; Suyūṭī, Muḥāṣīn, i, 240-50; idem, Buqyā, 107; Ibn al-Dājarā, Kurra, ii; L. Goldschīzer, Muḥ. Stud., ii, 134; G. Vajda, Zindsīs, 215; Ch. Pellat, Miṣiri, 169 and index. (Ch. Pellat)

IBN AL-MUNADHIR, Abū Bakr b. Badr, with the by-name al-Baytār al-Nāṣiri, was grand master and chief veterinary surgeon of the stables of the Mamlūk sultan of Egypt al-Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ǧalāwūn (who ruled in 693/1294, from 698/1299 to 708/1309-10 and from 709/1310 to 741/1341). It was at this ruler's request that Ibn al-Munadhir wrote, in about 740/1339-40, his treatise on hippology entitled Ḳāḥīm hamm awwal fī muṣrif l'amārad al-ḥayl, a compilation from earlier sources and in particular from the Kāmil al-sīnā`ayin (al-baytār wa l-`arūf) of a certain Ibn Akḥī Ḳīẓān or Ibn Abī Ḳāzām of the 3rd/9th or 4th/10th century, and the Ḳaṭḥīb Bābdādā of the 4th/10th century, and to the work of the Mamlūk veterinary surgeon. It is found also called, more simply, Kitāb al-Nāṣiri (MS Paris, Bibli. Nat. 2813-14 and Vienna, Flügel 1481). A. Perron published a translation of this treatise, in three volumes, with a detailed introduction, under the title Le Nāṣiri: la perfection des deux arts ou traité complet d'hippologie et d'hippiatry araheb, trad. de l'arabe d'Abou Bekr Ibn Badr. The first volume, which appeared in 1852, contains an introduction much information on the Arab horse and the breeding of horses [see FURUSIYYA], stressing the special efforts made by the sultan al-Nāṣir to develop stud farms in Egypt; it contains in addition a large collection of verses selected from the abundant classical poetry on the horse. The introduction to this first volume received from J. von Hammer-Purgstall (in Das Pferd bei den Arabern, Denkschr. d. K. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien, 1855-6) a rather censuring criticism, which he would surely have modified if he had lived long enough to see the rest of the publication. The second volume (1859) contains the translation of the section on hippology and the third (1860) that on hippiatry. Although it is a good source richly documented, A. Perron's Le Nāṣiri is no longer a basic work for
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the knowledge of early Arab hippology, in view of the number of works devoted to this subject which have been published during the last century; for a more complete list of works on this subject, see A. M. Abbadi, *Al-Makdmat al-^id li-'bn Muhammad b. Ihdta*, Cairo ed. 1949, vi, 315, viii, 209-13, 363-4; A. M. al-`Abbadi, *Bibliography: IBN AL-MUNDHIR, IBN AL-MUSLIMA 891. Ibn al-Khatib, by-name first given to Ahmad b. Umar (d. 415/1024), of the family of the Al al-Rakil, and name by which his descendants were known until the 6th/12th century. The most important member of the family was his grandson, Abu `l-Kásim `Ali b. al-Husayn, also known by the honorific title of ta'is al-ru'asád, vizier to the caliphate from 437 to 450/1045-58, concerning whom there have arisen a number of important questions which have not yet been satisfactorily answered. The conquest of Baghádád by the Bóyids in 334/945 had led to the evacuation of the office of vizier in the caliphate, and it was only the decadence of the dynasty and the rivalry among its later members which enabled the caliph al-Káhid to re-appoint one officially, and thus to recover a certain measure of real authority. But little is known either of the conditions under which this office was restored, or through what qualifications or services the caliph was led to choose Abu `l-Kásim, a lawyer sprung from a family of merchants, as the firstholder of the new vizierate. An unbigoted Hanbáli, who probably changed to Sháfí'ism while remaining Hálájí and anti-Ash'árí, Ibn al-Muslima certainly played an important role in the movement which arose at that time among the Sunnis in Baghádád towards a rebirth of Tradition in opposition to the mutakallimún of Sháfi'i tendency and towards a political and at first doctrinal stand against Isma'ilísm made by the caliphate and supported by the Büyíd "protectors". It would have been interesting to know what was the relationship between Ibn al-Muslima and Ibn al-Mutábi, to whom we owe one of the clearest expressions of the viewpoint of the caliphs at this period. But primarily, and certainly in part because of this politico-religious position, Ibn al-Muslima was regarded by his contemporaries as the man who introduced to Baghádád the Sáldjúkid sultan and his Turks. There is no doubt that he was the active agent and perhaps the initiator of this policy, even though later his interpretation of it or the inferences he drew from it did not exactly coincide with those of the new and powerful "protector"; but it is not clear what were the precise reasons which led him to do this or whether and, if so, to what extent he exceeded the instructions, if any, given by the caliph al-Káhid. It is certain that the years immediately prior to the entry of Toghríl-Beg into Baghádád (447/1054) saw a conflict between Ibn al-Muslima and the leader of the Turkish Búrid mercenaries, al-Básasírî (q.v.), who was continually in a state of semi-revolt; the latter finally recognized the Fátimids against the Sáldjúkíds, but it is not clear whether, or how far, he had originally been inclined in this direction. It is certain, however, that, from the time of his arrival on the political scene, Toghríl-Beg had been careful to emphasize his loyalty to the caliphate and its doctrine and thus to deserve the titles which Ibn al-Muslima had sent him long before and which set the seal on this loyalty.

When the Turks had established their power in Baghádád, Ibn al-Muslima seized the family and the possessions of al-Básasírî (who had fled) with a severity accentuated by the financial demands of the new rulers. When, therefore, Toghríl-Beg was obliged to withdraw from Baghdad and return to Iran, Ibn al-Muslima, supported by the Arabs of Mesopotamia and by Fátimíd money, had returned to Baghádád, al-Básasírî avenged himself on Ibn al-Muslima with a cruelty which was very different from the personal immunity which the 'Abbasíd caliph had enjoyed at the hands of an Arab prince. The vizier died under torture (450/1058) before he could be saved by the restoration of the Sáldjúkíd sultan. His son Abu `l-Fath al-Muqaffar was for some time vizier to the caliph, in 476/1083. His great-grandson, 'Adúd al-Dín Muhammad b. `Abd Alláh b. Híbat Alláh b. al-Muqaffar, also held this post for quite a long time under al-Mustádí, from 566 to 573/1171-8. It is true that the caliph was obliged by the Türk Kaymázh to dismiss him, the Turks taking advantage of this to sack the vizier's house; it was not until Kaymázh was forced to leave (570/1174) that Adúd al-Dín regained his post. A few years later, just as he was preparing to make the Pilgrimage to Mecca, he was murdered by a Bátíni (573/1178). Like other members of his family (to which 'Imád al-Dín devotes a special chapter in his *Kharída*) he had been a man of great learning, and the poet Síbí b. al-Táawdhi wrote various poems in praise of him.

Bibliography: For Ibn al-Muslima (ra*is al-
ru’asa3), the chief sources are the Muntazam of Ibn al-Djawzi, viii, the Kamil of Ibn al-‘Azhìr, vi, and the Muktazam of Sibî ibn al-Djawzi (unpublished); see also, for the Fâtîmid point of view, the Sîra of the missionary al-Mu’ayyad al-Shîrâzî, ed. Kâmil Husayn, Cairo 1940 (index). For a discussion of his rôle, see G. Makdisi, Ibn ‘Aqlî et la résurgence de l’Islam traditionniste, 1963, who seems, however, to have made too categorical an affirmation of Ibn al-Muslima’s difference of opinion with the caliph who kept his position. See also, for the article on IBN MUKTÂZ, for later members of the family see the Muntazam, ix and x (index) and the Kâmil, ix-x (index). (Cl. Câhen)

IBN MUCYÂR, ab. Husayn b. Mucyâr b. MUKAMMIL al-Asadi, Arabic poet of the 2nd/8th century. A muâwîa of the Banu Asad (following the origin. His grandfather al-Mutawakkil was killed in battle after the death of his father, Kabiha, who was deposed and put in prison where he was left to die. After the death of his father, Kabiha, the young prince and poet, son of the 13th caliph of the Abbasids who had to give up political aspirations, Ibn al-Mu’tazz except the conventional elegies by which he lamented the death of the latter (Dîwân, ed. Lewin, iv, 220, 222, 237, 255). In a more personal tone he lamented the death of his uncle Mu‘ammâd b. al-Mutawakkil (iv, 219, 221, 224, 250, 263), and of members of the al-Munadîdîm family, particularly the learned ‘Ali b. Yahyâ (d. 275/890, Yûkût, Ustabî, v, 459-77, Dîwân, iv, 213, 215, 224, 249, 271). After the death of the al-Muktâdîm in 279/892, he accepted an invitation of the new caliph al-Mu’utadîd to settle in Baghdad. This invitation was probably suggested to the caliph by the wa‘zîr ‘Ubâyid Allah Sulaymân b. Wahh, who was a friend of the poet (iv, 244, 256, 266, 268, 279), as was also his son and successor al-‘Askadî (iv, 246, 265, 267, 275-6, 281). The new and magnificent palace al-Thawāryyî built by al-Mu’tadîd (see BAGHDAD, 897-8) and its gardens were described by Ibn al-Mu’tazz in a poem (Dîwân, Cairo 1891, i, 115; Beirut 1913, 138-9; Yûkût, i, 924). In his Tabâshîr al-surâr, a collection of subjects discussed at the literary assemblies held at the court, he gives expression to his aristocratic attitude and to his personal experiences, often alluded to in his mu‘tâdîlîm poems, of an epoch in which the natural order of the old nobility and the vulgar had been disturbed. This epoch of disorder and humiliation had come to an end, according to the poet, with the glorious reign of al-Mu’utadîd. The restoration of the ‘Abbasîd empire and the defeat of its enemies are the themes of numerous fahrî and madîbî poems by the prince. His poetic attacks on the Shi‘a and other dissidents were remembered long afterwards (see, e.g., Yûkût, Ustabî, v, 254-7; Sadrî, v, 232). In his historical poem containing, in its present form, 417 strophes celebrating his life and work (ed. C. Lang in ZDMG, xi (1886), 563-611, xii (1887), 232-79) when the caliph died in 289/902 and was succeeded by his son al-Muktafi, Ibn al-Mu’tazz seems to have left public life to lead again a life of retirement. In the political emergencies, however, that followed upon the illness and death of al-Muktafi in 295/908, he was involved in the intrigues of those who desired to secure an influence over the new caliph. In Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 295/August 908, a brother of al-Muktafi, Diafâr, was proclaimed caliph as al-Muktafi. Already during the illness of al-Muktafi, a group of officers, secretaries and judges, who were not satisfied with the young Diafâr, had formed a plot to proclaim Ibn al-Mu’tazz, and had won his acceptance provided that there should be no bloodshed. The wa‘zîr al-‘Abbâs b. al-Hasan, who had opposed the dethronement of al-Muktafi, was murdered and, on 20 Rabî‘î 296/12 December 908, Ibn al-Mu’tazz was proclaimed caliph and took the

Ahmad ibn Sa‘d b. al-Dimâshq!). who has handed down what is probably the first attempt of the highly gifted boy to write poetry (al-Mazbûzî, Dîwân, ed. Sébîlî, ii, 140-1, cf. Yûkût, Ustabî, i, 133-4), and the famous philologists al-Mubarrad and Thâlab. When his grandmother died in 264, Ibn al-Mu’tazz settled in Mâṭara near Sâmarra. Like many other young princes of the house of the ‘Abbâsîs who had to give up political aspirations, Ibn al-Mu’tazz devoted himself, in these years, to the pleasures described by him in his rich poetic "fî garden and ghâzî. Little is known about his relations with his uncle al-Muktâdîm and his Muwaffâk except the conventional elegies by which he lamented the death of the latter (Dîwân, ed. Lewin, iv, 220, 222, 237, 255). In a more personal tone he lamented the death of his uncle Mu‘ammâd b. al-Mutawakkil (iv, 219, 221, 224, 250, 263), and of members of the al-Munadîdîm family, particularly the learned ‘Ali b. Yahyâ (d. 275/890, Yûkût, Ustabî, v, 459-77, Dîwân, iv, 213, 215, 224, 249, 271). After the death of the al-Muktâdîm in 279/892, he accepted an invitation of the new caliph al-Mu’utadîd to settle in Baghdad. This invitation was probably suggested to the caliph by the wa‘zîr ‘Ubâyid Allah Sulaymân b. Wahh, who was a friend of the poet (iv, 244, 256, 266, 268, 279), as was also his son and successor al-‘Askadî (iv, 246, 265, 267, 275-6, 281). The new and magnificent palace al-Thawâryyî built by al-Mu’tadîd (see BAGHDAD, 897-8) and its gardens were described by Ibn al-Mu’tazz in a poem (Dîwân, Cairo 1891, i, 115; Beirut 1913, 138-9; Yûkût, i, 924). In his Tabâshîr al-surâr, a collection of subjects discussed at the literary assemblies held at the court, he gives expression to his aristocratic attitude and to his personal experiences, often alluded to in his mu‘tâdîlîm poems, of an epoch in which the natural order of the old nobility and the vulgar had been disturbed. This epoch of disorder and humiliation had come to an end, according to the poet, with the glorious reign of al-Mu’utadîd. The restoration of the ‘Abbasîd empire and the defeat of its enemies are the themes of numerous fahrî and madîbî poems by the prince. His poetic attacks on the Shi‘a and other dissidents were remembered long afterwards (see, e.g., Yûkût, Ustabî, v, 254-7; Sadrî, v, 232). In his historical poem containing, in its present form, 417 strophes celebrating his life and work (ed. C. Lang in ZDMG, xi (1886), 563-611, xii (1887), 232-79) when the caliph died in 289/902 and was succeeded by his son al-Muktafi, Ibn al-Mu’tazz seems to have left public life to lead again a life of retirement. In the political emergencies, however, that followed upon the illness and death of al-Muktafi in 295/908, he was involved in the intrigues of those who desired to secure an influence over the new caliph. In Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 295/August 908, a brother of al-Muktafi, Diafâr, was proclaimed caliph as al-Muktafi. Already during the illness of al-Muktafi, a group of officers, secretaries and judges, who were not satisfied with the young Diafâr, had formed a plot to proclaim Ibn al-Mu’tazz, and had won his acceptance provided that there should be no bloodshed. The wa‘zîr al-‘Abbâs b. al-Hasan, who had opposed the dethronement of al-Muktafi, was murdered and, on 20 Rabî‘î 296/12 December 908, Ibn al-Mu’tazz was proclaimed caliph and took the
regnal name al-Muntasif bi'llah. But things changed rapidly as the guards of the caliph made a resolute resistance to attacks on the palace and set out to attack Ibn al-Mu'tazz and those who were with him in his house. These supporters abandoned him, and "the caliph of one day", who had taken refuge in the house of a jeweller, was found and strangled.

Ibn al-Mu'tazz's poetry did not fail to impress his contemporaries and later generations, who particularly admired his tashbihāt among his contemporaries and later generations, who particularly admired his tashbihāt and those who were with him in his house. These supporters abandoned him, and "the caliph of one day", who had taken refuge in the house of a jeweller, was found and strangled.

Ibn al-Mu'tazz did not aim at presenting a systematic summary of his "modernism", Ibn al-Mu'tazz's poetry remains within the traditional scope of Arab poetry, of which he had a profound knowledge.

The surviving specimens of his prose are in the strain of the fluent, simple and natural style that is known to have its earliest representatives in the famous risāla of 'Abd al-Hamid [q.v.] to the Secretaries and in the writings of Ibn al-Mukaffa [q.v.].

The verses of Ibn al-Mu'tazz were collected by his friend and other contemporary Sa'd ibn al-Mukaffa [q.v.], who edited them twice: (1) in a diwān divided into chapters in which the poems were arranged in an alphabetical order (parts iii-iv ed. B. Lewin, Istanbul 1943-50); (2) in an anthology containing specimens of poems of 'Abbasid princes and forming one part of his Kitāb al-Aṣrār (ed. J. Heyworth-Dunne, London 1936). There are traces also of another edition made by the philologist and historian Hamza al-Ifjarānī [q.v.].

For a copy of the poems that reached Isfahān in the early years of the 4th/10th century, see Yākūt, Udābā', vi, 285.

The rhetorical figures intentionally sought for and occurring with great frequency in the poetry of the Abbasid period with extensive quotations particularly of their lesser known works; the book, therefore, contains inter alia long poems which are not to be found in any other source.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references given in the text and in Brockelmann, I, 79-80, S I, 128-130: Hilāl al-Sāhī, Kitāb al-Muṣārāt [q.v.], ed. H. F. Amedroz, Leiden 1904 (index); 'Arūb, Tabābarī, Zād al-adāb, ed. J. M. de Goeeée, Leiden 1897 (index); Miskawayh, The eclipse of the Abbasid caliphate, ed. H. F. Amedroz and D. S. Margoliouth, i-vii, Oxford 1920-21 (index). The titles of numerous papers by I. Krachkovsky on the subject are quoted in the Introduction to his edition of Kitāb al-Asba'd. (1) in a monograph devoted to "the newer ones" did not in fact begin with "the older ones"; the book, therefore, contains inter alia long poems which are not to be found in any other source.

**IBN AL-MU'TZI,** ABU 'L-ḤUSAYN YĀḤĪYĀ B. 'ABD AL-NĀ'R ZAYN AL-DIN AL-ZAWĀWi, grammarian of the Maghribi origin, b. 564/1168-9, d. in Cairo 628/1231. After studying in the west under al-Qurṣānī, he went to the east, where he taught grammar, first at Damascus and then in Cairo. Ibn Mu'tzi wrote commentaries on grammatical treatises and turned lexicographic works into verse; he seems to have been the first writer to compose a grammatical treatise in one thousand verses (al-fusūl). This treatise, al-Durra al-ala'fīyya wa'tirdthuh fi 'l-adāb wa'l-mafâyih, was printed also in Beirut 1961 (ed. Karam al-Bustānī).

**IBN AL-MUWAĞKIT,** MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD B. 'ABBĀD ALLĀH AL-MARRĀKUSHĪ, born in Marrākush in 1894, where he died on 30 November 1949. His father held the office of muwağkit in the Ibn Yusuf mosque at Marrākush. Hence the son, at the start of his career as a writer, bore the surname Ibn al-Muwağkit, but when he came to hold the same position he was himself called al-Muwağkit.

From 1917, he became known to scholars interested in Morocco through the publication of four biographical works, the principal and most useful of which is entitled al-Sādāra al-abadīyya fi 'l-tā'īr bi-magāḥir al-ḥadār al-Marrākushīyya (lith. Fās 1917-20, 2 vols.); the second work, Ta'īr al-anfūs fi 'l-tā'īr bi 'l-ghayth Abī 'l-ʿAbbās, is a monograph devoted to the saint Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās al-Sabti, one of the seven patron saints of Marrākush; the author adds that in the margin, the biography of his own father, Muḥammad b. 'Abbād Allāh al-Mubarak, under the title type of adāb al-kāhīb, adāb al-nadīm etc.; it is a collection of anonymous sayings illustrating the moral qualities of an educated man.

In the field of the history of poetry, the subject of a vast literature of which only two specimens now remain, namely those of Ibn Kucbha [q.v.] and of Ibn Alīmān al-Djamāhi [q.v.], both dealing with poets of pre-Islamic and early Islamic times, Ibn al-Mu'tazz, in his last years, wrote Taḥbadd al-ṣūrār al-mubādāfiyya (facsimile of the unique and incomplete Esorial MS, ed. A. E. Ghebel, London 1939, GMS, n.s., xily; ed. A. A. Farrājdī, Cairo 1956, in which he collected anecdotes concerning poets of the Abbasid period with extensive quotations particularly of their lesser known works; the book, therefore, contains inter alia long poems which are not to be found in any other source.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references given in the text and in Brockelmann, I, 79-80, S I, 128-130: Hilāl al-Sāhī, Kitāb al-Muṣārāt [q.v.], ed. H. F. Amedroz, Leiden 1904 (index); 'Arūb, Tabābarī, Zād al-adāb, ed. J. M. de Goeeée, Leiden 1897 (index); Miskawayh, The eclipse of the Abbasid caliphate, ed. H. F. Amedroz and D. S. Margoliouth, i-vii, Oxford 1920-21 (index). The titles of numerous papers by I. Krachkovsky on the subject are quoted in the Introduction to his edition of Kitāb al-Asba'd.
Ibn al-Muwakkit was brought up in the school of those 'ulama’ who, influenced by Sufi doctrines, were not reluctant to adhere to a religious confraternity. His father, a devoted reader of the Da'īd al-Majd al-Adil and al-Malik al-Muzaffar Ghazi.

In Ibn al-Muwakkit was brought up in the school of those 'ulama’ who, influenced by Sufi doctrines, were not reluctant to adhere to a religious confraternity. His father, a devoted reader of the Da'īd al-Majd al-Adil and al-Malik al-Muzaffar Ghazi.

In bn al-Muwakkit was contentedly following the saintly tradition of the biographers and hagiographers of his country as exemplified by Ibn 'Askar, Ibn al-Kādī and Ahmad Bāhā, when suddenly he discovered the writings of the great orthodox reformers of Cairo, Muhammad 'Abduh and Muhammad Rashid Riḍā, and the satirical novels of Muhammad Hāfiz Ibrāhīm and Muhammad al-Muwaqqit. At once he rallied to the viewpoint of the Muslims and, with the ardor of the convert, hurled himself into the battle then being waged by the orthodox reformers against the upholders of religious conservatism.

He started his new career with the publication of a short treatise on bida’, al-Kashf wa l-tibydn 'an bīt al-khāl al-zaman (Cairo 1932), followed almost immediately by al-Riḥla al-Marrakushiyya (Cairo 1933), in which, by means of a simple fable with a moral, he drew a pessimistic picture in the darkest colours of the Muslim society of his time. From then onwards, until his death, he kept up a relentless struggle, within his own country, against the confraternities, the marabouts, the kadis, and the marabouts, the kadis, and the marabouts, the kadis. It contains much valuable and original information on a history whose direct sources have disappeared.

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa (particularly 45 and 46); A. Faure, Un réformateur marocain, Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Abd Allah al-Muwaqqit al-Marrakushi, in Hespéris, 1957, 1-2, with the bibliography of most of his works.
while occupying the office of royal letter-writer in the diwan al-inshad. Ibn al-Nabih lived the carefree and frivolous life which characterized the court of his patron. He dedicated himself to the pursuit of this fact in certain fragments the erotic genre has an important place, Ibn al-Nabih's work is mainly laudatory in character.


(J. Rikabi)

IBN AL-NADIM

Abd 'L-Faraq Muhammad b. Abi Ya'qub Ishtak al-Warrak al-Baghdadi, author of the well-known Kitab al-Fihrist, an "Index" of Arabic books, completed according to the author's own statement (p. 2, line 12; 38, 89; cf. also 132, 7 and 219, 7) in 377/987-8. Of his life very little is known. He died on 20 Sha'ban 385/17 September 995 according to Ibn al-Nadjjar, Dha'iri Ta'risih Bagdad (see Flügel's edition, i, XII, n. 2) or to others in 388/998 (see Ibn Hajar, Lisân al-Mizân, v, 72, where 38 is apparently a misprint); dates later than 385 (e.g., 87, 6; 169, 13, both lacking in codex B) are additions made by copyists; cf. 193, 17, where the author invites his readers to fill in the lacunae in his lists of books. At 237, 6 he mentions that in 340/951-2 he made the acquaintance of a certain scholar, so we may infer that he was born in 325/936-7 at the latest. Of his family nothing is known; there is no reason to connect him with Isbhâ [q.v.]. Ibrâhim al-Mawšil al-Nadim or with Yahyâ b. al-Nadim, a pupil of al-Bâja'juri; nor do we know to whom to whom the name al-nadim is given (i.e., the companion of a grande of the realm or even of the caliph) refers. He was a bookseller (warrâq), one who copies manuscripts and sells them, see Dozy) like his father (see p. 303, 24; 318, 7; 351, 14). He lived in Bagdad (see e.g., p. 337, 26 f.; 349, 7 where darr al-Râm means the quarter of the Byzantines in Bagdad). Sometimes he mentions a stay in Mosul (p. 56, 12; 190, 2; 265, 25 and modifiers 197, 4, because al-Safwani was, according to Ibn al-Nadjjar, d. 368/978-9), and one quatrain, of about 1590 verses. Ibn al-Nadim himself, was published in Beirut in 1299/1881 [q.v.]).

Although in the prologues to the panegyrics and in the last four discourses, in other words, the Arabic translations from Greek, Syriac and other languages, together with Arabic books composed on the model of these translations. Of the larger edition the first half (pp. 2-172, 7, Flügel) is extant in the manuscripts F = Paris (de Slane no. 4457) written in 617/1221-2, and B = Chester Beatty, described by A. J. Arberry, in Islamic Research Association Miscellany, i (I.R.A. Series no. 12, 1948, 19-45); B contains not the only text of pp. 2-172 (Flügel), with the exception of pp. 14, 22-29, 13 owing to the loss of some leaves, but also the beginning of the fifth discourse giving the text of the first section up to the article on the Nâsh al-Makhtûb (see bibl.). The second half of the larger edition (pp. 172, 11-360, Flügel) is extant in the manuscript S = Istanbul.

The shorter edition (pp. 2-213 and 238, 5-360, Flügel) is preserved in codex K = Istanbul, Köprülü 1135, written in 600/1203-4 (see Ritter, i.e., who shows that Flügel's manuscripts H, V, and C are also directly or indirectly derived from the Istanbul
manuscripts. In the larger edition the preface and the list of contents correspond ... connoisseur of history and polite literature; an excellent discourser and lecturer, and a composer of fine poetry.*

Ibn al-Nadim wrote also a Kitāb al-Anwa' wa l-tashbīḥāt (Fihrist, p. 12) which has not survived.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references in the article: Kitāb al-Fihrist, vol. x, 1900, and xiv, 1902; M. Steinschneider, *Die griechischen Philosophen in der arabischen Überlieferung,* l, 147; S I, 226. (J.W. Fàcx)
(Iṣrāḥād, vii, 103). The esteem accorded to his erudition is attested by his having a following (maṣḥ-yahḥa) of three thousand men and four hundred women (Dhahabi, Ḫuffūs, iv, 213). In securing data for his history, therefore, he did not hesitate to use the authors' own handwriting; he carried on extensive correspondence with the authorities of his day and travelled widely to effect personal contact with his informants.

Ibn al-Najjdjar’s history of Baghdād, itself a dhāqāl to that of al-Khālīfah, was completed by Ibn al-Sā’a (d. 675/1275-6). Ibn al-Fuwātī (d. 723/1323), and Ibn Rāmī (d. 725/1325-7). His work on the Baghdad madrasa was carried on by Ibn Kūlī (d. 750/1350-1), Dhahabī (d. 764/1364-7) and Ibn Ḥadījl (d. 852/1448-9).

**Bibliography:** In addition to the works mentioned in the text: Ibn al-Ḥmad, Ṣhadharkhī, ii, 226; Ibn al-Fuwātī, Ḫawādith, 205; Ibn Ḥallīkān, Wafayāt, Cairo 1949, vi, 28-9; Ṭubūlī, Fawātī, Cairo 1952, ii, 522; Wustenfeld, Geschichteschreiber, 122-3; Brockelmann, S 1, 360; Hammer-Funga, Lit. des arab. Medizin, 257; Cl. Huart, Histoire, Paris 1901, 229. For a broader treatment see C. E. Farah, Ibn al-Najjdjar: a neglected Arabic historian, in JĀOS, 1964, 220-30. (C. E. Farah)

**IBN AL-NAFIS, ʿALĪ** AL-DĪN ʿABŪ ʿL-ʿALĀʾ ʿALI B. ABU ʿL-ḤARĀM AL-KURASHI AL-DIMASQĪ, a distinguished physician and many-sided author of the 7th/13th century. Except for the date of his death, only few facts of his life have been recorded; because Ibn Ḥusayn b. ʿAṣlah, although his contemporary, does not mention Ibn al-Nafis in his history of physicians; but al-ʿUmārī and al-Safādī give detailed though anecdotal accounts of him and his personal habits. Born in or near Damascus (presumably in the village of al-Kurashiyya), he studied medicine there under Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥarīm b. ʿAlī known as al-Dakhwār (d. 629/1230; Ibn Ḥusayn b. Ṣalāḥ, ii, 239-46), who came from the school of Ibn al-Tilmidh [q.v.], who in turn had formed many disciples several of whom came from Baghdād to Damascus. Besides medicine, Ibn al-Nafis studied grammar, logic, and Islamic religious sciences. At an unknown date he moved to Cairo, where he was given the important post of Chief Physician of Egypt and became the personal physician of sultan Baybars I [q.v.]. He presumably worked at the Nāṣiri hospital and trained a number of pupils. The best known among them was Ibn al-Kūfī (Brockelmann, J 1, 649; S 1, 890), author of a work on surgery [see al-Djarrāh]. He lectured on Shāfīʾī law at the Masʿūrīyya madrasa. The famous grammarian, Abū Ḥayyān al-Dimashqī [q.v.], was his disciple in logic and praised his teaching. His contemporary, the philologist Ibn al-Naḥṣah [q.v.], praised his style in grammar. He became rich and had a luxurious house built for himself in Cairo. He died in Cairo, vii, 1287/16 January 1288 at the age of about 80 (lunar) years, and left his house, his fortune and his books to the Masʿūrī hospital there, founded by sultan Kālūwān and only recently completed (683/1284). In prescribing, "he never departed from the method to which he was accustomed; he did not prescribe a remedy as long as he could prescribe a diet, and he did not prescribe a compound remedy as long as he could content himself with a simple drug" (al-ʿUmārī). Notwithstanding these modern ideas on treatment, and although Ibn al-Nafis was exalted by his admirers as a second Avicenna, he seems to have been a learned theorist rather than a practical physician, but the range and depth of his general culture are impressive.

The literary activity of Ibn al-Nafis was important and extensive. He was mainly a commentator but one of independent mind and very extensive knowledge. He is said to have written most of his works out of his head, about five thousand books, although it seems to be confirmed by the fact that as a rule they contain, as far as they are not commentaries, very few references to earlier works. His main writings are: (1) the Kitāb al-Shāmil fi ʿl-fibb, an encyclopaedia of medicine which was to have consisted of three hundred volumes (this word to be taken in the conventional meaning of some ninety folios), of which only eighty-two volumes were compiled; the volumes exist, partly in the autograph of the author (see N. Heer, in RIMA, vi (1960), 203-10); (2) the Kitāb al-Muḥadhdhab fi ʿl-ḥukūm, a comprehensive but not very original record of the whole knowledge of the Arabs in ophthalmology; it was used by several later authors; (3) the Kitāb al-ʿUmārī, an extract from all parts of the Kanun of Ibn Sīnā [q.v.], omitting anatomy and physiology; it is a concise manual of medical practice and is very much used by the practitioner, and among the works of Ibn al-Nafis it has met with the greatest success in the Oriental medical world; it exists in numerous manuscripts, was printed or lithographed a number of times, was the subject of a series of commentaries and glosses, the most reputed of which, by Nafis b. Ṣawdāʾ al-Kirmānī (completed 641/1241-2), was lithographed in India for the last time as recently as 1928/1910; it was also translated into Turkish and into Hebrew. (4) Among the medical commentaries written by Ibn al-Nafis the most widely disseminated one is on the Aphorisms (Fusṣāl) of Hippocrates; he also wrote commentaries on Hippocrates's Prognostics, Epidemics, and De natura hominis; (5) he further commented upon the Masāʾil fi ʿl-fibb of Ḥusayn b. Iṣḥāq, (6) and he wrote an extensive commentary on the Kanun of Ibn Sīnā which exists in numerous manuscripts, improving the arrangement of the subject-matter and, in particular, collecting the passages relating to anatomy from the first three sections of the Kanun and commenting on them in a separate section, which was often copied as an independent book; in this section, Ibn al-Nafis sets out his theory of the lesser circulation of the blood (see below); his commentary on the fifth section of the Kanun was translated into Latin by the Renaissance physician and scholar, Anselm Alpagos, and posthumously printed in Venice 1547 (see M. T. d'Alverny, in Medioevo e Rinascimento, studi in onore di Bruno Nardi, i, Florence 1955, 195 f.). (7) Of the writings of Ibn al-Nafis on logic, there exists his commentary on his own Kitāb al-Wuraydhāt, a summary of the contents of Aristotle's Organon and Rhetoric; the section summarizing the Analytica Priora includes a discussion of the legal proofs in Islamic law and of the limited value of kifās [q.v.] from the point of view of logic. His writings on grammar and rhetoric, and his commentary on the Tanbih al-Shārikāt [q.v.] (if the mention of this last work by al-Subki is not merely the result of an error) do not seem to have survived, but the Muhāṣṣār fi ʿilm uṣūl al-ḥadīth, on the science of tradition, has been preserved. (8) There is, finally, al-Risāla al-ʿUmarīyya fi ʿl-sirr al-nabawwyya, which can be freely translated as The Theological Autodidactus.

In this intellectual tour de force, which was already admired by his contemporaries, Ibn al-Nafis set out to show, by abstract reasoning which he put into the mouth of a solitary person, called Kāmil, on a desert island, that the events in the life of the
Prophet and in the history of the community of Muslims, including the incursion of the Mongols in his own lifetime and even the physical appearance of the Muslim ruler, no doubt Sultan Baybars, were the best things that could possibly have happened and therefore, under divine providence, unavoidable. He ends with a naturalistic explanation of the Last Things.

The most important achievement of Ibn al-Nafis in the field of medicine is his theory of the lesser or pulmonary circulation of the blood, from the right ventricle of the heart through the pulmonary artery (arteria venae comitantes) to the left ventricle of the heart, boldly contradicting the accepted ideas of Galen and of Ibn Sīnā and anticipating part of William Harvey's fundamental discovery; in contrast with Harvey, who started from experiment, Ibn al-Nafis derived his theory from the same kind of abstract reasoning as in the Theologus Autodidactus. This remarkable theory, perhaps because of its unorthodox character, was almost ignored in the Arab and Islamic hospitals and medical authors, excepting only an anonymous commentator of the Kānūn (Bibliothèque Nationale, Arabe 5776) who agrees with it, and an otherwise unknown al-Fāḍil al-Baghdādī in his commentary on the Kānūn ga, an extract from the Kānūn by Maḥmūd b. Muhammad al-Caghminī (d. 745/1344), who made it his object to refute Ibn al-Nafis's criticisms of Ibn Sīnā (Berlin, Ahlwardt 6294). A theory of the lesser circulation, identical in all essential respects with that of Ibn al-Nafis and expressed in terms strangely reminiscent of those used by him, was formulated by Michael Servetus in his Christianismi restitutio (Vienna 1553), and an exposition of the same doctrine by Realdus Columbus (Realdo Colombo) in his De re anatomica libri XV (Venice 1559) forms a close parallel to this. Detailed philological analysis has made it probable that Servetus (and perhaps Columbus, too) had direct knowledge of the theory of Ibn al-Nafis, and it is likely that this knowledge was transmitted by Andrea Alpago, who spent more than 30 years in Syria, travelled widely in search of Arabic manuscripts, and is known to have translated from the Arabic numerous medical texts not all of which were printed posthumously (he died about 1524).


IBN AL-NAFIS, AHMAD B. MUHAMMAD B. ISMAIL (d. 338/950), Egyptian grammarian, expert in poetry, grammar, and mathematics. He was a pupil of Masoud b. Mufid, and is known to have translated (published in Cairo by Zaki Muǧāhid) an extract from the Kānūn, (Bibliotheque Nationale, Arabe 5776), and an exposition of the same doctrine by Realdus Columbus (Realdo Colombo) in his De re anatomica libri XV (Venice 1553), and an exposition of the same doctrine by Realdus Columbus (Realdo Colombo) in his De re anatomica libri XV (Venice 1559) forms a close parallel to this. Detailed philological analysis has made it probable that Servetus (and perhaps Columbus, too) had direct knowledge of the theory of Ibn al-Nafis, and it is likely that this knowledge was transmitted by Andrea Alpago, who spent more than 30 years in Syria, travelled widely in search of Arabic manuscripts, and is known to have translated from the Arabic numerous medical texts not all of which were printed posthumously (he died about 1524).

IBN AL-NAHHAS — IBN AL-NAJJĀH


According to some sources Ibn al-Naṭṭāḥ excelled in history. Among his authorities were the Wāgakdī, al-Madārīnī and Abu Ubayda Ma'mar b. al-Muthanna. Thanks to his (lost) work Kīlāb (or Aḥḥār) al-da'wla al-‘Abbāsiyya, later biographers consider him one of the pioneer writers of the dynastic history of the ‘Abbāsid. Whether this work was original or, as F. Rosenthal suggests, a revision of an earlier work by the Shīfi al-Ṭurrā, at least according to A. Dūrí that Ibn al-Naṭṭāḥ may have been the author of an important extant work on the ‘Abbāsid known as Aḥkār al-‘Abbās ... wa wa‘l-dā‘ih, preserved in manuscript in the library of the Institute of Higher Islamic Studies in Baghhdād. The first pages are missing (204 fols. survive); the name of the author is not given. The work is an annalist account in biographical form dealing with al-‘Abbās and his descendants, the ‘Abbāsids. The abrupt manner in which the manuscript ends shows that it is incomplete. A consistent attribution of the work to Ibn al-Naṭṭāḥ would appear, however, to be rash, in view of the paucity both of the available information on Ibn al-Naṭṭāḥ’s works and of the deductions which may be drawn from this manuscript.

As a traditionist Ibn al-Naṭṭāḥ was also known among the circle of the Muḥaddithūn, who thought highly of him and regarded him as trustworthy (thāba). This judgement enhances his importance as an early historian.

Bibliography: In view of the important place held by Ibn al-Naṭṭāḥ in Muslim historiography, the lack of information on him is surprising. Few references have been found to him, he is mentioned in Maṣūdī’s list of authors (Muḥājâd, ed.-tr. Pellat, § 8) and he figures also among the historians in Sakhawi’s list (mainly derived from Maṣūdī’s list, except for its alphabetical arrangement; see F. Rosenthal, History, 430 (Arabic tr., 686)) and also among the historians in Sakhawi’s list (mainly derived from Maṣūdī’s list, except for its alphabetical arrangement; see F. Rosenthal, History, 430 (Arabic tr., 686)).


Little is known about his life except that, as his nisba (his Baṣrī shows, he was born in Baṣra and lived there for the greater part of his life. He used to visit Baghhdād in order to hear and relate traditions.

IBN AL-NAZHAR, Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Sulaymān al-'Umānī, bāṣiqī scholar of 'Uman who lived in the 6th/12th century (he was killed by Khardala b. Samak). He was the author of the Kitāb al-dīwān, a collection of poems on ḥākīm of which two editions have been published (one of them in Cairo in 1351). Among his other works there should be mentioned an important Kitāb Sīlah al-dīzmān fī siyār aḥl 'Umanā.


IBN NUBATA, Abū ʿAYYĀ.§ Abī ʿRaqīm b. Muḥammad b. ʿIsāʾīl al-Ḥudhālī al-Farrākī, born at Mayyafarīkīn at a date not known, that of 335/946 given by his biographers being probably incorrect (cf. Amedroz, The Mawardi dynasty at Madīnāt al-Muḥājirīn, in J.R.A.S., 193, 125, n. 1; idem, Notes on two articles on Mayyafarīkīn, in J.R.A.S., 1900, 175), was preacher (ḥāfiq) at the court of Sayf al-Dawla at Mayyafarīkīn and Aleppo. He died in 374/984-5 in his native town. His sermons (khufāb) dīhādīyya, often composed sermons for political occasions. His most famous sermons, the ḥuṣlāb dhīhādīyya, were written to exhort the population to support Sayf al-Dawla in the war against the Byzantines, and they aroused great enthusiasm. They contain references to contemporary events, for example the taking of Aleppo by the Byzantines in 351/962, the measures that he was made superintendant of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. To fulfill this duty he went there every year and then returned to Damascus. After al-Afḍal's fall and death at Damascus, Ibn Nubata dedicated to him a threnody which he composed himself to a lie of mysticism and lost interest in all poets; this put an end to the happy period of Ibn Nubata's life. From then on he wandered from town to town in Syria, earning his livelihood by writing panegyrics. It was during this period that he was made superintendent of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. In 743/1342, Ibn Nubata was appointed secretary to the Chancellery (Dīwān al-īawah) at Damascus. His misfortunes at this time led him to write poems soliciting the support of the sultan ʿAbd ʿRaqīm, who ruled at Damascus from 710 to 723/1313-41, and whose famous poet he became. To him he addressed his most famous panegyrics, known as al-Muʾayyadīyyāt. Al-Malik al-Muʾayyad paid him an annual allowance, which he sent to him at Damascus. Ibn Nubata led at this period a happy life and wrote a number of literary treatises commissioned by al-Malik al-Muʾayyad. When the latter died in 732/1332, the poet wrote moving threnodies lamenting his death. Al-Afḍal, who succeeded his father and ruled Ḥamāt from 732 to 743/1332-41, continued for a time to patronize Ibn Nubata, but then he devoted himself to a life of mysticism and lost interest in all poets; this put an end to the happy period of Ibn Nubata's life. From then on he wandered from town to town in Syria, earning his livelihood by writing panegyrics. It was during this period that he was made superintendent of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. To fulfill this duty he went there every year and then returned to Damascus. After al-Afḍal's fall and death at Damascus, Ibn Nubata dedicated to him a threnody which was in fact a lament for the whole of the Ayyubid dynasty.

In 743/1342, Ibn Nubata was appointed secretary to the Chancellery (Dīwān al-īawah) at Damascus. His misfortunes at this time led him to write poems soliciting the support of the sultan ʿAbd ʿRaqīm, who ruled at Damascus from 710 to 723/1313-41, and whose famous poet he became. To him he addressed his most famous panegyrics, known as al-Muʾayyadīyyāt. Al-Malik al-Muʾayyad paid him an annual allowance, which he sent to him at Damascus. Ibn Nubata led at this period a happy life and wrote a number of literary treatises commissioned by al-Malik al-Muʾayyad. When the latter died in 732/1332, the poet wrote moving threnodies lamenting his death. Al-Afḍal, who succeeded his father and ruled Ḥamāt from 732 to 743/1332-41, continued for a time to patronize Ibn Nubata, but then he devoted himself to a life of mysticism and lost interest in all poets; this put an end to the happy period of Ibn Nubata's life. From then on he wandered from town to town in Syria, earning his livelihood by writing panegyrics. It was during this period that he was made superintendent of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. To fulfill this duty he went there every year and then returned to Damascus. After al-Afḍal's fall and death at Damascus, Ibn Nubata dedicated to him a threnody which was in fact a lament for the whole of the Ayyubid dynasty.

In 743/1342, Ibn Nubata was appointed secretary to the Chancellery (Dīwān al-īawah) at Damascus. His misfortunes at this time led him to write poems soliciting the support of the sultan ʿAbd ʿRaqīm, who ruled at Damascus from 710 to 723/1313-41, and whose famous poet he became. To him he addressed his most famous panegyrics, known as al-Muʾayyadīyyāt. Al-Malik al-Muʾayyad paid him an annual allowance, which he sent to him at Damascus. Ibn Nubata led at this period a happy life and wrote a number of literary treatises commissioned by al-Malik al-Muʾayyad. When the latter died in 732/1332, the poet wrote moving threnodies lamenting his death. Al-Afḍal, who succeeded his father and ruled Ḥamāt from 732 to 743/1332-41, continued for a time to patronize Ibn Nubata, but then he devoted himself to a life of mysticism and lost interest in all poets; this put an end to the happy period of Ibn Nubata's life. From then on he wandered from town to town in Syria, earning his livelihood by writing panegyrics. It was during this period that he was made superintendent of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. To fulfill this duty he went there every year and then returned to Damascus. After al-Afḍal's fall and death at Damascus, Ibn Nubata dedicated to him a threnody which was in fact a lament for the whole of the Ayyubid dynasty.
Ibn Nubata wrote many prose works mentioned in the ididza which he gave to his pupil Salah al-Din al-Ṣaḍāḥ, and listed also by Brockelmann. In accordance with the fashion of the period, Ibn Nubata’s prose is characterized by mannerisms of style. The most important of these works were written at the request of the ruler of Hamāt, al-Malik al-Muʿayyad, when the poet was in Syria; among them are: *Maṭla* al-fawā'id, a work of adab praised by some men of letters of the period; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-muṣawwār*, biographies of the scholars of the period; *Ṣurk al-ayyad*, a commentary on the *Sārghitmish*, and died in 970/1563, when he had not yet reached the limit of his intellectual development; (4) Ibn Nubbaym also wrote commentaries on several handbooks of law, except that he was born in Cairo in 926/1520, studied in Cairo and several times afterwards; it is one of the great handbooks of the Hanafi madhab.

Zayn al-Din’s younger brother ʿUmār, also called Ibn Nuqaym, studied under him and wrote another commentary on the Kān al-daḥāʾib, called al-Nahr al-fāʾīḥ; he died suddenly, presumably poisoned by a jealous wife of his, in 1005/1596 and was buried near his brother (al-Muhībī, Khiṣāṣ al-ʿulār, iii, 206).

**Bibliography:**

Nubata was particularly interested in the systematic structure of ʿikb, and this interest shows itself in his literary activity, which was very extensive.

(1) His Kītāb al-ʿagāb wa l-nasīʿah (printed in Calcutta 1240/1825 and repeatedly in Cairo) is based on the usual subjects of Islamic and Arabic learning, started to teach and to give fatūās at an early age while his teachers were still alive, performed the ḥadīṯ in 953/1547, taught at the madrasa of the amir Şarghtimish, and died in 970/1563, when he had not yet reached the limit of his intellectual development; he was buried near the sanctuary of Sayyida Sukayna. Ibn Nubata’s work on the ʿikb al-dāna, which he criticizes the Andalusians (text in Ibn al-Nakib (694-764/1294-1362), and Saʿd ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, al-Mustaḥaffad, Cairo 1344, vii, 249; Ahmad Amin and others, *Sarh al-ʿuyun* (Cairo 1964) contains further bibliographical references and a list of Ibn Nubata’s works.
IBN RA'IK, or MUHAMMAD B. RA'IK, first amir al-umārāʾ (q.v.) of the 'Abbāsid caliphate. The son of an officer of the caliph al-Mu'taṣid, and of Khazar origin, Ibn Ra'ik had been chief of police, and then chamberlain during the reign of al-Muktaḍir. On the accession of al-Kāḥir, at first in disgrace for having supported the former caliph and having fled from Baghdaḏ, he succeeded in being made governor of al-Ḍār al-Ṣafira. With the accession of Rabbān, he was made governor also of Wāṣṣi, because he was one of the most powerful governors, and had no scruples about withholding the payments which were due from him in order to make difficulties for the caliph and the vizier. He obtained, through his appointment as amir al-umārāʾ (q.v. "commander of the commanders"), the chief command of the army, together with responsibility for the financial administration and for maintaining order throughout the empire (342/953–954). During the two years of his ascension, Ibn Ra'ik concerned himself mainly with depriving the caliph of every means of defence, and ordered for this reason the massacre of the Ḥudariyya (q.v.) guards, who had proved intractable. He also entered into conflict with the governors of the Ahwāz, the Banu 'l-Bardāl, from whom he attempted to take their province, and treated in a particularly cruel manner the former vizier Ibn Mukla (q.v.), who was intriguing against him. In spite of all this, he was removed from office in 362/973 by his own subordinate, Badjkam, who appointed him as governor of the Diyar Muḍar. After Badjkam's death, he seized the power from the new amir Kurānīkī and succeeded in getting himself appointed again as amir al-umārāʾ in 372/982/September 941. But he was not long in office, as he was assassinated in Raḡāb (330/April 942) by the Hamdānīn al-Ḥasan b. Abū 'l-Allāh, who felt himself to be threatened by him.

of the Al-Tidjani (d. after 708/1308) and especially of Ibn al-Rakik (ca. 706/1306-7), al-Nuwayri (d. 732/1331-2), Ibn Khaldun (d. 808/1405-6) and al-Mafcrizi (d. 846/1442-3). Al-Sakhawi (I, 222; d. 908/1496-7), al-Shamakhî, and even al-Wazir al-Sarrâdh (Izial, p. 289 ff.), who was writing in 1137/1724-5, appear to quote directly from him. Today, however, the Ta'rîkh of Ibn al-Rakik, although it is constantly referred to as surviving in certain private libraries in Tunisia, cannot in fact be traced. An anonymous fragment (Ibn al-Katta, ed. M. al-Ka'bi, who attributes it to Ibn al-Rakik; but this attribution is in fact very dubious. It should be noted finally, if the passages borrowed from Ibn al-Rakik's work are to be correctly interpreted, that although compiled or written with scrupulous care it is coloured by the šī'ī sympathies of its author, a fact which seems to have been forgotten or overlooked by the historians who have identified long fragments from it.

Ibn al-Rakik, who in 388/998 was sent by the Zirid Bâdis on a diplomatic mission to al-Hâkim of Egypt, seems, to judge from a poem reproduced by Yâkuţ (Mu'âşim, i, 222-4), to have stayed for a long time in Cairo, of whose delights 'al-lafz' writes poignantly and nostalgically. Among his other works not yet traced, there are mentioned: Kitab al-Nisâ' (on women); al-Hâfiz wa 'l-irtiyaf (on pleasures); al-Aghâni (on songs); and Nasm al-suluk fi mus'amardt al-mulâk (a manual for the perfect courtier).

Bibliography: The sources are given by Brockelmann, i, 161, S I, 252; Amari, Storia, ed. Nallino, 1933, i, 39; Zirid, ed. i, 51-2; H. R. Idris, Zirides, i, XIV and ii, 81-2. The best biographical notice on Ibn al-Rakik is that by Yâkuţ, Mu'âşim al-udâbâ, Cairo ed. 1936, i, 216-26. (M Talbi)

IBN RAŞHÎD [see Rashid, al.]

IBN RAŞHÎ, Ābî 'Alî Ḥâsan b. Raşhî Raşik al-Kayrawâni, and also al-Āzîd, al-Masflî, one of the most illustrious men of letters of Ifrikiya, born 390/1000 at M'sila (Masla = Muhammadiyya) in the region of Constantine. His father, known by the single name Rashik, was probably a freed slave of the Azd. He followed the trade of goldsmith in Byzantine origin (rumî), who had become a client of the Azd. He followed the trade of goldsmith in M'sila, where the young Hasan, after his first studies, soon revealed his poetic talents, as well as a taste for energy: witty, jovial, high-spirited, and indeed a conscious artistic elegance, in which the poet's qualities, his charming character and his boundless
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metre (al-mā'ām), rhyme (al-ḥāfiya), and the culture, intelligence and dexterity of the poet who must be able to handle all types with the same ease and to adapt his poetry according to the subject, the circumstances and the public. The work concludes with some particulars about the life of the Arabs, their language and the knowledge required in order to develop poetic talent. The quotations, which are varied and accompanied by comments, give this work on poetics a quality of adab which appreciably enhances it; the reasoned and well-founded judgements which accompany the exposition throughout all al-Umda in themselves allow Ibn Rashik to be ranked as one of the greatest Arab literary critics. Making use of the various currents of literary criticism which, from Ibn Sallām to al-ʿAskari, through Kudāma, al-ʿĀmidī and al-Dījrānī, reached its final but incomplete form in the East, Ibn Rashik, who devoted himself to the criticism of poetry, composed a work of synthesis that was at once rational, systematic and original, in which he did not confine himself to a theoretical exposé or to the study of one aspect of poetry or of a single poet, but dealt with poetry in its entirety and as a man of letters, since this criticism flows from the complete and copiously illustrated exposition of poetics, as well giving a place, along with the classical criteria, to taste and the "literary sense".

The favourite problem of the Arab literary critic, plagiarism (al-sarīka)—already considered at the end of al-Umda—became with him, in a remarkable work, Kurādat al-dhakhāb fi nādaq ʿabīr al-ʿArab (ed. Khāndjī, Cairo 1926; ed. Ch. Bouyahia, forthcoming), a study of poetic creation, and more precisely of the particular use made by each poet of poetic themes and the art of expressing them, and, to some extent, of the evolution of Arab poetry. Ibn Rashik's method of literary criticism finds its application in his admirable Ummdhad al-samān flī ḥārār al-Kayrawān (a lost work, the substance of which has, however, mostly been preserved in later biographical dictionaries, which often adopted it as a model, closely imitated but never equalled; Ibn al-ʿAbbār makes no secret of this fact for his Tuhāt al-bāḍīm, incomplete ed. under the title al-Muṣlihad min K. Tuhāt, Cairo 1948, ed. idem, Tuhfat al-kidam, Cairo 1326/1908, 220; al-Wazīr al-Sarrādī, al-Bulāl al-sundusiyā, Tunis 1287/1870-1, 99-102; Rādi lī Khālid, Istanbul ed., 185, 301, 973, 1029, 1160, 1907, 1918; Brockelmann, i, 307, S I, 539-40; H. H. Abū al-Wāḥab, Bisdīt al-shīr fi ḫāratī al-Kayrawān wa-ḥādirāt Ibn Rashik, Tunis 1330/1911-2, idem, al-Muntakhab al-madrasi, Cairo 1944, 75-8; Abū al-ʿAzīz al-Maymānī, Ibn Rashik, Cairo 1343/1924-5; idem, al-Nuṭaf min zihr Ibn Rashik, Cairo 1343/1924-5; Muḥ. al-Nafyār, Ḫanān al-arīb, Tunis 1351/1932-3, i, 52-4; M. Amari, Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia, Catania 1932-9, i, 39, ii, 562-7; Ch. Fallāt, Ibn Ṣhrāf al-Kayrawānī: Questions de critique littéraire, Algiers 1953, Introd. XVIII-XXIII; A. Trabulsi, La Critique politique des Arabes, Damascus 1956, 105-7, and passim; Abū al-Razzām Yāghī, Hayāt al-Kayrawānī wa maqābīt Ibn Rashik minhā, Beirut 1962; idem, Ṭawiw Ibn Rashik al-Kayrawānī, Beirut n.d.; H. R. Idrīs, Zīrids, ii, 792-4 and index; And ibn Wāḥab, al-Qudrāt, Beirut 1965/6, 233-44; see also Bibli. to Ibn Ṣhrāf for their polemics.

(Ch. Bouyahia)

IBN RASHIK
Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Razzām al-Kushayrī, ruler of Murcia, 1492/1493-1501/1502. He is first heard of as ʿdāmi of Ḫīn Balī, the modern Vilches, in 1474/1481. In this year Ibn ʿAmīr [q.v.] stayed with Ibn Rashik on his way from Seville to take Murcia from Ibn Ṣhrāf for his master al-Mūtamīd Ibn Ṣhabīb. Ibn ʿAmīr and Ibn Rashik formed an association, as a result of which, and by a process of which the accounts differ, Ibn Rashik became the independent ruler of Murcia. Ibn Rashik's position, like that of his neighbours at Valencia and Almeria, was precarious, being threatened both by internal strife and continual pressure from the Christians. Indeed the Christians possessed an outpost in the very heart of Ibn Rashik's territory at Aledo, 45 km south-west of Murcia.

The advent of the Almoravids and the great defeat suffered by the Christians at Zallaqa (479/1086) had but slight immediate effect on the Levante. Ibn Rashik was obliged to pay a token tribute to Muṭamīd and Aledo remained in Christian hands. Yūsuf b. Ṭashfin's second expedition put an end to this situation. Yūsuf made directly for Aledo


(Ch. Bouyahia)
and laid siege to it with the help of his Andalusian allies (481/1088). He had already made a pact with Mu'tamid that Murcia should be restored to him and, though it seems that Ibn Rashik contrived to postpone the evil hour for a time, he was finally deposed under suspicion of actually helping the Christians besieged at Aledo and was delivered as a prisoner to Mu'tamid. 'Abd Allāh the Zirī says that Mu'tamid had him put to death but according to Ibn al-Khaṭīb he was kept prisoner at Seville until released by the Almoravids when they took possession of the city in 484/1093. His subsequent fate is unrecorded.


**IBN RAWAHA** (see 'Abd Allāh b. RAWAWA).

**IBN AL-RAWANDI or AL-RAWANDI,** Abu 'l-Husayn Ahmad b. Yahya b. Ishāk, Mu'tazill and heretic, born at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century. The unsolved problem of the date of his death (the middle or the end of the 4th/ioth century) should probably be decided, in spite of certain indications to the contrary, in favour of the earlier date, given that his work on the supposed criticism of prophecy by the Brahmans (see **ABARİMA** but the article omit to mention this point) is already mentioned in an unannounced fragment by the Jewish mutakallim Dāwūd b. Marwān al-Raḥḥal, known as al-Muḳammi, whose literary activity was not later than the last third of the 3rd/9th century (cf. G. Vajda, in Oriens, xv [1962], 61: 2.).

Ibn al-Rawandi's intellectual development is difficult to trace. At first an adherent of Mu'tazilism, he then left his friends and attacked them mercilessly, emphasizing their real or apparent inconsistencies, deducing heretical conclusions from their speculations, and provoking from them, but probably after he had left them, refutations no less violent. His attachment, at least temporarily, to Shi'ism seems underlain by a 'Bābī'ian' streak, even in the essay that he turned after this to free thought (sandawa), perhaps under the influence of Abū Ṭās al-Warrāq (q.v.), as stormy a figure as himself. It is not clear whether he ended as a sceptic or whether there is some truth in the Mu'tazila's claim that he finally repented. Whatever the facts may have been, a discerning scholar like al-Tawḥīdī (q.v.) pays homage to his periplicity and his perfect mastery of language.

There are also several obscure points in the bibliography of Ibn al-Rawandi. The Fīrīst gives two lists of works which were attributed to him: one consists of eight titles, the other, incompletely transmitted, thirty-seven, the first seven of which are considered to date from his Mu'tazilī period; the second list contains none of the titles enumerated in the first except 'Azwān, Našr, al-Bika, Dāmīgī, Kādīb, Fardā (or Firdān?), Mūḏqān, Luluʻa; on the other hand it lists, under numbers 34, 35 and 36, some refutations supposedly composed by Ibn al-Rawandi himself (see J. Fück, Texts ... from Ibn al-Nadīm's Kitāb al-Fīrīst, in Professor Muhammad Shafī'ī's Presentation Volume, Lahore 1955, 72 f.). H.S. Nyberg has compiled (Arabic introduction to his ed. of the K. al-İnüşār, Cairo 1925, 32 f., in French in A. N. Nader, Kitāb al-İnüşār, Le Livre du Triomphe...). 

Beirut 1957, xxvii-xx) a list of nineteen works to which should be added a Kitāb al-Khāṣṣī and perhaps a Kitāb al-Ma'taṣīla, refuted by al-Djabbār (see A. Borisov, in S.O., iv [1947], 81 f.).

Fragments of three of his works are preserved in works written by those who refuted his ideas: (1) the Kitāb Faṣfaṣāl al-Mu'taṣīla is contained, divided up but the major part of it reproduced, in the Kitāb al-Inüşār of al-Khayyāt. Ibn al-Rawandi's attack was in its first part a reply to an apologia, or rather a panegyric, of the Mu'tazilī school (Faṣfaṣāl al-Mu'taṣīla, q.v.) by al-Khayyāt, who maintains of a defence of the Shi'ī. Nyberg's ed. has been reproduced, with a French translation (to be used with caution) by A. N. Nader, Beirut 1957. (2) Fragments of his Kitāb al-Dāmīgī, written against the Kurān, were reproduced by the kātib 'Abd al-Djabbār (q.v.) in the course of his refutation (also lost) of Abū 'Ali al-Djabbār (q.v.). These fragments are not the same as those reproduced later by Ibn al-Djawi in his Minhaj (see Ibn al-Mu'taṣīla, xvi, Cairo 1380/1960, 389-94, and also 156 and 416. The purely dialectical refutation of the Baharīma in vol. xv of al-Mugham, Cairo 1915, 109-6, does not mention Ibn al-Rawandi at all, but see pp. 73 and 127; see also by the same, Tāhīth dal'il al-nubuwalla, ed. 'Abd al-Karim 'Uṯmān, Beirut 1956, 51-63, 90 f., 128 f., 222, 224, 232, where the use of Ibn al-Rawandi's works by Shi'ī propagandists is stressed. (3) Some fragments of the Kitāb al-Zumurrud are preserved in the Madījah of the Ismaʿīlī al-Muʿayyadī fī 'l-Dīn (q.v.), ed. and tr. by P. Kraus in Beiträge (see bibl.).

The quotations, whose verbatim accuracy is not certain, which are found in the Kitāb al-Tawḥīd of al-Māturīdī (q.v.), MS Cambridge Add. 3581, 96 v., 101 v. (particularly against al-Warrāq) and in Naṣīr-i Khusrav (q.v.), Kitāb-i Di jamīʿ al-Ḫulma tāy, ed. Corbin-Molin, Tehran 1953, 232 f. (against the "Hašnīya", but it does not deal with those who are usually referred to by this name in the Sunni sources) have still to be investigated.

The plentiful extracts from the K. al-Zumurrud provide a fairly clear indication of the most heterodox doctrine of Ibn al-Rawandi, that for which posterity has been least willing to forgive him: a biting criticism of prophecy in general and of the prophecy of the First Three Khilafahs in particular that for which posterity has been least willing to forgive him: a biting criticism of prophecy in general and of the prophecy of the First Three Khilafahs in particular, which should be added a Kitāb al-Khāṣṣī and perhaps a Kitāb al-Ma'taṣīla, refuted by al-Djabbār (see A. Borisov, in S.O., iv [1947], 81 f.).

Fragments of three of his works are preserved in works written by those who refuted his ideas: (1) the Kitāb Faṣfaṣāl al-Mu'taṣīla is contained, divided up but the major part of it reproduced, in the Kitāb al-Inüşār of al-Khayyāt. Ibn al-Rawandi's attack was in its first part a reply to an apologia, or rather a panegyric, of the Mu'tazilī school (Faṣfaṣāl al-Mu'taṣīla, q.v.) by al-Khayyāt, who maintains of a defence of the Shi'ī. Nyberg's ed. has been reproduced, with a French translation (to be used with caution) by A. N. Nader, Beirut 1957. (2) Fragments of his Kitāb al-Dāmīgī, written against the Kurān, were reproduced by the kātib 'Abd al-Dijabbār (q.v.) in the course of his refutation (also lost) of Abū 'Ali al-Djabbār (q.v.). These fragments are not the same as those reproduced later by Ibn al-Djawi in his Minhaj (see Ibn al-Mu'taṣīla, xvi, Cairo 1380/1960, 389-94, and also 156 and 416. The purely dialectical refutation of the Baharīma in vol. xv of al-Mugham, Cairo 1915, 109-6, does not mention Ibn al-Rawandi at all, but see pp. 73 and 127; see also by the same, Tāhīth dal'il al-nubuwalla, ed. 'Abd al-Karim 'Uṯmān, Beirut 1956, 51-63, 90 f., 128 f., 222, 224, 232, where the use of Ibn al-Rawandi's works by Shi'ī propagandists is stressed. (3) Some fragments of the Kitāb al-Zumurrud are preserved in the Madījah of the Ismaʿīlī al-Muʿayyadī fī 'l-Dīn (q.v.), ed. and tr. by P. Kraus in Beiträge (see bibl.).

The quotations, whose verbatim accuracy is not certain, which are found in the Kitāb al-Tawḥīd of al-Māturīdī (q.v.), MS Cambridge Add. 3581, 96 v., 101 v. (particularly against al-Warrāq) and in Naṣīr-i Khusrav (q.v.), Kitāb-i Di jamīʿ al-Ḫulma tāy, ed. Corbin-Molin, Tehran 1953, 232 f. (against the "Hašnīya", but it does not deal with those who are usually referred to by this name in the Sunni sources) have still to be investigated.

The plentiful extracts from the K. al-Zumurrud provide a fairly clear indication of the most heterodox doctrine of Ibn al-Rawandi, that for which posterity has been least willing to forgive him: a biting criticism of prophecy in general and of the prophecy of the First Three Khilafahs in particular, which should be added a Kitāb al-Khāṣṣī and perhaps a Kitāb al-Ma'taṣīla, refuted by al-Djabbār (see A. Borisov, in S.O., iv [1947], 81 f.).
the bibliography prior to its publication; there should be added (what follows is a selection only): for the works of Ibn al-Rawandi in Arabic literature, S. Poznański, in MGWJ, ii (1907), 731 ff.; other details of this (and in particular of the affinity between Ibn al-Rawandi and the slightly later Jewish heretic Hayyayawāy al-Balghī) in the work in Hebrew by M. Zucker, Rav Saadia Gaon's Translation of the Torah, New York 1959, 13-5, 29-33; see also G. Vajda, in REJ, xcix (1953), 88 f. A. Badawi has translated into Arabic a Cronograph of Ibn Khrais al-ţawgī al-îltamāsī fi 'l-ta'ābīr al-îltamāsī, Cairo 1945, 77-88. Passages from Persian sources, Táwḥīd: al-Imād wa l-mu'āwnās, Cairo 1937/1933, ii, 14 and al-Baṣīd wa l-dhāhīdār, same date and place, 183. The notice by Ibn Mūrtāda on Ibn al-Rawandi may be read in the ed. by S. Diwald-Wilzer, Die Klassen der Musulmānien, Wiesbaden 1961, 92, lines 1-5. The passage from Ibn al-Anbārī, Nawādat al-alībī, quoted by Kraus, Berti, 379, is found in the most recent ed. by I. Sāmarrātī, Bāhdād 1959, 150. See also the notices in Brockelmann, S I, 340 f., in F. Sezgin, GAS, i, 1967, 620 f. and in Zirikli, As'Lāmāh, i, 252 ff.; further, H. S. Nyberg, 'Amr Ibn Udbaid et Ibn al-Rawandi, deux reprouvés, in Classicisme et déclin culturel dans l'histoire de l'Islam, Paris 1957, 125-36. A preliminary sketch, so far only fragmentary, of a doctrinal study (premature in view of the state of the documentation but excellent so far as it goes) is J. van Ess, in Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie, xlv (1953), 79-85 and Die Erkenntnislehre des ^Adudaddīn al-lci, Wiesbaden 1966, passages indicated in the analytical index, p. 492. (P. Kraus-[G. Vajda])

Ibn Ridwan, Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Ali b. Ridwan b. 'Ali b. Da'far al-Miṣrī, a renowned physician and medical author and polemist of Egypt. He is well informed about his life and personal circumstances because he composed an autobiography, the essence of which has been preserved by Ibn Abī Ḫasyiba, when he was approaching sixty. It is pervaded by a strong feeling of complacency which is, perhaps, explained by his experiences and explains, in its turn, his addiction to polemics. He was born in 386/998, the son of a baker in Giza (Dūza) near Cairo. He was very poor, had a hard youth, and had to earn his living and the money for his instruction by astrological forecasting in the streets and by similar means. He never had a teacher in medicine, which became a matter of reproach to him later, and he studied exclusively from books. He says himself that he did not possess the means to pay the apprentice's fee demanded by medical practitioners. He also was unable to marry until he was thirty. But after his thirtieth year he began to acquire a good medical reputation, and when he was appointed Chief Physician of Egypt by the Fāṭimid Caliph of Cairo (it cannot have been al-Ḥākim who disappeared in 411/1021), when Ibn Ridwan was only twenty-three years old, but probably al-Muṣtaṣirīn, 427/1036-487/1094), he acquired prosperity and wealth. Abu 'l-ʿMuṣṭarkar al-Husayn b. Maḍīn, the ruler of Makran [q.v.], consulted him when he was stricken by hemiplegia. Ibn Ridwan never left Egypt and perhaps not even the immediate neighbourhood of Cairo, where he became "one of the foremost to give information about the branches of knowledge in which he claimed authority" (Ibn al-Kiftī). The site of his house remained known for a long time. According to Ibn Abī Ḫasyiba, he adopted an orphan girl in the period of famine and plague which started in 445/1053, and he educated her and she grew up in his house; but once when he left her alone, she took possession of his goods and she was never heard of again and fled, and nothing more was heard of her; thereafter, his mind became deranged. Ibn Ridwan was inclined to acrimonioum polemics against his predecessors and contemporaries, including Ḥunayn b. Isbāṭ, al-Rāzī, Ibn al-Dīazzār, Ibn al-Tayyib, Ibn Būṭlān [qq.v.], and others. Whereas he is unanimously praised as a medical practitioner, and Ibn Abī Ḫasyiba calls him "a better medical man (than Ibn Būṭlān) and better trained in the philosophical and associated sciences", he does not seem to be satisfied with his personal relationships. According to Ibn al-Kiftī, he was a man of narrow mind and not of sound judgment. He was, moreover, not of good looks and appearance. Nevertheless, many pupils followed his lectures and studied under him, and his fame spread abroad"; but "his pupils used to relate about him ridiculous things concerning his medical arguments, astrological sayings and logical assertions, if those who have related them are right." Among his disciples were the Fāṭimid prince, philosopher, and bibliophile al-Mubāshshīr b. 奋斗目标 [q.v.], who had an argument". This is amply borne out by the passage from Ibn al-Kiftī. Among his disciples were the Fatimid prince, philosopher, and bibliophile al-Mubāshshīr b. 奋斗目标 [q.v.], who had an argument". This is amply borne out by the passage from Ibn al-Kiftī, who called his works not "a call to deviate in the least from the thought of Galen, to such a degree that he did not allow an original thinker such as al-Rāzī to deviate in the least from the thought of Galen, and indeed most of his polemics have their starting-point in this contention of his. In addition, as Ibn Abī Ḫasyiba observes, Ibn Ridwan "was insolent in what he said, and he abused those with whom he had an argument". This is amply borne out by the contents of his treatises against Ibn Būṭlān (see below).

Among his more important and better known works are: (a) A Commentary on the Quadrupartium of Ptolemy (Sharḥ al-makāliṭa al-arba'ā li-Bāllāmīsāt); it was translated into Latin and into Turkish, and the Latin translation was printed, together with the Quadrupartium itself, among the incunabula of Venice (and later) several times: (2) a Commentary on Galen's Ars parsa (Sharḥ al-sīnadā al-sāqhirā li-Qāmilīnā); this too, was translated into Latin, and the translation was repeatedly printed, together with the text of Galen, before and after 1500 (Brockelmann, i, 657, no. 74, and S. I, 886, no. 24 are to be combined); it was also translated into Hebrew; (3) Kālid al-ʿUṣāl fi l-fībāb, a compendium (kabābīd),
another of Ibn Riḍwān’s books to have been translated into Hebrew; (4) al-Kitāb al-Nafis fi taḥīm ṣindūt al-jibb’, in Ibn Riḍwān, displaying a remarkable knowledge of Greek medical writers, tries to show that learning medicine from books is preferable to learning from teachers, turning the necessity of his own study into a virtue; the work contains important information on the transmission of Greek science to the Arabs; summary of the existing part in Schacht-Meyerhof, Controversy, 20–8; (5) Risāla fi ḍaf‘ maqaḍ ar-rādī bī‘ard Miṣr, a treatise dealing with the effects of disease in Egypt and Cairo, the plague and its causes, preventive measures and hygienic rules for the inhabitants of Egypt, including a medical topography of Cairo and its suburbs in the 5th/11th century; translation of this last section by M. Meyerhof in Sitzungsber. d. Physikalisch-medicinischen Gesellschaft, liv, Erlangen 1923, 219–24, and in Comptes rendus du Congrès international de médecine tropicale et d’hygiène, ii, Cairo 1929, 251–52; see also K. Voliers, ZDMG, xxvii (1890), 386 f.; (6) finally, his controversy with Ibn Bültan of which three treatises of his have been preserved (edited and translated in Schacht-Meyerhof, Controversy), whereas two and perhaps three more have been lost; the controversy started from a disputed point of physiology, and perhaps three more have been lost; the controversy started from a disputed point of physiology, and finished with Ibn Riḍwān calling upon the practitioners of Cairo to boycott Ibn Bültan.


IBN RŪḤ, ABU ‘L-KĀSIM HUSAYN b. Rūḥ b. Abī Bahr al-Nawbāṭī, third safīr or wakil (305/917–326/938) of the absent twelfth imām of the Twelver Shi‘a, during the lesser Ghayba [q.v.]. Of the Nawbāṭī family only on the mother’s side, he was from Kūm. He held the title bāb already under Ḥasan ‘Askarī [q.v.], and transmitted ḏadīths from earlier imāms. Appointed successor by the second safīr, Abī Dā‘far al-Umari, despite some opposition, he made himself the unquestioned centre of Twelver Shi‘ism at Baghdād under al-Muṣṭādir. During a time in hiding, he appointed al-Shalmaḏānī [q.v.], his deputy, but then denounced him as a heretic. Along with his adherents, the Banū Furāt, Ibn Rūḥ was accused of correspondence with the Karāmūṭa. For five years (312/924–317/929) he was imprisoned, allegedly on a fiscal complaint. Freed by Mu‘ānis, under al-Kādī he was favoured by the court. Ibn Rūḥ calmed disputes among Shi‘ī courtiers and suavely avoided giving offence to Sunnis. Before his death, he appointed Abu l-Ḥasan al-Samarrī his successor.


IBN AL-RŪMĪ, ABU ‘L-HĀSA IN AL-‘AABS B. DURAYDĪ (or Djurdjí or Djurjí), poet of the 3rd/9th century, was born at Baghdād on 2 Rajab 221/21 June 836 and died there in 283/896 (some sources give the date of his death as 276/889 or 284/ 897). His father, al-‘Abbās, a Byzantine freedman and a client of ‘Ubayy Allāh b. Ṯā‘ār b. Dī‘ār, was probably the first member of the family to embrace Islam. His mother Ḥāsana, the daughter of ‘Abbās Allāh al-Sīdī, was of Persian origin.

Little is known of his studies. It is known, however, that he went to a school attended by upper-class children and that he was the pupil of Mūsāmād b. Hābīb, the friend of his father and like him the son of a freedman and a client of the Banu l-‘Abbās. At various times he was in contact with Thālab, al-Mubarrad, al-Zaḥrīyādī, al-Asbakhī fī iṣābāh al-Banū al-Sarrādī and many other men of letters of the period, which provided him with a solid cultural background, the evidence of which is found in his work.

Al-Mas‘ūdī comments that “poetry was only the least of his talents”, and al-Ma‘arrī describes him as being primarily a philosopher. During his lifetime his fame as a “scholar” seems to have weighed heavily upon him; some spiteful critics considered that it accorded ill with the bouts of drinking from which he was unable to refrain.

His poetic talent showed itself at an early age. There exist poems which he is said to have composed while at school, and at the age of twenty he had already made his name as a poet. His poems were the subject of study and commentary, and he no longer paid any attention to malicious criticism. Convinced of his own worth and of the poet’s sacred right to receive due reward, he preferred a career as a composer of panegyric to an appointment at the chancery which had been offered to him and which later he was to seek in vain.

His violent Shi‘ism and his Muʿtazilism inevitably closed to him the doors of the court, to which he gained access only towards the end of his life. The branch of the Abāsids of which he was the client was unable to be of any help to him. Ṯā‘ār b. Dī‘ār, the father of his patron ‘Ubayy Allāh, was the brother of Zuhayr b. ʿAbd Allāh, the brother of al-Ma‘mūn who succeeded, in spite of the opposition of the Hāšimi majority, in having his nephew proclaimed heir presumptive and in the conflict which arose soon after between al-Amin and al-Ma‘mūn, he had opened taken the side of the former. Al-Ma‘mūn’s victory banished him and his descendants from the court, and no further mention of the latter is found.

In 250/864, Ibn al-Rūmī, who until then had
maintained a certain labiyya, openly gave his support to the Zaydi revolt begun at Kufa by the Tālibi Yabāy b. 'Umar. Each of the two lamentations which he dedicated to Yabāy was a Shi'i manifestation of a call to revolt and a violent and insulting threat directed at the ʿAbbāsids. This same hostility to the dynasty is found in other poems preserved in the Diwān.

But the poet seems to have regained the favour of his patrons under the regency of al-Muwaffak, the brother of al-Muʿtāmid, who adopted a conciliatory policy towards the ʿAlids. He is even said to have fallen in love with the sarrāja bint al-Muwaffak, the sister of al-Muwaffak, who continued the policy of his father and who, himself a poet, brought back the vanished tradition of the Bayāt al-Ḥikma by establishing in his palace various scholars and men of letters.

As the result of his long opposition to the party in power, Ibn al-Rūmī must have been obliged to seek for wealthy patrons outside the court. His Diwān gives numerous suggestions to this end. Both Tahir and especially with Ubayd Allah b. ʿAbd Allāh, Ahmād b. al-Ḥāṣib, ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Yazād, Ahmād b. ʿIsārāl, ʿIsārāl b. Bubbul, ʿṢādī b. Makhḍam and his son al-ʿAllā, the Banū Wahb and especially al-Ḵāṣim b. Ubayd Allāh, Ahmād b. Thawāba, ʿĪbrahim b. al-Mudabbir, the Banū ʿDjarraḥ, the Banū ʿFurāt, the Banū Nawbakhāṭ, and a great number of minor secretaries too many to enumerate. Many of them showed him favour and gave him presents. But he was extravagant, thriftless and difficult to please, and his praise almost always turned to invective against those who had not fulfilled all his wishes. It must also be recognized that the attitude he had adopted towards the authorities earlier in his life discouraged some high officials from compromising themselves by rewarding him. Others were unable to forget his Byzantine and Christian origin, in spite of his being a Muslim and in spite of the fanatical anti-Christian attitude which, as a new convert, he adopted. Yet others were offended by his arrogance and aggressiveness, and by the proud and threatening manner which he sometimes adopted when reminding them of a promise or trying to hasten a gift. His bitter and sometimes even scurrilous epigrams caused a fair share of the receipts to remain. It is, however, difficult to believe that these epigrams were the direct cause of his death, as is stated, though with many reservations, in some Shi'i and Muṭazzīlī sources. Al-Ḵāṣim, who is accused of having had him poisoned at his table (it is the caliph who is accused in MS Paris 3594), had at this time not yet become vizier; he was engaged in avoiding any scandal and in trying to gain the good opinion of all in order to ensure that he would be appointed to succeed his father. His hatred of the Shi'i şīr and his bloodthirsty disposition did not become apparent until later. But the poet's death aroused suspicion because of the way in which al-Ḵāṣim's followers had intentionally spread rumours in order to frighten the poet, who had become old, sick and nervous. Nevertheless, the various details given of his final illness seem to be the signs of diabetes.

Popular rumour is also probably responsible for the fictional statements of the poet's pathological superstition and tendency to hypochondria. There seems nothing in his general life to justify them. Any truth which may lie behind these allegations may perhaps be sought in the last years of his life, when he lost one after the other the four (at least) children of his late marriage, as well as his wife, and found himself banished and threatened by his chief patron al-Rūmī.

Ibn al-Rūmī did not have the leisure to collect his poems into a Diwan himself. The first to undertake this was a certain al-Musayyabi, probably ʿAli b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Musayyab, a friend of the poet and the author of a biography of him which has not survived. They were then collected by al-Ṣāli, who produced another recension of the Diwan in which the poems were arranged alphabetically. His work was continued and completed by Abu ʿIyyāb, who is said to have added a thousand verses collected from the various existing recensions. The manuscripts of these recensions which have survived total nearly seventeen thousand verses.

Only a small part of this enormous Diwan has been published. In 1947, Muḥammad Sharif Salim had the two first letters printed; five years later there appeared five other letters published by the same editor, who also has collected and published some extracts, among which may be mentioned the anthology made by al-Bārūdī (Cairo 1909), the selection by Kāmil Kīlānī (Cairo 1924) and that by al-Ṣādīq (Cairo, circa 1930). In the greater part of his work Ibn al-Rūmī shows himself to be a neo-classicist; but his production was so varied that it is difficult to classify him with one specific school of poets. Indeed, side by side with formal poems, which in their thought, their art and their studied elegance foreshadow Muṭannaḥī, are found a great number of poems whose spontaneity, sensitivity, naturalness and clarity prefigure the expressive poetry of the Rūmīṣūl of Abū Firdaws and the nature-poems of which al-Ṣawwārī was to be the master. In addition there exist, in his Diwan, hundreds of poems, mainly short, in which he shows himself to be, more than anyone else among his contemporaries, a society poet, able to make rhymes at command and seeking to dazzle with his learning, his affections, his fondness for antiquity and his search for things witty and unusual. He was above all an example of the Baghdādi tradition which was to distinguish court poetry in the following century.

**Bibliography:** Early biographical sources: Masūdī, Muruǧī, index; Zubaydī, Tabātābāʾī, Cairo 1954, 125-7; Marzuqānī, Muḥājīm, Cairo 1960, 120, 124-5, 410; idem, Muṣawwār, Cairo 1935, 336, 338, 347-8, 357-8, 370; Tawḥīdī, Imdād, Cairo 1953, i, 17; al-Sharīf al-Murtādī, Amād, 1945 ed., i, 239, 290; Maṣʿārī, Ṣuhrān, Cairo 1963, index; Ḥuṣrī, Zahr al-ʿādīd, index; idem, Imdād al-dājunāḥ, index; Ibn Ṣārāf al-Kayrawānī, Masāʾīl al-intibāḥ, Algiers 1953, 34-5; Baghdādī, Taʾrīkh Bahgādī, no. 6387, xi, 23-6; Ibn Ṭabhīḥī, ʿUmdat, passim; Samʿānī, Amād, 1912, 190; Ibn al-Djawzī, Muntaṣar, v, ʿHāydarābād 1938, 165-8; ʿAṣālī, ʿIyārī, ii, 198; Ibn al-Aṯir, v, 159; Ibn Ṣallūkī, Wafayāt, Cairo 1946, no. 436, ii, 142; Ibn Tabātābāʾī, Ḩafṣrī, Paris 1895, 329-31, 345-6, 350; ʿYāḍī, Mirʿād al-dājunāḥ, Ḥāydarābād 1337, ii, 198-200; Ibn Ṭabhrī, Bidāya, Cairo 1946-51, xi, 74-5; Ibn Ṭabghīrībī, Cairo, iii, 69-76; Dawlat Shāh, Ṭadhkira, 23-4; Abūlī Hayyān, Maṣʿūdī al-tanṭūsī, Cairo 1949, i, 108; Ibn al-ʿImād, ʿIṣāḥārī, Cairo
IBN AL-RUMI — IBN RUSHD


To complete his education, Ibn al-Rumi went to the court of the Marinid ruler Uthman b. jiadiths two kadi al-mandkih. In 683/1284, he decided to travel to the east in order to perform the Pilgrimage to Mecca. At the invitation of Ibn al-Hakim al-Rundi, he went to the court of the Marinid ruler Uthman b. jiadiths two kadi al-mandkih.

FIHRI AL-SABTI, jurist and man of letters, a native, as indicated by his nisba, of Ceuta. He was a Maliki jurist, he was also an eloquent orator. Al-Makkari formed a friendship with him and travelled with him on the author's visits to Tunis, Damascus and Cairo, where he gave a commentary every day on the Koran in the great mosque of Khajib and offices of Mufti.

ABD ALLAH MUHAMMAD B. UMAR B. RUSHAYD AL-MARRAKUSHI, jurist and man of letters, a native, as indicated by his nisba, of Tunis, where he was born. He was born at Cordova in 520/1126 and died at Marrakush in 595/1198.

The sources are unanimous in praising the extent of Ibn Rushayd's learning, his competence in the science of hadith, his austerity and his modesty. A Malikî jurist, he was also an eloquent orator. Al-Makkari, who wrote about ten titles of works by Ibn Rushayd, they cover the science of hadith in all its aspects; mathematics; and Arabic language, literature and metrics.

Four works have survived in manuscript. The greatest part of his works, published Mîl al-mawrî bi-mi'jam al-qaysî bi-islâm al-rûshîdî, written in 689/1290 (MSS Escurial*, 1972/1 and 1785, a collection of biographies of Andalusian jurists, and the Kitâb al-Sanân al-abâyân wa l-mawrîd al-amân fi 'l-muhammâma bayâna 'l-îmâmâyîn fi 'l-îsmân al-muârikhîn (MS Escurial*, 1806), a biography of the traditionists of the Kharijites and Muslim. A short fragment (40 fols.) of the treatise on metrics by Ibn Rushayd, Dimasî mukhtasâr fi 'l-îsmâyûl, written in 689/1290 (MSS Escurial*, 1972/1 and 1785), a collection of biographies of Andalusian jurists, and the Kitâb al-Sanân al-abâyân wa l-mawrîd al-amân fi 'l-muhammâma bayâna 'l-îmâmâyîn fi 'l-îsmân al-muârikhîn (MS Escurial*, 1806), a biography of the traditionists of the Kharijites and Muslim. A short fragment (40 fols.) of the treatise on metrics by Ibn Rushayd, Dimasî mukhtasâr fi 'l-îsmâyûl, written in 689/1290 (MSS Escurial*, 1972/1 and 1785)


(R. ARIÉ)
Muhammad ibn Rizk and he became very competent in the science of kalām (controversies and contradictions in the legal sciences). He left his heart in the dialectic and the science of the traditions of the Prophet; but the same author says that the science of law and of the principles (usūl), ṣādiq, interested him more than the science of traditions, ṣawāda. He worked also on Ash'arī kalām which he was later to criticize. In medicine, he was the pupil of Abū Džafar ibn al-Abbar al-Marrakushi, who was in addition a teacher of hadith (cf. 'Uyūn). Ibn al-Abbar mentions another of his teachers, Abū Marwān ibn Džurrāyyūl (notice no. 1714), who (he says) was one of the foremost practitioners of his art. The biographers do not mention philosophical studies. Ibn Abī 'Uṣaybi'a limits himself to reporting, following al-Bāḏj, that Averroes studied "philosophical sciences" (al-ʿulām al-ḥikmāyya) with the physician Abū Džafar. Ibn al-Abbar mentions in passing that he "inclined towards the sciences of the Ancients (ʿulām al-aṣwāṣiʿ)" probably an allusion to his knowledge of Greek thought.

In 548/1153, Averroes was at Marrākūsh. Renan supposes that he was occupied there in carrying out the intentions of the Almohad Abū al-Munīn "in the building of colleges which he was founding at this time". It is known, through the Commentary of the De Caelo, that he was engaged there in astronomical observations. It is perhaps to this period of his life that he is referring in the Commentary of book Α of the Metaphysics, when he speaks of the researches which must be done on the movements of the planets in order to found an astronomy which would be physical and not only mathematical: "I hoped in my youth that it would be possible for me to carry out this research successfully; but now that I am old, I have lost this hope...". It is possible that he met at this time Ibn Tufayl, who was to play an important part in his career as a philosopher by presenting him to Abū Ya'qūb Yusuf, the successor of Abū al-Munīn. Al-Marrākūshī (Munṣīgib, ed. Dozy, 174-5) obtained the account of this interview from a pupil of Ibn Rushd, who reported the actual words of the teacher. The prince questioned Averroes on the possibility of this world having been created from nothing, and asked him whether it had a beginning. (It is known that, ever since Plato's Timaeus and the De Caelo and the Metaphysics of Aristotle down to Proclus, this had been a problem for Greek philosophers. It was only during the last years of his life that he was engrossed in the study of the nature of the universe (organum) and the First Cause (de creazione in the Muslim theology, New York 1903, 255). Indeed, not only was Averroes banished from Cordova, but several of his works were burned and forbidden, this study, which were considered dangerous to religion. Those who were jealous of Ibn Rushd or doctrinally opposed to him took advantage of the occasion to criticize him in vulgar epigrams, which have been published and translated by Munk (427-8 and 517).

But once he had returned to Marrākūsh, to a Berber milieu which was less sensitive on matters of doctrine, the caliph repealed all these edicts and summoned the philosopher again to his court. Ibn Rushd did not have long to enjoy this return to favour, since he died in Marrākūsh on 9 Safar 595/11 December 1198. He was buried there outside the gate of Taghzūt. Later his body was taken to Cordova, where the mystic Ibn al-'Arabī, still a young man, was present at his funeral (cf. H. Corbin, L'imagination créatrice dans le soufisme d'Ibn 'Arabī, 32-8).

II. Works. The chronology of the works of Averroes has been established by M. Alonso (La cronología en las obras de Averroes, in Miscelanea Camilliani, 1 (1943), 418-32) and later by A. H. M. Jones (Averroes: the caliph Yusuf, he had already written some paraphrases or short commentaries (ṯaṣfur) on the Organon, the Physics and the Metaphysics, as well as the first redaction of his great medical work, the Colliget (al-Kulliyāt, the Book of Generalities), requesting his friend Abū Marwān Ibn Žuhr to write a book on the "particularities" (al-ʿumār al-ḥisāyya, therapeutics), "so that their two works together should form a complete treatise on the art of medicine" (Ibn Abī 'Uṣaybi'a). He continued to write the short or middle commentaries (tallāḥīn) between 1169 and 1176. But from 1174 to 1180 was the period in which his original works were produced: "Treatises on the intellect", De substantia orbis, Faṣl al-makhāfi, Kāshī al-mandhīji, Tahāfut al-Tahāfut. The great commentaries (taṣfur) did not begin until later. M. Cruz Hernandez (La filosofía de Averroes, Madrid 1963, 253) has produced a clear outline of the various tendencies which have governed the study of Averroes' work. Whereas for the Latin schoolmen Averroes is essentially the Commentator: Averroes, che'li gran commento feo (Dante, Inferno, iv, 144). Renan points out the differences which can exist between the ideas contained in the commentaries and often presented as those of Aristotle, and the personal ideas of the philosopher.
Nevertheless, even where Ibn Rushd marks this distinction, Renan’s attitude is “this may have been only a precaution to allow him to express his philosophical ideas more freely under the cover of someone else” (Oeuvres complètes, iii, 67). A little later (67), on the subject of the Tahāfūt, he claims that “the doctrine set out in it is, on several points, in flagrant contradiction with that of Ibn Rushd”. It is true that he bases his judgement on the Latin version, in which he suspects there are interpolations. For him, as for the followers of Averroes in the Middle Ages, this is the one who, inspired by Aristotle, the rationalist method and doctrine, as much as he was opposed to religious dogmas. This being so, Renan, following his preconceptions, considers the theological writings as artifices intended to deceive or to provide a challenge to the inquisition of the Mālikī jufahārī. An examination of the biography and the work of Averroes shows that this assessment is entirely without foundation. Munk, on his side, has attempted to establish the validity of the “Tahāfūt” a number of analogous works of al-Fārābī on the philosopher and the prophet: “The double expression of one and the same truth, in terms which are abstract and clear on the one hand, in sensitive and symbolic terms on the other, philosophy and religion will thus exist side by side, without ever clashing, since, addressing themselves to two different categories of mind, their fields will remain entirely separate”. Cruz Hernandez concludes his investigation by showing the absurdity of making a priori a choice between the philosopher and the theologian. Since Averroes was never forced to dissociate his ideas, he considers that one must admit the sincerity of the whole work and the fundamental unity of the thought it expresses.

Only a small number of works in Arabic survive. The majority have been preserved only in Latin or Hebrew translations. Some manuscripts give the Arabic text in Hebrew characters. Brockelmann gives a list of the Arabic texts of Averroes, in his MFO, vi, a sur les philosophes arabes connus des latins, v, a list of the Arabic texts of Averroes, in MFO, viii/i (1922), may also be consulted. Among the works in Arabic which are known so far to have survived are: short or middle commentaries on the Physics (al-Sādūq al-fāḥshī); on the De Caelo et mundo (al-Sādūq wa ‘l-‘ulwiyya); on the De Generatione et corruptione (al-Kawn wa ‘l-fassād); on the Meteorologica (al-‘Abd wa ‘l-ma‘ṣīḥ); on the De Anima (al-Najjās); on metaphysical questions (Mā ba‘ḍ al-fāḥshī’ā); on the De Sensu et Sensibilitas (al-‘Abd wa ‘l-ma‘ṣīḥ), the great Commentary on the Metaphysics (Tafṣīr . . ., ed. M. Bouyges, Beirut 1936-48), the Fāṣīl al-makhālī and the Dimāgīa (ed. with Dr. L. Gauvrit, Tractī definitīvī, Algiers 1946, ed. G. F. Hourani, Leiden 1959), the Kāshf ‘an manāḥīdī al-adīlī (ed. with German tr., with the Fāṣīl, by M. J. Müller, Philosophie und Theologie von Averroes, Munich, text 1859, tr. 1875). There should also be mentioned the research and publications of ʿAbd al-ʿRahmān Badawi in Cairo.

III. The thought of Averroes. It seems certain that Ibn Rushd approached philosophy through the theoretical sciences. As a jurist, he was interested in the šarīʿi (on this question, see R. Brunschvig, Averroes juriste, in Études . . ., Paris 1962, 35-68). Ibn al-ʿAbdābāh mentions the importance of Kitāb Bidāyat al-muṣājāhāt wa-nīkhāyāt al-muḥtaṣābī fi ‘l-fikhr, and adds: “In it he gives the reasons for divergences, demonstrates their motivations and justifies them”. What interested him in law was a strictness of thought which, without going as far as that of philosophical syllogism, entailed a well-defined method of reasoning and a logic. On the other hand, it is known that he received his first education in philosophy from a physician. At the end of his book on the Generalities (Colliget), he stresses the method followed and writes: “We have assembled, in our propositions, the individual facts and the general questions. Whomever has grasped the generalities which we have written is capable of understanding what is correct and what is erroneous in the therapeutics of the writers of humādī” (‘Uyun). At the time when he was writing the Collabor, Averroes was studying the Organon and the Physics, which naturally led him to formulate the metaphysical problem. He thus saw in Aristotle mainly the logician who follows a strict method of demonstration, the scholar who starts from the concrete in order to explain it by linking it with general propositions. He was to grasp even better the theory of knowledge when writing a commentary on the Posterior Analytics (1170). This approach led him to discover the true Aristotle, and he thus learned to distinguish it from the image of him given by the Greek commentators such as Alexander of Aphrodisias and the Muslim faṣāṣīfī such as Ibn Sinā. This is why he criticized so vigorously the philosophy of Ibn Sinā, while respecting the medical work of his predecessor (he wrote a commentary on his medical poem al-‘Urūgūṣa fi ‘l-fīḥb). Among the other philosophers, he was interested in the ideas of al-Fārābī on logic and was inspired by his moral and political doctrines in the commentary which he wrote on Plato’s Republic. But he was chiefly in the tradition of Ibn Bāḍījī, and wrote a commentary on his Risāla on union with the Intellect and on his book on the “Regime of the solitary”. His relations with Ibn Ṭufayl are well known: Ibn Rushd wrote a commentary on Ḥāfiṣ b. Ḥāfṣ (q.v.). There are definite similarities between the two philosophers, but although Ibn Ṭufayl was interested in the independent attitudes inherent in philosophy and revealed faith, Ibn Ṭufayl the duality of the persons Ḥāfīz and Absāl who represent them (this is resolved, at the end of the myth, in a common life devoted to contemplation far from human society) leads to a mystic vision of knowledge, which is not at all to be found in Ibn Rushd, as Renan has clearly pointed out.

A. The theologico-philosophic treatises. It may be considered that they were written in the following order: Fāṣīl al-makālī and its appendix the Dimāgīa, Kāshf al-manāḥīdī (575/1179), which mentions the Fāṣīl, Tahāfūt al-Tahāfūt (which does not mention either of the two preceding works and which, according to Bouyges, was not written before 1180). (a) The Fāṣīl al-makālī wa taḥṣīlāt ma‘ṣīḥ lihāna min al-‘ittīḥād ("An authoritative treatise and exposition of the convergence which exists between the religious law and philosophy"). Ibn Rushd begins by giving a definition of philosophy entirely in accordance with the Kurʾānic recommendations. He himself quotes verses LIX, 2 and VII, 184, among others. It is a rational view of creation which leads to the knowledge of the Creator. These sacred texts are
interpreted as a recommendation to use either purely rational inferences (fiyds *akli), or to use them together with inferences based on the Law (fiyds *ahkmd), Thus the Law establishes the legitimacy of rational speculation (nasar), whose method reaches perfection with demonstrative syllogism (burhdn). Here Averroes was involved in a quarrel among the theologians about the definition of faith and what part it should play in intellectual knowledge. His reply is clear: "The Law imposes an obligation on the believer, since it must be obeyed when it commands rational research: thus the Law establishes the legitimacy of undertaking rational speculation, to proceed by degrees and to take account of what plays the same part in relation to speculation as instruments do in relation to action". This is less a fides quaerens intellectum than a perfect faith which embraces rational knowledge. It demands the knowledge of the kiyds *akli, which is indispensable to the true knowledge of God, as it demands also that of the kiyds *fikhi, thanks to which, in matters of law, it is possible to know exactly the Divine commandments. Nevertheless this obligation is bounded by the intellectual capacity of each person, since God never imposes more than one individual soul is able to carry out.

But Ibn Rushd states that a study of this magnitude cannot be made without taking previous research into account. Thus the pursuit of the above reasoning involves the obligation to examine the works of the ancients (cf. a similar idea developed by Fasqur al-Din al-Razi in his Majaddat al-ghayb, introduction). It is therefore contrary to the Law to forbid such an examination, provided that the person carrying it out possesses dhakat* al-fisra (a technical term, derived from a Kur'anic root, to indicate a gift which is given to man of remembering things and recognizing the truth, which may be translated by "a keen sense of the truth"), and al-`adda l-ghar*yya accompanied by ethical virtue, that is a religious and moral qualification defined by the Law. But not all men accept proof by demonstration: some give their assent (tasddik) only to dialectical discourses (al-ab`writ al-`qada`liyya), others only to rhetorical discourses (khik* biyya). God speaks to men through these three types of discourse in order to reach them all (cf. Kur'an, XVI, 126). If rational research ends in a truth which is not understood literally, the Law sets the philosopher on his way: thus, if it is the same as in law (this new comparison with the truth), and the Water existed before this world, and that the Kurgan itself distinguishes the passages which need no difficulty, or else it is in apparent disagreement, by scholars must be forbidden to the ordinary man, whereas the common man must adhere to the literal meaning. Here Ibn Rushd distinguishes the passages which need interpretation from those which are to be accepted as they stand: on the one hand, the ayat mutasaddhibumi, on the other, the ayat mubhaymati (Kur'an, III, 7), the verses which have several meanings and those which have a clear and precise meaning. The taw尉 of these ambiguous verses is known only to God Himself and to those who have a solid grounding in scholarship. Ibn Rushd reads this text as a justification of ta`wil for men of true scholarship (cf. L. Gauthier, La theorie, 59 f., on the two possible readings). To determine what should be interpreted and what should be understood literally, Averroes does not have recourse to a consensus (ijtima`[q]), but he criticizes this argument curiously, without convincing that of Ibn Hazm on the impossibility of establishing concrete proof of its existence (cf. R. Brunschvig, Averroes juriste, 47). On this subject Averroes deals briefly with a question disputed among the jurists: that of takfir, an accusation of infidelity; he considers that the excommunications launched against the philosophers should not be regarded as takfir bi`r* (or `al-d jawl *bi`r), i.e. a decisive condemnation against which there is no appeal. It is known that more tolerant persons previously had this takfir `al-d jawl *ta`lir as a severe measure. But in the case of the philosophers, they cannot be accused of infidelity on the strength of the consensus, since God restricts the use of ta`wil to scholars in particular. It cannot be a question of a consensus communis (ijtima` mutasadi) accessible to all. Here Ibn Rushd uses the technicality of the Law to support the cause of the philosophers whom he seeks to defend. Thus he attacks the takfir that al-Ghazzali launched against the falasifa. Then he reverses the positions and shows that it is often the mutakallimin, the theologians, who make undue use of ta`wil, for example over the verses (XI, 9) concerning the Creation: the Kur'an manifestly teaches that the Throne and the Water existed before this world, and that before the six days there existed a period which is the number of the sphere. It is not, of course, impossible that the philosopher may be wrong on such difficult questions (ji `il-`agh* al-`awsi`a). But he may be excused and he will nevertheless have his reward, like the judge who blunders when performing sitti*hid, since in this case his error is an involuntary one (khikd*) which may creep in even when a duty is being performed.

Thus there is a division in the Law texts which are to be taken in their sarih and to interpret which would be to lapse into unbelief (kufr) or heretical interpretation (bid`a); there are also texts which is obligatory for scholars to interpret, but concerning which, for those who are not scholars, on the other hand, ta`wil is a kufr or a bid`a (this is what happens to theologians who do not make use of rational demonstration); finally, there are texts concerning which there is doubt: thus the verses on the future life are to be understood literally so far as regards the affirmation of its existence but they admit of different opinions as regards the qualification (si`a) given to them by scholars, whereas the common man must adhere to the literal meaning. The scholars, for their part, must not "popularize" their learning in the form of dialectical, rhetorical or poetic writings; they must write only works of demonstration (khutub al-har*mm), so that they will be accessible only to those who are capable of following such demonstration. Al-Ghazzali did not follow this rule and was therefore in error, though his intentions were good. The books written by scholars must be forbidden to the ordinary man by the leaders of the community.

Faith involves an assent (tasddik) to a representation (tasawwur). This assent is in response, accord-
ing to temperament, to a demonstrative, dialectical or rhetorical argument. The representation leads to a grasp of either the thing itself or its image (mutakallim). Revelation, being addressed to a larger number, makes very little use of demonstration. It can happen that premises based on opinion may also be certain (yabīna). In this case, and if no term used in the conclusion is understood in a figurative sense (representing the image of the thing), the text must be understood literally. But if the conclusion is in figurative terms, then interpretation is necessary. If the premises consist only of opinion and the conclusion affects the things themselves, the premises may be interpreted, but not the conclusion. Finally, if the premises consist only of opinion and the conclusion is figurative, scholars have an obligation to interpret, but the ordinary man may not go beyond the literal meaning. Otherwise, in this case, it would be turning away from the letter a mind which had access to nothing else, and since the text contains only opinions and figurative meanings, it would no longer offer any support to a person unable to find other support elsewhere. Thus his faith would be destroyed.

There is therefore only one truth, and strictly speaking there cannot be two different expressions of one single truth as though it were spoken in two languages, that of reason and that of imagination, for that would only introduce different types of tasawwur. Ibn Rushd's original contribution is to stress the importance of adherence to the truth. Men understand it through the ways (furuh) which gain their assent; the majority consent to something because of what they themselves are, rather than because of what the thing itself is. Their truth is subjective. Incapable of adopting a rational objective attitude which would govern their personal reactions, they have to have their personal sensibility affected in order to accept what is proposed to them. Consequently it is necessary that the dialectical or rhetorical approaches which they follow should lead them to a representation of the truth, either actual or figurative, which they can accept and adopt, so that their subjective attitude does not lead them into erroneous representations. This is realized in the Kurān. But going beyond this, scholars, through ta'wil, find the way of reason which leads to the understanding of the truth. At the same time the agreement of Law and Reason, of religion and philosophy, while the common man profits from this agreement without knowing that it exists. But it is necessary to respect the situation of the ordinary man and not to reveal to him anything of the interpretations. To act in any other way is to give rise to sects, and this was the error in particular of the Mu'tazila and the Ash'arīs. The majority of people should be taught only the general methods which the Kurān has revealed and used for them. The special method which the Holy Book suggests for those who are capable of it should be reserved for scholars. To conclude, the agreement of the maṭhānū and the manhijī is not that of two formulations, of two expressions, of two equivalent types of representation. It is that of the different types of opinion on a single truth at the same time; it is the practical agreement of two methods in order to arrive at a single practical conclusion, one of them being no more than this, the other based also on a theoretical demonstration and a speculative knowledge. It is thus that, to take an example which is not in Ibn Rushd, the same problem may be solved and the same result arrived at by arithmetic or by algebra, although the arithmetical method, remaining at the level of real intuition, produces a better understanding of the concrete relations between facts than does the algebraic method, consisting of the manipulation of conventional signs.

The Faṣl al-mahbūl is therefore a treatise on methodology. The problematical element is that of all Muslim thinking: that of the jurisconsults, the grammarians and the Kurānic commentators, and indeed the theologians. Averroes employs the technical vocabulary in use among these scholars. But he very skilfully manipulates all these ideas within a logical framework borrowed from the Greeks, which can later be applied to the problems of theology: it is the framework of Aristotle's Organon, rational demonstration (Analytics), dialectical reasoning (Topics), rhetorical argument (Rhetoric) and to a lesser degree Poetics, with discernible at times in the background, allusions to sophistics.

(b) The Kidūb al-Kalīf “an manākhif al-adillā fi ʿabd al-mīla wa laʾirf ʿāna wa l-bīdār al-māzīlī (“Exposition of the methods of demonstration relative to the dogmas of religion, and definition of the equivocations and innovations which appear in them as methods of interpretation and which distort truth or lead into error”). This treatise foreshadows the Tahdhīb still more clearly than the preceding one, whose general conclusions it evokes in its introduction. Its aim is to show that the theories of the sects satisfy neither the demands of scholarship nor the needs of the common man. It consists of five chapters. The first is devoted to the existence of God; in it the author examines the opinions of the Khāghiyya, the Ash'arīs, the Sūfis and the Mu'tazila. For the first, faith is based entirely on the authority of the Book and owes nothing to reason: a question already dealt with in the Faṣl. The Ash'arīs allow the use of reason but their methods are open to criticism. They prove the existence of God by the contingency of the world, which has come into existence (muhdākh). But the agent which brings it into existence (muḥādīkh) must have an eternal existence. Consequently its action is eternal and the effects of it are also eternal. In order to escape this consequence, it is not possible to say with these theologians that the action of an eternal being has a beginning in time, since this would presuppose a cause which at first prevented this action and then allowed it; and a situation which precipitated it. This cause, in its turn, is either eternal or situated within time. And so the reasoning continues, reminiscent of a similar argument of Fakhr al-Din al-Rāzī on tark and the muraqadākh. There follows a criticism based more particularly on the atomism of this school. Averroes disagrees with a thesis which, in order to retain the absolute freedom of God, destroys His wisdom and the regular order of His providence. In addition, the Ash'arī argument supposes that the universe, in its entirety, is formed in exactly the same way as the sublunary world which surrounds us, which is not proved (Aristotle gives to heaven and the heavenly bodies a separate situation). Ibn Rushd also considers time—whether it is created or eternal. This recalls very clearly discussions which go back to Plato and the problem of the mobile to middle Platonism (Calvisius Taurus), Philo of Alexandria, Johannes Philoponus (Yahyā al-Nahlī; cf. Ernst Behler, Die Ewigkeit der Welt; J. Pouilloux and R. Arnaldes, Philon d'Alexandrie, De Aeternitate, Introduction, translation and notes). He examines critically the argument that the infinite cannot be crossed, which demands a point of first departure if one is to arrive at the present event. This is true for sequences in a straight line, but not for cyclic
sequences where an initial point of departure is not apparent. Thus, evaporation is not the first origin itself produced by clouds. These clouds therefore stem from other clouds; the very nature of clouds does not permit the idea of any definitely first clouds. In rectilinear causality on the other hand (man gives birth to man), a point of departure is necessary. Nevertheless, if, in such a line, each cause were merely the instrument of an eternal agent, the present effect would result from the action of an eternal agent, and it would exist even if this agent had made use of such instruments an infinity of times (cf. the double causality of Spinoza).

Ibn Rushd devotes a special criticism to al-Djuzwayni, accusing him of being unaware of the necessity of that which exists, which leads him to oppose Avicenna's doctrine of the necessary by itself and the possible by itself (which is necessary by another). That which is possible by itself can never become necessary by means of its agent. Another argument of al-Djuzwayni is that the world was created at a certain place within the infinite void; but any one part of the void is the same as another (cf. Leibnitz), therefore a free will is necessary to decide between one place and another. But, Averroes objects, it is essential to prove first that the void exists and that it is infinite and eternal, otherwise another void would be necessary to contain it.

Against the theory of the Sûfis Ibn Rushd admits that mystic training may help in the attainment of rational knowledge, but that it cannot replace it. Regarding the Mu'tazila, he states that he has found none of their books in Spain; he says nothing of them, and passes on to the Kur'anic proofs. This is argument by means of Providence and by means of the creation of substances (animals, vegetables, heaven). Averroes underlines the generation of the organic starting from the inorganic; there is therefore an agent which gives life (this was to be stated in the Tafsîr of book A of the Metaphysics, see below). As for the heavens, they are commanded; it is the Kur'anic idea of tashhir (sakhbhar Allah, in many verses). The idea of the divine amr expressing the act of the unmoved Mover which commands without coming into any contact with it to be taken up again in the Tâkahf. These two types of proof concern the ordinary man, but the scholars give them demonstrative value, and they have a deeper and wider knowledge of the realities on which they base their demonstrations.

In the second chapter he studies the unity of God. The Kur'an proves it by the unity of the government of the world, a proof which the scholars, and Averroes in particular, take up and go into deeply. The criticism of the Ash'aris reasoning is subtle and technical. It is enough merely to mention it.

The third chapter deals with the attributes of God: knowledge, life, power, will, hearing, sight, speech. Ibn Rushd distinguishes clearly between the Kur'anic doctrine and the theories of the theologians who raise problems on which the Kur'an is silent. Thus on knowledge he says, "It is indicated by the surfaces of bodies. Thus the envelope of the Being which exists in the direction marked by the exterior surface of this sphere will be incorporeal. That is the true demonstration."

The fifth chapter deals with divine actions: creation, the sending of prophets, predestination and divine decree, justice and injustice, the future life. On the creation, in addition to what he has already said about it, Averroes states against the Ash'aris that although the world contains contingency, it cannot be contingent as a whole. The liberty of God cannot be that of indifference. Finally the term bûdîth (coming into existence) is not Kur'anic and constitutes in itself a bûdîa. On the prophetic mission, Ibn Rushd makes a critical examination of the probative value of miracles and of the igâs al-Kur'am. He regards the problem of predestination as "one of the most difficult". The Kur'an contains on this for and against the Ash'aris. The argument cannot be found in bûdîth. Both series of texts must be retained: on the one hand human action obviously depends, both for its cause and its execution, on external and internal conditions created by God; but on the other hand, we are the authors of our own acts since "it is evident that God has created in us faculties by means of which we can acquire things which are opposed by nature", which proves that freedom of choice exists.
Here there is involved the question of secondary
causes. All causes other than God Himself have no
existence, neither they nor their effects, other than
through God. The word "agent" may not be used in-
discriminately of God and of other causes. But causes
operate, not only because God uses them as instru-
ments, but also because He created them as causes.
Furthermore, it can be said that substances and
esses have for their cause only God, whereas acci-
dents have other causes. On divine justice, Ibn Rushd
agrees with Agh'arism: it is necessary to believe at the
same time both that God is just, and that He is just
creator of good and evil, in order to avoid any dualism.
God created evil with good ends in view: it is by
accident that fire, which is good, does harm. On this
delicate problem, Averroes does not hesitate to
reproduce all the sophistries which creep into the
theodicy of all periods. It is true that this is a point on
which it is necessary to convince both the ordinary
man and the philosophers themselves. This does not
mean that God is above the just and the unjust: He is
just, but in Himself, and not as a judge is, in the
service of others. Finally the future life exists; that
is not contrary to reason. It is left to each person to
imagine the modalities of it for himself.

This treatise is directed against the doctrines that
theologians, going beyond all sound demonstra-
tion, construct upon the Book; against the problems
which they raise. The feeling behind it is not, basic-
ally, very different from that of al-Ash'ari and al-
Ghazâli at the beginning of their careers, they having
become theologians rather in spite of themselves,
in order to refute the errors which were threatening
Islam. But they were wrong; Ibn Rushd considers
that the only recourse is to demonstrative knowledge.
He condemns theology; the literal meaning of the
sacred text seems to him on the whole wiser, even
more acceptable to reason, than the theological
lubrications. One would expect that, in distinguishing
thus clearly between the common man and the schol-
ars, he would maintain that the arguments and the
representations which are in the Kur'ân form a bad
diet for the uneducated masses who are incapable of
teaching themselves (the doctrine of the double truth
of the western Averroists: that which is true for
religion on the one hand, and for philosophy on the other
hand, is not so: there exists a religious truth which is true for all men
whoever they are. The worst misfortune which could befall them would be to lose their faith. Now philo-
osophy, particularly when dealing with obscure ques-
tions, shakes the faith of many men and should be
reserved for scholars. But theology, with its uncertain or
sophistic arguments, while giving the appearance of
adhering to the texts, is still more dangerous, especial-
ly because its intention is to elaborate the authentic
doctrine in which everyone must believe. Philosophers,
in all cases where the system of rational demonstra-
tion is not followed, are in the same situation as the
ordinary man; they also must adhere to the literal
meaning of the Kur'ân and beware of the false exal-
tations of theology.

(c) The Tahâfut al-Tahâfut. In the Fâsi and the
Kashf, al-Ghazâli had been very severely handled. In
the Tahâfut, the battle against him grows, becomes
more definite and leads Ibn Rushd to embrace all the
great problems of philosophy. This work combines the
results of the paraphrases and of the middle
commentaries, as well as all his basic personal ideas
on religious questions, the development of which may
be traced in the preceding treatises. But in the attack
on the Tahâfut al-faldâsifâ al-Ghazâli is not the only
target. Many of the criticisms in his work directed
against Aviceenna are accepted by Averroes, if not
in the form of argument used by al-Ghazâli, at least
for the correctness of their conclusions. The Tahâfut
al-Tahâfut is thus a reconstruction of the false phil-
osophy, that of Aristotle himself, against the false,
that of the neo-Platonic falsâdifs, which distorted the
thinking of Aristotle, and against the theological
systems. In this sense, it can be said that Ibn Rushd's
original philosophical doctrine is to be found in this
book.

There is a very precise study of this work in the
introduction written by S. van den Bergh to his
English translation. The two Muslim thinkers are
separated on a fundamental point: in the tradition
of his master al-Djuywâynî, al-Ghazâli does not consider
that philosophical reasoning has the strictness of
mathematical reasoning, and in the Ma'âshid, he
points out that there exists there a source of error
which misleads the unthinking supporters of logic.
Aristotle, on the other hand, believes in the value
of demonstration, and shows, as he did for the theolo-
gians, that it is the neo-Platonic philosophers who
lack strictness, but that sound logic should not be
accused of this.

A large part of the work of al-Ghazâli, and thus
that of Ibn Rushd which follows it, is devoted to the
problem of the creation of the world. Averroes' solu-
tion is that of an eternal creation. There cannot have
existed an empty time which preceded the appera-
tance of the world at a certain moment in it. Time
is, according to Aristotle, the numbered number
(τὸ άριθμομένον) of movement (Physics, IV,
219 b 8). It measures movements only within the
limits that movement measures time itself since they
are mutual definitions of each other (οὖ μόνον δὲ
τὴν κίνησιν τὸ χρόνον μετρώμεν, ἄλλα καὶ
τὴν κίνησιν τὸν χρόνον δία τὸ άριθμοῖ τοῦ
άλλαττον, Physics, IV, 220 b 14-16). But although the
time of the movement of the sphere measures the
movements within the world, there is no movement
outside the sphere which enables time to measure the
movement of the sphere. The illusion is therefore one
of "aligning": the revolutions of the sphere in a sort of
empty, rectilinear time, which, if it is infinite, cannot
be crossed, so that an actual revolution cannot take
place. But reality, each revolution is independent of
the others. Each of them depends immediately on the
actions of the first agent: "Their sequence is accident-
al" (para. 20). In the sequences of causes it is neces-
sary that the present effect is the result of all these
causes. If they are all infinite, it cannot exist. But it
is not necessary for all the past revolutions of the
sphere to be added together in order for the present
revolution to take place. Thus it can be said that "The
Circular movements of the past and the future are non-
existent" (para. 23). This example shows that in the
Tahâfut the ideas already outlined in the earlier trea-
tises are analysed philosophically in a much deeper
fashion. He maintains that the creative will in God
should not be conceived in relation to our own; it is
found in the excellence of God, separate from the
world; the world does not emanate from Him in con-
tinuity with Him; God is not an agent in the way that
it is said, at least as an image, that a person "makes"
a shadow, his own shadow. The term "will" expresses
the method of this action of a perfectly transcendent-
al being. This is why Ibn Rushd sees no incongruity
in the fact that such a creator produces a multiplicity
of beings as the effect of his act; he thus rejects
the principle which is the basis of the emanatist
doctrines, that the One can give birth only to one.

In ontology, Averroes criticizes with al-Ghazâli
Avicenna’s conception of the Being necessary in itself (wādij bi-dhatih), but he goes further: being is that ‘which is predicated of the ten categories and analogically, and it is in this sense that we speak of the substance that it exists by itself and of the accident that it exists through its existing in the existent which subsists by itself. As to the existent which has the meaning of the ‘true’, all the categories participate in it in the same way, and the existent which has the meaning of the ‘true’ is something in the mind, namely that a thing is outside the soul in conformity with what it is inside the soul” (902.4).

A quiddity, in thought, is only the explanation (sharh) of the meaning of a name; and it is only when one knows that this meaning exists outside the soul that one knows that it is a quiddity. It is thus not possible really to separate essence and existence; the distinction is made only in thought. In this lies Avicenna’s error. If the being which is possible of itself is pure essence, it exists only in thought. Outside it, it is either an essence which exists, or it is nothing. If it exists, to “add” to it existence so that it shall be has no meaning. If it does not exist, it is obviously not possible to add something to nothing. Thus when Avicenna defines the possible as that which has a cause, it must first be specified what cause is referred to, since apart from the fiction of a cause which would give an existence added to a pure essence, if the idea of the cause enters that of the possible, then either the possible becomes necessary (darūr) (since the cause which makes it necessary forms part of its definition), or else one becomes involved in a tautology: that which has a cause is possible, that is, it has a cause (277), and this line can be followed to infinity. In short, Avicenna destroys the idea of the possible as such, since he makes of it either the necessary, or a simple verbal idea in thought. Avicenna admits the existence of the true possible (mumkin habīb) which leads to the necessary possible (mumkin darur), by which he implies a necessary reality based on a true possibility, that is on a potentiality. The cause is the agent which translates the potentiality into the actuality. There is no other action than this. God makes actual the potentialities which are in the world. The world in its God’s will does not resemble ours (see above). But being in action and not potential, it resembles more closely our knowledge of the particular than our knowledge of the universal. Similarly God’s will does not resemble ours (see above).

There remains the question of the last things. Demonstrative proof can establish spirituality and immortality only as regards the intellect, since it alone among the faculties of the soul is indivisible and operates without the need of physical organs.

Since the knowledge of the soul remains obscure, it is reasonable to have recourse to revelation. As for the resurrection of the body, this is not demonstrable. But the speculative virtues cannot do without the moral virtues. Although the soul is immortal, it will not survive by contemplation alone but will need those moral virtues which imply the presence of the body. However the resurrection is not conceived of as the return of life to the earthly body. It is, as the Qur’ān says, a second creation.

B. The Tafsir of the Metaphysics. Averroes’ work ended with the great commentaries. We therefore now examine the main ideas which, towards the end of his life, he drew from Aristotle’s
Metaphysics. Understanding well his thought and his method, he elucidates the Aristotelian doctrine while expressing his own point of view on it. Among the possible interpretations he chooses that which suits his own ideas. This commentary is a major work. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.

The object of metaphysics. This science is concerned with the study of certain words: “His aim in this book is to distinguish the meanings contained in words. In this science a speculative examination is made of them, and these meanings have in it the place which in any art is held by the object (mawdu*).

This art. The Arabic translations were bad. Often Ibn Rushd consulted two or three of them. He studied the writers of antiquity: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Theophrastus, Nicholas of Damascus, Johannes Philoponus. He discusses them and often, by his own inspiration, he improves, an accepted version. Where the incomprehensibility of a text causes him to stray from the original thought of Aristotle, Averroes never strays very far.
cause, there would have to exist an eternal and continually existing anniyya which would determine absolutely the form and substance of each being. Appealing to experience, Averroes disagrees with this entirely deterministic conception. No doubt the relation of the cause to the effect is always necessary; but a cause can interfere in a natural process which, as such, is a stranger to its causality. "As for a cause which results in an effect of chance, this is not at all the cause of a natural movement!" (ll. 735-6). The result is that the causation of the natural processes with regard to the effect produced in the natural process, is without cause. The natural causes are ordered towards a natural end. But the accidental cause, not being naturally directed towards this, is one which produces such an end without its being determined by any cause. Thus fire burns or heats; this is its natural effect. But if it burns a man, its causation intervenes in the natural process of life and destroys it, although the natural end of fire is not to alter the natural processes of life.

Contrary to this is the study of primary substance and of ontological necessity. In a long preamble to the commentary on book A, Ibn Rushd re-states the complete rational plan of the work and explains that this book is the actual end of it, the two following containing only the criticism of the philosophy of Ideas and Numbers.

Although he is conversant with the analogy of proportionality (III, 1552), Ibn Rushd considers in depth the analogy of attribution. He shows that anteriority of a substance is not like that of one number in relation to another, but that it is "the anteriority of a thing to that which is related to it". Substance is not a universal (this is contrary to Plato). It is divided into perceptible substance, either eternal (sarmadi), the heavens, or corruptible (fasiid), and unmoved and separate substance. Perceptible eternal substance comes into the field of physics (this is contrary to Avicenna): "The metaphysician seeks to discover what are the principles of substance considered as such, and he explains that separate substance is the principle of physical substance; but in order to solve this problem, it is necessary to resort on the one hand to what is explained in book I of the Physics either on generable and corruptible being (i.e. composed of matter and form), or on eternal substance; and on the other hand to that which is explained at the end of book VIII: that the mover of eternal substance is exempt from matter" (III, 1424). Unmoved substance therefore forms part of metaphysics, but in order to reach an understanding of it, it is necessary to study the changes in moved beings. All generation stems from a being in posse: matter. But the matter of the heavenly bodies, subjected merely to a change of place, is in actuality. Thus the heavenly bodies are neither divisible nor corruptible, contrary to the ideas of Avicenna, who considers that the matter of all the bodies is in posse.

All generation has three causes: the subject (maw-du'), matter in posse, and the two contraries (iddin) to which it is in posse: the one, on which the definition hangs, is form (qaran); the other is the lack of form ('adam al-sara). Such are the principles (mabada') of substance. Neither form nor matter can be generated; all that can be engendered is their union (madjam) under the action of a mover (muhrrik); what it moves is matter, that towards which it moves is form. Thus the only thing which is engendered is that which is composed (murakkab).

Ibn Rushd stresses, in criticizing Alexander and Themistius, the question of the "synonymous" or univocal agent (al-muwathi?): man is born of man. But how to explain the animals which are bred by putrefaction (al-muwafi*)? It is explained thus: there are the natural substances which are engendered naturally (this is what is meant by "univocal generation"), and the accidents which may be produced by nature, art, chance (bi 'ilisi?h) or spontaneity (min tilid? nafsik, ?rukto 'amurma). But all generation of natural substance is natural. Thus the animals which are born from putrefaction are natural productions of a synonymous agent and not the products of chance, "since that which is produced by chance is a generation without order (nisam) and is not an aim pursued by nature". The efficient natural cause has always a natural finality. Decay has the same power as semen among creatures which reproduce themselves in a line of issue (mutanasi'li: since semen it contains a power of forming each animal which is born of it.

Matter is common to all material beings. In this sense "it has the nature of something universal". But if this were really the case, it would have a form and would be made one by the form. How, being one in number, can it exist in a plurality? It is possible only because it is in posse. When the individual differences (al-fusul al-shakhsiyya) which give existence to numerical multiplicity are removed, it is said of matter that it is one, and thus that it is common to many things. But it is not called common because it has a common form, as is the case with the category (cf. III, p. 1473). Unity by form comes from the fact that several concrete beings, numerically distinct, form one same species or one same category. "The community (isfi'ik) which the intelligence recognizes in the common forms has an existence in posse outside the soul. That which the intelligence recognizes in matter is pure nothingness, since it is included only by the negation which withdraws from it individual form. But since matter has no existence outside the soul, in so far as it is conceived of as common to the totality of the generables and of the corruptibles . . ., that by means of which it is matter distinct from nothingness and existing outside the soul, is reduced to the fact that it is a subject (substratum) of the perceptible individual which may be seen but is not understood, the problem in question is: how does Zayd exist is not the fact that the intelligible form of the man is shared by common matter: this form and this matter are only thought, and from their encounter, which is that of a universal positive form and a universal negative (matter), it having existence only in the soul, there cannot result, outside the soul, this concrete and individual reality which is Zayd. Properly speaking, the creation of an individual takes place neither through matter nor through form. As has been clearly said by M. Cruz Hernandez: "la materia y la forma no poseen per se actividad motora, ni autoprincipio de transformacion alguna". What exists is the individual form in a particular subject, and that which engenders a particular is a particular. Ibn Rushd disagrees here with Themistius, who believed that, in generation, the form was created for him the generation of animals by putrefaction was a proof of this since, he asked, where did the form of these animals come from?) The substantial form would thus be separate and come from without; there would be a dator formarum (wakhi al-swar) which would be the agent intellect (al-tali al-fa'idal). This was also the doctrine of Avicenna, based on the following argument: "there are no active powers in matter except the four qualities, hot, cold, dry and wet. These qualities produce what is similar to
them. But the substantial forms do not act upon each other”. Ibn Rushd’s thesis is that “the agent produces as separate forms "(ibid.).

As for the agent, Averroes criticizes the theologians who admit only one single efficient cause and who deny secondary causes. This is because they think that all action is creation ex nihilo, and when they see a mover act on a mobile thing, they ask which mover it was that moved the thing; but this is not the question; the true agent is that which causes a subject to pass from potentiality to actuality, and it is in this sense only that it is said that it unites matter and form. The forms exist in posse in primary matter and in action in the prime mover, rather in the sense in which it is said that the object of art exists in actuality within the soul of the artist.

The moved movers are thus really agents which have their own natural action. This being so, it is necessary to find not only what moves them but what co-ordinates them. There exists a real and universal movement, that of the sphere, which gives continuity and permanence (al-ittisal wa ‘l-azaliyya) to all the movements of the world. As for the sphere and the heavenly bodies, they are moved by the desire inspired in them by the first unmoved mover, “because heavenly bodies, they are moved by the desire inspired into them by the first unmoved mover, “because they understand of themselves that their perfection and their substance are only in movement... and also that their movement is the cause of the passage into actuality of what is in posse in the separate forms, i.e., the material forms” (iii, p. 1595). In fact, although the forms are in action in the prime mover and in posse in matter, as has been seen above, it must be stated that the reverse is true in connexion with the concrete realization of material beings: "one has the impression (wujubabbaku) that they have two existences: the one in action, which is material existence, and the other in posse, which is their existence as separate forms "(ibid.). This was the theory of the supporters of the Platonic Ideas, but they fell short of the truth, since the separate forms in themselves are not movers: they are found in the Prime Mover which draws all beings to them and through them. The first end of the movement of the heavens is the immortality of the non-animalic existence of (täb—is) its search for this that in the second place it ensures this passage of material beings from potentiality to action. ‘Thus he who performs exercise to preserve his health by practising an art, has as his main aim the preservation of health, and as a secondary aim the practice of this art’ (1596).

On the Intellect, Ibn Rushd takes his stand against Alexander, who considered that the material intellect was generated and corruptible, which presents insoluble problems in the matter of intellectual knowledge. Ibn Rushd takes up a thesis which he attributes to Theophrastus, Theonistius and the majority of the Peripatetic philosophers: the material intellect exists and the separate agent intellect is as the form in the material intellect. But he states this more clearly by referring to what he has said in the De Anima. The material intellect is in itself general and corruptible (Bouyges, 1489: the Latin translations add a negative: non est generalis et corruptibilis.) The habitual intellect (bi ‘l-malakalhabituli£,ei), which holds at our disposition the knowledge of the intelligibles, has a generable and a corruptible part; the corruptible is its action; but in itself it is incorruptible. It comes to us from without (min kibrigi ljupadorev) and is not generated; this is why the intellect in posse is for it like a place (mahään) and not like a material thing. If this intellect, in so far as it must unite with the material intellect, had an action which was not general and corruptible, although it is essential and there would be nothing in it which constrained it to unite with the material intellect. But since it does unite with it, its action in so far as it unites is not its substance. The action which it produces is not for the benefit of itself, but of another. So it is possible for an eternal being to give to a generable and corruptible being the power to understand. When man exercises his faculty of reason, he is not in all potentiality, and of necessity its action, which is not it itself, is reduced to nothing. So, either we no longer understand at all through this intellect, or we understand through it, in the sense that its action is reduced, in this state, to its substance. Ibn Rushd shows that the second case is the true one (cf. iii, 1489-90). The question is a difficult one. It seems that Averroes considered the habitual intellect to be the way in which the agent intellect is present in us that is, in that part of our soul which is the material intellect. Its action in us has a beginning and an end; like acquired knowledge in the scholar, it is not continually in use. It is therefore, from this point of view, connected with the psychological reality of the feelings, of the imagination, of the memory, and of the will. But when used to perfection, it no longer needs the instruments of the soul: it turns back on itself and in itself in its own action, in which it is identical with the intelligible which it thinks. In this perfection of our intellect we understand through the agent intellect itself, that is through the action which substantially constitutes it. This is what has led to the statement that our individuality disappears. We have seen the modifications which Averroes introduces into this doctrine, which he considers as being that of Aristotle, without altering it in its demonstrative value: since although all that is demonstrated is true, that which is not demonstrable is not necessarily false.

A general study of the thought of Averroes would have to be based on the texts preserved in Latin or Hebrew. This article has been limited to the main works surviving in Arabic. A Latin Averroes, given the slight variations in emphasis which translations always give the action word, can be transposed into various languages of the Almohad empire, as mentioned in the commentary on the Republic which has survived in Hebrew (ed. with introd., tr., and notes by E. I. J. Rosenthal, Averroes’ Commentary on Plato’s Republic, Cambridge 1956). Ibn Rushd did not know the Politics of Aristotle; Plato takes its place. “The two works — Nichomachean Ethics and Republic—form two complementary parts of the same science of Politics, as Averroes stated himself”. Averroes’ social awareness appears here in his ideal of a perfect city, the image of the world; he makes frequent use of al-Fārābī; he transposes in a very interesting fashion the Greek institutions into Muslim realities, as, in the Poetics, he transposes the Greek literary genres; finally he makes many allusions or applications to Muslim public law and to the situation of the Almohad empire compared with the Almoravids.

Ibn Rushd had few disciples in Islam. His great fame among the Western schoolmen is well known. Renan, followed by many others, claimed that Ibn Rushd’s thinking contained nothing original. This is because he deliberately belittled the religious and
juristic works. In a general way, he committed an error of appreciation which was to remain a blind spot in Greek historiography. If one considers the whole corpus of Ibn Rusd's works and the unity of his wide thought, it becomes apparent that the "Commentator" was a true philosopher.
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IBN AL-SA’BĪ (the son of the clock-maker), Faqhr al-Dīn Ridwān (or Ridwān) b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Rustam al-Khurāsānī, born at Damascus, where his father, a native of Khurāsān, had settled. His father was a skilled clock-maker, whose most notable works were the clocks at the entrance to the Great Mosque at Damascus, commissioned by the Zangid al-Malik al-ʿĀdil Nūr al-Dīn al-Maḥmūd (died in Shawwal sâg/May 1174); he was also versed in astronomy. Ibn al-Sabčīn was a physician, but he was also well-versed in literature, logic and the other philosophic disciplines as well as in clock-making. He was first the vizier of al-Malik al-’Ādil b. al-Malik al-ʿĀṣirī al-Hilālī, and then vizier and personal physician of his brother al-Malik al-Muʿāṣir b. al-Malik al-ʿĀdil (died 624/1227). He died at Damascus in about 627/1220. There survives a work of his on clock-making, the Risāla fi ʿamal al-sabčīn wa-sirt’mālik (abridged translation E. Wiedemann and Fritz Hauser, Über die Uhren im Bereich der islamischen Kultur, in Nova acta academiae naturae curiosorum, c (1915), 176-267), in which he deals primarily with his father’s clock, which he repaired and improved.

His brother, Bahār al-Dīn Abu ʿl-ʿĀsān ʿAlī, also called Ibn al-Sabčīn ʿAlī, was a well-known poet whose diwān has been edited by A. E. Khūrī (Beirut 1938-9). He died, in Cairo, in about 604/1207; for details of his life see Ibn Khalīkān, no. 489.

The same name was also given to the Ḥanafī jurist-consult Muẓaffar al-Dīn al-Hāfīz b. ʿAlī al-Baghdādī, died 694/1295, author of a much used compendium of fiqh which is called Mašūmā al-bayrān wa-muṭalāka l-nayyirayn, because it is an adaptation of the Muḥtāṣar al-Kindūrī [q.v.] and of the Mašūmā of al-Nasafī; for details see Tabākāt al-Ḥanafīyya, ed. Flügel, 4.

Biography: Ibn ʿAbī Usaybāʾī, ii, 183; Suter, Abhandl. 2. Gesch. d. Mathem. Wissenschaft,


IBN SABČIN, ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Ḥaṣan b. ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq b. Ibrahim b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Rūḥ al-Dīn, ʿAlī, the last representative of the Arab ‘Peripatetic’ school.

In 520/1126 he returned to Murcia in 613 or 614/1217-8 and died in Mecca in 668 or 669/1271-2.

“A bitter and tormented spirit”, L. Massignon called him. His life, consisting entirely of controversies, quarrels and persecutions, seems to have been a long and painful trial, alleviated however by the love and loyalty bestowed on him by his disciples, the sabīnīyya, men humble of heart and living in poverty. In Spain, where he carried out his studies, his fortune at first favoured him. His wide learning and knowledge of medicine and alchemy were esteemed. On the other hand, his Sūfism was suspect; he was reproached for some of his doctrinal assertions, among others, that in which he defined God as being the sole reality of existing things; this was regarded as a profession of monist faith, which his own position as a bellenizing philosopher could only render more suspect in the eyes of the ‘ulamā’ and ṣafābāt. He was compelled to leave his native land, when about thirty years old, to escape from persecution by his enemies. Followed by a group of disciples, he settled in Ceuta. There he acquired such celebrity that Ibn Khālās, the governor of the city, deputed him to answer the philosophical questions which the emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen had put, through his ambassador to the Amir of Khurasan b. al-Wāḥīd al-Rāshīd (630-40/1232-42). But this high official, fearing that public order might be disturbed by the philosopher’s teaching, soon expelled a visitor whom he considered to be compromising. Once again, Ibn Sabčīn was compelled to go into exile. He turned towards the East. He travelled to Bādis, then to Bougie. It was in that town that he met al-Shuṣhārī (610-12/1213-9), who became the most faithful, as well as the most moving, of all his disciples. Continuing on his way eastwards, he came to Tunis. In a milieu of orthodox Islam, this Aristotelian Śūfī once again came up against the hostility of the ‘ulamā’. To escape from his chief enemy Abī Bakr al-Sakūnī, a theologian from Seville who had settled in Tunis, he hurriedly left the town. There is a record of his journey on to Cābeg, and thence to Cairo. But there he scarcely felt secure and the great Mamlūk sultan Baybars I was ill-disposed towards him. Only the kārām of Mecca remained as a place of refuge for him. But there too he was persecuted, by an Andalusian emīr named Kūtb al-Kastallānī (614-12/1217-8). For once, however, he escaped unharmed from the accusations that were brought against him.

M. A. F. Mehren regards Ibn Sabčīn as “one of the last representatives of the Arab ‘Peripatetic’ school”.

The same name was also given to the Hanafī jurist-consult Muzaffar al-Din al-Hafti b. Ali al-Baghdadi, died 694/1295, author of a much used compendium of fiqh which is called Madjima al-Tabrisy an-wasul be-nayyirun, because it is an adaptation of the Muhtasar al-Kuduri, and of the Mansuma of al-Nasafi; for details see Tabakat al-Hanafiyya, ed. Flügel, 4.

Biography: Ibn Abi Usaybi'a, ii, 183; Suter, Abhandl. 2. Gesch. d. Mathem. Wissensch.,
This opinion is shared by L. Massignon, who considers that through his very Hellenism the philosopher was condemned to remain without disciples in the history of Islam. Ibn Khaldūn places him among the adherents of wahda, that is to say among the Monists, whom he contrasts with the theorists of tāḍālī. His isolation in a world of ‘ulumāʾ, mujāhids, theologians and faḥāḥīf is not without its poignancy. He reacted by adopting a haughty attitude, pouring scorn on his adversaries. He possessed a restless temperament, racked by a nervous distemper which led open no to the conclusions he arrived at, according to his own judgment, to be false. The reports of some of his biographers. This aristocratic intellectual seems to have found his only consolation among the humble men who listened to him and allowed himself to be charmed by his words. His disciple al-Shuṣhtāri, who spoke of himself as his slave and dedicated three of his šajāls to him, called him "the magnet of souls" (magnífis al-nūsūs). That he took his own life in the manner of the Stoics, by opening the veins of his wrists, is in no way improbable [see intīmār. For this philosopher, possessed by Love, it was the ultimate way of uniting himself with the Beloved, of fleeing a world that rejected him.

The šīnaḏ of the tarīkh šabiʿiyiya given by al-Shuṣhtāri in one of his šajāds shows the overlapping of the two cultures, the Greek and the Muslim, as accepted by the followers of Ibn Sabʿīn. In it, among other links, we find Plato, Aristotle, Alexander the Great, al-Hallādī, al-Shādhī who, as a mystic was the teacher of that strange character al-Suhrawardi, and Abū Madyan. In this initiatory chain, Hellenistic philosophy and Muslim ṭasawwuf are linked together under the patronage of Hermēs, the spokesman of the gods and their messenger to men.

His biographers ascribe a certain number of works to him, the principal ones being Badd al-ʿarif, which he is said to have written at the age of fifteen (an ed. is being prepared in Paris), Durādī, Ḥādīs, al-Fath al-mushararat, a short book, al-Fāḥīriyya, several treatises and a few essays.

**Bibliography:** M.A.F. Mehren, Correspondance du philosophe soufi Ibn Saʿd b. Abd al-Raqq, with the emprorcer Frédéric II de Hohenstaufen, in J.A., 1890 (in this edition will be found information concerning his biography, the text of the replies that he is said to have given to the four philosophical questions put by the emperor Frederick II, and also some extracts from his two principal biographers, namely Kutubi, Fawād al-unṣafayī and Makākīrī, Naṣf al-šibb). See also Al-Ḥaṣāb al-Bādāsī, al-Maqṣād (Vies des saints du Rиф), annotated trans. by G. S. Colin, in AM, xxvi (1926), 157-9, 150-2, n. 141; L. Massignon's helpful studies, Ibn Saʿdīn and la critique psychologique dans l'histoire de la philosophie musulmane, in Mémoires Henri Basset, ii, Paris 1928, 123-30; idem, Recueil de textes inédits relatifs à la mystique en pays d'Islam, Paris 1929, 123-34; idem, Investiguaciones sobre Sultāri, in al-And., xvi, (1949), bibliographical note, 33-5.

**IBN SAʿD**

Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Saʿd b. Maṇīr al-Baṣrī al-Ḥāḍirī, traditionist, b. Baṣra ca. 168/784, d. Baghdād on 4 Dīnāmād II 230/16 February 845. He was a client (mawla) of the Banū Ḥāshim, for his grandfather had been a freedman of Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḫubayy b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. 140 or 141; see Ibn Saʿd’s apud Ibn Ḥadhrāj, Taḥḥāb al-Taḥḥābī, ii, 344). Ibn Saʿd’s travelled in search of traditions and studied under many authorities. Later he settled in Baghdād and attached himself to al-ʿWāṣiki (q.v.), became his secretary and transmitted his works. He also studied genealogy under Ḥighām b. al-Ka'bī. During the Caliphate of al-Maʾmūn, Ibn Saʿd and some other orthodox scholars were summoned by order of al-Maʾmūn and were made to declare their adherence to the Muʿtazilli dogma (Ṭabarī, iii, 1116 ff., sub anno 210).

Ibn Saʿd’s fame rests on his Book of the Classes (Kitāb al-Taḥbāb al-kāfirī, there existed also a small edition, probably an abridgement). It was intended to be an aid to the study of traditions by reviewing information as one or more periods (including about 600 women) who, from the beginning of Islam down to the author’s time, had played a rôle as narrators or transmitters of traditions about the Prophet’s sayings and doings. Ibn Saʿd compiled it from the works of his predecessors, especially al-ʿWāṣiki and Ibn al-Ka'bī; he usually gives the full isnād, but no title; he often quotes, however, the Kitāb Nasab al-anṣār of ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ḫumārī, called Ibn al-Kaḍāḥ (see Taʾrīḵ Baghdādī, x, 62) which he had written down at the author’s dictation (Ibn Saʿd, ii/2, 70). Ibn Saʿd opens his work with a biography of the Prophet; then follow the classes, arranged geographically, and within each region chronologically, and sometimes also genealogically. The articles on the Companions of the Prophet are often extensive, whilst the articles on the other classes get shorter and shorter, until sometimes only the name is given. Later on some lacunae were filled in, and even an article on Ibn Saʿd himself (vi/2, 99) was added by his pupil, al-Ḥusayn b. Fāhām (d. 289/900), in his recension of the work. Another recension (used by Ṭabarī in his “Annals”) was made by al-Ḥāribī b. Ābū Usāma (d. 282/895), and a third one by Ibn Ḥabīl ‘l-Dunyā (q.v.), which was used by Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (see Ibn Ḥayrāṣ, Fāhrāsā, 224). The edition published by E. Sachau and others (Leiden 1904-9, 9 volumes in 16 parts) gives the recension of Ibn Hayyayawī (d. 381/991), which was also used by Ibn Sayyid al-ʿNāṣī, Dhabāhī, Ibn Ḥadhrāj and others.

According to his biographers Ibn Saʿd wrote also books on āfīḥ and kariḥ. The Fīāṣir (MS Chester Beatty, p. 60) mentions besides the two editions of his Tabākīt the Kitab al-Hiyal of Ibn al-Husayn b. Muḥammad b. Ḫurāf al-Kurān under al-ʿWāṣiki and taught them to Ibn Abī Usāma, who transmitted them to Ibn Ḥanṣădī (see Ibn al-Dżāzari, Chāṭāt al-nihāya, i, 142). Among the critics of traditions Ibn Saʿd has—unlike his master al-ʿWāṣiki—the reputation of being a trustworthy authority.

Muḥammad b. Saʿd is not to be confused with his namesake, Muḥammad b. Saʿd al-ʿAwfi (d. 276/895; see Taʾrīḵ Baghdādī, v, 322 f.), to whom al-Fādārī is referring when he says hadāthāni Muḥammad b. Saʿd “an abīb . . . in an isnād which occurs no less than 1500 times in his Ĥāṣfīr (see H. Horst in ZDMG, iii (1953), 294) and occasionally in his “Annals” (i, 45, 75, 143, 314, 376, 420, 1394, 1451, 1530). All the transmitters mentioned in this isnād belong to the same family: Muḥammad b. Saʿd’s father Saʿd b. Muhammad b. Ḫasan b. ʿAṭiyāya (Taʾrīḵ Baghdādī, ix, 126; cf. Ibn Saʿd’s vi, 212, 20); the latter’s paternal uncle Ḥusayn b. Ḫasan b. ʿAṭiyāya al-Kāfī al-Ḥanāfī (d. 201 or 202; see Taʾrīḵ Baghdādī, viii, 29 ff.; Ibn Saʿd’s vi, 74); Ḥasan b. ʿAṭiyāya (d. 181; see Ibn Ḥadhrāj, Lisān al-Miṣān, ii, 294) and ʿAṭiyāya b. Saʿd (d. 122 in Kūfā; see Ibn Saʿd’s vi, 212; Ibn Ḥadhrāj, Taḥḥābī, vii, 224 f.), who transmits from ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḫubayy b. Allāh b. Ḫubayy b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḫubayy b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḫubayy, the abbās explanations of Kantūrī verses. None of them was considered by the critics
as an unimpeachable authority; and it was said of 'Atiya b. Sa'd that he had his tafsir from al-Kabîl but insinuated (by sadîq) that he had heard it from Abd Sa'd al-Khâlid (Manhal, no. 516) and called Karim al-Din Akram, (Manhal, no. 516) and called Karim al-Din al-Saghir to distinguish him from his uncle, served as Ndzir of the First Class. After the death of Ibn Ghurab, one of the most powerful Secretary Sa'd al-In Ghurab. Except for brief biographical sketches, little is known about him. Like Ibn Ghurab, he was of Coptic origin, and moved from one high position to another during the reign of the Mamlûk Sultan al-Nâṣîr Faradj (reigned 808-1405-6) in place of Ibn Ghurab, who was elevated to the office to be Controller of the Royal Stables (Kdtib al-sirr), at that time to Head of the Council and made Emir of Sultan al-Muzaffar Baybars II (708-q/1308-9), and after a temporary setback at the latter's fall, he rose under Baybars's successor, al-Nâṣîr Muhammad b. Kalâwûn (709-41/1309-40). During that ruler's third term Ibn al-Sadîd became, for a time, the most powerful figure in the governmental administration.

Most contemporary as well as later accounts, generally based on a biography by Khalîl b. Aybak al-Safadî, assert that he was the first to bear the title of Controller of Privy Funds (Nâṣîr al-dawâla, or khâwâsî). According to al-Mâkrizî, however (cf. Khâtaj, Bâlîk ed., ii, 227), the title was known from Fâtîmid times but was of minor importance until Sultan al-Nâṣîr Muhammad abolished the vicerate and appointed Ibn al-Safadî as Controller. In this office he was the supreme financial administrator in the realm and bore other titles as well, such as 'azîm al-dawâla and wakil of the Sultan. Among his other responsibilities was the control of the finances of the Manşûri hospital and madrasa and of the wakîf of the mosque of Ahmad b. Tûlûn.

Ibn al-Sâdîd seems to have had absolute control over the personal finances of the ruler to such an extent, as is related which some chroniclers liken to that of the Barâzîd. The exact reasons for his fall from favour are not clear, but in 723/1323 he was seized, confined, and forced to sign a statement, witnessed by the Chief Kâdi, to the effect that all the wealth in his possession actually belonged to the Sultan and that none of it was his (Khâtaj, Bâlîk, ii, 59). After this he was moved from one place of confinement to another, from the tomb that he had built at al-Karafa outside Cairo to Karak al-Shawbak, building the port facilities of Ladhikîyya to equal those of Alexandria, with the intention of using that harbour as his point of departure. On the other hand, Ibn Taghribîrdî (Cairo ed. ix, 77), following earlier authorities, praises him for the sincerity of his Islamic feeling, his generosity, reliability and executive ability.

His sister's son, also named Karim al-Din Alkâmăr, (Mankhul, no. 38) and called Karim al-Din al-Saghîr to distinguish him from his uncle, served as Nâṣîr
al-dawla and was also exiled to Aswan, where he died in 726/1326. Some nine years later, in 735/1334, the sons of both Karim al-Din ibn al-Sadhid and of his uncle, Ibn al-Salat, were arrested.

Although the downfall of Ibn al-Sadhid may be attributed to a change in the Sultan's personal attitude, deeper historical causes may be suggested. One is the possibility that it was connected with changes in fiscal policy as reflected in the monetary reforms introduced by the Sultan almost immediately after the death of Ibn al-Sadhid. Another is the evident suspicion that Ibn al-Sadhid was involved in events connected with the anti-Christian riots in Cairo and other parts of Egypt in 721/1321. It is recorded that he was stoned by the populace for interceding on behalf of Christians accused of starting fires and was condemned by pious Muslims for having persuaded the Sultan to order the demolition of a minbar erected on the site of a destroyed Christian church (cf. Khulās, 311, 314-6). A number of building projects are attributed to Ibn al-Sadhid, including a mosque and a khānskhā in Cairo, and the endowment of two mosques bearing his name in the outskirts of Damascus.

**Bibliography:** As mentioned above, most of the available biographies are based on the as yet unpublished work of al-Safadi and repeat the same material. This is true of Ibn Haḍjur, Durur, which has two biographies, one under Akram (i, 401-4) and one under ʿAbd al-Karim (i, 401-4); of al-Kutubi, Faḍūlī, ii, 8-15; of Ibn Taghribirdi (Cairo, i, exc. 75-7; and even of modern works such as al-Zirikli, al-ʿĀlam, iv, 180, and Dāʾirat al-maʿārif, iii, 164. Additional material occurs in Dawādārī, Kanz, i (ed. Roemer), 188, 203, 217, 247, 282, 296, 302, 305, 306, 310, 311, 314-15, 349, 354, 375, 388, 390, 394; and Kāfī (Bilbīlī), ii, 59, 66, 68, 131, 164, 186, 225, 227, 269, 392, 425, 426, 511, 514-6. Other references are Sauvare, in JA, 1896, 231-268; Wiet, Lampes, app. no. 21-2; Wiet, Manhal, no. 1463; ʿAli Pasha, ii, 28, 99-100. (W. M. BRINNER)

IBN SAĐDUN [see vAHYĀ B. SAĐDUN].

IBN AL-SAFFAR, Abu l-ʿKĀSIM Ahmad b. ʿAbd AllĀH b. ʿUMAR al-ḫāfiFr Kh[F]AN[AL-ANDALUSI], a Spanish Jewish astronomer and mathematician Maslama al-Maḍīrī [q.v.], lived in Cordova until shortly after the outbreak of civil strife, at which time he moved to Demi, where he died in 426/1035. ʿṢāfīd al-Andalusī (d. 462/1070) informs us that Ibn al-Saffar wrote a set of astronomical tables according to the Sindind method as well as a treatise on the astrolabe. The former seems to survive only partially in an Arabic manuscript written in Hebrew characters (MS Paris, hebr., 1102). The latter text has been edited by J. M. Millās Vallicrosa (see Bibliography). There are two Latin versions of this treatise on the astrolabe; one by Johannes Hispalensis is ascribed to al-Madjriti (Alcalicum de Mageri qui dicitur Almacheritus) and the other by Plato of Tivoli is ascribed to Ibn al-Saffar (Abucazin filio Asafer). Since they both represent the Arabic text of Ibn al-Saffar, Millās Vallicrosa argued (in his article of 1955) that al-Madjriti had been substituted in one version because of the confusion that both they had the same kunya (Abu l-ʿKāsim). A Hebrew version by Jacob ben Makhir, in two recensions, and a Spanish version are also extant. No other treatises by Ibn al-Saffar are known.

Muḥammad, a brother of Abu l-ʿKāsim Ibn al-Saffar, is described as an astrolabe-maker by ʿṢāfīd al-Andalusī; at least one surviving astrolabe (dated 420/1029) is ascribed to him (cf. L. A. Mayer, Islamic astrologists and their works, Geneva 1956, 75).


IBN AL-SHABIR, historian, author of a chronicle on the Rustamid ināms of Tāhert. His work forms the earliest document on the Ibadīs of North Africa which has survived up to the present, with the exception of extracts from the work of Ibn Saḥīm b. ʿUmar [q.v.]. The chronicle of Ibn al-Ṣaghrī was very highly esteemed by the Ibadī historians of the Maghrib, two of whom, al-Barrādī [q.v.] and al-Ṣamākī [q.v.] quoted large extracts from it. His opinions concerning the Ibadīs of Tāhert and particularly the Rustamids were certainly not hostile, in spite of an anti-Ibadī statement made in one passage of his work. He himself was more a Shīʿī, and his Ālīid tendencies appear in more than one passage of his chronicle. While still a young man he owned a shop in Tāhert, in the al-Rahādīna quarter, and attended the mosque in this quarter. He lived during part of the reign of the inām Abū l-ʿAṣāfīr and also during the inām Abū Ḥātim, when he wrote his chronicle, probably in about 290/903.

Ibn al-Ṣaghrī’s work is an anecdotal rather than a political history, and has been rightly described by A. de C. Motylinski as “la monographie de la Tâhert abadhite dans sa vie intime”. The author used as his basic sources stories narrated by various persons of Tâhert, mainly Ālīids, who were often relating their ancestors’ version of events. He only rarely gives the names of his informants, among whom there should be mentioned a certain Abūmad b. ʿBaṣhrī.


IBN SĀḤĪB AL-SALĀT, Abū Marwān ʿAbd al-Malik B. Muḥammad al-Bāqli, Andalusian author of an important historical of the Almohads entitled al-Mann bi l-iḥānā ala l-mustaṣaf bi-an ḍaʿalahum Allāh al-ʾaṭīma wa-d/g/aʿalahum al-muṣribihin (ed. A. de Āhdī al-Tāzi, Beirut 1964). Practically nothing is known of this Ibn Ṣibīl al-Salāt, nor of his connection with several other men of the same name. Ibn Sāhib al-Salat seems himself to have been an Almohad ḍāḥīs and clearly was closely
involved in the events which he describes. Brockelmann's statement, presumably taken from Amari, that he died in 578/1182 is incorrect; it may be deduced from the work itself that he was still living in 594/1198 (Tâlî's Introduction, pp. 24-6). The surviving fragment of al-Mann bi'mâna begins with the year 554/1159 and finishes with 568/1172 (not 580/1182) as is his connexion with the work mentioned by Brockelmann, S II, 935, No. 58.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, S I, 554.

( J. F. P. Hopkins)

IBN SAHI AL-ISRA'ILI AL-ISBILI, Abû 'Isâk IRÂBÂNI; one of the few genuine poets of Muslim Spain in the 7th/12th century. When compared with the great names of poetry during this period, such as Abû Bâshr Saîfân b. Idrisi (d. 619/1222), Abû 'l-Hasan 'Ali b. Harîk (d. 622/1225), Muhammad b. Idrisi 'Aliy Mardj al-Kuhl (d. 634/1236), Ibn Lubbâl (d. 683/1284), Shbî b. Sharîf al-Rundi (d. 684/1285) and Hzâmîn al-Kartâ'dînâni (d. 684/1285), Ibn Sahl impresses us by his truly poetic temperament and his artistic sensibility.

Born in Seville in about 609/1212-3 of a Jewish family, he spent nearly all his life in his native town, wholly absorbed in poetry, to which he devoted himself entirely, and it is only towards the end of his life that we find him attached to one of the governors as secretary. The Seville in which he lived was sad and under constant threat, but he succeeded in escaping into a world of imaginary love and romantic dreams. As early as 625/1227, when he was only sixteen years old, he impressed his contemporaries with his poetic talents when he suggested the insertion of a verse in a poem composed by al-Haythaml (d. 684/1285) and Hazîm al-Karti'dînâni (d. 684/1285), Ibn Sahl impresses us by his truly poetic temperament and his artistic sensibility.

In 594/1198 (Tazi's Introduction, pp. 24-6). The surviving fragment of al-Mann bi'mâna begins with the year 554/1159 and finishes with 568/1172 (not 580/1182) as is his connexion with the work mentioned by Brockelmann, S II, 935, No. 58.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, S I, 554.

( J. F. P. Hopkins)
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Bibliography: Brockelmann, S I, 554.

( J. F. P. Hopkins)

IBN SAHI AL-ISRA'ILI AL-ISBILI, Abû 'Isâk IRÂBÂNI; one of the few genuine poets of Muslim Spain in the 7th/12th century. When compared with the great names of poetry during this period, such as Abû Bâshr Saîfân b. Idrisi (d. 619/1222), Abû 'l-Hasan 'Ali b. Harîk (d. 622/1225), Muhammad b. Idrisi 'Aliy Mardj al-Kuhl (d. 634/1236), Ibn Lubbâl (d. 683/1284), Shbî b. Sharîf al-Rundi (d. 684/1285) and Hzâmîn al-Kartâ'dînâni (d. 684/1285), Ibn Sahl impresses us by his truly poetic temperament and his artistic sensibility.

Born in Seville in about 609/1212-3 of a Jewish family, he spent nearly all his life in his native town, wholly absorbed in poetry, to which he devoted himself entirely, and it is only towards the end of his life that we find him attached to one of the governors as secretary. The Seville in which he lived was sad and under constant threat, but he succeeded in escaping into a world of imaginary love and romantic dreams. As early as 625/1227, when he was only sixteen years old, he impressed his contemporaries with his poetic talents when he suggested the insertion of a verse in a poem composed by al-Haythaml (d. 684/1285) and Hazîm al-Karti'dînâni (d. 684/1285), Ibn Sahl impresses us by his truly poetic temperament and his artistic sensibility.

In 594/1198 (Tazi's Introduction, pp. 24-6). The surviving fragment of al-Mann bi'mâna begins with the year 554/1159 and finishes with 568/1172 (not 580/1182) as is his connexion with the work mentioned by Brockelmann, S II, 935, No. 58.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, S I, 554.

( J. F. P. Hopkins)
Andalusian poet, anthologist, historian and geographer, born near Granada in 610/1213, in a family which was descended from the Companion of the Prophet 'Ammar b. Yasir [a.s.] and which had long previously emigrated to Spain, where, during the period of the Ta'ifah, it had carved out a principality for itself in the Kal'a of the Banu Yabuṣ (modern name Alcala la Real), but had afterwards been forced to enter the service of the Almohads (for this family, see G. Potiron, *Elements de biographie et de généalogie des Banu Sa'id*, i, Baghdad 1376/1957, 90-5; Mustafa Diawd, introd. to his ed. of *Nisā' al-khulūfa*.

(F. Rosenthal)

**IBN SAID** [see al-munjib bi. sa'id].

**IBN SAID-AL-MAGHRIBI,** ABO 'L-HASAN 'ALI b. MŪSĀ b. MUQ. B. 'ABD AL-MA'LIK b. SA'I, Andalusian poet, anthologist, historian and geographer, born near Granada in 610/1213, in a family which was descended from the Companion of the Prophet 'Ammar b. Yasir [a.s.] and which had long previously emigrated to Spain, where, during the period of the Ta'ifah, it had carved out a principality for itself in the Kal'a of the Banu Yabuṣ (modern name Alcala la Real), but had afterwards been forced to enter the service of the Almohads (for this family, see G. Potiron, *Elements de biographie et de généalogie des Banu Sa'id*, i, Baghdad 1376/1957, 90-5; Mustafa Diawd, introd. to his ed. of *Nisā' al-khulūfa*).

(F. Rosenthal)

After spending his youth in Seville, where he divided his time between the traditional studies and pleasures, Ibn Sa'id left Spain in 639/1241 to perform the Pilgrimage, together with his father, who died on the journey, at Alexandria, in 648/1249. He was then given a warm welcome in Cairo, where there had preceded him a fame which was probably due to the *Kitāb al-Mughrib fi ḫulā 'l-Maghrib* which he had brought with him. This work has a curious history: begun in 530/1135 by Abu Mūsā ibn al-ʿAbbās al-Mashriqī, the work seemed to be a counterpart to the first; this work does not appear to have been completed, but several volumes of it manuscript exist in Cairo. He next performed a second Pilgrimage to Mecca and started on his return journey, writing on the way an account of his voyage, al-Nafha al-mishiyya fi ʾr-iḫtih al-Makhṣiya. On his arrival in Tunis (652/1254-5) he entered the service of the amir al-Mustansir (see R. Brunschvig, *Hafsides*, index), fell for a time into disgrace, but finally succeeded in regaining favour. In 666/1267, he made a second journey in the East which took him as far as Iran, but the last years of his life are surrounded by some obscurity; he seems to have returned in about 675/1276 to Tunis, where he died in 685/1286.

Ibn Sa'id's poetry, to judge from the few examples which have survived (for his *Diwan* is lost), reveals, among much that is hackneyed and stereotyped, some original ideas and personal accents when, in the East, he expresses his nostalgia for his native Andalus. But his fame rests mainly on the *Mughrib*, the anthologies deriving from it and his historical and geographical works, most of which have today disappeared. The following have been printed: *Rāyāt al-mubarrisīn wa-ḥāyāt al-mumayyizīn*, partial ed. with Spanish tr. by E. Garcia Gómez, Madrid 1942; Eng. tr. A. J. Arberry, Cambridge 1953.—*Umān al-murbiṣīn wa-ʾr-murbiṇāt*, ed. Cairo 1286; partial ed. and Fr. tr. by A. Mahdad, Algiers 1949.—*Al-ṣūfīn al-ṣabīlīn wa al-sabīlīn*; *Maqālāt*, ed. Ibrāhīm b. al-ʿAbbās b. 'Abd Allāh al-Hidārī at the suggestion of 'Abd al-Ibrāhīm al-ʿAbbās b. al-Mūsā b. Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Sibā, under the title *al-Muṣarrāt wa-ʾr-Murājāt*, ed. Cairo 1286; partial ed. and Fr. tr. by A. Mahdad, Algiers 1949.—*Al-Mustansir*, ed. Ibn Katfī 674, also (or its *muṣarrāt*), *al-Muṣarrāt*, 343 f., and other brief notices. Cf. further, Brockelmann, S I, 590 f. (S II, 293 f.); *De genalogia des Banu Sa'id*, 462 f., 491; 'Abbās 'Azāwī, *al-Tā'īf bi-ʾl-му'arrikhin, i, Baghdad 1376/1957, 90-5; Mustafa Diawd, introd. to his ed. of *Nisā' al-khulūfa*.

**IBN AL-MAHDIS**—**IBN AL-SAIGH**, Abu 'L-HASAN 'ALI b. MŪSĀ b. MUQ. B. 'ABD AL-MA'LIK b. SA'I, Andalusian poet, anthologist, historian and geographer, born near Granada in 610/1213, in a family which was descended from the Companion of the Prophet 'Ammar b. Yasir [a.s.] and which had long previously emigrated to Spain, where, during the period of the Ta'ifah, it had carved out a principality for itself in the Kal'a of the Banu Yabuṣ (modern name Alcala la Real), but had afterwards been forced to enter the service of the Almohads (for this family, see G. Potiron, *Elements de biographie et de généalogie des Banu Sa'id*, i, Baghdad 1376/1957, 90-5; Mustafa Diawd, introd. to his ed. of *Nisā' al-khulūfa*).

**IBN AL-SAIGH**—**IBN AL-SĀ'I**, ABO 'L-ḤASAN B. AL-HASAN B. SIBĀ, al-Maghribī, historian and geographer, born near Granada in 610/1213, in a family which was descended from the Companion of the Prophet 'Ammar b. Yasir [a.s.] and which had long previously emigrated to Spain, where, during the period of the Ta'ifah, it had carved out a principality for itself in the Kal'a of the Banu Yabuṣ (modern name Alcala la Real), but had afterwards been forced to enter the service of the Almohads (for this family, see G. Potiron, *Elements de biographie et de généalogie des Banu Sa'id*, i, Baghdad 1376/1957, 90-5; Mustafa Diawd, introd. to his ed. of *Nisā' al-khulūfa*). His writings on the scholars of his time, his own family, his journey to Mecca, and on geography etc. have been used by later writers such as al-Maḳṣari or Abo 'L-Fidā', but the latter admits that Ibn Sa'id's geographical writings are full of errors.

mentary on Ibn Durayd's Maṣṣūra, an abridgment of the Şaḥā of al-Djumhari, an abridgment of the commentaries by Ibn Khārīf and by al-Sirāfī on the Kitāb of Sibawayh (manuscript in the Karawiyān, etc.), as well as of a Māmah ẓahibiyya and of a large Dīwān, containing especially a long ḥāfiyya, composed in Egypt, in which he expressed the nostalgia he felt on being far from his native town; this composition is numbered among the famous zahrīyyāt.

**Bibliography:** Kutubi, Fawād, s.v.; Şafadī, Wādī, ii, 340; Ḥādīdī Khulīf, vi, 94; Ḳabīhā, ix, 173; F. Bustānī, DM, iii, 281-2. On other persons known by the name of Ḫānīf, see DM, iii, 281, 282. (ED.)

**IBN AL-SALĀH, TAṢI 'L-DIN ABŪ 'AMR UTHMĀN B. 'ABD AL-RAHMĀN AL-KURDI AL-SHAHRĀZĪRĪ, who belonged to the Şaḥīf madhhab, was born in 577/1181 at Sharakhān, a village in the Irīlī district near Shahrazūr, and died in Damascus in 643/1246. He was one of the most prominent of the three scholars of the period, among them the great names of Arabic literature, al-Asma'ī, i, Abu ‘l-Adīl B. al-Salar, and al-Adīl B. al-Salar, see Al-Adīl B. al-Salar. He was the author of several works in poetry and lexicography. He was in contact, at various times, with such figures as Abu 'l-Khattāb al-Ma'ārifī and Abu Ḥātim al-Malzārī, with the relations of the Ibaḍī of Tähert with their co-religionists in the East during the imāmāte of ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, and with several important Ibaḍīs of Kayrawān and central and eastern Tunisia. The date of composition of the work is not known, though it seems fairly probable that it was completed shortly after the year 693/1294, which is the last date mentioned in the extracts given by al-Shammākhī.

**Bibliography:** al-Shammākhī, Kitāb al-Siyar, Cairo 1301, 133-4, 135, 142, 143, 161, 162, 260-2; T Lewicki, Le culte du bélier dans la Tunisie musulmane, in REI, ix (1935), 196-7; idem, Une chronique ibāḍīte, in REI, vii (1934), 73; idem, Les historiens, biographes et traditionnistes ibāḍītes—wahhâbîtes de l'afrique du Nord du VIIe au XVIIe siècle, in Folia Orientalia, iii (1961-2), 106-7. (T Lewicki)

**IBN AL-SALĀH (see AL-SALĀH B. AL-SALLĀH).**

**IBN SALLĀM AL-DJUMAḤI, ABŪ 'ABD ALLĀH MUḤ. B. SALLĀM, traditionist and philologist of the Baṣra school. He was a maṣūm of Kudāma b. Maṭīna Djuwānī (d. 777/1181) at Baṣra in 1397/1395. It was in his native town that he began the transmission of the book on the sciences of adab and all branches of ḥadīth and fiqh that he collected. He was one of the most prominent of the three scholars of the period, among them the great names of Arabic literature, al-Asma‘ī, i, Abu ‘l-Khattāb al-Ma‘ārifī and Abu ‘l-Adīl B. al-Salar, see Al-Adīl B. al-Salar. He was the author of several works in poetry and lexicography. He was in contact, at various times, with such figures as Abu ‘l-Khattāb al-Ma‘ārifī and Abu ‘l-Adīl B. al-Salar, see Al-Adīl B. al-Salar.

His biographers attribute to him several works: a šahrī al-Kur’ān (which, however, is not mentioned by Ibn al-Nadim), a K. al-Faddāl (؟) fi mulk (؟) al-ḥākhūr wa 'l-ṭāgbār, a K. Buṣūtī al-Arab, a K. al-Hallāb (al-Hallāb?) wa-yāḏūr wa-khadr al-khalīf? Ahlāf, perhaps also a K. al-ṣūrūṣ, but his fame rests mainly on his Kitāb Ṭabābāt al-ṣūrū’s, which nevertheless presents several problems; these are not easy to solve because of the disordered state in which the text has survived and the unsatisfactory way in which it has been transmitted; in fact, although it can be accepted that Ibn Sallām is indeed the originator of this work, its contents were transmitted orally and probably worked over by his nephew Abū Ḫallīf al-ṣāfī al-Hubāb al-Djuwāni, who was blind, and were not written down until some decades after the death of its real author; an indication that
this was so is to be found in the fact that al-Djahiz, when he cites Ibn Sallam, mentions his inad (this does not necessarily refer to the work which was to become the Tabakht fi'l-adwiya al-mufrada il-islamiyyin, which seem to form the two basic parts of the printed graphic facts and brief quotations of verses, but notices contain in general only rudimentary bio-

Bibliography: K. Tabakht al-shu'ard* al-isldmiyyin, which certain-
a period which is translated into Spanish as the first book of Libro de las Idminas de las VII planetas, in which he lists the medicinal properties.

This scholar must not be confused with a homonym whose kunya is Abū Sūrīn (Abū al-Abbar, Ibn al-Nashi), whose properties. [23x-65] whose opit of Hermes and may be from Ibn al-

The only other surviving fragments of Ibn al-Samh also wrote a work on a planetarium, which is translated into Spanish as the first book of Libro de las Idminas de las VII planetas, in which he lists the medicinal properties.

This scholar must not be confused with a homonym whose kunya is Abū Sūrīn (Abū al-Abbar, Ibn al-Nashi), whose properties. [23x-65] whose opit of Hermes and may be from Ibn al-

The only other surviving fragments of Ibn al-Samh also wrote a work on a planetarium, which is translated into Spanish as the first book of Libro de las Idminas de las VII planetas, in which he lists the medicinal properties.
chapter 13 gives the longitudes of the apogees of the planets for 416/1025 (Libros del Saber, iii, 241-71). Ibn Khaldün (iii, 135) also ascribes to him an abridgement of Polenoy's *Almagest*.

Steinschneider (Heb. *Ueber*., 584) thinks that Kalonymos ben Kalonymos' Hebrew translation, finished in 1312, of a treatise on the cylinder and the cone ascribed to "Sammah" is to be referred to Ibn al-Samh, and suggests (Diet europa. *Ueber*., sect. 182) that the Latin *Antiquariatum* of Abnaşah is also his work; neither of these attributions has anything to support it beyond the vague similarities of the names. Moreover, the implication made by Millá's Vallicrosa (Asarqueil, 4, 247 and 278) that the Abû 'Abd Allâh Muḥammad Ibn al-Samh whose observation activity is mentioned by al-Zarkali is our author seems erroneous; he should rather be our author's father. Finally, Ibn al-Samh is named as the recipient of an epistle on alchemy alleged to have been written by his fellow-student of al-Maḏgiriti, Abû Bâkîr b. Bîshrun (see Ibn Khaldün, iii, 230), and F. Rosenthal (ibid., n. 696) notes that a biography of Maslama names Ibn Bîghrûn as the authority for a statement that there was an estrangement between al-Maḏgiriti and Ibn al-Samh. However, Rosenthal goes on to conclude that Ibn Bîghrûn's epistle is pseudepipigraphical, and therefore throws no additional light on the still nebulous Ibn al-Samh.

*Bibliography: Brief articles on Ibn al-Samh can be found in Steinschneider, Hebr. *Ueber*., 585; Suter, 85; Sánchez Pérez, *Biografías de matemáticos árabes*, Madrid 1921, 67; Brockelmann, i, 623 and S 1, 681; and E. S. Kennedy, *Islamic astronomical tables*, Philadelphia 1956, no. 26. References to him are also found in J. M. Millá Vallicrosa, *Estudios sobre Asarqueil*, Madrid-Granada 1943-50, and Los primeros tratados de astronómia en la España árabe, in Rev. Inst. Egipcio de Est. Isl. en Madrid, iii (1935), 35-49, an article which is republished in his *Nuevos estudios sobre historia de la ciencia española*, Barcelona 1960, 61-78. But there has been no study of his works or of his influence. (D. Pinckney)

*IBN SANÀ'-AL-MULK, ABU 'L-KÂSIM HIBAT ALLÂH B. ABI 'L-FA'ÂD DIA'VAR B. AL-MUTÂ'ÂMID,* known as al-Kâdî al-Sa'îd, Arabic poet of the Ayyubid period famous mainly for the treatise *Fusus al-fusul wa khardâ'at al-uqul* (published by Di. Rikâbî in Damascus in 1368/1049, and made it possible to see more clearly the structure of *muwâshshâhâb* just at a time when the originality of the *khardâja* was beginning to be perceived [see *muwâshshâh*]). The work consists of a selection of 34 *muwâshshâhâb* from al-Andalus and the Maghrib and 35 specimens composed by the author himself. The whole is preceded by a long introduction in which Ibn Sanà' al-Mulk sets out his theory about the structure and the prosody of the genre.


*IBN SARÂBÎYÛN, SUHRÂB,* author of the *Kîl'âb 'adâ'ib al-âkhâm al-sabâ'.* lived in the first half of the 4th/10th century. Hardly anything is known about the life of the author except for the little that can be ascertained from internal evidence in his extant work. In its introduction he calls himself Suhrâb (p. 5), and so was presumably of Persian origin. Again, from the detailed information that the author presents about the rivers of Baghdad and of *Irâq* (pp. 114-38) it seems that he lived in these regions for some time. The work was produced between 289-334/902-45, and although the title of the work suggests that it dealt with "marvels" ('adâ'îb) of the world, these are not described in the extant work. The author characterizes the work as a summary of information gathered from various works of earlier writers on the subject, it being his object to make this information on the positions of towns, seas, rivers, mountains, valleys, and on land- and sea-routes, available to those interested in constructing a map of the world. Hence, he describes in detail the technique of constructing a map on a cylindrical projection. Al-Khwârizmî's work, *Sûrat al-arâd,* which forms the basis of Suhrâb's work, must, in the opinion of H. von Mâzik, have originally contained similar introductions on map-making (the world-map described by Suhrâb and al-Khwârizmî has been reconstructed in detail by Râdîya Diâiri of the Aligardes and of Damascus, to whom he dedicated some pieces of poetry; he also wrote in praise of Salah al-Dîn (Salâdîn).

Ibn Sanà' al-Mulk wrote in the traditional genres without much originality; he is the author of a *Divân* (published in Haydarâbâd [Dairatu'l-Ma'ârif, n.s. no. xii] in 1958, by M. 'Abd al-Hâkîm, with detailed biography) and of an anthology of his own works in verse and prose, the *Fâysâl al-fâsîl wa 'shâbâl-al/******/(MS Paris 3233); he is said to have written also an abridgement of the *K. al-Hayâvân* of al-'Dzhîrîh under the title Râh al-hayâvân; but his importance is due less the fact that he was the first person, in the East, to compose *muwâshshâhâb* (sometimes with a *khardâja* containing Persian words) and that he had the idea of deducing from the Andalusian and Maghribi specimens available to him the rules of the genre, while realizing the difficulty of such an enterprise. His treatise, the *Dâr al-fâzir fi 'umal al-muwâshshâbât,* was published by Di. Rikâbî in Damascus in 1368/1049.
Equator which are given by al-Khuwarizmi; Suhrab also gives a few additional names of mountains, e.g., Tabaristan, Djan, Shir, Kirth, etc. (4) Suhrab calls the Sea of Baṣra (the Persian Gulf) the "Sea of Fārs" which suggests that he was under the influence of the Balkh School of Muslim geography; (5) the main difference between the two lies in the arrangement of the rivers: while al-Khuwarizmi describes all the rivers under the climes in which their sources lie, Suhrab describes most of the large and small rivers in a separate chapter and does not give their longitudes or latitudes as al-Khuwarizmi does, but describes their courses in terms of farsākhs or mils or in relation to places; (6) Suhrab makes use of diacritical marks to names and to portions added by him.

As pointed out by Krackovskiy, Suhrab's style is that of a naturalized Arab. The works of Suhrab and al-Khuwarizmi are complementary and should be studied together.


**IBN AL-DIRAYA** [see ṢAFI AL-DIN AL-HILIL].

**IBN AL-SARRAJ** [see IBN AL-ṢITT].

**IBN AL-SARRĀDI** [see IBN AL-RĀDI].

**IBN AL-SARRĀDI** [see IBN AL-RĀDI].

**IBN AL-SARRĀDI** [see IBN AL-RĀDI].

**IBN AL-SASSAR, and SARSARI**), the name of a scholarly family from the world, 450/1060 to 800/1398. The family of Damascus which can be traced for several centuries. Probably of Mesopotamian origin, as is attested by their nisbas al-Ṭaghlibi and al-Qaladī (referring to the town of Balad/Balat, now known as Eski Mosul), the family, like others of its class during the thalith laydīl, was led away from grammatical studies in favour of logic and music, but then returned to them respectfully. He taught in Baghdad, and some famous grammarians were included among his pupils: Abu ʿl-Ḳasīm al-Ẓaḍādiḏi, Abū Saʿd al-Ṣirāfi, ʿĀli b. ʿĪsā al-Rumdāni and Abū ʿĀli al-Fārisī. There is mention of his modesty and the soundness of his teaching, and one fact noted is that he had difficulty in pronouncing the rolled rā which, in his speech, became a ghwyn ( Ibn Khalīkān, Wafayāt, iii, 462).

A pupil of al-Mubarrad, he took part in the widespread movement which led the Arab grammarians to base their work on the Kitāb of Sibawayhi. He wrote a Sharḥ to the Kitāb as the outcome of his teachings. He repeated the doctrine of the Kitāb in various didactic works:— the K. al-ʿUṣūl al-ḥabīr which was esteemed very highly, then the Kitāb of Dhuqayl, and the K. al-Mawṣilat al-ṣaw (wa-huwa ʿl-ʿUṣūl al-taḥakhir, according to Yākūṭ, Mūḍjam, xviii, 200). The Fihrist (62) mentions also the K. al-Majāz, the K. al-Diḥawī, the K. al-Mawṣilat, the K. al-ʿAṣbaḏ, the K. al-ʿAṣbaḏ ḫārjī, the K. al-ʿAṣbaḏ ḫārjī and the K. al-ḥilāl, he which did not complete, according to Yākūṭ ( loc. cit.); the latter adds the K. al-Ḥaḍīth and the K. al-Ḥālidī? He touched on lexicography in the K. al-ʿArwafī wa ʿl-ḥawādīl wa ʿl-nār, and Kur'anic sciences in the K. Ṣādādi al-ḥarrāt and the K. al-Ṣāḥib wa ʿl-nār, mentioned in al-Ḥifūzī, infe, ii, 295.

As pointed out by Kradkovskiy, Suhrab's style is that of a naturalized Arab. The works of Suhrab and al-Khuwarizmi are complementary and should be studied together.
Hibat Allah, 'Ali, and Muhammad. Of these three, the family of Hibat Allah was most important.

(4) Hibat Allah b. Mahsud, Abu 'l-ghanam, d. 563/1168, served as a kadi at the age of twenty, heard and transmitted many traditions from teachers such as Hibat Allah b. Abmad b. Tâ'ús and studied jurisprudence with Abu 'l-Hasanc al-Sulami, cf. Sibt b. al-Djawzi, Mir'ât, 274; Ibn Taghibirdi, iii, 125.

(5) al-Hasan b. Hibat Allah, Abu 'l-Mawhîrî, 537-86/1142-90, probably the most important of the 6th/12th century members of the family, travelled extensively in the eastern Islamic world in pursuit of the study of traditions. In Iraq he studied with Ibn al-Butá (d. 564/1169), and in Iran with al-Hasan b. Abmad al-'Atâr (d. 560/1164) and Ibn Mâshâdâh (d. 572/1176). He was a companion of Ibn 'Asâkir, the historian of Damascus, and his name appears frequently in the samâ'dî of Ibn 'Asâkir's history as well as in the works of other authors. The titles of at least four of his own works are known. He was the first of his family to have been buried in a family turba on Mount Kâsîyûn, cf. al-Dhahabi, iii, 48; Ibn Taghibirdi (Cairo), vi, 112.

(6) al-'Usayn b. Hibat Allah, Abu 'l-Kâsim, 530-626/1135-1229, the elder brother of al-Hasan, also a scholar and traditionist, but not so well known and often confused with his brother by later historians and chroniclers. He was important as a teacher of tradition, which he studied first with his grandfather (on his maternal side 'Abd al-Wâhid b. Hâlîl, d. 565/1169-70) and with many other scholars listed in a 17-volume work no longer extant. See Abû Shâma, Tarâjidîm, 154; Ibn Taghibirdi (Cairo), vi, 272.

(7) Sâlim b. al-Hasan, Abu 'l-Ghânâtim, Amin al-Din, 577-637/1181-1240, accompanied his father on some of his journeys and thus had the opportunity of studying with important scholars in other lands. See Orientalia, ii, 286.

The children and grandchildren of Sâlim were the bearers of the family tradition of scholarship down to the beginning of the 9th/15th century, when the family name disappears. The sons of Sâlim, 'Abd al-Ra'âman (d. 664/1266), al-Hasan (d. 664/1266), and Muhammad (d. 670/1272), are all noted in their biographies for their learning and for performing public religious functions—usually as kâdis. In the next generation, that of the grandchildren of Sâlim, there is increasing involvement in the financial administration of the province of Damascus. Among the chief figures of that period are the following:

(9) Ibrâhîm b. 'Abd al-Ra'âman b. Sâlim, Damâl al-Din, Abu Ishâk, d. 693/1294, became Nâsit al-dâneuwîn, as his father before him, serving from 679/1279-80. In the latter year he was seized, together with the Vizier of Damascus, Ibn Kusayyîr, and they were mulcted of much wealth. In 682/1283, he was appointed muhsâbî and re-appointed to his previous post as well. He continued to serve until 687/1287, when he and a number of Damascene notables were summoned to Cairo and was forced to pay 60,000 dirhams to obtain his release. He was reinstated as kadi but died a few years later. See Orientalia, ii, 277; Wiet, Manhal, no. 1050.

(10) 'Abd al-Mumâmmad, Na'dîm al-Din Abu 'l-'Abbas, 655-723/1257-1322, brother of no. (8) and the most prominent of all the Banû Sha'râ. He studied tradition in Egypt as well as Syria, and also studied jurisprudence and grammar. He was appointed to teach at several madrasas, among them the Lesser 'Âdilîyya, the Aminîyya, the Ghazzâliyya, the Greater 'Âdilîyya, and the Aminîyya of the Arab, the Alî and the Aminîyya in Damascus, a post he held until his death 21 years later. He figured prominently in the religious and civil events in Damascus during that period, which included the cause célèbre of Ibn Taymiyya. Students flocked to his lectures and some of the prominent scholars of Damascus were taught by him. Many biographical notices and references are devoted to him, among them Ibn Kâthîr, xiv, 166; al-Kutubi, Fawâ'id, i, 62; Wiet, Manhal, no. 260; Ibn Hâdjar, Durar, i, 263; Ibn Taghibirdi (Cairo), ix, 258.

Two women of the family are noted for their scholarly attainments, a sister of the Chief Kâdi named Asmâ', 636-733/1240-1333, and her daughter Malika, d. 749/1348.

Finally there is a writer of local history known only through a unique Bodleian Library manuscript of one of his works, Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Abmad—presumably a great-grandson of the Chief Kâdi. His work al-Durra al-mu'âdâ'a fi 'l-da'wa al-Zâhiriyah, a valuable study of Damascus during a part of the reign of Sultan al-Zâhir Bârîq, has been edited and translated by W. M. Brinner as A Chronicle of Damascus 1239-1379, Berkeley 1963, 2 vols.

Bibliography: A brief survey is found in Dâbrat al-ma'ârif, iii, 285. A full study of the family may be found in the article by W. M. Brinner, The Banû Sha'râ: A Study in the transmission of a scholarly tradition, in Arabic, vii/2 (1960), 167-95. Some important additions to this article appear in a brief notice by G. Vajda, A propos des Banû Sha'râ, in Glanes intéressants sur l'intérieur du VII'XIHI siècle dans le Mu'âm al-Suvûd al-Dâmîjîdî, in Arabc, viii/1 (1961), 98. (W. M. Brinner)

ISBN Sâ'ûd [see su'd, AL].

IBN AL-SAWDA' [see 'ABD ALLAH B. SABA'].

IBN SAYHÂN, 'Abd al-Ra'âman (b. Sayhân) b. Arâfat al-Mu'âribî, a minor poet of Medina who lived in the 1st/7th century, on intimate terms with the governors or members of the Umayyad aristocracy of the town—al-Walîd b. 'Uthmân b. 'Affân, al-Walîd b. 'Uthba b. Abî Sufyân, 'Abd al-Ra'âman b. al-Hakam and al-Walîd b. 'Uthba b. Abî Mu'sâyît; indeed he belonged to a clan which was a half of the Banû Harb b. Umayya, a fact which incidentally won him the friendship and protection of Mu'âwîya. Although we possess a number of his verses, which belong to 'A'âmîya and the Arabâyayî, as well as some in praise of the singer Djamâl [g.e.], this somewhat unproductive poet has escaped falling into total oblivion merely because some of his compositions were set to music; in these works panegyrics of his friends are usually combined with the glorification of wine, and he even uses sacrilegious terms in advocating its enjoyment. He thus takes his place in the line of Bacchic poets, while giving this poetry a distinctly anti-Muslim flavour. The potations in
which he indulged with his Umayyad friends brought him into conflict with Marwan b. al-Ḥakam (q.v.), who punished him with the slaughter of 80 strokes of the whip, but it is interesting to note that Mu'āwiyah compelled Marwan to make a public retraction. 

**Bibliography:** the only notice is that in the *Aḥārān* (Beirut ed., ii, 208-26) which contains interesting details regarding the consumption of wine in *Medina*; see also C. A. Nallino, *Letteratura*, French tr., 96; F. Bustānī, *Dār al-maʿārif*, ii, 331-32.

**IBN AL-ŠAYRAFĪ, TĀDĪ AL-RĀṢĪ AḤMAD AL-DĪN ABU 'L-KĀSIM 'ALI b. MUḤDĪB b. SULAYMĀN, Egyptian civil servant and a prolific writer in prose and verse, was born on 22 Šaḥbān 645/25 May 1071. His grandfather had been a kātib and his father was a money-changer. He learned the profession of kātib under Ibn Mu'arridī, wali of the Department of the *Arma* (*Dīwān al-Ŷayḫ)*, and finally rose to the Chancery (*Dīwān al-Ŷaḥūd*). On the death of its head Sana al-Muluk Muḥammad, Ibn al-Šayrafī succeeded him, and he was employed there for some fifty years, until his death on 20 Šafar 542/21 July 1147. The following is a tentative list of his works: (1) *Ṣiyāṣī al-asrā'ī* (referred to as *raṣā'ī*), which he composed in the course of his official duties; according to Yākūt, he wrote more than four volumes of official letters, while Ibn Sa'd (al-Murūji), 111) says that he saw a collection in twenty volumes. For those that survive, dispersed in various histories and literary works, see Dāmāl al-Dīn al-Šayrafī, *Maḏmaṣ'āt al-waṭaḥīf al-Ŷāfi‘īyya*. (2) *Kānim Dīwān al-Raṣā'ī*, a guide to chancery practice, ed. 'All Bāḥlarī, Cairo 1905, with extensive notes; Fr. tr. by H. Massi, *Code de la chancellerie*, in *BIFAO*, xi (1934), 55-120. The work is dedicated to al-Ŷaḍī kātib muwashṣaḥī. (3) *Iḥrār al-Ŷai al-waṣī‘a*, a history of the Fatimid viziers from Ibn Kilis to al-Bata; according to al-Muṣ'id b. al-Ṭāhir, Fatih 5410; a microfilm in the Institute of Arabic Manuscripts, Cairo 1950; F. Bustānī, *L'Antologia di Ibn as-Sairafi sui poeti arabo-siciliani*, in *Boll. del Centro di Studi filologici e linguisticici Siciliani*, iii (1954), 1-15; O. Kaak, *De la poésie arabo-sicilienne*, in *Arabo-sicilienne*, no. 1 (1960), 149-170; F. Bustānī, *Dār al-maʿārif*, iii, 292, (Ed.) *IBN SAYYID AL-NAS, FATIH AL-DIN MUHAMMAD b. YUSUF AL-ANSĀRĪ, Andalusian poet, historian and traditionist, born at Granada in 467/1074. He had a profound knowledge of Arabic language and literature, and was a prolific poet, particularly of muwaṣṣaḥī. He was kātib of the amīr Muḥammad Tāṣhīn at Granada; but his fame rests on a history of the Almoravid dynasty entitled *Ta'rīkh al-dawla al-lamtunīyya or Anawār al-di'ālayfi fī al-hābīr al-dawla al-murābitiyā;* at first ending at the year 530/1136 6, then continued by the author until shortly before his death, which took place at Orihuela probably in 537/1142 (the other date recorded, 570/1175-5, seems to be too late), this chronicle has not yet been discovered; there exist only some extracts, preserved in particular in the *Bayān* of Ibn Iḍhārī and the publication of which had been promised by E. Lévi-Provençal (see Lévi- Provençal and R. Menéndez Pidal, in *Andalucía* (1936), 57, 160, 161); this chronicle is also quoted in al-Ḥulal al-muwaṣṣaḥī, and some passages from it are reproduced by Ibn al-Khāṭib and other historians. 

**Bibliography:** In the course of his official duties; according to al-Muṣ'id b. al-Ṭāhir, Fatih 5410; a microfilm in the Institute of Arabic Manuscripts, Cairo 1950; F. Bustānī, *L'Antologia di Ibn as-Sairafi sui poeti arabo-siciliani*, in *Boll. del Centro di Studi filologici e linguistici Siciliani*, iii (1954), 1-15; O. Kaak, *De la poésie arabo-sicilienne*, in *Arabo-sicilienne*, no. 1 (1960), 149-170; F. Bustānī, *Dār al-maʿārif*, iii, 292, (Ed.) *IBN SAYYID AL-NAS, FATIH AL-DIN MUHAMMAD b. YUSUF AL-ANSĀRĪ, Andalusian poet, historian and traditionist, born at Granada in 467/1074. He had a profound knowledge of Arabic language and literature, and was a prolific poet, particularly of muwaṣṣaḥī. He was kātib of the amīr Muḥammad Tāṣhīn at Granada; but his fame rests on a history of the Almoravid dynasty entitled *Ta'rīkh al-dawla al-lamtunīyya or Anawār al-di'ālayfi fī al-hābīr al-dawla al-murābitiyā;* at first ending at the year 530/1136 6, then continued by the author until shortly before his death, which took place at Orihuela probably in 537/1142 (the other date recorded, 570/1175-5, seems to be too late), this chronicle has not yet been discovered; there exist only some extracts, preserved in particular in the *Bayān* of Ibn Iḍhārī and the publication of which had been promised by E. Lévi-Provençal (see Lévi- Provençal and R. Menéndez Pidal, in *Andalucía* (1936), 57, 160, 161); this chronicle is also quoted in al-Ḥulal al-muwaṣṣaḥī, and some passages from it are reproduced by Ibn al-Khāṭib and other historians. 

**Bibliography:** In the course of his official duties; according to al-Muṣ'id b. al-Ṭāhir, Fatih 5410; a microfilm in the Institute of Arabic Manuscripts, Cairo 1950; F. Bustānī, *L'Antologia di Ibn as-Sairafi sui poeti arabo-siciliani*, in *Boll. del Centro di Studi filologici e linguistici Siciliani*, iii (1954), 1-15; O. Kaak, *De la poésie arabo-sicilienne*, in *Arabo-sicilienne*, no. 1 (1960), 149-170; F. Bustānī, *Dār al-maʿārif*, iii, 292, (Ed.)
fast handwriting, both maghribi and eastern. He was popular with almost all high government officials, but there are hints that this was not the right company for a scholar and that he was not as devoted to scholarship as a root of his gifts should have been. He held a professorship in hadith in the Zahiriyya, and some other teaching and mosque positions. Instead of a government appointment offered him by al-Malik al-Manṣūr Lāḏiṇ, he accepted a pension for life, and he had additional sources of income. He died on 11 Shaban 734/17 April 1334.

It is a good deal of poetry which was highly esteemed. He is credited with two works on the ṣakība, and he wrote a commentary on al-Tirmidhi’s Ṣahih (cf. Segzin, i, 155). MS. Escorial 1160 (= 1515 Casiri) contains his answers to questions submitted to him in 731/1330-1 by Ahmad b. Aybak Ibn al-Dimayy, concerning various ḥadīths, some problems of the science of hadith, and, it seems, biographical items (requiring further study). Mainly, he wrote on the Prophet and his last years, and his reputation rests on his biography of the Prophet, entitled ‘Uyun al-ṭalār fi junūn al-maghdal wa ’l-ṣamā‘il wa ’l-ṭayar (ed. Cairo 1356). It is compiled on the basis of Ibn ʿIsḥāk (Ibn Hishām) and al-Waḳi’dī (q.q.v.), but it makes use also of a number of sources now lost or imperfectly known, such as Mūsā b. ʿUkba, Ibn ʿAqil, Abū ʿArūba, and Abū Bishr al-Dawla’ī (cf. ‘Uyun, ii, 342-7). The work was eminently successful in its time. Ibn Sayyid al-Nās himself wrote an abridgement of it, and it was commented upon several times and also versified. 

Biography: Bibliographies by contemporaries such as al-Ṣafādī, Wāfi, i, 289-311; al-Uḍfawi, al-Badr al-sāfīr (not available, quoted by Ibn al-ʿImād, Shahrārdī, vi, 108); al-Ḍahabī, al-Muʿjam al-maḥkūmat (not available); al-Kutubi, Fawā'id, Cairo 1951, ii, 344-9, etc., and many later notices, such as, for instance, al-Subkī, Tabākāt al-Ṣafārīyya, Cairo 1324, vi, 29-31; Ibn Ḥadijār, Durar, iv, 208-13. Cf. also Pons Boigués, 320 f.; R. Basset, in Le Musée, v (1886), 245-55 (with a discussion of the important inhabitants. He was welcomed by the Mamluk sultan Baybars and enjoyed his favour and that of his successors. He did not return to Syria until 669/1271, in the course of a journey made with this sultan.

It was in Egypt that he wrote his main works: the historical topography of Syria and the Ḍijarzra entitled al-ʿĀhâd al-halṭara fi dhīhur umrād ʿAl-Saḥam wa ’l-Ḍijarzra, in three substantial sections, written between 671/1272-3 and 680/1281-2, and the life of Baybars (Turkish tr. of the Edirne MS by Yaltkaya, 1941), sometimes wrongly attributed to Bahāʾ al-Din Ibn Shaddād (see next art.). There is also attributed to him a work on the Yemen, unpublished.

Biography: Brockelmann, ii, 634, S I, 883; Cl. Cahen, La Syrie du nord . . ., Paris 1940, index; parts of the historical topography have been published: of Aleppo, by D. Sourdelle, Beirut 1953; of Damascus, by S. Dahan, Damascus 1956; of Lebanon, Jordan and Palestine, by S. Dahan, Damascus 1963; on the section relating to the Ḍijarzra, see Cl. Cahen, La Djazira au milieu du XTT ies, Paris 1958, iii, Paris 1959, v, (not to be confused with ‘Uzūn al-Din, see above), biographer of Saladin, was born in Mosul in 439/1045 and died at Aleppo, at a great age, in 662/1265.

After completing his education in Mosul, he spent four years as assistant teacher (muṣṭaf) in the Nizāmīyya at Baghdad. Returning to Mosul, he taught at the madrasa founded by Kamāl al-Din al-Shahrāzūrī. He was sent by the Atabegs of Mosul on various embassies, to the caliph in Baghdad, to Saladin, and to the governors of neighbouring towns. In 583/1188 he performed the Pilgrimage; while he was at Damascus, on his way home, Saladin, then besieging the castle of Kawkab, sent for him and listened to a work on ḥadīth which he had composed. Ibn Shaddād visited Jerusalem (now back in Muslim hands), and then sought Saladin’s permission to return to Mosul. Saladin, much impressed by a work on ḥadīth which Ibn Shaddād had dedicated to him, retained him in his service (from Djumada I 584/July 1188); as kādir of the army and of Jerusalem he remained in constant attendance on Saladin until the latter’s
death (589/1193), of which he has left a moving description.

Ibn Shaddad then moved to Aleppo, where he acted as the conciliator and adviser of Saladin's sons. In 591/1195 al-Malik al-Zahir appointed him kādi of Aleppo, with supervision of the madrasas. It was in these years that he founded his magnificent madrasa, for the promotion of the Shāfiʿī madhhab, opposite the madrasa of Nūr al-Dīn, and a dār al-badhīd, erecting his own tomb between his two foundations. There are numerous records of missions he made to Cairo (in 593, 608 and 609) in attempts to compose Ayyubid family quarrels; and in 629/1232 he led the delegation which brought the daughter of al-Malik al-Kāmil from Cairo to marry al-Malik al-ʿAṣīl of Aleppo. In his latter years his house was frequented by such famous writers as Ibn Khallīkān, who has left an impressive description of the aged scholar; Abū Shāma, who gives Ibn Shaddad's biography, s.a. 632, in his Dhayl ʿala Ṽal-Rawdatayn; and Ibn ʿAbīl Wālī (q.v.), who visited Aleppo in 627 and 628, and traced Ibn Shaddad's sources.

Ibn Shaddad’s minor works are: (1) Dalāʾī al-ḥikām, still in manuscript (Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS ar. 736); (2) Maǧlaʿa al-ḥukkām ʿinda ilibbās al-ḥikām (MS in 2 vols. at the Egyptian National Library, Cairo); (3) Durūs al-badhīd, lectures delivered in Aleppo in 629/1232 (Bodleian Library, Cat. i, 1173); (4) Kiīlāʾ al-ʿaṣīl, on the encounter of Moses and Pharaoh (MS: Patna); (5) Fadāʾīl al-qāḥdī, the work presented to Saladin (Istanbul, MS Körprüli 764); (6) Asmāʾ al-rājīdāl al-laḍădīn fī Muḥadhdib al-Ḵīrārī (not in Brockelmann: Istanbul, MS Millet/ Velkyūtdīn Carullah 255).

His most important work is his biography of Saladin, entitled al-Naḥḍūd al-sulṭānīyya wa ʿl-maḥāsin al-Yūsifiyya ʿsa Sirat Salāḥ al-Dīn. First published by A. Schultens in 1732-3, it was edited, with French tr., by De Slane in RHC, ii, 170-5, iii, 104; Brockelmann, I, 316-7, S I, 549-50. (GAMALEL-DIN EL-SHAYYAL) His works have been used by nearly all later historians, and has been used by nearly all later historians, Muslim and European; it gives invaluable information not only on the battles of the opposed armies and the weapons employed, but also on the social and administrative systems on both the Muslim and the Christian sides, and contains important documents illustrating the relations between Saladin and the neighbouring Crusader States. As a “specimen of royal biography . . . a based on a study of character”, it is, in F. Gabrieli’s words, “without parallel in the historical literature of early Islam”.


Ibn AL-SHADJARl AL-BAGHDADl, ABU ʿl-SAʾDĀT HIṢAṬ ALLĀH b. ʿALI b. MUḤAMMAb b. ḤAMsA, a descendant of ʿAlī b. Abl Ṭāḥī (he is thus called al-Sharīf al-Ḥasan al-ʿAlawī), was a gram-maryan and poet of Baghdad, born in Ramadān 450/November 1058. After making the traditional studies under the direction of numerous teachers he began how, at the end of his youth, Ibn al-Anbārī (q.v.), who introduced him to the practice of folklore knowledge to ʿAll through an unbroken line of teachers, he taught grammar for 70 years. At the same time he was maḏāb of the nakīb (q.v. of the Tālibīs in al-Kāhkh, where he lived. He died in Ramadān 542/February 1148, and was buried in his own house.

His Amālī, dictated in 84 sessions, forms his principal work (ed. Haydarābād 1349), completed by his Intisār which was published by a commission with Ibn al-Khāṣḥāb (q.v.). He is also the author of a Hamāsā (ed. Krenkov, Haydarābād 1345; Cairo 1306, under the title Maḥḍīrāt shuʿārāʾ al-ʿArab). Of his other works, we may note a commentary on the Luma ʿa Ibn Dīnī (q.v.) and a treatise entitled Māʿ laʿfatā laṣfūn wa ʿl-khalaṣa maʿnī. His poems in qaṣīa form, his panegyrics, funeral orations and verses of parentic character do not reveal any great originality.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Anbārī, Nuzha (last biography); Yākūṭ, ʿUdabāb, xii, 282-4; Ibn Khallikān, index, s.v.; Suyūṭī, Būḥāyā, 407-8; Brockelmann, S 1, 493; F. Krenkov, in JRA S, 1929, 96-100; F. Bustamī, Dīвать al-mawāṣif, iii, 252.

IBN AL-SHAHID, ABD ḤAFṣ UMAR AL-TANGAL, Andalusian man of letters of the 5th/11th century. Almost nothing is known of his life except that he was one of the panegyrist of al-Muṣtaʿīm Ibn Ṣaʿūd, king of Almeria. Ibn Bassām devotes to him a notice of some length in his Dhakhlra (1/2, 380-200) and quotes a fair number of his poems. Ibn Saʿīd also mentions him in the Maghīra (ed. Sh. Dayf, ii, 209-10) but without giving any personal details of him.

As a poet, Ibn al-Shāhid was merely one of the many flourishing at that period, without any especial claim to fame. He has on the other hand some importance as a prose writer, although this may be judged only from a Risaʿīa and a Maḥāmā, both of them reproduced (the latter only fragmentarily) by Ibn Bassām. The Maḥāmā, written in an elegant rhymed prose without excessive use of ornament, follows its subject, in the manner of a short story, and differs slightly, in its theme and its structure, from the classical works in the same genre written in the East.

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the text, see Humaydī, Diwān al-μulābābīs, Cairo 1952, 283-4; Dabbi, Būḥāyā,
IBN SHAHIN
[see NISIM BEN YA'COB IBN SHAHIN]

IBN SHAHIN AL-ZAHIRI, GHARS AL-DIN KHALIL, born in Cairo (or Jerusalem) in 1314/14, son of a man of distinction. Ibn al-Salih, author of the Diwan al-Shafi'i, was a pupil of one of the most important Shi'i scholars of his time and was recognized and highly thought of even by the Sunnis. His sermons having never before been published, and his treatise entitled Mutashabih al-Kur'an, is its chief source, is incorporated in it; a unique feature, however, is the chapter on the Shi'i poets, certainly written, according to Ibn Kabbal, between 573 and 582/1177-86; (2) Manáshíl Ābí Abí Tālib, 3 vols., ed. Na'dal, 1956, a theological-apologetic treatise on the imāms rather than a work of genealogy and hadith. Other works, the majority consisting of Shi'i apologetic: Mudhakkab al-Kind (printed in Tehran); Bayān al-tanzil', Abaum al-tara'ikfi 'l-hudud, (printed in Tehran); Bayān al-tanzil', Abaum al-tara'ikfi 'l-hudud, (printed in Tehran); Bayān al-tanzil', Abaum al-tara'ikfi 'l-hudud, (printed in Tehran); Bayān al-tanzil', Abaum al-tara'ikfi 'l-hudud, (printed in Tehran);
"reader" of the Kur'an and teacher of Kur'anic reading, died Safar 328/November-December 939, introduced in the public prayer (fi 'l-mihrd) readings of Ibn Mas'ud, Ubay and others which varied from 'Ughmân's pronunciation; for this purpose, or perhaps at the instigation of his influential colleague Ibn Mujâhid (whom he detested), he was brought to trial in 325/935 before a special court presided over by the vizier Ibn Mûkla and with Ibn Mujâhid also as a member; he at first in a confident and aggressive manner defended the variants which had provoked the charge. However, after he had been flopped on the vizier's orders he performe ceased resisting, made a complete recantation and signed a document (mahdar) stating that for the future he would adhere to 'Ughmân's text as being the only valid one. After being discharged from the vizier's house, Ibn Shanâbudh had at first to seek safety outside Baghdâd from the infuriated mob.


(R. Paret)

**IBN SHARAF AL-KÂRWAṈI,** Abû 'Abd Allâm Muhammad b. Sa'id al-Qayrawânî, is a prose writer and poet, born at Kayrawân about 390/1000. He received his initiation into poetry under the direction of Abu 'l-Hasan al-Kâbi and Abû 'Imrân al-Fâsî, into grammar under Muhammad b. Dja'âfar al-Kazzâz, and into belles-lettres under al-Husri [q.v.]; he probably studied also under Ibn Abî 'Rtidjîl [q.v.]. Although he was one-eyed, he succeeded in gaining admittance to the entourage of al-Mu'izz b. Bâ'dîs [q.v.] and thus was on terms of familiarity with the best minds of the age, though not without making enemies and falling in disgrace. In them he gives in rhymed prose the name of Ibn Rašîq [q.v.]; whose name is inseparable from that of Ibn Sharaf because the two men followed more or less parallel courses; their rivalry, spitefully maintained by al-Mu'izz, turned out in the end to be fruitful, for it stimulated not only an exchange of epigrams and epistles (which are today lost) but also the composition of several works which testify to the high degree of culture reached by the Kayrawânîs at the beginning of the 5th/11th century. Besides this, Ibn Sharaf devoted himself to the habitual activity of court poets, composing verses in praise of the amir, describing flowers and fruits, taking part in the literary gatherings which were held at the court, and replying on the spot to the slightest caprice of his master.

The Hilâl invasion [see HILAL] obliged al-Mu'izz to take refuge in al-Mahdiyya in 447/1055, and he took the two rival poets with him. After a short stay with Tamîl b. al-Mu'izz, Ibn Sharaf went to Sicily and established himself at Mazara, where he was shortly joined by Ibn Rašîq, with whom, it is said, he was reconciled. However, he did not stay long in Sicily but in 449/1057 embarked for Spain; after trying his luck at the courts of several of the

---

**Bibliography:** Ibn Bassâm, Dhâhîrâ, iv/1, 133-8; Yaâkût, Irshad, xvi, 28-31; *Udâbâ,* viii, 37 ff.; Kâmil ibn Yâqût, ii, 204-5; Ibn Bashkuwal, *Dhâhirat al-ma'ârid,* i, 3-10; Ibn Bashkuwal, *Shîla,* no. 1208; Suyûtî, *Bugyâ,* 46; Hâdjîlî Khâfîa, i, 145; Ibn Dibyâ, Mu'tirîb, B.M. MS, fols. 52r-57r (Cairo and Khartoum edd., 1954, index); Ibn Nâdî, Ma'sîlm, iii, 249-51; H. Abî Wahhâb, Bisâ'î al-abâ'id fi hadarat al-Kayrawânî wa-shâ'iriyya Ibn Rašîq, Tunis 1330/1911; F. Bustînhî, Dhâ'irat al-ma'ârîf, iii, 259-60; Maymann's collection of verses may be supplemented from Nuwayrî, Nihatî, Ibn Dibyâ, Mu'tirîb, Ibn Bassâm, Dhâhîrâ, Ibn Lûyûn, Lâmbî, Ibn al-'Imad, *Kharîda,* Umârî, Ma'sâlîh al-abâr, etc. (a new collection is being prepared in Paris).

---

The son of the foregoing, Abu 'l-Faḍîl Dja'âfar b. Muhammad, was likewise a celebrated poet and prose writer. Born at Kayrawân in 444/1052-3, he emigrated with his father as a child to Spain, where he spent the rest of his life in Spain, where he attained the rank of waṣîr at Almeria during the reign of Muhammad al-Mu'tasim (443/1051-4/1091), at whose court he passed a number of years. He died in 534/1139. Abu 'l-Faḍîl was a man of wide culture and a facile talent in the customary genres: panegyric, description, gnomic poetry. He is the author of two collections of aphorisms and maxims in prose and verse, *Nûgîh*
IBN SHARAF AL-KAYRAWĀNĪ — IBN SHIBL

The available data would seem to indicate that the use of the figure of Ibn Sharya as an historical narrator does not antedate the early 3rd/9th century, after the figure of the sage had become securely established. The author of the "Book of kings" may not have been a South Arabian patriot, but rather some Baghdadī antiquarian who tried to profit from the fashionable interest in South Arabian antiquity. Whether the work contains many reflections of genuine South Arabian folklore, as Kremers maintained, or the whole thing is a piece of fiction, as a later, Fatimid-period addition, though great scepticism would seem to be indicated.


IBN SHAYKH HITṬĪN [see AL-DIMASHQĪ, SHAMS AL-DIN-].

IBN SHİBL [or AL-SHİBL], ʿABD AL-ḤUSAYN B. ʿABD AL-LĀH B. YÛSUF . . . AL-BAGHDĀDI, according to Ibn Abī ʿUṣaybiʿa (d. 655/1257), but MUḤAMMAD B. AL-HĀSĪN B. ʿABD AL-LĀH B. YÛSUF according to al-Kuttabī (and according to Kahhaba his genealogy is continued thus: B. AMR B. ʿAṢĪĪR B. ʿUṢAMI AL-STAMI) and, according to al-Ṣafādī, Ḳhvāṣna al-ḥādab, and, later, al-Zirktī, MUḤAMMAD B. AL-ḤUSAYN b. ʿABD AL-LĀH B. AMR B. ʿAṢĪĪR B. ʿUṢAMI SHIB, theoretician and practitioner in medicine, and poet; he lived during the reigns of al-Kādīr bi-ʿIlāh and of al-Kāʾīm bi-amr Allah (381/468-997/1057). The exact date of his birth is not known, though Kahhaba puts it at 401/1010-11; he was educated in Baghdādī to which his family belonged, and died there in 473/1080-1; according to al-Safādī, al-Ḳhvāṣna al-ḥādab, al-Zirktī and Kahhaba, or in 474/1082-3, according to Ibn Abī ʿUṣaybiʿa, and was buried at Bāḥ al-Ḥarb. The sources, notably the ʿUyān al-anbāʿ, contain little information on his medical career, merely mentioning that he continued in it until an advanced age; but they contain more details on the ṭuwaṭ which he wrote. Among the verses which they quote, in particular two famous ḥadīthāt reproduced in full by Ibn Abī ʿUṣaybiʿa, the attribution of some is uncertain (Ibn Sīnā and al-Mafārīq are mentioned as possible authors). They seem to display, together with a pessimistic view of life similar to that of Ibn Sīnā and ʿUmar Khayyām, a certain mechanistic and determinist conception of the universe seen as
independent of the divine will. This could explain some suspicions of atheism, or at least of doubtful orthodoxy, which were attached to this writer, whose philosophical-scientific scepticism was typical of his period.

Bibliography: Ibn Abû Ţayyibâ, 'Uryân al-anbâ’ fi tabâdî al-afîbîb', ed. A. Müller, i, Göttin- gen 1884, 248-52; al-Kutubi, Falâd al-wafâyât, ii, Cairo Rab刺激 1283/1866, 244-7; al-Safadi, Wāfî, iii, Damascus 1953, 11-16, n. 572; Hâdî Khallîfa, i, column 766; Kâbîlîa, ix, Damascus 1959, 196-7; Zirkî, 'A’dâm', ii, 332. An important part of Ibn Shuhayd's poetry is to be found in Kifti, al-Muhammadun min al-shu’arâ’, Paris MS. 3335, fols. 91a-101b (an ed. by M. Mammâr is to appear).

(Scârcia Amoretti)

IBN AL-SHIHNA, MuHBB al-DîN ABU ‘L-FâDAL MuHAMMAD, Hânâfî chief bâdî in Cairo between 866/1463 and 876/1471, died in 890/1485. He belonged to an important family of Aleppo, whose ancestor was a freedman called Mâbûdî al-Rîshûkhi or b. al-Khutûkî al-Hâdîdî, who was the father of the Ayyubîd ruler al-Malîk al-‘Azîz in about 616/1219. His father was bâdî of Aleppo at the beginning of the 9th/15th century, and is remembered for having founded a wakf for the benefit of the mosque of the citadel of Aleppo, commemorated by an inscription which still exists, dated 811/1408. He himself wrote several works, the most important of which is a description of Aleppo and northern Syria entitled al-Durr al-muntakhab li-ta’rikh lialab, Syria entitled al-Durr al-muntakhab li-ta’rikh lialab, (Isbâra, ii, 341; c. 596), c. 1235, whose author is presented as an ascetic); Ibn al-Inbî, al-Shaghdarî, i, 210; al-‘Abdî, al-kudât, see index, iv, 15. (J-C. VadeTr)

IBN SHUHAYD, ÂBÛ ‘AMîR AHMAD b. ÂBî MARWân ‘ABD AL-MALIK b. ÂBî ‘UMAR AHMAD b. ‘ABD AL-MALIK b. ‘UMAR b. MUHAMMAD b. ’ISâ b. SHUHAYD AL-ÂSHDÂ’î, Andalusan poet, man of letters and vizier, born at Cordova, in 382/992, of an Arab family whose ancestor Shuhayd had settled in Spain before 162/778 and whose members included the famous viziers in the Umayyads, the Abbasids, and the Sharifs. He probably belongs to the same family as Ibn Hazm, but this ministry lasted for only forty-seven years. His father, Abu Marwan, was an important official and al-Mansûr had even appointed him vizier. Abu ‘Amîr was therefore destined to hold similar offices, and on his father's death, in 393/1003, he was even to inherit the honorific title of wâsir and to incur heavy responsibilities while still very young, since he was the last representative of the family. However, he was prevented from occupying the offices which, by his descent, he might have expected through the unrest which very soon occurred in Cordova, the fall of the Âmirids, who were his protectors, and the overthrow of the Umayyads, and was thus led to devote himself wholeheartedly to literature.

He received in his youth the education usually given to young members of the aristocracy, learning a great deal about poetry and adab, some history and adab, perhaps also a little medicine and philosophy, and prepared himself to fill his position as powerful official and courtier. Certainl, when the Âmin broke out in 399/1008, he was attached to the court, but the title of sâkid al-shu’urâ’ which is attributed to him seems to have been a purely honorific one. A legitimist to a lesser degree than Ibn Hazm (q.v.), he refused to leave the capital during the years of unrest, but he certainly seems to have had no scruples about making approaches to the Ham- mâdîs (q.v.), who were established at Cordova, in 406/1016; probably his situation was not always very secure, and Ibn Khâkân even claims, as a result of an unjustifiable interpretation of an alleged dijāb-dariyya, that he was for a time in prison. The accession of al-Mustazhir in 414/1024, seems to have put an end to his troubles, and indeed the new caliph did appoint him as wâsir in company, notably, with Ibn Hazm, but this ministry lasted for only forty-seven days; while Ibn Hazm was imprisoned, Ibn Shuhayd succeeded in fleeing and took refuge with the Ham- mâdîs Yâbây b. Âl at Malaga. He probably returned to Cordova after the flight of al-Mustakfi, in 416/1025, and did not again leave his native town. After the final attempt to restore the Umayyads and the accession of al-Mutâ’add, in 418/1027, he had
an opportunity to play a political rôle under the new caliph; in particular he drew up, against the Cordovans who were discontented because of the exhortations of the minister Hákam b. Sa'íd, a violent manifesto which he himself read in front of the assembled notables. After the abdication of al-Mu'tadd (422/1031), Ibn Shuhayd was able to live at the court of the Djahwarids, and his funeral prayer was recited by Abu 'l-Hazm himself; he was afflicted by hemiplegia and died, after a period of suffering which inspired some of his finest poetry, on 21 Dhu al-Fīdād (426/11 April 1035), while still in the prime of life.

Ibn Shuhayd is generally thought of as a libertine who led a dissolute life. It is true that his conduct was not of the standard demanded by the puritans of his time, but he seems to have been slandered by the historians and biographers, who accuse him in particular of having sacrificed his salvation to futile pleasures and of having preferred āšl to ġidād, that is, to have written nothing on religion. Actually the dominant feature of his character was an inordinate pride, which is not, however, too much to be regretted since it gave rise to a small masterpiece, the Risālāt al-Tawdbi wa l-zawdbi (the spirits of inspiration and the saviours, pl. of sa'wba'a— the name of a genie—given in this form in order to make the rhyme with the preceding word). The author of this article believes that he has demonstrated the originality of the Risālā in the manner in which it has survived (all that exists in its present form is a late copy), supplemented by a suitable proportion of ghārāb and of grammar; (2) it is God alone who teaches bayān; (3) beauty is indefinable and inexplicable, for it derives precisely from this innate talent and is composed of subtle and intangible elements; (4) in short, bayān alone is the mark of poetry. In this connexion Ibn Shuhayd distinguishes three categories of men of letters, but more precisely of poets: those who have original ideas but not much inspiration; those who are able to improvise without difficulty long poems of great worth; those who succeed by using the resources of technique. From all the evidence he classes himself in the second category.

Ibn Shuhayd's rôle as a literary critic is therefore not a negligible one, particularly since he has a feeling for the evolution of Arabic literature in prose as well as verse; but the very perceptive observations of E. García Gárate in his book on the poetry of al-Mutanabbi, Madrid 1952, 60-5, and in the introduction to his translation of the Taqī al-hamāma, 6-9, classes Abū 'Amir and Ibn Hazm as the leaders of a poetic school with a tendency to create a specifically Andalusian poetry, seem in the last analysis to be an exaggeration, since Ibn Hazm was hardly ever an innovator and Ibn Shuhayd's only ambition was to surpass his models with the aid of inspiration and no longer of craftsmanship. Some of his verses are indeed of high quality (for example the theme of the dabīb) and he excels in description; a writer of great sensibility, he brings to the ghazal great finesse, while in his panegyrics he maintains the dignity and nobility suitable to his rank.

In short, although Abū 'Amir may be considered as the eminent representative of classical poetry (for he did not stoop to composing muwassakhābil and literary prose in Spain at the beginning of the 5th/11th century, his chief merit resides in the form which he had devised to present his youthful works, the Risālāt al-Tawdbi wa l-sawdbi'.

Bibliography: The notice in the Matn of Ibn Hayyān was extensively used by Ibn Bassam who, in his Dhakhira (ii, 161-289 and passim), provides the fullest biographical detail and reproduces the
major part of the prose or verse texts which have survived, in particular long extracts from the Risalat al-Tawdib wa 'l-tanzabi, which have been published separately, with a long introduction, by B. al-Bustānī, Beirut 1951; Ibn Khākān, in the Kālidī and the Majmah, gives extracts especially from the poems, with personal commentaries which should be read with caution; biographical details are found also in Dabbi, Bughya; Yākūt, Udbatī, iii, 220-3; Ibn Sā'id, Mughrib, 78-85; Ibn Khājiānī; Ibn Ṣafī Allāh al-ʿUmrānī, Masdīkāt, xv, MS Paris 1937, 209; Ibn Ṣafādī, Bughya, extracts from the works of Ibn Shuḥayd are scattered throughout the works mentioned above, as well as in Thālībī, Yatīma, ii, 35-50 (which proves that Ibn Shuḥayd had quickly become famous also throughout the East); ʿīmād al-Dīn al-ʿIṣfahānī, Kharīdī, MS Paris 3331, 2017-20184; Ibn al-Ḫaṭṭīb, ʿAṣrī; Maṣkārī, Analektes. Among the modern works should be mentioned: A. Dayt, Balīgat al-ʿArab fi ʿl-Andalus, Cairo 1944, 43-59; H. Pērēs, Poétique andalouse, passim; Z. Mūbārak, Al-Isfahānī, ii, 35-50 (which also mentions Ibn Sīdā); Ibn Ṣādī, Mīmām. The greatest Andalusian lexicographer, in Acts of the First Congresses, ed. Cheikho, Beirut 1913). Incidentally, in the recension of the old dārdrūh, he holds chronologically an intermediate position between the works of his contemporaries, he went to live for a time in Khuzistān, but apparently he was born in Baghdad in about 386/992. His father, nicknamed the Sīkkit (the Taciturn), is reputed to have been an expert in poetry and lexicography; it was he who started his son's education, which was later continued under the direction of Abū ʿAmr al-Shaybānī, al-Farrāʾ, Ibn al-ʿArāʾibī and other famous teachers; like many of his contemporaries, he went to live for a time among the Bedouin in order to perfect his knowledge of Arabic. After teaching at the Darb al-Ḵanṭara, in Bagh ḍād, he turned to instruction at a higher level and dictated the most important of his works to pupils. Entrusted by al-Mutawakkīl with the education of his sons al-Muʿtazz and al-Muʿayyad, he came to be on familiar terms with the caliph, but his attachment to the ʿAlīds, which was imprudent enough to display in the presence of al-Mutawakkīl, brought about his fall; trampled underfoot by the Turkish soldiers of the guard (it is often said that his tongue was torn out), he died at the age of 58, on 5 Ṣaʿīd 244/17 October 858 (but other dates, 243, 245 and 246, are also given).

In grammar, Ibn al-Sīkkit would belong to the Kūfī school, but he could not be regarded as an eminent grammarian, while the lexicographical works and commentaries that have won him fame would connect him rather with the ʿAlīf school, for he underwent the influence of the celebrated masters of that town, al-ʿAṣnāʾī, Abū ʿUbayda, Abū Yazīd al-Anṣārī; in reality, he represents the syncretist tendency characteristic of the Bagh ḍād school. A specialist in lexicography and Arabic poetry, Ibn al-Sīkkit left, firstly, about twenty works, the most important of which appear to be the Kitāb ʿIsālāh al-Manṭik (ed. Shākir and Hādūn, Cairo 1368/1954); cf. Fīrās, i (1950), 325 ff.) and the Kitāb al-ʿArabī wa al-Kalbī (ed. Cheikho, Beirut 1897 (comm. of al-Ḵaṭṭīb, al-Taṣrīḥ, Kans al-hūfūs, ed. Cheikho, Beirut 1895-8); in addition, Haffner published the Kitāb al-Kalb wa ʿl-ʿArabī (in Texte zur arabischen Lexicographie, Leipzig 1905, 3-65) and the Kitāb al-ʿAḍād (in Drei Quellenwerke über die ʿAḍād, Beirut 1921). Incidentally, in the recension of the old dārdrūh, he holds chronologically an intermediate position between
on the one hand al-Asmaci, Abu 'Ubayda and some others who initiated the first work of methodical arrangement, and on the other hand al-Sukkari who completed the process. It is for this reason that the Fihrist (i, 157-8) lists some thirty ancient poets whose dīwan was collected and commented on by Ibn al-Sikkīt, with a care which in general compels the respect of critics. Only a few of his works have survived; those on al-Khansāʾ (see Cheikho's ed. of the dīvan of this poetess, Beirut 1897) on Urwa b. al-Ward (see Nöldeke, Die Gedichte des Urwa ibn Alward, Göttingen 1887); on Kays b. al-Khashāʾ (ed. Th. Tschopp, 2 vols., 1879, 1890) and on Muhammad b. al-Hujayrā (ed. N. A. Tāhā and M. al-Halabi, Cairo 1958).

Bibliography: Fihrist, i, 72, 157-8 (Cairo ed. 107, 224-s); al-Anbārī, Nazha, ed. A. Amer, 109-11; Zubaydī, Ţabāqāt, in RSO, viii; Ibn Khayr al-Ishbili, Fahrasa, 382; Yāḏūt, Uḏābāʾ, xx, 50-2; Ibn Mālikkānī, Cairo 1310, i, 305; Suyūṭī, Bughya, 418; Flügel, Die grammatischen Schriften der Araber, Leipzig 1864, 159; M. Ben Cheneb, Etude sur la fahrasa... . . . 433, § 237; R. Blachère, HLA, i, 113; M. Makhzūmī, Madrasat al-Kūfā, Baghdad 1374/1955, 155; S. A. Ahmedali, Ibn as-Sikkīt, Lahore n.d.; idem, in ZDMG, xc (1936), 201-8; R. Sellheim, Die klassisch-arabischen Sprachwörtersammlungen, The Hague 1954, 112 and index; H. Pleisch, Traité de philologie arabe, i, Beirut 1961, index; Brockelmann, i, 122, S I, 180.

**IBN SINĀ, ABū 'ALI AL-HUSAYN B. 'ABD ALLĀH B. SINĀ, known in the West as AVICENNA.** He followed the encyclopaedic conception of the sciences that had been traditional since the time of the Greek Sages in uniting philosophy with the study of nature and in seeing the perfection of man as lying in both knowledge and action. He was also as illustrious a physician as he was a philosopher [see HIMA].

Life. His life is known to us from authoritative sources. An autobiography covers his first thirty years, and the rest are documented by his disciple al-Dzjadānī, who was also his secretary and his friend.

He was born in 370/980 in Afshana, his mother's home, near Bukhārā. His native language was Persian. His father, an official of the Samanid administration, had wished to remain loyal. He took flight and was obliged to hide on several occasions, earning his living by medical consultations. He was imprisoned, escaped, lived for fourteen years in relative peace at the court of Isfahān and died at Hamadān, during an expedition of the prince 'Aibā al-Dawā'ī in 418/1027.

He was buried there, and a monument was erected to him to celebrate the (ḥīdārī) millenary of his birth. If his works are to be understood, they should not be thought of as those of a philosopher who lived in his books. He was occupied all day by affairs of state, and he laboured by night on his great works, which were written with astonishing rapidity. He was never safe, and was frequently compelled to move; he would write on horseback, and sometimes in prison, his only resource for reference being his memory. It has been found surprising that he differs from Aristotle in his works: but he quoted him without re-reading him, and, above all, his independence of mind inclined him to present his own personally worked out thought, rather than to repeat the works of others. Besides, his personal training was different. He was a man who lived in touch with the concrete, constantly faced with difficulties, and a great physician who dealt with specific cases. Aristotle's Logic seemed to him insufficient, because it could not be applied in a way that was sufficiently close to life. Many recent controversies have been aroused since the study of his works has increased, especially at the time of his millenary, but the most plausible view of his personality is still the following: he is a scientific man, who attempts to bring the Greek theories to the level of that which needs to be expressed by the study of the concrete, when apprehended by a great mind.

The secret of his evolution, however, will remain concealed from us as long as we do not possess such important works as the Kitāb al-Inṣaf, the "Book of Impartial Judgement", which investigated 28,000 questions, and his "Eastern Philosophy", of which we have only fragments.

Works. The corpus of Ibn Sinā's works that has come down to us is considerable, but incomplete. To the many questions that were put to him he replied hastily, without always taking care to keep his texts. Al-Dzjadānī has preserved several of these; others have been transmitted with different titles, others lost. The manuscript of the Inṣaf disappeared at the sack of Isfahān, in his own lifetime. The fundamental bibliography is that which al-Dzjadānī included in his biography, but it is not exhaustive. G. C. Anawati lists a total of 276 works, including texts noted as doubtful and some apocryphal works, in his bibliography of 1950. Mahdavī, in 1954, lists 131 authentic, and 110 doubtful works. Ibn Sinā was known primarily as a philosopher and a physician, but he was always listened to; he became an object of envy, sometimes persecuted by his enemies and sometimes coveted by princes opposing those to whom he wished to remain loyal. He took flight and was obliged to hide on several occasions, earning his living by medical consultations. He was imprisoned, escaped, lived for fourteen years in relative peace at the court of Isfahān and died at Hamadān, during an expedition of the prince 'Aibā al-Dawā'ī in 418/1027.

He was buried there, and a monument was erected to him to celebrate the (ḥīdārī) millenary of his birth. If his works are to be understood, they should not be thought of as those of a philosopher who lived in his books. He was occupied all day by affairs of state, and he laboured by night on his great works, which were written with astonishing rapidity. He was never safe, and was frequently compelled to move; he would write on horseback, and sometimes in prison, his only resource for reference being his memory. It has been found surprising that he differs from Aristotle in his works: but he quoted him without re-reading him, and, above all, his independence of mind inclined him to present his own personally worked out thought, rather than to repeat the works of others. Besides, his personal training was different. He was a man who lived in touch with the concrete, constantly faced with difficulties, and a great physician who dealt with specific cases. Aristotle's Logic seemed to him insufficient, because it could not be applied in a way that was sufficiently close to life. Many recent controversies have been aroused since the study of his works has increased, especially at the time of his millenary, but the most plausible view of his personality is still the following: he is a scientific man, who attempts to bring the Greek theories to the level of that which needs to be expressed by the study of the concrete, when apprehended by a great mind.

The secret of his evolution, however, will remain concealed from us as long as we do not possess such important works as the Kitāb al-Inṣaf, the "Book of Impartial Judgement", which investigated 28,000 questions, and his "Eastern Philosophy", of which we have only fragments.

Works. The corpus of Ibn Sinā's works that has come down to us is considerable, but incomplete. To the many questions that were put to him he replied hastily, without always taking care to keep his texts. Al-Dzjadānī has preserved several of these; others have been transmitted with different titles, others lost. The manuscript of the Inṣaf disappeared at the sack of Isfahān, in his own lifetime. The fundamental bibliography is that which al-Dzjadānī included in his biography, but it is not exhaustive. G. C. Anawati lists a total of 276 works, including texts noted as doubtful and some apocryphal works, in his bibliography of 1950. Mahdavī, in 1954, lists 131 authentic, and 110 doubtful works. Ibn Sinā was known primarily as a philosopher and a physician, but he was always listened to; he became an object of envy, sometimes persecuted by his enemies and sometimes coveted by princes opposing those to whom he wished to remain loyal. He took flight and was obliged to hide on several occasions, earning his living by medical consultations. He was imprisoned, escaped, lived for fourteen years in relative peace at the court of Isfahān and died at Hamadān, during an expedition of the prince 'Aibā al-Dawā'ī in 418/1027.

He was buried there, and a monument was erected to him to celebrate the (ḥīdārī) millenary of his birth. If his works are to be understood, they should not be thought of as those of a philosopher who lived in his books. He was occupied all day by affairs of state, and he laboured by night on his great works, which were written with astonishing rapidity. He was never safe, and was frequently compelled to move; he would write on horseback, and sometimes in prison, his only resource for reference being his memory. It has been found surprising that he differs from Aristotle in his works: but he quoted him without re-reading him, and, above all, his independence of mind inclined him to present his own personally worked out thought, rather than to repeat the works of others. Besides, his personal training was different. He was a man who lived in touch with the concrete, constantly faced with difficulties, and a great physician who dealt with specific cases. Aristotle's Logic seemed to him insufficient, because it could not be applied in a way that was sufficiently close to life. Many recent controversies have been aroused since the study of his works has increased, especially at the time of his millenary, but the most plausible view of his personality is still the following: he is a scientific man, who attempts to bring the Greek theories to the level of that which needs to be expressed by the study of the concrete, when apprehended by a great mind.
of a true poet, clothing his philosophical doctrine in images, both in verse (as in his poem on the soul) and in prose, in symbolic narratives whose meaning has given rise to retrospection (see DAVY V. YASEK). Ibn Sina's writings are the substance of scientific and philosophical works, but natural history and mathematics are thought of as parts of philosophy. Thus, his principal treatise on these sciences is included in the great Kitāb al-Shifa', "Book of Healing of the Soul"), in the same way as that on Metaphysics, while the famous Kānūn ji 'l-ṭibb, "Canon of Medicine", is a separate work.

The Kānūn appears to have formed a more scientific basis for the medical practice of the doctors, because it constituted a monumental unity, which maintained its authority until modern times when experimental science began, and because it still remained more accessible than Hippocrates and Galen, it served as a basis for seven centuries of medical teaching and practice. Even today it is still possible to derive useful information from it, for Dr. 'Abd Allāh Ahmadieh, a clinician of Tehran, has studied the conditions of the heart as described by the great teacher with good results, particularly in treating rheumatism.

The Kānūn is the clear and ordered "Summa" of all the medical knowledge of Ibn Sīnā's time, augmented from his own observations. It is divided into five books. The first contains generalities concerning the human body, sickness, health and general treatment and therapies (French translation of the treatise on Anatomy by P. de Koning, 1905; adaptation giving an incomplete résumé of the first book, in English, by Cameron Grüner, 1930). The second contains the Materia Medica and the Pharmacology of herbs; the page on experimentation in medicine (115, of the Roma 1593 edition) quoted in the Introduction to the French translation of the Işhârât, 58, is to be found there. This passage sets out the three methods—agreement, disagreement and concomitant variations— that are usually regarded as characteristic of modern science. The third book deals with special pathology, studied by organs, or rather by systems (German translation of the treatise on diseases of the eyes, by Hirschberg and Lippert, 1902). The fourth book opens with the famous treatise on fevers; then follow the treatise on signs, symptoms, diagnostics and prognostics, minor surgery, tumours, wounds, fractures and bites, and that on poisons. The fifth book completes the superscription.

Several treatises take up in isolation a number of the data in the Kānūn and deal with particular points. Some are very well-known: their smaller size assured them of a wide circulation. Among the most widely diffused are treatises on the pulse, the medical pharmacopoeia, advice for the conservation of health and the study of diarrhoea; in addition, monographs on various remedies,ichory, oxymel, balsam, bleeding. The virtues of wine are not neglected.

Physicians were offered a mnemonic in the form of a poem which established the essentials of Avicenna's theory and practice: principles, observations, advice on therapeutics and dietetics, simple surgical techniques. This is the famous Urdūzī fi 'l-ṭibb, which was translated into Latin several times from the 13th to the 17th century, under the title Cantūca Avicennae (ed. with French trans. by H. Tjaher and A. Noureddine, Paris 1956, Poème de la Médecine, together with Cormengaud de Blaise's Latin translation).

Ibn Sīnā's philosophical works have come down to us in a mutilated condition. The important Kitāb al-Shifa' is complete (critical text in process of publication, Cairo 1952). Extracts chosen by the author himself as being the most characteristic make up the Kitāb al-Najāt, "The Book of Salvation" (from Erröl), which is not an independent redaction, as was thought until 1937 (table of concordances established by A.-M. Goichon La distinction de Vessence et de Vexistence d'après Ibn Sīnā, 499-503). The Kitāb al-Ishârât wa 'l-tanbikāt, "Book of directives and remarks", is complete (trans. into Persian and French), as is the Dânîshnâma-i 'Alâ'ī, "The Book of Knowledge for 'Alâ'ī", a résumé of his doctrine written at the request of the prince 'Alâ'ī-al-Dawla. We have only fragments of the Kitāb al-Inṣâf, "Book of Impartial Judgment". Some treatises, too concerned with the individual sciences, have been published by A. Badawi, and a small part of the Manṭik al-maṭāriṣiyin, "Logic of the Easterners", which is the logic of his "Eastern Philosophy", the rest of it being lost. A fairly large number of minor writings are preserved; they illustrate points of detail which are often important, but are far from completing the lacunae.

Ibn Sīnā's was too penetrating a mind, and one too concerned with the absolute, not to venture outside the individual sciences. He looked for the principle and the guarantee of these, and this led him to set above them, on the one hand, the science of being, Metaphysics, and, on the other, the universal tool of truth, Logic, or "the instrumental science", as the falāṣīf termed it.

As far as one can tell in the absence of several of his fundamental works, he seems to have been an innovator particularly in logic, correcting the excess of abstraction which does not permit Aristotle to take sufficient account of change, which is present everywhere and at all times in the terrestrial world; and, thus, of the difference between strict (mulâb) meaning, and concrete meaning, specified by the particular "conditions" in which a thing is actualized. As a physician, he enters into logic when he admits a sign as the middle term of a syllogism. He gives it the force of a proof, as the latter is recognized in a symptom in medical diagnosis (see Introduction to the French trans. of the Işhârât).

In Metaphysics the doctrine of Ibn Sīnā is most individual, and is also illuminated by his personal antecedents. On the other hand, his thought was fashioned by three teachers, of whom, however, he knew only two by name: Aristotle and al-Fârābî, who introduced the Aristotelianism of the Easterners, subsequently developed by Ibn Sīnā. The third was Plotinus, who came down to him under the name of Aristotle, in the so-called "Theology of Aristotle" (see ARISTÔTALIS), which was composed of extracts from Plotinus' Enneads, and presented as the culmination of Aristotle's Metaphysics. This error of attribution dogs the whole of Avicenna's work. As a born metaphysician he earned the title of "Philosopher of being", and as a realist he wished to understand essences in their actualized state, so that he is just as much the "Philosopher of essence". The whole of his metaphysics is ordered round the double problem of the origin of being and its transmission to essence, but to individually actualized essence (cf. Goichon, La distinction de l'essence et de l'existence d'après Ibn Sīnā, Paris 1937).

It is at this point that a free interpretation of Aristotle and Plotinus gives him his theory of the creation of forms by emanation. This is linked with a cosmogony taken from the apocryphal Theology, but is also inspired by hylemorphism and Aristotelian data on the soul. The extensive place occupied in his thought by the intelligence prompts him to this startling view: the gift of being is linked with the
light of the intelligence. Moreover, Ibn Sinà is a believer; in accordance with Islam he believes in God as the Creator. None of the philosophies handed down from paganism or antiquity take account of this. He attempts to integrate dogma with his philosophical formulation. In fact, he does not succeed very well, but he continually works in this direction.

The first certitude apprehended by the human mind, he says, is that of being, which is apprehended by means of sense-perceptions. The idea of being, however, is so powerful in Ibn Sinà (see in the Physics of the Dīnīgūnāmā the part that it played for him) that he bases himself here on a metaphysical apprehension of being; in addition, since the human soul, according to him, is a separate intelligence, which leads its own spiritual existence while being united with the body, it is capable of apprehending it by itself.

The second certitude is that the being thus apprehended in man, and in every existing thing, is not present there of necessity. The essence of "man", "horse" or "stone" does not imply the necessity of the existence of a particular man or horse. Existence is given to actualized, concrete beings by a Being that differs from all of them: it is not one of the essences that have no existence in themselves, but its essence is its very being. The Creator is the First Cause; as a consequence of this theory the proof of the existence of God is restricted to Metaphysics, and not to Physics, as happens when God is proved to be the prime mover.

A Western controversy enters here: did Avicenna really believe in the analogy of being? It is true that he does not place the uncreated Being in the genus Substance or in a genus Being; but if he proceeds from knowledge of created beings to that of the uncreated Being, is not this a proof that he considers their natures to be allied? He certainly apprehends an analogy between the being of substance and that of accident, as he states explicitly, but did he go further? (see M. Cruz Hernández, passim.)

Ibn Sinà did not formulate the distinction between the uncreated Being and created beings as clearly as did Thomas Aquinas, but the latter does base himself on Ibn Sinà's doctrine; only being is in God, God is in no genus and being is not a genus. He then sets out his thought precisely (cf. Vasteenkiste, Avicenna-Citaten bij S. Thomas, in Tijdschrift voor Philosophie, September 1953, citations nos. 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 145, 330, pp. 460-1, 473 and 491).

With the principles established, two reasons for the omission of the conclusion are plausible, but neither involves the distinction not being made. Either, having set it out and admitted it, he withdrew it with difficulty because of the confusion between the data of Aristotle and Plotinus, or, as G. M. Wickens (Avicenna, scientist and philosopher, 52) suggests, he does not speak of it as a discovery because the celebrated distinction was then generally admitted—as Abû Hâyân al-Tawhîdî says. But Ibn Sinà maintains that God, as he conceives Him, is "the first with respect to the being of the Universe, anterior to that being, and also, consequently, outside it" (E. Gilson, L'esprit de la philosophie médiévale, 80-1).

However, this apparent impetus of Ibn Sinà is interrupted by the data of Plotinus, for they inspire the emanatist theory of creation. The Kūr in, like the Old and New Testaments, explains creation by a free act of will on the part of God. For Ibn Sinà, by way of Plotinus, the necessary Being is such in all its modes—and thus as creator—and being overflows from it. (Ibn Tijaddir himself asks the question: "Is it an analogous being? is it not rather the same being?") Moreover, this emanation does not occur freely, and creation involves intermediaries, which are also creators. From the One can come only one. The necessary Being thus produces a single Intelligence. This, having a cause, necessarily possesses a duality of being and knowledge. It introduces multiplicity into the world; from it can derive another Intelligence, a celestial Soul and a celestial body. Ptolemy's system becomes the framework of creative emanation; emanation descends from sphere to sphere as far as a tenth pure Intelligence, which governs, not a sphere, but our terrestrial world, which is made, unlike the others, of corruptible matter. This brings with it a multiplicity which surpasses human knowledge but is perfectly possessed and dominated by the active Intellect, the tenth Intelligence. Its role is demonstrated in a poetic and symbolic form in the "Tale of Háyy b. Yaštán", a name that refers to the active Intellect itself.

The philosophical origin of this active Intellect is the passage in the De Anima in which Aristotle refers by this name to the active part of the human soul. Ibn Sinà irredeemably mutilates the latter by taking away from it this active part, and with it its most noble action and its highest intellectual function: abstraction of intelligibles. This active Intellect, which, according to Aristotle, produces all intelligibles, is now a separate Intelligence. Thus the human soul receives them passively, and so cannot think except by leave of the Intellect; comprehension, knowledge and the sciences are now no longer its affair. It can elaborate only that which is given to it by the active Intellect. The latter produces not only these intelligibles but also all the substantial forms that are created in accordance with the models that it has conceived in conformity with the potentialities of matter. It is in this way, Ibn Sinà replies to Plato's anxious question (Parmenides, 131 a-b), that the concrete being can share in the Idea. The active Intellect has an ability which Plato sought for in vain: it apprehends the two series of relative perceptions, from both the forethought of the world: from it can derive the concrete beings with their mutual relationships; in addition, it apprehends their common repository, which is its own essence (cf. Goïchon, La théorie des formes chez Avicenne, in Atti XII congr. intern. de filosofia, ix, at 137-8). A reply is also given to the question of Aristotle as to the provenance of form and the contribution of the Ideas to sensible beings (Metaph., Z 8 and M 5).

The human soul by itself can attain only the first three degrees of abstraction: sensation, imagination and the action of estimation that extracts individual non-sensible ideas. It then apprehends the intelligible that is given to it from outside. Intuition is due to its joining with the active Intellect.

Being and intelligence overflow like a river from the necessary Being and descend to the extreme limits of the created. There is an equally full recreation, produced by creatures' love and desire for their creators, as far as the supreme Principle, which corresponds to the abundance of this gift. This beautiful concept, which could derive only from a soul inclined towards religion, has been thought of as mysterious. The Risāla fi 'l-İshārāt, "The Epistle on Love", however, is primarily a metaphysical explanation of the tendency of every being towards its
good, and a physical explanation of the motion of the stars; they imitate in their fashion, which is material, the unceasing action of the pure Act. The spheres, in fact, thus imitate the unceasing action of the pure Act.

Among the fierce controversies to which Avicenna’s thought has given rise is the discussion as to whether or not he should be considered a mystic. At first sight, the whole range of expressions that he uses to speak of love’s re-ascending as far as to the Creator leads one to an affirmative interpretation—not in an esoteric way [see Ḥaṭṭī b. Yaḥyā], but in the positive sense of the love of God. The more one studies his philosophical doctrine, the more one finds that it illuminates these expressions. The stages of the Sāfsīs, studied in the Ighār, leave rather the impression of experiences observed by a great, curious and respectful mind, which, however, does not participate. Ibn Sinā is a believer, and this fact should be maintained in opposition to those who have made of him a lover of pleasure who narrowly escapes being a hypocrite, although there is so much seriousness in his life and such efforts to reconcile his philosophy with his faith—even if he is not always successful. He is far above the gnostic impregnated with occultism and paganism to which some would reduce him. Is he a mystic in the exact sense that the word has in Catholic theology? It reserves the word for one whose whole life is a great love of God, in a kind of intimacy of heart and thought with God, which implies that God holds the first place in all things and everything is apprehended as related to Him. Had it been thus with Ibn Sinā, his writings would give a totally different impression. Nevertheless, at bottom he did perhaps apprehend God. It is in the simple expression of apprehension through the heart, in the secret of the heart (sirr), in flashes, however short and infrequent, that we are led to see in him a beginning of true mystic apprehension, in opposition to the gnosticism and its symbols, for at this depth of the heart there is no longer any need for words. One doubt, however, still enters in: his general doctrine of apprehension, and some of the terms that he uses, in fact, in texts on sirr, could be applied at least as well to a privileged comprehension with the active Intellect, and not with God Himself (cf. Goichon, Le sirr [l’intime du cœur] dans la doctrine avicennienne de la connaissance). Again, on this question, the absence of his last great work, the "Eastern Philosophy", precludes a definite answer. This irreparable lacuna in the transmission of his works does not allow us to understand in what respects he wished to complete, and even to correct, Aristotle, as he states in his prologue. As a hypothesis, suggested by his constant efforts to express the concrete and by his biography, we may suppose that he wished to make room for the oriental scientific tradition, which was more experimental than Greek science. The small alterations made to Aristotelian logic are of the same nature. In metaphysics, it is probable that he was shocked by the contradictions between Plotinus and Aristotle that were evident in the texts which the knowledge of the time attributed to one single author, and that he wished to resolve these anomalies by giving new explanations.

Influence of Ibn Sinā. The transmission of Greek science by the Arabs, and the translation of the works of the works of Aristotle into Latin, produced the first Renaissance in Southern Europe. The medical translations are less replaceable didactic corpus, for the Ḥayyāt and the Kānūn, made him an undisputed master in medicine, natural sciences and philosophy.

From the 12th to the 16th century the teaching and practice of medicine were based on him. The works of Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Zakariyyā' al-Rāzī were also known, and he was considered to be a better clinician; but the Kānūn provided an irreplaceable didactic corpus, for the Kitāb al-Kulliyāt fi 'l-ḥibb of Ibn Rushd corresponded only with the first part of the Kānūn. The latter was translated in its entirety between 1150 and 1187 by Gerard of Cremona, and, in all, eighty-seven translations of it were made, some of which were only partial. The majority were into Latin, but several Hebrew translations were also made, in Spain, Italy and the south of France. The medical translations are less good than those of the philosophical works; some words transcribed in Arabic from Greek were not understood or identified, and some Arabic technical terms were more or less transcribed in Latin, and remain incomprehensible. The Kānūn formed the basis of teaching at all the universities. It appears in the oldest known syllabus of teaching given to the School of Medicine at Montpellier, a bull of Clement V, dating from 1309, and in all subsequent ones until 1557. Ten years later Galen was preferred to Ibn Sinā, but the latter continued to be taught until the 17th century. The editing of the Arabic text, at Rome in 1593, demonstrates the esteem in which he was still held. (On the teaching of the works of Avicenna in the universities, see A. Germain, Influence of Ibn Sīnā. The transmission of the works of the works of Avicenna into Latin, see A. Germain, Influence de la pensée arabe sur la philosophie, 1880, 71; Stephen d’Israël, Histoire des universités françaises et étrangères des origines à nos jours, Paris 1933, 1, 119; C. Elgood, A medical history of Persia... until the year 1932, Cambridge 1951, 205-9). Chauvin reminds us in the Prologue to the Canterbury Tales that no doctor should be ignorant of him. Almost all, in fact, possessed either fragments of the Kānūn, especially the "Fevers" and the "Diseases of the eyes", or shorter writings, the treatise on the pulse or that on "Diseases of the heart". All Arab authors, from the 7th/8th to the 10th/16th century, are dependent on Ibn Sinā, even though they question him, like the father of Ibn Zuhr (Avenzoar), or augment and correct him, like Ibn al- Nadīf, who recorded his discovery of pulmonary circulation in his commentary on the Kānūn; he wrote a summary of the Kānūn which any physician could obtain more easily than he could the original text.

In the West several physicians learned Arabic for the sake of the works of Ibn Sinā. The first known influence appears in the works of a Dane, Henrik Harpstræng, a royal physician who died in 1244. Arnold of Villeneuve, born at Valence, translated the treatise on the diseases of the heart, as well as
some of the books of al-Kindi and other Arab authors. Some surgeons also quoted him as their authority: William of Saliceto in Italy, and his disciple Lanfranc, the founder of surgery in France; Guy of Chauliac, who died in 1368, and whose teaching employed Arabic terms and doctrines. At the University of Bologna, anatomy was still being taught in Arabic terms in the 14th century.

The Renaissance brought a violent reaction; Leonardo da Vinci rejected Ibn Sina’s anatomy, but, for want of another vocabulary, used the Arabic terms. Paracelsus burned the Kānsū at Basle. Harvey denounced the gloom which surrounded his discovery of the major circulation in 1628.

The natural sciences presented in the Shifāʾ were much used by the mediaeval encyclopedists, as were the treatises of al-Rāzī and apocryphal treatises. The ‘‘Treatise on Animals’’ was translated by Michael Scot; Albertus Magnus employed the mineralogy (on Ibn Sina’s scientific influence, see G. Sarton, Introduction to the history of science, ii, published 1931). Ibn Sina was an Aristotelian, and as such inferior to al-Rāzī, who had discovered the existence of the vacuum, which he himself denied. However, he opposed the theory of the transmutation of metals, and hence alchemy (for citations to this effect from several Arab authors, see the introduction by Holmyard and Mandeville to their translation of Avicennae De congelatione et conglutinatione lapidum, Paris 1927, 6-7).

Ibn Sina’s influence in philosophy was less absolute and more disputed, but more lasting, for the use made of him by St Thomas Aquinas embodied certain of his proofs in Catholic theology (cf. Goichon, La philosophie d’Avicenne et son influence en Europe médiévale, Paris 1944, ch. III).

The translation of the Shifāʾ came at a moment when Aristotle was scarcely known, and that only through the ‘‘Posterior Analytics’’, the ‘‘Topics’’ and the ‘‘Refutation of the Sophists’’. The corpus that presented a ‘‘Metaphysics’’, the ‘‘Treatise on the Soul’’ and that on the ‘‘Heavens’’, etc. seemed to hold another significance. It was, however, thought to be a simple commentary on Aristotle. For a century it received unreserved admiration; when Aristotle was better known, it was still thought that the Shifāʾ augmented his work on the subject of the origin of the world, the study of intelligence and angels. He was placed in the Neoplatonist and Augustinian traditions; his attempts to reconcile philosophy and faith corresponded with the ardent desires of the Schoolmen. He was forbidden by the decrees of 1210 and 1215, referring to ‘‘Aristoteles et sequaces ejus’’, which banned Ibn Sina from the Sorbonne. But his role remained undiminished in private discussions.

After acclaim for his similarities with Christian thought came criticism of his diversifications from it, violently initiated by William of Auvergne in 1230. Nevertheless, a pontifical decree of Gregory IX, in 1231, once more permitted the study of Ibn Sina’s philosophy. The lacunae, however, were now apparent. Nonetheless, the thought of all philosophers was nourished by his, to such a degree that it is impossible to tell what it would have been like without him. Latin scholasticism owes to his opponent, William of Auvergne, the fact that it received from him the distinction between essence and existence, which William considered that he had found in him.

Another current of thought, stemming from English centres of study, developed particularly in the Franciscan order. It saw Ibn Sina as more of a philosopher, augmenting Saint Augustine: the active Intellect was like the sun of minds and the internal Master. They believed that he opened up a whole mystic world. Roger Bacon and Duns Scotus were influenced by him. The latter, however, based his doctrine of the univocity of being on the same text that Thomas Aquinas had used to support the opposite doctrine.

Selection was gradually practised in the corpus of Ibn Sina. He took his definitive place, together with Saint Thomas Aquinas. The distinction between essence and existence became one of the fundamentals of Thomist philosophy. It gave an explanation for the immortality of angels; Saint Thomas’s De Ente et Essentia is imbued with Avicennism. The better the theologian masters his own thought, the less he cites Ibn Sina (see the quotations in Vansteenkiste, op. cit.), but he still respects him. Saint Thomas’s commentators, Cajetan and Jean de Saint-Thomas, writing respectively at the end of the 15th century and during the 17th, still allotted to Ibn Sina the place that he had taken in Thomism, the place that is definitely his.

III. Books and articles on Ibn Sīnā: innumerable, particularly since the millenary; see the bibliographies cited, Nullino up to 1930, Ėrgin, Anawati, Mahdavi, A.-M. Goichon, Distinction . . ., bibliogr. 504-20, up to 1957, and the collection A., scientist and philosopher, a millenary symposium, London 1955, bibliography after each chapter; some information in Islamologie, Pareja et al., bibliography and notes by A.-M. Goichon, Ibn Sīnā, A VIEW, and Eigemo, in Encyclopaedia philosofica, Venice-Rome 1957, i, 253-35, and 2nd ed., 1968, i, coll. 66-78 (German trans. Lexicon der Philosophie, Munich 1968, i); S. Naficy, Bibliographie des principaux travaux europèens sur A., Tehran 1953 (83 eds. of Latin translations from 1472 to 1939). For the scientific section, see the numerous articles and books in the Library of Congress, for 1880-1943, Index Catalogue, Washington; since 1879, running bibliography, Quarterly cumulative Index Medicus, Chicago; G. Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science, Baltimore 1927-50, especially vol. i.
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IBN SINR, ABU BAKR MUHAMMAD, the first
renowned Muslim interpreter of dreams, was
also, according to Ibn Sa'd (viii, 140), a traditionalist
"of great trustworthiness, who inspired confidence,
great and worthy, well-versed in jurisprudence. He was
an imam of great scholarship and piety"
Born two years before the end of the caliphate of 'Ummān,
i.e., in 34/654, he was the contemporary and friend of
al-Hasan al-Askari (q.v.) and died in the same year as
he, in 110/725. His father, a tinker from Djerdjarāyā,
had been taken prisoner in 'Irāk (at Mayyān or at
'Āyn al-Tamr) by Khālid b. al-Walid; he then
became a slave of Anas b. Mālik who was ordered by
the caliph 'Umar to set him free by contract of
enfranchisement (see Bukhārī, ed. Kreil, ii, 50, no. 1,
p. 127). His mother, Šafīyya, was a slave of the
caliph Abū Bakr; she was held in such esteem within
the community that when she died her laying-out
was performed by three of the Prophet's wives, and
eighteen Badrīs, led by Ubayy b. Ka'b, were present
at her burial.

Muhammad was a cloth merchant, but this does
not seem to have earned him enough to live on,
since he died in debt (on the origin of this debt, cf.
the various opinions reported by Ibn Sa'd, 144 f.).
He is reputed to have had thirty children by the
same Arab wife, only one of whom survived. He was
an elephantine man at one period the secretary of Anas b. Mālik, who
had requested that Sirin should be sent out to
lead his funeral prayer. In order to do this, he had to
be released from prison for one day.

So renowned was he for his piety and for the
reliability of the information which he handed on
that a century later al-'Aṣma'ī was to say of him:
"When the deaf man [Ibn Sirin was deaf] relates
traditions, clasp your hands" (probably as a sign
of the intense interest aroused by his statements).
Full details of his life are to be found in Ibn Khallîkān,
n. 576.

The pages which Ibn Sa'd (op. cit., 140-50) devotes
to Muhammad b. Sirin prove the seriousness with which
he acted as a muḥaddith. He said: "This
science is religion; take care from whom you learn it"
(144). In the chain of transmitters of ḥadīths in
which his name appears there are found in particular,
Especially noticeable among those who have
transmitted his ḥadīths are Kāṭāda and Khālid al-
Hādhāḥi. He was opposed to the written trans-
mision of traditions (ibid.), and regarded the cunning
questions which he was asked, particularly on the
subject of predestination, as having been prompted
by devils (143). He was capable of laughter and joking, but he had a quick temper, which led to a comparison between his irascibility and the mildness of his friend al-Isḥāq b. Salāḥ b. Ṣaʿd (142). The details of his behaviour of his way of dressing, of his scruples over anything unlawful and of his private devotions show him to have been very pious and also very eccentric.

Much less is known of Ibn Sirin's activity as an interpreter of dreams than of his interpretations as a dream interpreter. In fact Ibn Sa'dī (d. 350/945) although he does not fail to mention his ability to interpret dreams, not stresses this, whereas the works of Ibn Dāwūd do include a whole list of dreams interpreted by Sa’dī b. al-Musayyab (v, 91-2) who was the true ancestor of Arab dream interpretation (see T. Fādī, La divination arabe, 309-12). It was, however, in about the middle of the 3rd/9th century that his fame as an interpreter of dreams began to be attested: several of his interpretations are mentioned in the K. al-Bayāna‘ī of al-Dāhibī and his ability as an interpreter of dreams is also known to Ibn Khūṭayba (see ibid., 313 ff.).

From the 4th/10th century onwards he was credited with works on the interpretation of dreams (see Fīhirī, 316), the diversity of whose titles, and the contents and the late character of which show them to have been the work of forgers anxious to acquire for their writings the authority and prestige of a tābi‘ī of the second generation. The first of these writings is the Tābi‘ī al-najdī, published several times in Egypt; the second is the Munṭakhab al-kalām fi tābi‘ī al-ḥālim, a compilation made, at the beginning of the 9th/15th century, by Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Ḥasan b. Ibrāhīm al-Khalīlī al-Dārī (see T. Fādī, op. cit., 335, no. 27) and printed in the Uoniromancie arabe d'après Ibn Sirīn.

Much less is known of Ibn Sirīn’s activity as a preacher. He wrote also Tufyfa ‘alā ‘l-Dīmātsa al-mansūb li-Khalīl (MS Rabat, no. 1414); (3) a commentary on the Lāmiyya of al-Zākki (MS Rabat, no. 316). The references to the editions and the manuscripts of all these works are to be found ibid., 345, no. 85. In this it is on the compilation that there is based the thēsis complémentaire by A. Abel Dālī on L’omironomance arabe d’après Ibn Sirīn. Other unpublished writings which bear his name are: Tābi‘ī al-ḥālim (or al-mamār or al-mamād); K. al-najdī fi tābi‘ī al-māni, K. al-tanwīrīr fi rūyīt al-ta‘bir; K. al-Da‘wūdī; etc. His name is also found as the author of treatises in Turkish, Persian, Greek and Latin. The references to the editions and the manuscripts of these works are to be found apud T. Fādī, op. cit., 355, no. 117.


IBN AL-SĪRĪ [see ibn al-bawwāb]

IBN SŪDA (Sawda), name of a number of Malikī scholars and bādis of Fez belonging to an Andalusian family which had emigrated to Tāwād (present name Fās al-Bālī), about 80 km. north-north-west of Fez, and was therefore known by the name of Tāwād.

2. MUHAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD IBN SŪDA (d. 1066/1666) was bādi of Fez (see Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, 402).

3. ABD AllāH MUḤAMMAD B. AL-TĀLĪB AL-TĀWFI, died at Fez on 20 Dhu ’l-Hijjah 1290/17 July 1795, is the most famous member of the Banū Sūda family; Lévi-Provençal (Chorfa, 332) even considers him as "one of the greatest scholars that Morocco has produced". After having been the pupil of the leading scholars of Fez, he was initiated into Šī‘ism, then taught in his native town tafsīr, ḥadīth, fiqh, taṣawwuf, kalām, logic and wa‘il; his learning earned him the honorific title of ḥaqqī al-dā‘imā. In 1310/1894-5, he went on the Pilgrimage to Mecca and spent quite a long time in the holy cities and in Cairo, where he gave lectures and met notably Ḥaqqī Murtaḍā al-Zābidī, author of Tādī al-Arās, which mentions him under S.W.D. At Fez, he was the teacher of the majority of the Moroccan scholars of his time and in particular of Ibn ‘Adībī (q.v.). He wrote a number of glosses and commentaries, among which may be mentioned: (1) Tālīf ‘al-‘ámān ‘alā sharī‘ al-Zarkhānī (q.v.); (2) a sharī‘ of the Tufa‘a of Ibn ‘Āṣīm (q.v.) (Cairo, in the margin of the commentary on the Tufa‘a by al-Tasālī); (3) a commentary on the Lāmiyya of al-Zākki (q.v.) (MS Rabat, no. 1486); this sharī‘ has been the subject of a gloss, MS Rabat, no. 1483; (4) Zād al-ma‘dīdī al-sā‘ī fi maqāṣīr al-Bukhdārī, a commentary on the Bukhdārī, published at Fez 1238-39, 4 vols.; (5-6) Dā‘u ‘alā l-dā‘imī ‘ayn ghurā‘ al-Dīmātsa of Khailli (q.v.) (MS Rabat, 40, 314) also a Tufyfa ‘alā ‘l-Dīmātsa al-mansūb li-Khalīl (MS Rabat, no. 1414); (7) Mandīsīh al-hadīdī; (8) Tufyfa al-takhdīw (MS Rabat, no. 1395); MS of the Real Acad. de Cordoba (see al-Mulh, iv (1964-5), 108]; (9) finally a Fahrarsa (q.v.) (MS Rabat, no. 414 bis).

4. ABU ‘L-ABBĀS AHMAD B. MUḤAMMAD (1753-1755/1780-20), son and pupil of the above, was bādi of Fez and took part in the preparation of a commentary on Ibn Dāwūd (MS Rabat, no. 55). See also al-Kattāni, Salwa, i, 115; Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, i, 115.

5. ABU ‘L-FADĪL ‘AL-ABBĀS B. AHMAD B. MUḤAMMAD, died 26 Dhu‘ al-Mu‘āna 11 (1826-1903), is the most famous member of the Banū Sūda family; Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, index.

6. ABD AllāH MUḤAMMAD AL-MIḤDĪ B. AL-TĀLĪB MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD (1820-1840), was also a Malikī faqih and a philologist. In 1269/1853 he was the subject of a gloss, MS Rabat, no. 1483; (8) finally a Fahrarsa (q.v.) (MS Rabat, no. 414 bis).

7. ABD AllāH IBN ‘ABD AL-WAHĪD B. AHMAD was bādi of al-Kaṣr and a preacher at Fez; he died in Dhu ’l-Kaṣr 1259/1882. See al-Kattāni, Salwa, i, 121; Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, 380.

8. ABU ‘L-ABBĀS AHMAD B. AL-TĀLĪB (1241-1321/1862-1909), a man of great learning in religion and philology, was bādi at Azemmour in 1280-1863-4; then at Tangier in 1292/1875, and finally, in 1294/1877, at Meknès, where he also held the office of
preacher. Among his more important works are a gloss on the Shāhīd of al-Bukhārī, a risāla on the Basm Allah and a Rau' al-lubs wa l-shubuhdt fī 'l-Abbās min biḥl al-ummākhād, Cairo 1231.

Biography: apart from the sources mentioned in this article, see Dā'īrat al-maṭāţīr, iii, 208-9; Sulaymān al-Hawwāt (1160-1231/1747-1816) wrote al-Ra'ıf wa al-maṣāda wa l-ḥulal al-mamāḍāa fī maḍā'īr Bani Sūdā, a biography of the family of the Banū Sūdā from its beginning to Muhammad al-Tawdī (3) who was the teacher of al-Hawwāt, to his son Abu l-ʿAbbās (4) and even to his grandsons Abu l-Faḍl (5), who was in his turn the pupil of the author; a microfilm of this work is said to exist in the Rabat library.

(Ed.)

IBN SULAYM AL-ASIWAṉĪ, ʿAṢĪB ALLĀH B. AHMAD, a Fātimid dāʿī, author of Kitāb Aḥḥār al-Nubā wa l-Muṣūra wa ʿAlla wa l-Buḍa wa l-Nī. He was sent on a special mission to Nubia by D`awhar al-Manṣūrī (q.v.), probably in 366/976. He persuaded King George of Nubia to resume the delivery of the ṣabāf (q.v.), which had lately been withheld, but failed in debate to convert the court which had lately been Bakj [q.v.], delivering the azhdhār, the latter text appearing on comparison to be Kitāb al-Askār, a biography of Ahmad b. Dawud, in the presence of the Subkī, ii, 93 f., Ibn ʿAbd al-Hayyāmī to his Kitāb al-Ziyādāt, and Al-Asnawi possessed his Kitāb al-Fihrist (cf. Islamica, ii, 1927, 505-37 on this type of literature) and his Kitāb al-Waddāʾi (on deposits). Other titles mentioned include a Kitāb Muḥhasār fī ʿl-fihrist, a Kitāb al-Ghunya fī ʿl-fihrist, a Kitāb al-ʿĀyn wa l-Dayn, and a Kitāb al-Fārūq fī ʿl-furāʾ, but with Dawud's son, Muhammad b. al-Ifasān (information to this effect is [Yusuf FADL HASAN]) Ibn Suraydi further wrote a number of polemical treatises against his opponents, both Hanafīs and Ṣāḥibīs, and the asīl al-kalām [see ʿilm al-kalām]; this is perhaps why the Fīrisīt calls him also a muṭahālim, although nothing is known of a particular interest of his in theology. So we hear of a Kitāb al-ṣālī Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan, a Kitāb al-ṣālī al-Dawūdī, a Kitāb al-ṣālī al-Kāṣhārī, a Kitāb al-ṣālī al-Dawūdī, and “another retarding him (i.e., Ibn Dāwūd) on questions on which he had been in opposition to al-Ṣāḥīfī”.

Ibn Suraydi has given its name to the hotly debated problem of the Masʿāla al-Suraydiyya, or “vicious circle of repudiation” (dawer al-falāk, al-masʿāla al-dawāwīra). If a man says to his wife: “If I repudiate you, consider yourself to have already been repudiated by me three times”, and then repudiates her once, two (or with a variant, three) answers are possible: either nothing but the repudiation not subject to the condition is effective (or, as an alternative, it is effective and two repudiations of the lot which was repudiated in the additional, conditional answer) or no repudiation is effective if three repudiations later than it have already taken place, because the repudiation not subject to the condition is effective, three repudiations earlier than it have already taken place, and if this is the case, there is no marriage in which that first repudiation could have effect, and if this is the case, the three repudiations made conditional on it can also have no effect, so no repudiation is effective if three repudiations later than it have already taken place. Ibn Suraydi was no doubt the first to formulate the dilemma (it is most improbable that al-Ṣāḥīfī himself should have done so and have laid down the second answer, as is sometimes asserted), and the kind of reasoning behind it corresponds to the reasoning apparent from Ibn Suraydi’s reported treatment of some other problems (al-Subkī, ii, 93 f.), and for which some veiled criticism was levelled at him (al-Nawwār, al-Dhahabī). Ibn Suraydi refers to his Kitāb al-ṣālī al-Dawūdī, and in this he gives his own answer to the hotly debated problem. If a man says to his wife: “If I repudiate you, consider yourself to have already been repudiated by me three times”, and then repudiates her once, two (or with a variant, three) answers are possible: either nothing but the repudiation not subject to the condition is effective (or, as an alternative, it is effective and two repudiations of the lot which was repudiated in the additional, conditional answer) or no repudiation is effective if three repudiations later than it have already taken place, because the repudiation not subject to the condition is effective, three repudiations earlier than it have already taken place, and if this is the case, there is no marriage in which that first repudiation could have effect, and if this is the case, the three repudiations made conditional on it can also have no effect, so no repudiation is effective if three repudiations later than it have already taken place. Ibn Suraydi was no doubt the first to formulate the dilemma (it is most improbable that al-Ṣāḥīfī himself should have done so and have laid down the second answer, as is sometimes asserted), and the kind of reasoning behind it corresponds to the reasoning apparent from Ibn Suraydi’s reported treatment of some other problems (al-Subkī, ii, 93 f.), and for which some veiled criticism was levelled at him (al-Nawwār, al-Dhahabī). Ibn Suraydi refers to his Kitāb al-ṣālī al-Dawūdī, and in this he gives his own answer to the hotly debated problem.
mended the second answer as a possible escape for people who had been forced to take an oath of secrecy, under penalty of automatic repudiation, by order of 'Abd al-Malik to Damascus. According to al-Walid b. Abd al-Malik, the traditionist al-Ta'awudh, Diwan, 1922, 34, 164-7; Brockemöller, S.I, 306, 167 (obiterate). On the Ma'sala al-Suraydiana: Goldscheider, "Streitschrift", 78 f.; Arabic text, 57 f.; (ed. 'Abd al-Rahman Badawi, Cairo 1964/1382, 168); L. Massignon, "al-Hallaj", ii, 1922, 34, 283 f.; Yusuf Ya'qub Maskûnî, Sihâ Ibn al-Ta'awudh, Dîwan, published in Cairo by Margoliouth in "al-Musulîf, 1321/1903, his manuscript, which is gene..."

The sources generally give the by-name of Ta'awudh to Muhammad's grandfather, who owed it to a defect in pronunciation, but the 'Umdat al-tâlib calls his father Ibrahim by this name and explains it by relating an anecdote according to which Isma'il, ordering a garment for his son, said farâ instead of farâb. This same text states however that the expression lawâmza 'ala ismail, common in the language, saysîd al-sâdî, that of Al as against both the father's and the mother's side, a meaning which this word still retains in Persian).

The sources generally give the by-name of Ta'awudh to Muhammad's grandfather, who owed it to a defect in pronunciation, but the 'Umdat al-tâlib calls his father Ibrahim by this name and explains it by relating an anecdote according to which Isma'il, ordering a garment for his son, said farâ instead of farâb. This same text states however that the expression lawâmza 'ala ismail, common in the language, saysîd al-sâdî, that of Al as against both the father's and the mother's side, a meaning which this word still retains in Persian).

He lived mainly at Medina and his descendants disappeared as a series of migrations (to Ethiopia and to Kirman).

While his nephews, the grandsons of Ibrahim b. Isma'il, are often referred to as good poets, his own reputation is linked with the Zaydi revolt which took place in Kôfa under the effective command of Abu 'l-Saray'â [q.v.] in 198/815. Ibn Ta'awudh's political ambitions seem to have been awakened by Naṣr b. Shabab (Shabib in the Mafradat al-Tâlibîyan), who

The sources generally give the by-name of Ta'awudh to Muhammad's grandfather, who owed it to a defect in pronunciation, but the 'Umdat al-tâlib calls his father Ibrahim by this name and explains it by relating an anecdote according to which Isma'il, ordering a garment for his son, said farâ instead of farâb. This same text states however that the expression lawâmza 'ala ismail, common in the language, saysîd al-sâdî, that of Al as against both the father's and the mother's side, a meaning which this word still retains in Persian).
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sought him out at Medina during the frudji (probably of 198), preferring him as imam to the Hasani 'Abd Allah b. Mās'ūs b. 'Abd Allah and to the Husaynid 'Ali b. Ubayd Allah b. al-Hasan, who refused to become involved personally in an armed conflict, in accordance with the usual attitude of the Abī al-Bayt. Once in 'Irāq, Ibn Tabāţabā encountered the opposition of Nağr's collaborators, who seem to have abandoned him and offered him as compensation the sum of 5,000 dinārs, which he refused. Returning towards the Hijāz, Ibn Tabāţabā stopped at 'Anāt, where he succeeded in contacting Abu 'l-Sarayyā, who was engaged in organizing the Zaydī revolt. While the 'Alīid was with difficulty gathering together a few inadequately armed citizens at Kūfā, where he had immediately gone, Abu 'l-Sarayyā was arming a small group of Zaydis around the tomb of al-Ḥusayn, and arrived on the day appointed in the suburb of Kūfā chosen in advance. The two groups went together towards the town, where Abu 'l-Sarayyā pronounced a khutba which included all the Mu'tazili principles, the ideological basis of the Zaydī revolt; while the 'Alīid, was engaged in organizing the revolt. As the 'Alīid found himself with some difficulty, the investiture of his leader (in the Umda: amir al-mu'minin) on 10 Djumādā I 199/27 December 814, as had been predicted by a ḥadīth going back to Zayd b. 'Alī.

The revolt went through various phases; it began with some victories due in part to the negligence of the enemy commander, al-Ḥasan b. Sahl, who was occupied in studying the horoscope of the Kibdjak. Ibn Taymiyya was forced to leave his native town, and he obtained, with some difficulty, the investiture of his leader (in the Umda: amir al-mu'minin) on 10 Djumādā I 199/27 December 814, as had been predicted by a ḥadīth going back to Zayd b. 'Alī.

During the reign of al-Malik al-Mansūr Lāḏīn (695/1297-9) he was appointed by the sultan to exhort the faithful to the djihād at the time of the expedition undertaken by the sultan against the kingdom of Little Armenia. At almost the same time, in 698/1299, he wrote, at the request of these of Hamāt, one of his most famous professions of faith, al-Ḥamawiyya al-kubrā, very hostile to Aš'arism and to kalām (MRK, i, 414-69).

Accused by his enemies of anthropomorphism (taṣbīḥ), Ibn Taymiyya refused to appear before the Ḥanafī kādī Dījāl al-Dīn Al-Māzdār (d. 745/1344-5), on the grounds that this kādī had not received from the sultan powers of jurisdiction in matters of dogma. After a private meeting, held in the house of the Shāfi'ī kādī Imām al-Dīn Umar al-Kaẓwīnī (d. 699/1299-1300), at which the Ḥamawiyya was studied, Ibn Taymiyya, whose replies are said to have been judged satisfactory, was troubled no further.

During the Mongol invasion in 699/1300, led by the Ilkhan Ghazān with the support of the Mamlūk amir Kībdayk, Ibn Taymiyya was, at Damascus, one of the spokesmen of the resistance party. In addition, he took part, in Shawwāl 696/June 1300, in the expedition which the Mamlūk authorities undertook against the Šī'is of Kasrawān who were accused of helping the Franks and the Mongols.

In 700/1303, when a new Mongol threat arose, he was instructed to exhort people to the djihād and went to Cairo, in Djumādā I 700/January 1301, to ask the Mamlūk sultan Muhammad b. Kālāwūn to intervene in Syria. In 702/1303, at the time of the new Mongol invasion, he was present at the victory of Shākhab, on 4 Ramadan 702/22 April 1303, where he had been instructed to issue a fatwā to impose the dispensation from the duty of fasting for those who were fighting.

The years which followed were marked by intense polemical activity. In 704/1305, he attacked a certain Ibrāhīm al-Kattān, accused of using kahshā, and another sayyih, Muhammad al-Khabībāz, who was accused, among other things, of antinomianism. At about the same time he went with some stone-
masons to smash a sacred rock in the mosque of al-Narandj (Biddya, xiv, 34). He also took up arms against the Itti''hadyya, supporters of Ibn al-''Arabi (d. 638/1240-1), and sent to one of his most prominent members, the shaykh Naqr al-Din al-Manbiji, the spiritual director of Baybars al-Djashnikir, a letter which was courteous, but nevertheless firmly condemned the monism of Ibn al-''Arabi (MMR, i, 161-83). Towards the end of the year 704/July 1305, he took part in a new expedition against the Rawdfid of Kasrawan and, on his return, attacked in Damascus the Ahmadiyya Rifa''iyya, whose shaykh was accused of Mongol sympathies (MMR, i, 121-46).

His enemies then renewed their attacks on his credo and cast doubts on the correctness of his profession of faith al-Wasitijyya, written shortly before the arrival of the Mongols in Damascus. Two councils were held on 8 and 12 Rajab 705/24 and 28 January 1306, at the residence of the governor of Damascus, al-Afram. The second council, a member of which was Safi al-Din al-Hindi (d. 715/1315), a pupil of Fakhr al-Din al-Razi (d. 606/1209-10), found that the Wasitijyya "was in conformity with the Kur'an and the Sunna".

The affair seemed to be finished. However the Shafi'i kadi Ibn al-''Asrari (d. 723/1323), a pupil of MA''boud al-Islafni (d. 688/1289), set about reforming the traditionist al-Mizzi (d. 743/1342-3). A third council was held at the governor's residence on 7 Sha'ban 705/22 February 1306, on the sultan's orders. Again the Wasitijyya was not condemned, and Ibn al-''Asrari resigned. The two adversaries were finally sent to Cairo, where they arrived on 22 Ramadan 705/7 April 1306.

The very day after his arrival, Ibn Taymiyya appeared before a new council which was held in the Citadel and consisted of a number of high officials of the state and the four kadi 'l-khadat of Egypt. Ibn Taymiyya was accused of anthropomorphism and condemned to imprisonment. He remained in the Citadel of Cairo for nearly a year and a half, until 26 Rabii' I 707/25 September 1307. He was released on the intervention of the amir Salar, the rival of Baybars al-Djashnikir, and of the Bedouin amir Muhanna b. Tankiz (d. 740/1340), who had been appointed in Rabi' II 712/August 1312. It was under the governorate of Tankiz that Ibn Taymiyya spent his last fifteen years. Promoted to the rank of professor, and considered by his supporters as an independent mudallak, he had now as his chief pupil Ibn Kayyim al-Djawziyya (d. 751/1350 [cf.]), who did much to spread his ideas and indeed shared some of his persecution. Relations between Hanbalis and Ash'arists continued often to be strained, as is proved by the incident in Muharram 712/February 1313, which again saw the two schools in disagreement on the question of dogma (Biddya, xiv, 75-6).

Towards the end of 716/February 1317 and in the following months, Ibn Taymiyya was involved in the affair concerning Husma''da, the amir of Mecca who had formed an agreement with the Ikhlani Xudabanda (d. 716/1316) in order that there should prevail in Mecca a policy favourable to Shi''ism; it seems to have been at about this time that Ibn Taymiyya wrote the Minhaj al-sunnah al-nabawiyya (Cairo 1321/1904; reprinted), in which he attacked the Ikhlans and received him in audience in Cairo (Biddya, xiv, 53-4).

Ibn Taymiyya was back in Cairo on 8 Shawwal 709/21 March 1310 and remained there again for about three years. He was occasionally consulted by Muhammad b. Kalawun (al-Malik al-Nasir) on Syrian affairs and continued to teach privately and to give answers to the various enquiries which were addressed to him. It was at this time that he began, if not the final redaction, at least the development of his treatise on juridical policy, the Kutt al-sti''asa al-ghar''iyya, the date of which may be put at between 712/1312 and 714/1315 (cf the Fr. tr. by H. Laoust, Damascus (PIFD) 1948, and Eng. tr. by Omar A. Farrukh, Beirut 1966; latest ed. by Muhammad al-Mubarak, Beirut 1967). Several of the Fatawa misriyya (Cairo 1368/1949) also date from this period. A new Mongol threat, rapidly dispelled, caused Ibn Taymiyya to return to Damascus, where he arrived, after a brief stay in Jerusalem, on 1 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 712/28 February 1313. Al-Malik al-''Nasir, who had preceded him by one week, had left on the Pilgrimage; on his return to Damascus on 11 Muharram 713/8 May 1313, he took various measures of administrative and financial reorganization. In addition, a new governor of Damascus, the amir Tankiz (d. 740/1340), had been appointed in Rabii' II 712/August 1312.

Towards the end of 716/February 1317 and in the following months, Ibn Taymiyya was involved in the affair concerning Humaydah, the amir of Mecca who had formed an agreement with the Ikhlani Khudabanda (d. 716/1316) in order that there should prevail in Mecca a policy favourable to Shi''ism; it seems to have been at about this time that Ibn Taymiyya wrote the Minhaj al-sunnah al-nabawiyya (Cairo 1321/1904; reprinted), in which he attacked the Ikhlans and received him in audience in Cairo (Biddya, xiv, 75-6).

However the persecutions were soon to recommence. In 718/1318, a letter from the sultan forbad Ibn Taymiyya to issue any fatwas on repudiation (jaldh) contrary to the prevailing Hanball doctrine; he was criticized for denying the validity of uniting three repudiations into one single one and for considering the oath (half) of repudiation as a single oath if the person who uttered it did not intend to proceed to an actual repudiation. Two councils were held on the matter, presided over
by Tankiz, in 718/1318 and 719/1319. A third council, held on 10 Muḥarram 721/9 February 1321, by a decree from al-Malik al-Nāṣir. He is mentioned in the years that followed as taking part in various incidents in the religious or political life of Egypt and Syria.

On 16 Shawān 726/18 July 1326, Ibn Taymiyya was again arrested, without any further trial, and was deprived of the right to issue fatwas by a decree of the sultan which was read out in the Umayyad Mosque. He was criticized because of his risāla on visits to tombs (niyārat al-buḥūr) in which he condemned the cult of saints. A number of his disciples were arrested at the same time as he was but must have been released shortly afterwards except for Ibn Kayyim al-Djawiyya (the text of the Niyyarat al-buḥūr, written before this date, is given in MR, 103-22).

Ibn Taymiyya then encountered the opposition of the Mālikī bāṣī al-ḥudūl, Tāṣi al-Din al-Ighnāt (d. 730/1330). Another influential opponent was ʿAlī al-Din al-Kūnawī, a disciple of Ibn al-ʿArabī, who, after having been director of the Dār al-Ṣafīd al-ṣāliḥiyya in Cairo, had recently been appointed Shāfiʿī bāṣī al-ḥudūl at Damascus.

Ibn Taymiyya remained a prisoner in the Citadel for more than two years; he continued to write and to issue fatwas; there date from this period several works which have survived and which were written with the aim of justifying his doctrines, in particular the Kūdab al-muṣāfīr al-waṣīḥiyya, on the methodology of fiqh (MR, i, 180-217), the Rašī al-malām (MR, 55-83) and the Kūdab al-Radd ʿala ʿl-Ikhnāt (Cairo 1346/1928), in which he made a violent personal attack on his opponent and set out at length his ideas on the cult of saints (cf. Ṣasai, 353-4).

As a result of a complaint by al-Ighnātī to the sultan, the latter ordered, on 9 Dżumāda II 728/21 April 1328, that Ibn Taymiyya's paper, ink and pen should be taken in. This order was left unexecuted, and Ibn Taymiyya died in the Citadel, on 20 Dhu al-Ḥaḍār 728/26 September 1328. His burial, attended by a large number of the inhabitants of Damascus, was in the cemetery of the Ṣafīyya, where his tomb is still honoured.

Ibn Taymiyya's works are numerous; nearly all have now appeared in print. A list of his main works is given in the treatise by Ibn al-Kayyim entitled Asmāʿ muṣallafāt Ibn Taymiyya (Damascus 1372/1953); cf. Brockelmann, I, 125-7 and S II, 119-26. There should be mentioned several collections published in Cairo or in Arabia: Maṣūmat al-rasāʾīl (abbr. as MR in this article, Cairo 1322/1906); Maṣūmat al-rasāʾīl al-ḥusnīyya (abbr. MRK, Cairo 1326/1906, 2 vols.); Kūdab Maṣūmat al-rasāʾīl (Kuwait 1333/1915); Maṣūmat al-rasāʾīl ʿala ʿl-maṣāʾīl (abbr. MRM, Cairo (Minār press) 1349/1930-1931, 5 vols.); and finally Maṣūmat al-fuṭūḥa ḥayba al-Islām Aḥmad Ibn Taymiyya (Riyād 1381/1962, 40 vols.).

Ibn Taymiyya's education was primarily that of a Hanbali theologian and jurist. He possessed a very sound knowledge of all the great works of his school, from those of the imām Aḥmad (d. 240/854-5) or of al-Khallāl (d. 312/924) to those of Muwaffak al-Din b. Kudāma (d. 620/1223) or of his own paternal grandfather, Majdīd al-Din Abū ʿl-Barakāt (d. 652/1254), whose Muṣābarat and Muṣūlaḥā became part of the everyday reading of the Ḥanbalis of the Mamlūk period.

To this knowledge of early and classical Hanbalism, he added not only that of the other schools of jurisprudence (khulafāʿ), but also that of heresiographical literature (fīraḥ), in particular of ṣalāfat and of Ṣūfism. Indeed, he refers to knowing and having reflected on the works of many of the Ṣūfīyya: Kūdab al-Tābiʿīn al-ṣaḥābīyya (MR, i, 180-217), in which he declared the superiority of Aḥmad (d. 643/1245), Abū Ṭalīb al-Makki (d. 386/996), Abū Ṭālim al-Khāyārī (d. 562/1169), Abū al-Kādir al-Dījīlī (d. 561/1166) and Abū Ḥaṣṣ al-Suhrawardi (d. 652/1254). He mentions also having allowed himself to be deluded, in his youth, by the Futuḥat of Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 638/1242-1), before discovering how subtly heretical they were. He never condemned Ṣūfism in itself, but only that which he considered to be, in the case of too many Ṣūfis, inadmissible deviations in doctrine, ritual or morals, such as monism (wuhdaṭ al-ʿawālīd), antinomianism (ibdāḥa) or esotericism (ḥuzūmuw).

His doctrine was intended to be primarily, while centred on and inspired by the spirit of Hanbalism, a doctrine of synthesis or of conciliation—"the happy mean" (masāʾal)—which would accord to each school its rightful place in a strongly hierarchical whole in conformity with the precepts of the Kurān and the Sunna. "The dogmatic theologians", he wrote, "based their system on reason (ʿaql), the traditionists based theirs on hadīth (nabīḥ), and the Ṣūfis theirs on free-will (irḍa)." Tradition, reason and free-will are precisely the three elements Ibn Taymiyya aimed to integrate and harmonize in a solidly constructed doctrine which might be defined as a conservative reformism, whether it was a case of the formulation of the credo, the rehabilitation of ʿiṣṭihād or the reconstruction of the state.

In the field of dogma, Ibn Taymiyya's main intention was to follow the Kurān and hadīth, "to describe God only as He has described Himself, in His Book and as the Prophet has described Him in the Sunna." Repudiating simultaneously the ʿaql, the hadīth and the Sunna, the theologians of his school, from the imām Aḥmad (d. 643/1245) to those of the respective caliphs (Rāṣūldūrī), order of succession, but distinguishes between the problem of the caliphate (khilāfa) and that of the respective merits (tafṣīl) of these four caliphs; although he declares the obvious superiority of Abū Bakr and "Umār, he acknowledges that there might be hesitation in pronouncing (lauwāḥṣaḥ) on the respective merits of ʿUṯmān and "All. His loyalty to the "men of old" (ṣaʿaḥa) led him to prefer the ideas upheld by the Companions.
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(safa'aba) or their early successors to the doctrine taught by the founders of the madhdhib. Ibn Taymiyya did not, as is sometimes said, abandon the "re-opening" of idjihdd, and still less did he claim this privilege for himself; he did not consider that idjihdd required to be "closed", since its continuance is necessary for the interpretation of the Law (cf. the opposition between kulliyiyat and iqtisayiyat). But anxious to impose some discipline on this idjihdd, he attempted to define the rules which every mujtahid ought to follow. With this intent, he announced the absolute supremacy of the text (mas#,) (Kur'ân or hadith) and reduced correspondingly the importance of idjma, to which he opposed the agreement (itti'fakh) of the doctors of the Law, the validity of which derives from the text on which it is based.

He attaches much importance to reasoning by analogy (kiva), which consists first of all in seeking the cause ("illâ") of a judgement (hukm) resulting from the Kur'ân or from the Sunna and then in extending this judgement to all cases which share the same cause.

Ibn Taymiyya was often suspicious of maslama, which he criticized for approaching methods based on reason (ra'; ištihbar; shawa; kafa), but he finally approved a use of it which was both extensive and disciplined. The application of maslama, which may apply in all fields, including even that of the 'shadat, presupposes a previous long meditation on the Kur'ân, on kama and on the jurisprudence of the great doctors of the Law.

In fact Ibn Taymiyya considered religion and the State to be indissolubly linked. Without the coercive power (shawka) of the State, religion is in danger. Without the discipline of the revealed Law, the State becomes a tyrannical organization. The essential function of the State is to see that justice ("adl) prevails, to ordain good (amr) and to forbid evil, to bring about, in reality, the reign of unity (takhhil al-tawhîd), and to prepare for the coming of a society devoted to the service of God ("ibâda").

While recognizing the legitimacy of the Râghidun, Ibn Taymiyya never upheld the principle of the permanence of the single caliphate. He pointed out that the "re-opening" of faith (shakl) requires obedience only to God and to His Prophet: it does not limit the number of the imams to whom obedience is owed. He regards the Muslim community (umma) as a natural confederation of states.

Every imam is at once the proxy (waki') and partner (sharik) of those whom he administers, and therefore his mission is to construct and instil respect for the system of orders and prohibitions which, within the framework of the revealed Law according to the circumstances, is to govern the various areas of the life of the community.

Furthermore, each member of the community has the duty and the right to give advice (nasîba), within the limits of his competence, to his brothers in religion and hence to ordain good and forbid evil, striving to avoid anything which could endanger the solidarity of the Believers and divide the community.

Ibn Taymiyya's economic ethics also share this emphasis on solidarity or the importance of the community. He favours the idea of property, but states that the rich should be the friends and partners of the poor, and substitutes for the idea of competition that of co-operation and mutual help.

He disapproved of the authoritarian fixing of prices (tas'ir) and permitted this fixing only after negotiation and agreement. He reminded people that "The revealed Law continues to be deeply felt by everyone in his goal and wish to resemble Karun, just as it condemns those whose aim is political power and who wish to be like Pharaoh".

Ibn Taymiyya's influence, even in his own lifetime and under the BaÅrî Mamlûks, was great, in spite of the hostility which he encountered from the powerful family of the Subki, the two founders of which, Taki '1-Din (d. 756/1355) and his son Tadj al-Din (d. 771/1369-70), were among the most eminent representatives of Shâfi'iism and Syro-Egyptian Ash'arism. Among his chief disciples, in the world of the 'ulamâ', were, in addition to Ibn al-Kayyim mentioned above, men or women who sometimes belonged to other schools than his. AÅmd b. Ibrâhim al-Wâski (d. 711/1311-2), one of his first disciples, was the son of the head of the Rifa'iyya brotherhood of Wahf. Umn Taynab (d. 711/1311-2), a native of Baghhd, who led a campaign in Damascus against the Iftihadiyya, is an excellent example of the type of devout woman which existed at that time in Syria. Al-Mizl (d. 743/1342-3), who had come from Aleppo and was one of the greatest traditionists of the period, belonged to the Shâfi'î school.

His influence was also great in the world of the 'ulamâ', as illustrated by the fact that Hatib al-Mansuri (d. 721/1321), Ibn al-Kayyim mentioned above, men or women who sometimes belonged to other schools than his. AÅmd b. Ibrâhim al-Wâski (d. 711/1311-2), one of his first disciples, was the son of the head of the Rifa'iyya brotherhood of Wahf. Umn Taynab (d. 711/1311-2), a native of Baghhd, who led a campaign in Damascus against the Iftihadiyya, is an excellent example of the type of devout woman which existed at that time in Syria. Al-Mizl (d. 743/1342-3), who had come from Aleppo and was one of the greatest traditionists of the period, belonged to the Shâfi'î school.

Finaly, Ibn Taymiyya's influence was also great in the world of the 'ulamâ', as illustrated by the fact that Hatib al-Mansuri (d. 721/1321), Ibn al-Kayyim mentioned above, men or women who sometimes belonged to other schools than his. AÅmd b. Ibrâhim al-Wâski (d. 711/1311-2), one of his first disciples, was the son of the head of the Rifa'iyya brotherhood of Wahf. Umn Taynab (d. 711/1311-2), a native of Baghhd, who led a campaign in Damascus against the Iftihadiyya, is an excellent example of the type of devout woman which existed at that time in Syria. Al-Mizl (d. 743/1342-3), who had come from Aleppo and was one of the greatest traditionists of the period, belonged to the Shâfi'î school.

Under the Circassian Mamlûks (783-922/1382-1517), Ibn Taymiyya's influence was less apparent but nevertheless continued to be deeply felt in various 'ulamâ' circles. Al-Maqrizi (d. 845/1441-2), in his Kita'at (Cairo 1326/1909, iv, 185), contrasts to the supporters of al-Ash'ari—of whom he is one—those of Ibn Taymiyya, the defender of the faith of the "men of old" (salaf). "People", he writes, "are divided into two factions over the question of Ibn Taymiyya; for until the present, the latter has retained admirers and disciples in Syria and Egypt".

The Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt (922/1517), which led to the official supremacy of the Hanafi school, struck a severe blow to Hanbalism, which did not however disappear altogether. Supporters of Ibn Taymiyya remained: among them were al-'Ulaymi (d. ca. 928/1522), the historian of Jerusalem and Hebron, who wrote a history of Hanbalism which is a valuable source of information on this school after the death of Ibn al-Kayyim, and also especially al-Marî (d. 1033/1623), who wrote a laudatory biography of Ibn Taymiyya, al-Awâlîk al-durrîyya (Cairo 1320/1911). It was under the Ottomans also that Ibn Taymiyya's ideas, most of which were adopted by MuÅmmad b. 'Abd al-Wahhûb (d. 1206/1792), gave rise to Wahhâbism and to the state of the SuÅ'îd dynasty. Ibn Taymiyya
remains today, with al-Ghazali (d. 505/1111) and Ibn al-<Arabl (d. 638/1240), one of the writers who have had the greatest influence on contemporary Islam, particularly in Sunni circles.

**Bibliography:** In addition to references given in the article, the following may be consulted: Moh. Ben Chenve, s.v., in *EI*; Brockelmann, II, 125-7; S II, 119-26; H. Laout, *Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques d'Ibn Taymiyya*, IFAO, Cairo 1939; idem, *Contribution à une étude de la méthodologie canonique d'Ibn Taymiyya*, IFAO, Cairo 1939; idem, *La bibliographie d*Ibn al-Thawaba*, Reclus, ORI, 1943, 115-62; idem, *Le banalismos sous les Mamluks Bahrides*, in *REI*, 1950, 1-77; idem, *Les schismes dans l'Islam*, Paris 1965, 266-76.

(H. Laout)

**IBN AL-TAYYIB** [see TAMMAM B. GHALIH].

**IBN AL-TAYYIB,** ABU 'L-FARADJ 'ABBAD ALLAH AL-'IRAQI, Nestorian monk, physician, philosopher and theologian known in mediaeval Europe under the name of Abu 'l-Bayd. He was the brother of Abu 'l-Bayd. The best-known members of the family are:

Abu 'l-Husayn Dja (see TAMMAM B. GHALIH). His son and his grandson were also talented men.


(J. Verket)

**IBN THAWABA,** name of the members of an important family, of Christian origin, among whom were several high officials of the 'Abbāsid administration. An anecdote related by Ibn al-Nadim (* FHirth*, 130) and repeated by Yākūt (*Udāba*, iv, 144-5) suggests that the family's ancestor, Thawaba, lived in Baḥrayn where he was a barber. His son Muhammad entered the administration at an unknown date. The best-known members of the family are:

Abu 'l-'Abbās Ahmad B. Muḥammad, who was, under al-Muhtadi (ruled 255/869-256/870), one of the chief assistants of the vizier Sulaymān b. Wahb. Isma'il b. Bulbul himself, whom Aljmad disliked and disagreed with, forgave him for his hostile attitude towards him and entrusted him with the administration of several regions of Ṭirāk. He was to remain in charge of these districts until the arrival in office of the vizier 'Ubayd Allāh b. Sulaymān b. Wahb, who replaced him by Abu 'l-Hasan b. Ḍakhd; but Ibn Thawaba remained an official until his death, in 277/980 according to the majority of his biographers, in 273/886 according to al-Ṣūlī.

He was a poet of talent and a poet. He is said to have left two works, one of them a collection of letters, which have not survived. But he had acquired a reputation for clumsiness, and his contemporaries regarded as grotesque his affected language, his upstart affectation, and his excessive arrogance. It is not known whether he shared the pro-Shī'ī sentiments of his son Muḥammad, but Ibn Bulbul's conciliatory attitude towards him seems to indicate that he did not.

Ibn Thawaba presided over a circle in which a number of poets and men of letters met regularly. His generosity, sometimes ostentatious, led some poets of his time (such as al-Buṭṭur and al-Rūmī) to write of him very elegant panegyrics, which still survive. But the disagreements which he had with some of them, and notably with Ibn al-Rūmī, earned him a series of epigrams full of irony and sarcasm. Several of them, and notably al-Tawbī, retained the image of him which is given in these satires and present him in some of their anecdotcs as a grotesque, narrow and pretentious bore.

Very little is known of the career of his son Muḥammad. He was the secretary of the Türk Bāykābāk and he had to go into hiding for a period to escape from the anger of al-Muhtadi, who had been incited against him by certain courtiers who accused him of Shī'ism. His master finally exonerated him and obtained for him the caliph's pardon, which enabled him to return to his office in 250/864. He also was a man of letters and is said to have left a hand written manuscript of letters which has not survived.


Abu 'l-Husayn Dja 'Far' b. Muḥammad, the brother of Abu 'l-'Abbās Ahmad, occupied a high office in the administration; under the vizierate of 'Ubayd Allāh b. Sulaymān b. Wahb he was appointed as deputy to the vizier's son, al-Hasan, who had just been put in charge of several offices, among them the Chancellery and the Police (*Nisā'īr*, viii, 83-4; Yākūt, *Udāba*, vii, 187). On al-Hasan's death, Dja 'Far succeeded him in these offices and remained in them until he died in 284/897 (al-Ṣafadī, *Whāfi*, iii/2, 68). He was replaced by his son Muḥammad, who was a great favourite of al-Muhtadīr and who died in 312/924 (*Udāba*, xviii, 96). Muḥammad was succeeded by his son Abū 'Abd Allāh Ahmad, who was the last of the Banū Thawāba to hold an important office in the administration. On his death, the offices which had been hereditary among the Banū Thawāba since the death of al-Hasan b. 'Ubayd Allāh were entrusted to Abū Isḥāḳ al-Ṣābi (*Udāba*, vii, 188).

Dja 'Far was a cultivated man and a talented poet. It is known that he attempted to compare with Ibn al-Rūmī and that he was closely connected with Ibn al-Mu'tazz, who wrote a touching elegy on his death in which Dja 'Far's moral and literary virtues are sympathetically enumerated.

His son and his grandson were also talented men of letters. Abū 'Abd Allāh is said to have left a collection of letters (*Udāba*, iv, 146).

**Bibliography:** Fī Ḥirṣīyūt, 130, 168; Yākūt,
This Munya was probably a later edition of the historical section of the Faqārī. A Kūdī al-Tālibī is mentioned in Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, Taḥqīq Mādīna’ al-adād, ed. M. Dārṣā, 2: 309-10. 


IBN AL-TILMID, ABBU ‘AL-LÍ-ÁBÀ HIBAT ALLÁH, ABBI ‘AL-ÁLÁ SÁ’ID B. IRRÁHM, with the honorific names of Muwaufik al-Mulk and Amin al-Dawla (he was widely known under the latter name), Christian Persian translator of Baghdad, where he was born in the second half of the 5th/11th century, and son of a very eminent physician. He completed his education in various branches of learning by making fairly lengthy journeys in Asia Minor and Persia; he replaced the Pharmacopoeia of Sabur b. Sahl (Pharmacopoeia) and two abridged versions of it which had been used until then. These works and some others (a treatise on bleeding and a

...
practical manual of medical treatment) have sur-
vived in manuscript (see Brockelmann, I, 487, S 1, 891); nothing has so far been printed.


(M. MEYERHOF)

**IBN TUFAYL**

Ibn Tufayl, celebrated philosopher, whose full name was Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. Ṭabd al-Malik b. Muḥammad b. Ṭufayl al-Kaysî. He belonged to the prominent Arab tribe of Kays; he was also called al-Andalusî or al-Ighbîlî. Christian scholastics call him Abubacer, a corruption of Abû Bakr.

Ibn Tufayl was probably born in the first decade of the 12th/11th century in Wādî ʿĀghî, the modern Guadis, 40 miles N.E. of Granada. Nothing is known of his family background. The name Tufayl, a patrilineal name of Ibn Bâdjiya [q.v.], is frequently stated, is incorrect, for in the introduction to his philosophical romance he says expressly that he was not acquainted with this philosopher. He first of all practised as a physician in Granada, and then became secretary to the governor of the province. In 594/1154, he became secretary to the governor of Ceuta and Tangier, a son of ʿAbd al-Muẓîm, the founder of the Almohad dynasty. Finally he received the appointment of court physician to the Almohad sultan Abû Yaḥyâ b. Iṣâ, the Caliph himself attending his obsequies. According to his autobiography, called *Isâm al-arâdû, or what is more noted, in his own time as a teacher of philosophy, is perhaps more valued today for his historical writings dealing with the end of Mamlûk rule and the beginning of Ottoman domination of Syria. His autobiography, called *Al-Fulâl al-maghâbîn fi ahbâd Muḥammad b. Tâlûn* (pub. Damascus 1348/1929), while it gives little personal information, is an excellent source for a study both of the author's intellectual development and of traditional Islamic education at that time.

Ibn Tâlûn was born in al-Sâhilîyya, the suburb of Damascus on Mount Kâsîyûn, to a family with scholarly connexions. His paternal uncle, Ḍîmal al-Dîn Yûsûf b. Tâlûn, was a kâdhî and muqâtîl of the Palace of Justice (Dâr al-ʿâdî). He traced his paternal ancestry to a Mamlûk, Ḥūmûrâwîy b. Tâlûn, while his mother, ʿAṣdân, who died of plague during his infancy, was of Anatolian origin (rûmîyî). The latter term and the fact, mentioned in the autobiography, that she spoke liesân al-arâmî, has given rise to dispute as to whether this meant, in the usage of that time, that she was Anatolian Turkish or Greek. Reared by his father and the aforementioned uncle, Ibn Tâlûn showed precocious intellectual abilities, completing the reading of the Korân by the age of seven and in 891/1484, when he was eleven, receiving a stipend from the waqf of the Mârîdânîyya madrasa as a student of jurisprudence (fikh). During his lifetime he filled numerous teaching and administrative positions of a religious nature—the latter, however, never of very high rank—although in his last years he declined posts such as preacher (khâlid) in the Umayyad Mosque and Ḥanafî Muftî of Damascus, pleading advanced age as a reason. Most of his life was devoted to scholarship and writing and he seems to have avoided any political involvements under both régimes. He died over 70 years of age, a bachelor without issue.

In the breadth of his interests and variety of his writings Ibn Tâlûn resembles his Egyptian contemporary, al-Suyûṭî [q.v.] (d. 911/1505), from whom he received an iǧâsa. In his autobiography, which records all the scholars with whom he studied, he lists as well all the books he read, covering at least thirty fields of learning and representing all the traditional Islamic sciences as well as "secular" sciences such as medicine and astronomy. His wide-ranging interests are reflected in his numerous writings, the titles of 750 of which are listed, varying in length from brief pamphlets to weighty
volumes, many of which are no longer extant.

In the field of history the scholars who influenced him most strongly were Yûnûs b. Abd al-Hadî [q.v. (d. 927/1521)] and 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Nu'mânî [d. 927/1521], both of whom are known today for their studies of the mosques and madrasas of Damascus respectively. Several of Ibn Tûlûn's works, especially those devoted to suburbs of Damascus like al-
Šâlihibîyâ, his birthplace, and al-Mizzâ, reflect the methods of these scholars.

Among the numerous works by Ibn Tûlûn the following histories—mostly, but not exclusively, dealing with Damascus and its environs—have been published:

1. Mufâkahat al-khîlân fî hawâdih al-sâmân (2 vols., ed. M. Mostafa, Cairo 1962-4), a chronicle of Egypt and Syria covering the years 884-926/1479-1500. The published text omits the years 895/1492-93, 920/1514, and 925/1519, which were missing in the manuscript used—Tübingen MS No. MÀ VI, 7.

Extracts were published much earlier by R. Hartmann as Tübingen Fragment der Chronik des Ibn Tûlûn, in Schriften der Königsgesellschaft, 3. Jahr, Heft 2, 1926.


3. l'îâm al-uward bi-mân waliya nâ'id min al-ârâk bi-Dimashq al-ârâk al-kubr. The original has not been published as yet. A French translation by H. Laouist is included in the work Les gouverneurs de Damascus sous les Mamlouks et les premiers Ottomans... (Damascus 1952).

4. Five shorter works were published from autograph manuscripts in 1348/1929 in Damascus by Maktabat al-Kûsî wa 'l-Budây under the title Rasâ'il la'îrkhîyâ:

(a) al-Fûlkh al-madîkhôn, the autobiography, 54 pp.

(b) al-Šâma' al-mud'd拉 fî a'âbbâr al-khâl al-dîmarîyyîyya, a history of the Citadel of Damascus, 28 pp.

(c) al-Mûsîma fîlmâ bîli fî 'l-Mizzâ, about the suburb of Damascus al-Mizzâ, and an account of its mosques, tombs, great men, etc., 26 pp.

(d) al-Lamîda al-barriyya fî 'l-mukhtat al-ta'îrîyya, 44 stories, 72 pp.

(e) l'îâm al-sâ'sûn 'an hubûl sayyid al-mursulîn.

5. Sâbî b. al-Šâfi'î 'alâ 'dîrât al-mârîkh, about the first 30 years of the history of Damascus. Published by As'ad Talas in RAAD, xxiii/3-4, 149-61; 5-6, 236-47; 7-8, 338-51, and by Habîb al-Zayyât in al-Khâlida al-dârîyya, ii/39.


Some of his other historical studies, especially the biographical dictionaries, contain valuable contemporary material and are undoubtedly worthy of publication.

Publication: The best source for the life and work of Ibn Tûlûn is his autobiography al-Fûlkh al-madîkhôn, mentioned above. All other biographical sketches are based on it, for example: al-Ghazâlî, al-Kauwâthb al-nâmî, ii, 52-4; Ibn al-Mu'min, Sha'îrârî, viii, 298; al-Ziriklî, al-'Alâm, vii, 184-5; Dîrîr al-mu'ârif, iii, 318-20, by S. al-Munâdjidî, as well as the latter's introduction to Al-A'imma al-îtîdâ al-âshâr, mentioned above, and his study al-Mus'âribâhîn al-dîmâshqîyyûn, Cairo 1956, 79-81 (note some errors there, esp. attribution of publication of part of l'îâm al-uward to Littmann). See also the introduction to Al-Kalâ'id al-dawâriyya, i, by M. al-Mu'min, pp. [i-xxiv]; the introduction by M. Mostafa to vol. ii of Mufâkahat al-khîlân [q.v.], pp. [vii-xxi]; the excellent introduction by H. Laouist to the text of Damas, esp. pp. ix-xvii. The best information on extant manuscripts is in Brockelmann, II, 481, S II, 494. (W. M. Brinner)

IBN TûLûN [see Ahmad B. TûLûN and TûLûNî].

IBN TûMART, the Mahdi [q.v.] of the Almohads and founder of the Almohad movement [see Mawa'id al-Dîn]. The biographies of so celebrated a figure Influence on contemporary mountain men—legendary matter besides evident contradictions. He was born between 471/1078 and 474/1081 in the Anti-Atlas of Morocco. His father belonged to the Harga and his mother to the Masakalâ, both of which are divisions of the Masmûdा tribal group and there can be no doubt that he was a pure Berber despite the various shârîfîn genealogies attributed to him. Of his first 30 or so years we have no real knowledge. In 1115/1715 he left his native mountains and went first to Cordoba, where he spent a year. Only Ibn Kunfudh gives any information as to what he did there, saying merely that he studied with the hâdî'î Ibn Hamdîn. Ibn Tûmart next embarked at Almérîa for the East. At Alexandria he met Abû Bakr al-Tur'tu'î and then went via Mecca to Baghdad, where he met Abû Bakr al-Shâshî and Mubarak b. 'Abd al-Dîjabbâr. All the sources reckon, some with reserve, Ibn Tûmart's supposed meeting with al-Ghazâlî in Baghdad. The story (given most fully by Ibn al-Kat-tân, pp. 14-8) goes that al-Ghazâlî, learning that his new student was recently in Cordoba, enquired as to the doings of the fuhabâ from there. When told that at the instigation of Ibn Hamdîn, hâdî of Cordoba, the Ithâ'hî had been officially burnt throughout the Almoravid dominions he called upon God to destroy the Almoravids. Thereupon Ibn Tûmart exclaimed: "Imâm, pray to God to do that by my hand!" The Imâm ignored him at first but on a second occasion acceded. His prayer of course was granted. The story is, however, apocryphal: by the time Ibn Tûmart reached Baghdad al-Ghazâlî had already left the city for good and had been for over ten years in Kharusân, where it is never hinted that Ibn Tûmart ever saw him. The return towards the Maghrib began in 510/1115 or 511/1117. It was a turbulent journey. Ibn Tûmart caused public disturbances and put himself in danger of his life by his uncompromising insistence on the punctilious observance of religious obligations. At the same time his learning and piety made an impression, and during the many long halts in his journey he found ready audiences. En route, probably at Tunis, he was joined by Abû Bakr b. 'Ali al-Šâhâdâjî, surnamed al-Bayhâlkh, who became his devoted follower and whose Mémoires are a prime source of information for the remainder of Ibn Tûmart's career and that of his successor Abû al-Mu'mîn. At Mâllâla, near Bougie (Béjâya), the momentous meeting between Ibn Tûmart and Abû al-Mu'mîn took place. Love of the supernatural has embellished the circumstances of this meeting with a wealth of picturesque detail but subsequent events confirmed the power of this combination of Ibn Tûmart's personal magnetism and Abû al-Mu'mîn's administrative and military genius. This peculiar force of personality must be invoked to explain why Ibn Tûmart, despite the continual riots which he provoked, ran the gauntlet of lesser authorities unscathed and finally confronted the Al-
moravid sultan himself at Marrakush. This was in 514/1120. Ali b. Yusuf b. Tashfin arranged a debate between Ibn Tumart and a group of 'ashāḥa, who were as cloistered as his own. One party, represented by the vizier Mālik b. Wuhayb, saw in Ibn Tumart preaching a serious threat to the régime and so advocated his destruction. Others, among whom 'Umar is mentioned, could not stomach the punishment of one who could not be convicted of any crime against the Shari'a. While the pacific 'Ali vacillated, Yintan took Ibn Tumart under his protection. But Yintan succeeded in converting the lake people, and now perhaps over-confident, Ibn Tumart of his mortal danger, so he prudently withdrew to Aghmat. There the usual disturbances took place and a new stage in his career began.

Until now Ibn Tumart had apparently not viewed himself as the actual or potential leader of a movement or as a rebel against established authority; he was merely an individual fulfilling his religious obligations as he conceived them. But now the situation had changed. 'Ali b. Yusuf had finally overcome his scruples at the news of the latest troubles in Aghmat and despatched a messenger to order the return of the trouble-maker to Marrakush. Ibn Tumart refused to go and so was now in open rebellion. At the same time he had now won a powerful supporter in the person of Isma'il Ilg, chief of the Hazardja, who was soon after joined by 'Umar Fatii and Yusuf b. Wanudin of the Hintata.

He found himself apparently by accident the spiritual leader of substantial forces united, no doubt, more by tribal anti-Almoravid sentiments than by concern for the purity of the faith. The idea of proclaiming himself Mahdi began to grow in his mind and from the time he finally reached his birthplace at Igilliz in 515/1121 and installed himself in a cave (al-Qar al-mubaddas—not now identifiable with certainty) he devoted himself to spreading the belief that the appearance of the Mahdi in the Maghrib was imminent. At the end of one harangue in which he listed the attributes of the Mahdi he was finally acclaimed. "When the Imam al-Mahdi finished his speech", says ʿAbd al-Mu'min, "ten men, of whom I was one, rushed up to him and I said: 'These signs are found only in you! You are the Mahdi!'" And so we were fated to be among his Mahdisti.

The expedition was unsuccess ful, for though the Almohads besieged Marrakush for six weeks they were defeated, five of the Ten being killed, nearby at al-Bufcayra in mid-524/1130. This defeat was doubtless a severe psychological setback for the Almohads, but subsequent events show that it did not in fact much hinder the progress of the movement; and it was an empty victory for the Almoravids, who proved impotent to press home their advantage.

The Mahdi died a few months after the battle of al-Bufcayra, in Ramadān 524/August 1130. His close companion who saw his death and attended his body was called ʿAbd al-Mu'min by his followers. Ibn Tumart, judging it prudent to move to a more easily defended position, "emigrated" in 517/1123 to Tinnmalal (Dur. Tinnal) in the upper Nfis valley, about 75 kms. south-south-west of Marrakush. The manner in which he and his followers took possession of Tinnmalal and its territory is not entirely clear, but it led to a protest by one of the Ten which cost him his life. The Ahl Tinnmalal of the Almohad hierarchy are significantly a heterogeneous group. This fact and other evidence indicates that the original inhabitants of Tinnmalal were liquidated and replaced by a mixed group of the Mahdi's close followers.

The next few years were passed in the consolida tion and steady extension of Almohad power. This was made easier by the preoccupation of the Almoravids with troubles in Spain but also made more difficult by discord among the Almohads themselves. Though the Almohad movement was certainly helped by the antipathy for the Almoravids shared by all the mountain tribes, it was at the same time hindered by the fragmentation of the Masmuda into very small and jealousely independent groups who resisted incorporation into any larger federation. Perhaps impatience with the speed of the movement's development was the main motive behind the next important event in the Mahdi's career, the tamyiz.

The scanty texts on the tamyiz are difficult to interpret, but it is clear that he and the supervision of one Bāshir al-Wanghari there was a methodical and stringent elimination of real or suspected dissidents. This took place in 523 or 524/1128-9. Dating from this period, and obscurely connected with the tamyiz, is the peculiar organization of the Almohads into a hierarchy headed by the Ten. The origin and significance of this apparently quite artificial creation remain a mystery.

Whether the tamyiz so consolidated the movement's strength that Ibn Tumart felt strong enough to embark on the taking of Marrakush or whether it aroused such resentment that such a diversion of interest became necessary is an open question, but the campaign began at once. The leader was the same al-Bāshir. The expedition was unsuccessful, for though the Almohads besieged Marrakush for six weeks they were defeated, five of the Ten being killed, nearby at al-Bubayra in mid-524/1130. This defeat was doubtless a severe psychological setback for the Almohads, but subsequent events show that it did not in fact much hinder the progress of the movement; and it was an empty victory for the Almoravids, who proved impotent to press home their advantage.

The Mahdi died a few months after the battle of al-Bubayra, in Ramadān 524/August 1130. His close companion who saw his death and attended his body was called ʿAbd al-Mu'min by his followers. Ibn Tumart, judging it prudent to move to a more easily defended position, "emigrated" in 517/1123 to Tinnmalal (Dur. Tinnal) in the upper Nfis valley, about 75 kms. south-south-west of Marrakush. The manner in which he and his followers took possession of Tinnmalal and its territory is not entirely clear, but it led to a protest by one of the Ten which cost him his life. The Ahl Tinnmalal of the Almohad
or spiritualization of the concept of God, as opposed to Judaism, the literal acceptance of the anthropomorphic phrases of the Qur'an of which he so often accused the Almoravids. But there is nothing original in his religious ideas. He adopted those which suited him wherever he found them, including the Shi'ite notion of the impeccably (ma'sidin) Imām, who he claimed to be. His theology is not important. His career followed a pattern, familiar in the Maghrib, of a charismatic personality being able briefly to unite groups who live normally in anarchical fragments. He based his appeal partly on the romantic notion that the Berber race and that of the leader, and doctrine is of minor importance. The role of 'Abd al-Mu'min in founding the Almohad state was as important as that of the Mahdi, though probably neither would have achieved anything without the leadership of Al-Mu'tāz al-Ra'īsi or the Almohad state itself. Ibn Khaldūn (d. 620/1223) has observed that in the public mind the name of Al-Mu'tāz al-Ra'īsi is closely associated with that of Ibn al-'Utrūs the military leader, and Al-Mu'tāz al-Ra'īsi, who was of Berber origin, was closely identified with the Mahdī. His role was to bring about the victory of the Almohads over the Almoravids, the name of the latter being associated with that of the former. Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Malki (d. 671/1269) has described Al-Mu'tāz al-Ra'īsi as the only personality to have exercised a unifying influence in the Maghrib during the time of the Almoravids.

Bibliography:


(3) F. P. Hopkins, Ibn Tumlūs, Andalusian physician and philosopher, whose full name was Yūsūf b. 'Abd al-Mu'min, and with the kunyah Abu 'l-Hājdīdājī and Abu Islāk. He was known in mediaeval Europe under the name of Albagiūn Thulmas, and Nallino (cf. RSO, xii, 170) considers that the name Tumlūs may be a corruption of Barthelomayus or Ptolemaeus. He was born at Alcira in about 560/1164, was a pupil of Ibn Rushd, and named after al-Ihāsan b. al-Ṭaghibi (d. 250/865). Its construction is attributed also to Ardashīr Bābakān. The ancient town was called in Aramaic Džazaṭa d'Kardu, a town which re-appears in Christian texts of the 6th and 17th centuries. It has been identified with the ancient Bāzābdā, where Alexander the Great crossed the Tigris; later this was one of the foremost points of the Roman advance mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus (xx, xvii, i).

The town was called in Aramaic Džazarta d'Kardu, a name which re-appears in Christian texts of the 6th and 17th centuries. It has been identified with the ancient Bāzābdā, where Alexander the Great crossed the Tigris; later this was one of the foremost points of the Roman advance mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus (xx, xvii, i).

Situated in the Džajār Rābī'ī's (g.v. [37° 15' N and 42° 5' E], at 400 metres altitude, 125 kilometres downstream from the confluence of the Bohtan Su, to the west of Mount Džatl (g.v.), Džazarta Ibn 'Umar is on the Tigris at the point where its distance from the Euphrates is greatest. Emerging from the gorges of the Taurus, the Tigris then enters the Upper Džazarta, a flat region where the river flows more slowly. The city was built in a bend in the river, the two ends of which were joined at the narrowest point by a canal which is said to have been dug by al-Ḥasan Ibn 'Umar. The site of the town thus became an island, whence its name of Džazārta; the force of the current turned the canal into the main bed of the Tigris, while the flow in the original river bed encircling the town dried up. The town also possessed a bridge, and was a river port in an island position; from this point the Tigris was navigable, and a
system of navigation existed to transport merchandise in the direction of Mosul. As a river port, Diazirat Ibn Umar was an important centre in a prosperous region of vineyards and orchards, made so by the supply of fresh water. In the neighbouring mountains, covered with oak forests and producing an abundance of walnuts, hazel-nuts and gall-nuts, bees produced honey and wax which were exported. The frontier between the Arab and the Kurdish regions is marked by a Roman road, darb 'atib, which joins Diazirat Ibn 'Umar to Nişân and then Mardin.

The town, whose monuments witness to its brilliant past, lost many of its inhabitants at the beginning of the 20th century; the population, which consists of Muslims, Kurds, and Christians of various denominations, fell from 9,580 in 1890 to 5,575 in 1940. In 1960 it was 6,473. In the 4th/10th century, the town possessed imposing walls built of mud bricks, which in the time of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa had three gates; they were rebuilt in basalt, and a section of the wall is still preserved and its piers are carved representations of the signs of the zodiac as on the bridge of Ijīs. The great bridge in the time of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa had three gates; it was built by the Kurds and succeeded in maintaining a relative independence north by the castle of the Kurdish amirs. In the 6th/12th century, the town possessed a hospital, fourteen hammāms, of which eight still remained at the end of the 19th century, with thirty sabilis and nineteen mosques. The intellectual and religious role which the town played in the 6th/12th century was illustrated by four Saḥifāt madrasas, while there existed for the Saḥifs two ābāsāt outside the walls. Beside the original Great Mosque, the amir Badr al-Din Lu'Lū built another in the following century. In the 19th century, there remained of this active commercial centre, according to Cuenot, five chišām, a vaulted bazaar, one hundred and six small shops and ten cafés. The presence of some early churches demonstrates the importance of the Christian element.

Slightly downstream from Diazirat Ibn 'Umar there exist today the ruins of a fine bridge of which a single arch of twenty-eight metres is still standing; on its piers are carved representations of the signs of the zodiac as on the bridge of Ḥīn Kayfā [q.v.], a work of the Artuk period. Upstream there exists on the Batman Su a bridge built by the amir Timurtaş of Mardin.

For a long time under the control of the Kurdish amirs, Diazirat Ibn 'Umar had a certain importance in the 6th/12th century, since in the town was a dependency of Mosul; in the 5th/11th century, after having had as governor in 495/1102 Shams al-Dawla Diakarmish, a former manīš of Malkāshāh, it was in the hands of the Marwānids; in the 6th/12th century, it belonged to the Zangids, who appointed 'Izz al-Dīn Abū Bakr al-Dubaysi as governor in 547/1156. The region occupied by the Baybarsi Kurds was taken by Kutb al-Dīn Mawdud b. Zangi in the 6th and 7th/12th century. In 495/1102, the place was occupied by the Bashnawi Kurds was taken by Lizz al-Dīn Abu Bakr al-Dubaysi [q.v.], in 553/1158, the region was occupied by the Bakrīzī Kurds. In 860/1456, a section of the castle of the Kurdish amirs was taken by al-Sifr al-kabir fi ṣīlah al-turfid biwādwiyya, an ancient temple at Busir al-Sidr [q.v.]. Among his numerous writings are several khāṣds, one of which, the Risālat al-şams ila 'l-hiliāl, was commented upon by himself under the title al-Ma' al-warābī ila 'l-arād al-nadżmīyya. This commentary and the poem became known in mediaeval Europe in a defective Latin version as Tabula chimica and Epistola solis ad lunam crescenti, the name of the author being rendered Senior Zadith Filius Humelius. Al-Ma' al-warābī begins with a description of two quasi-archaeological excursions to an ancient temple at Bāšür al-Sidr [q.v.] in order to find documents of alchemical wisdom there. This introduction follows a common pattern of fiction in Hermetic literature, but, as H. Stricker has shown, Ibn Umayl must actually have been in that temple, where he saw a statue of Imhotep, without however being able to read the name (cf. L’écriture de Murtadi, pp. 101-37). His special interest in the old temples and their wall-paintings is also indicated by another title: al-Sifr al-kabir fi ṣīlah al-aṣkāl al-bīrbdwiyya ila 'l-tasdwir. Among the many alchemical authorities quoted in al-Ma' al-warābī we find the names of Hermes [see HIRMIS], the legendary Egyptian king Markūnus (cf. G. Wiet, L’Égypte de Mursiûd, Paris 1953, 21), Democritus, Socrates, Plato, Zosimus, Mary the Jewess, Khalīd b. Ya'qūb [q.v.], Dhu 'l-Nūn [q.v.], and Dībjūr b. Hāyiyyān [q.v.]; he also depends on the Turba Philosopher. He is silent about al-Rāzī [q.v.], but he seems to include him when attacking those contemporary adepts who tried to obtain the elixir [see al-IKSIR] from base organic substances such as eggs and hairs.
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IBN ‘UNAYN, Abu ‘l-Ma‘asin Sharaf al-Din Muhammad ibn Nasr, ‘Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Qahhaf al-An’asari, satirical poet born at Damascus on 9 Shawwaal 597/1200, he studied with the main teachers of Damascus and spent a period in Iraq, Ibn ‘Unayn began early to use his lively satire against many different kinds of people; he did not spare even Salaf al-Din al-Saladini, who had just made himself master of the town (570/1174), and for this he was soon banished. He then went on some journeys connected with commercial matters, which led him to Iraq, Asharaybihjan, Kharas, Transoxiana, and even to India; then he returned to the Yemen, where he spent some time in the entourage of Saladin’s brother, Tughtakin; and then he settled for a time in Egypt (before 593/1197). His nostalgia for his native town led him to write the Diwanz, “Collection of the sayings of ‘Unayn”, which was his most famous work, and translated into Latin by Gerard of Cremona and into Hebrew by Abraham ibn ‘Abi Dahan. It was finally published by R. Blachère, Paris 1935, 148 f.; Ibn Abi Uṣaybi‘a’s (ed. Müller), ii, 40; idem, El libro de agricultura de Ibn wasit, “Abridged text of the Diwanz of Ibn ‘Unayn” published by Khalil Mardam at Damascus in 1946. Bibliography: Ibn Khallikan, iv; Yāqūt, Udamā, xii, 81-92; Abu Shama, Rawdatayn; Ibn Kathīr, Bidaya, xxii; Sibt Ibn al-Djawzi, Mir’at al-samān, viii, 5 f.; Ibn al-‘Imād, Shadharāt, iv, v; Hādīlī Khalīfa, col. 267; J. Rikabi, La poésie profane sous les Ayyūbides, Paris 1949, index; Khalil Mardam, introduction to the Diwanz; idem, in DM, iii, 403-7. (G. Troupeau)

IBN ‘UYYANA [see sdyvān b. ‘uyyana].

IBN WAFAID, Abu ‘l-Mu‘arrif ‘Abd al-Rahmān Muhammad al-Qa‘im, Andalusian physician, pharmacologist, and agricultural theorist. Little is known of his life except that he was born in 597/1200, died in 670/1271; of his works, only four are translated into Latin by Gerard of Cremona and translated into Hebrew by Abraham ibn ‘Abi Dahan. It was finally published by R. Blachère, Paris 1935, 148 f.; Ibn Abi Uṣaybi‘a’s (ed. Müller), ii, 40; idem, El libro de agricultura de Ibn wasit, “Abridged text of the Diwanz of Ibn ‘Unayn” published by Khalil Mardam at Damascus in 1946. Bibliography: Ibn al-Abbar, ii, 551; Sād al-Andalusi, Cairo n.d., 110 = Fr. tr. R. Blachère, Paris 1935, 148 f.; Ibn Abi Uṣaybi‘a’s (ed. Müller), ii, 40; idem, El libro de agricultura de Ibn Wāfīd y su influencia en la agricultura del Renacimiento, in And., viii (1943), 281-332 = Estudios sobre historia de la ciencia española, Barcelona 1949, ch. 7; E. García Gómez, Sobre agricultura andalusí, Cuestiones bibliográficas, in And., x (1945), 127-46; Choulant, Handbuch der Bücherhunde für die ältere Medizin, § 96 (on the Latin tr. of the
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K. al-Adwiya); M. Steinschneider, Die Hebraei-
schen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters, § 475 (on the
Hebrew tr.); Miel, La science arabe, Leiden 1938,
§ 387-7.

J. F. P. HOPKINS

IBN WAHH, 'Abd ALLAH b. WAHH b. MUSLIM AL-
FIHRI al-KURASHI, Mālikī traditionist of Egypt,
born in Cairo in 125/743 and died there in 197/813.

From a very early age he was taught by the imām
of Medina, until the latter's death, and then returned
to Cairo, where his own tomb is in the Karāfa
(see Ibn Khullikān, tr. de Slane, ii, 16, Ibn al-Zayyāt,
al-Kasbāb al-malikī, nayyār 44). The kāfī ḫiyād (Tartib
al-Dīdmi', ed. i, xi, and J. David-Weill, Manuscrits
malékides d'Ibn Wafid, in Melanges Maspero, Cairo
1940, ii, 177-81.

J. DAVID-WEILL

IBN WAHHON, Abū MUHAMMAD 'Abd al-
DIWTHI b. WAFIDH, Arab poet of Spain, whose
career was passed at the court of the master
of Seville, al-Mutamid ibn 'Abbād [q.v.]. Born at
Murcia, probably about 430-40/1039-49, into a
family of humble origin, he went to seek his fortune
at Seville, where he was the pupil of the philologist
al-Ahmād al-Shattamari [q.v.] and formed a friendship
with the vizier and poet Ibn 'Ammār [q.v.] before
being admitted to the court, in circumstances which
are variously reported. He then became one of the
official panegyrists of al-Mutanabbi, to whom
Ibn Wafidhiyya states that he dictated his trans-
lations "from the language of the Chaldees* into
Arabic". This Abū Ta'lib al-Zayyāt, who claims to
be a pupil and secretary of Ibn Wahshiyya, was,
according to L. Massignon (apud Festugiere, La
Réalisation d'Hermès Trismégiste, i, Paris 1944,
App. III, 396), "a Sābi, a member of a family of
viziers" (d. ca. 340/951?); he lived in the time of
Ibn al-Nadim (Fihrist, 312). If all parts of his name
are correct, he was the great-great-grandson of
the vizier Abū Diwthi Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Malik
(b. Abān, omitted in all sources when Abū Ta'lib
is referred to) al-Zayyāt [see ibn al-Zayyāt, Kald'id,
Khafcan, Kald'id, Mi'addi ibn Ditya, Ibn Baddii
al-badd'ih, Ibn Kharlda, Ibn Khuzaa, Ibn Mu'addīb,
Mu'addin, Nakhshab, Nakhshab, Poesie andalouse,
Wad al-badd'ih, index; Marra-

Bibliography: Ibn Basām collected the Diwan of Ibn Wafidh under the title al-Ikhāl al-
mughtamil 'alā ḫirī 'Abd al-Dīdmi, but this collec-
tion has not survived, and of this anthologist's
work on the poet there remains only a chapter of the
Dīdmi (2, still unpublished); al-Fath Ibn Maktāb, Kāʾlid, 15-3, 242-5; Ibn Dīyār, Muṣrub, index, s.v.; Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umari, Ma-
ṣālik al-adab, 374; Ibn Khallikān, Šelash, MS
44). The name of a person to whom
the translations which are attributed to Ibn Wahshi-
yya are not those of a native user of Arabic. The
question is whether they were made directly from
Syria, from Greek or from Pahlavi. There are
certain indications which support the author's claim
to have translated from Syrian, the most import-
and, in addition to the style of the language,
the type of prayers which are included, in particular,
in the K. al-Fīlābnta nambaṣīyya and which bear a
striking resemblance to those of Syriac liturgy
(cf. in particular the prayer with which the book
begins see ZS vi, 1928-9, 35 f.) and which is a
sort of ṣaṣānīn = ṣīrāq in the style of the
Syriac brevialry). This type of prayer is found in
the manuals of magic and talismanic art (such as


(Ch. FELLAT)
Ibn WAHSIYYA

Ghadyat al-fyakim of the Ps.-Madiriti) and what has been preserved from the Harranians by Ibn... yadillu calayhi min afywdl al-mawludin, "translated from the Nabataean into Arabic by Abu Bakr b. A^mad b. Wahshiyya.

This indication alone however is of no significance, states that he "translated it from the language of scripts not all of which are complete. Ibn Wahshiyya of the period of Nabuchodonosor II (605-562 B.C.;... M. Plessner has given a list of its contents in ZS, vi (1928-9), 35-55. From 1835 to 1875, this work was the subject of vigorous debate among orientalists: E. M. Quatremere, in his Mémoire sur les Nabaldens, in JA, xv (1835), 5-55, 97-137, 209-71 (see also Journal des Savants, March 1857) considered it to be the translation of a Chaldean work of the period of Nabuchodonosor II (605-562 B.C.;... Die Uberreste der altbabylonischen Literatur im Germanique, x (1860), 136-66; v. Gutschmid, Inscriptions, in Mémoires des Savants Etrangers présentés à l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Petersbourg, viii (1859), 329-54, dates it at the latest to the beginning of the 14th century B.C. This extreme view of Chwolson produced such a violent reaction from orientalists that it was about fifty years before this work was discussed again. Three important studies were written in reply to the Chwolson exposition of 1857: A. von Wiedemann, in „Kleine Schriften, ii, 568-716; cf. also War Ibn Waskhijjah ein nabatalischer Herodot?, in Berichte über d. Verhandl. d. kgl. Sachs. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1863, 67-99 = K. Tankalusha (Sphinx des Anubis. Rerum... Noldeke, in spite of the efforts of several scholars during the last fifty years to re-instate him (cf. E. Wiedemann, Zur Nabatäischen Landwirtschaft, in ZS, i (1922), 201-2; M. Plessner, Der Inhalt der Nabatäischen Landwirtschaft, in ZS, vi (1928-9), 27-56; E. Bergdolt, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Botanik. I — Ibn Wahšija: Die Kultur des Vielvölkens (viola odorata) und die Bedingungen des Blühen's in der Ruhezeit, in Berichte der Deutschen Botanischen Gesellschaft, i (1932), 321-56; II — Über einige Pfropfungen, ib., iii (1934), 87-94; III — Wasseranzeigende Pflansen, ib., liv (1936), 127-34; G. O. S. Darby, The mysterious Abolays, in Osiris, i (1936), 251-59; idem, Ibn Waskhja in mediæval Spanish literature, in Isis, xxxii (1941), 433-8). The very pessimistic prediction of Franz Boll, who says, referring to the K. Tankalusha (see below): "ist gleich seinen übrigen Schriften verdientermaassen noch immer unedirt geblieben und wird es wohl auch bleiben" (Sphäera, Leipzig 1903, 428), certainly seems to be justified.

It was concerning al-Fīlāḥa al-nabatīyya that the dispute over Ibn Waskhija arose; the other works attributed to him, although much less well-known, suffered repercussions from this.

(2) K. Šawk al-mulsahám fi ma‘rifsat rumūs al-‘āblām, an extraordinary collection of 93 cryptic alphabets attributed to the Manichean (Surya-Navaratna) and some Buddhist, Jain and Hindu peoples, and to famous persons, accompanied by alphabets appropriate to each planet and each sign of the zodiac (MS Paris 6805, 131 fols., nasḫī of 1165/1751-2, in which it is stated, fol. 129 r., that the work was written for 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân in 241/855 (sic); the author lived in Damascus; J. Hammes, Ancient alphabets and hieroglyphic characters explained, with an account of the Egyptian priests, their classes, initiation and sacrifices in the Arabic language... London 1806; S. de Sacy, apud A. L. Millin, Magasin Encyclopédique, vi (1810), 145-75; v. Gutschmid, loc. cit., 16-21). This type of collection of scripts is used in works of magic and of talismanic art; specimens of it are found in many maqdi‘as of esoteric writings. It is not impossible that many of these alphabets which were used as ciphers; they have the attributes of this (symmetry, opposition, superposition, interlacing of downstrokes; differentiation by small downstrokes, decorative refinements).

(3) K. Tankalusha (= Teucros; cf. A. Borissov, in JA, cxxvi (1933), 300-5) al-Bāśli al-‘āblām, fi šwar darād al-falak wa-ma‘ yadillu ‘alāsya min ahdīl al-mau-sāli‘ān, "translated from the Nabatean into Arabic by Abū Bakr al-‘Ahdīl al-Wāshijjah, and...
and dictated to 'Abd (sic) b. 'Abd al-Zayyāt (MS Leiden 891/2, fols. 28-69, preceded by a treatise on astrology which dates to 1200/16th century, famous for one poem, well-known in the Arab world), the translator of which is said to have been 'Umar b. Farrākhān al-Tabarī, see Brockelmann, S I, 392), an astrological treatise describing the twelve signs of the zodiac and the thirty degrees of each of them and based on the Pahlavi versions of the Παραστάλοπος of Teucros of Babylon and the Ανδρολόγια of Vettius Valens (cf. Nallino, Trase di opere greche inuine agli Arabi per trasferire phelecona, in Αλφαλάμματα, presented to E. G. Browne, Cambridge, 342-8, and S. I. 434 ff.).

(4) K. al-Sumūm, translated from the "Nabataean" and dictated to 'Abū Tālib ... al-Zayyāt (MSS Istanbul, Şehid All Paşa 2073, nasḫī of 905/1509-1500, 21.5 × 15 cm.; Leiden 725, 142 fols., a copy made by the British Museum manuscript 1357; other manuscripts in Brockelmann, S I, 431). Ibn Wāṣḥyiyā gives his sources: it is a compilation from two treatises on toxicity, one by Yābūkā (Istanbul MS: Baryūfī) al-Nabāṭī al-Kardānī, the other by Shāhī Sāt (Istanbul MS: Shāhīt Bīṣīt) "of the inhabitants of 'Aqūṭākū" (so Istanbul). It is the manual of poisons of Čanaḵya, according to a new redaction, produced in the medical circles of Gondāghērā, from the Persian translation of this treatise (cf. B. Strauss, Das Gībūtash des Sīhāk, in Quellen u. Studien z. Gesch. der Naturwiss. u. der Medizin, vii (1954), 28 (116) ff; Massigmon, loc. cit., 393). The work covers (a) things which kill by a look, (b) voices which terrify, (c) things which kill by their smell, (d) those which are lethal if eaten or drunk and (e) those which are lethal if touched; from chapter 8 onwards it deals with snake-bites, bites by dogs, the stings of spiders, scorpions, etc. (cf. K. al-Sumūm wa-dā'ī madārīrkhā by the Ps. Dāhir: Brockelmann, S I, 428, n. 32; Kraus, Jabir, i, 156-9).

(5) K. al-Uṣūl al-ḥabīr, a treatise on alchemy (MSS Istanbul, Rāqqī Paşa 963/3, fol. 499 ff., nasḫī, 24 × 18 cm.; the same madāmītā, fols. 1-36v., attributes to him K. al-Shawādīrī fi 'l-ḥikma wa-ḥiward; Hāzi Biāṣa 849, fols. 227-30r, taʿlīk fūrisī, n. d., 35 × 26 cm., in a madāmītā of works on alchemy, the majority of these Persian, beginning with the K. Mutakabbir wa-dā'ī al-Fīlāṭa by [b.] Ḵayyām-Šāft, fols. 1-222. In another madāmītā in Konya (Yusuf Ağa, 4873/3, 55 fols., 16 × 11.5 cm., small taʿlīk of 707/1307-8; see also 546 in the same collection), there is attributed to him another treatise on alchemy entitled K. Kāhī al-ramūd. There are also attributed to him other Hermetic works such as Kans al-ḥikma, Malātī al-anwār fi 'l-ḥikma, used by the Ismāʿīlīs, K. al-Hayābīl wa-tamādghīl and K. Tabāhānī (cf. reference in Brockelmann, I, 281, S I, 431), about which much less is known. He himself states, in al-Fīlāṭa al-nabāṭīyya (Leiden MS, p. 2), that he translated also extracts from a vast and valuable work on astrology entitled K. Dīlḥawādīrī al-Bībīlī fi arsr al-falak wa-takhamīs wa-l-tamādīhīn min haratik al-nujūm, and K. al-Anāwī al-ḥabīr. The Fīsīrīt, 312, lists other titles, for the existence of which there is no other evidence.

From his works as a whole there emerges a striking resemblance between his opinions and those of the Neoplatonist school of Syria founded by Iamblichus (d. 330 A.D.). Like the latter, Ibn Wāṣḥyiyā believed that man can come into contact with God by means of esoteric rites and symbolic formulas. The perspicacious Ibn Khaldūn (Muḥammad, iii, 120/165 f.; tr. Rosenthal, iii, 151 f.) had realized this when he stressed the care which the ancient authors of Geoponica took to discover the secret correspondences between the spiritual properties (rāhīnīyyāt) of plants and those of the heavenly bodies, and when he stated that the K. al-Fīlāṭa al-nabāṭīyya had been translated from the Greek (currīmā min ḥawālīn al-Yundniyyin).

In conclusion, we believe (as had already been suggested by G. H. Ewald, in Göttinger Nachrichten, 1857, 141 and 1861 (15 May)) that the works attributed to Ibn Wāṣḥyiyā are really extracts from a vast and valuable work on Geoponica already used by All b. Saḥīb b. Rabbān al-Tabarī in Fīrdaus al-ḥikma, completed in 235/850: cf. reference in Brockelmann, S I, 363). The present writer plans further research on Ibn Wāṣḥyiyā's work along these lines.

Bibliography: In addition to the numerous works mentioned in the article, see also C. A. Nallino, 'Ibn al-falak ūnd arab, Rome 1921, 208 ff.; P. Kraus, Jabīr Ibn Ḥayyān. Contribution à l'histoire des idées scientifiques dans l'Islam (1-11, Mem. de l'Institut d'Egypte, xliv-xlv, Cairo 1942-3), i, p. LIX and index; I. Goldziher, Muḥ. S., i, 158 (a product of the ḡuṣībīyya); J. Ruska, Cassianus Bassus Scholasticus and the arabic Versions of the greekish Landwirtschafts, in Isl., v (1914), 174-9 (= Kūstā b. Lūgā, al-Fīlāṭa al-yundniyya; the Leiden manuscript is based on a Persian version; ed. Cairo 1293/1876); idem, Weinbau und Wein in den arabischen Bearbeitungen der Geoponica, in Archiv für die Gesch. der Naturwiss. u. der Technik, vii (1913), 305-20; idem, Turba philosophorum: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Alchemie, in Quellen u. Studien z. Gesch. der Naturwiss. u. der Medizin, i (1931), 1-368; idem, Arabische Alchemie, in Archiv, xiv (1932), 425-35; idem, Über die arabische Erstellung der antiken Wissenschaften in den Orient, in Archiv für Gesch. der Mathematik, der Naturwiss. u. der Technik, x (N. F. i) (1927-8), 112-35; P. Sbath, L'ouvrage geoponique d'Anatolius de Bṣrytos (4th cent.), Arabic manuscript discovered by Sbath, in BIE, xiii (1931), 47-54; G. Sarton, Introd. to the history of science, ii, 654-5, ii, 425, 842; Ps.-Maḏjīṭīrī, Ghāyat al-bākīm, ed. Ritter, Leipzig 1932, 160, 179, 229 ff.; Ibn al-ʿAwāwīm, K. al-Fīlāṭa, ed. Banqueri, i-i, Madrid 1802 (tr. J. J. Clément-Mullet, ii-i, Paris 1864-7); Ibn Baṣṣāl, K. al-Fīlāṭa, ed. with Sp. tr. and notes by J. M. Millas Vallicrosa and M. Aziman, Tetuan 1955. (T. FAHD)
nickname of his grandfather, and it is not known whether he was given it because of his peevish nature or because he played the μαν (cymbals) (see L.A. under the root w.n.ri.). His father was the grandson of the 'Ali b. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh (1170-1240/1757-90). Totally deaf, but with a lively intelligence, he left behind him the reputation of an amusing courtier, with an inexhaustible supply of witty anecdotes. The sultan, who prided himself on his literary culture, called him Abu 'l-Shama'makā, probably because he had a large mouth and a large nose, like the poet from Kūfa with the same name [q.v.], and was as skilful as he in panegyric and satire.

As Abu 'l-' Abbās Ahmad did not succeed, either during his father's lifetime or after his death, in gaining admittance to the court, which was barred to him by envy, and as he wished at all costs to recite to the sultan the urduza which he had written for this purpose, he resorted to a ruse: standing himself one day on a proconterlooking route of the royal procession, he declaimed at the top of his voice as the sultan was passing, in the radīzat metre, the following couplet:

"My lord, son of the Prophet (nabī),
Abu 'l-Shama'makā was my father (abī)."

The Sultan recognized him, received him, listened to his poem, with which he was delighted, gave him a generous reward and awarded him a place in his entourage where he remained until his death, which is said to have occurred in 1187/1773.

Of his works, which are reputed to have included epistles on various subjects and some poems, all that is known is the urduza called al-Shama'makābiyya, a bi'fiyya of 275 verses in the radīzat metre. The success of this work is due to its educational value. It is in fact a résumé of the traditional culture of the Arabs in a form which could be understood, learned and remembered by an educated Moroccan of that period: a vocabulary dealing with the desert, inherited from the early poets of the Diabiliyya—the names of its winds, its flora and fauna, its proverbs, legends, anecdotes, historical facts, famous characters (both men and women)—in short a syncretistic tapestry of adab, poetry and history. Thus the Shama'makābiyya was used as a textbook, a précis to be learned by heart in the same way as the al-Mas'īl al-Mudḥaba fi l-mas'īl (Cairo 1285); al-Thābit al-wadīyya fi muḥkālāt al-īrāb, an urduza of 125 verses (ed. R. Abicht, Breslau 1891); a commentary on the preceeding work (MS Berlin); al-Bahā'ī al-wadīyya, an urduza, a rendering in 5000 verses of the al-Fā'ālī al-saghir of al-Kawzin (a manual of Shā‘ī fikh) (lith. Cairo 1311); Tālimmat al-Muḥkāsar fi aḥkhār al-baṣḥar, an abridgement of the chronicle of Abu 'l-Fidā' with continuation from 729 to 740/1329-9 (Cairo 1285); al-Maṣ'īl al-muḥkhaba fi 'l-maṣ'ālīl al-muḥkhaba, an urduza of 71 verses on questions of succession (MS Berlin and Cairo); al-Shābī al-ūdāb wa 'l-ūdāb al-ūdāb, a work of mysticism (MS Aya Sofya); al-Allīyya al-wadīyya, an urduza on the interpretation of dreams (several eds. in Egypt after that of Bollée 1387); al-Muṣīr wa-manṣūr, an urduza entitled Ḥim al-īrāb; al-Durrā, a commentary on the Allīyya of Ibn Muṣīr; Taddhikār (Muḥakkār) al-gharb, Abāh al-akhūr.

Bibliography: Kutubī, Fawdī, ii, 116; Subkī, Taḥāf al-Allīyya, vi, 243; Suyūtī, Ruybah, 365; Ibn al-'Imām, Shadgarāt, i, 161; Ibn Ḥasan, Ḍurar, ii, s.v.; Ibn Iyās, Badī‘ al-nūh, i, 198; Wustenfeld, Geschichtsschreiber, no. 412; Sarkis, Muḥammād, October 1457. He is said to be the author of the Kharīda al-aqābil wa-fardāt al-gharbā, a sort of geography and natural history without any scientific value. In fact, one of the authorities mentioned in the introduction (al-Musā’di, al-Tūsī, Ibn al-Ṭahrīr, al-Marrākūshī), the Kharīda is merely a plagiarism of the Dī‘imī al-funūn wa-salawat al-muṣāfin of Ṣūfīn al-Dīn Āḥmad b. Ḥamān b. Shāhīb al-Hārnālī al-Ḥanbalī, who lived in Egypt circa 731/1332. The work has nevertheless had a certain vogue among orientalists, who have published or translated fragments from it: De Guignes, A. Hylander (Lund 1824), C. J. Torrens, in Les manuscrits arabes de Paris 1921, 28, no. 80; 115, no. 340; Brockelmann, Geschichte der Schriftsteller, no. 412; it has been printed in Cairo several times since 1276.

However, there remain two problems: the first is the name of this Ibn al-Warḍī, who, according to al-Zirīkī, was called Ibn al-Wurḍī; the second is the real authorship of the Kharīda, which is also attributed to Zakīn al-Dīn al-Warḍī [see next article] and to Ṣūfīn al-Dīn Āḥmad b. Ṣūfīn al-Walīd al-Sulṭānī in a Vatican manuscript.

Bibliography: Ibn Iyās, Badī‘ al-nāhīr, ii, 60; Brockelmann, II, 132-2, S II, 162-3; F. Bustānī, DM, iv, 137; Zirīkī, A‘lam, x. (ED.)

IBN AL-WARΔ, IBN AL-DIN ĀḤMAD HĀFS ‘UMAR B. MUṣAFFAR B. ‘UMAR B. ABī ‘L-FAWARĪS MUḤ. B. ‘ALĪ AL-WARDĪ AL-KURĀSHI AL-BAKRĪ AL-SHAFI‘I, Shā‘īfī al-ṣabīlī, philologist, man of letters, historian and poet, born at Maarrat al-Nu‘mān (he has also the nizāb al-Maarrat); 689 or 691/1290-1292, died of plague in Aleppo on 27 Dhū ‘l-Hijādī 749/18 March 1349.

He was educated in his native town, then at Hamāt, Damascus and Aleppo; he seems to have held for a time the office of deputy to the bāḍis of Mandīj and of Aleppo, but, as the result of a dream, he abandoned this career to devote himself to his literary work.

He is the author of the following works: a Dī‘imī including poems, maḥkāmāt, epistles, discourses, a risāla on the plague, etc. (published in Istanbul by Fāris al-Shidyāk, in the Madī‘mat al-Dī‘imī, in 1300); Lāmīyyat (or Nāshīrāt or Wasiyāt) al-īkhwān as-muḥkharāt wa-muṣāfin al-khillān, a moral poem of 77 verses in the rāmāl metre, long a classic (ed. Cairo 1302 with commentary by Mas‘īd b. Ḥasan al-Kunāwī; in C. J. David, Tansib al-adab, Mosul 1863; also al-Siyawwānī, Naḥīf al-Yaman; Fr. tr. in R1, 1900; with the text, he collected in 1896 [see next article]) an abridgement of the chronicle of Abu ‘l-Shamālī al-Dawwārī in 689 or 691/1290-2, died of plague in Aleppo on 27 Dhū ‘l-Hijādī 749/18 March 1349.

It is in fact a résumé of the traditional culture of the Arabs in a form which could be understood, learned and remembered by an educated Moroccan of that period: a vocabulary dealing with the desert, inherited from the early poets of the Diabiliyya—the names of its winds, its flora and fauna, its proverbs, legends, anecdotes, historical facts, famous characters (both men and women)—in short a syncretistic tapestry of adab, poetry and history. Thus the Shama’makābiyya was used as a textbook, a précis to be learned by heart in the same way as the Muwāllātāt, the dī‘imī and the maḥkāmāt, and it has formed the subject of several commentaries, the best known of which are: (1) Abu ‘l-’Abbās Ahmad b. Khālid ... al-Nāṣirī, Zahr al-adīfān min ḥadābat Ibn al-Warḍī, lith. Fez 1315; 1386; (2) Abī Hāmid al-Hādī al-Mubāhī, Muḥammad al-Makkī b. Muḥammad al-Bītāwlī al-Sharshālī al-Ḥasanī, Iḥṭīāf saḥrat al-adīfān min ḥadābat fiwāyīyat Ibn al-Warḍī, lith. Fez 1333/1393; (3) Abī Muḥammad al-‘Arabī b. Mattāshīrī, Sharḥ al-Shama’makābiyya (cf. Kattānī, Fīhirī, ii, 15); (4) Abī ‘Allāh Ḥannūn (Gunnūnī), Sharḥ al-Shama’makābiyya, Cairo 1964.


(Μ. ΗΑΔΗ-ΣΑΔΩΚ)
3. A noted family called Ibn Yacish, reputedly descended from Yakya ibn Yacish, a 6th/i2th century

4. In about 663/1264-5, Ibn Wâsîl returned to his native Hamât, where he was appointed chief hâdî but devoted little time to writing, composing there his Mukhâsir al-Akhbâr and his Bani Ayyub. His works include a detailed commentary in Arabic on Ibn Sinâ’s al-Kanân fi ‘l-jibb; an Arabic super-commentary on Abraham ibn ‘Ezra’s commentary on the Pentateuch; and a dictionary of difficult words occurring in Arabic poetry. He may also be identical with Solomon ben Abraham ibn Da’ud, who translated into Hebrew two Arabic medical works: Ibn Rushd’s Kulliyât fi’s-jibb (translation entitled Mikhâl), and Ibn Sinâ’s al-Urdius, with Ibn Rushd’s commentary.

5. In 659/August 1261, Baybars sent him an embassy to the King of Sicily, Manfred, whom he met in Barletta in southern Italy and to whom he dedicated a treatise on logic, Ta’rîkh al-Sulayhi (no. (i) below), and his successor al-Risdla al-Anbruriyya. He subsequently lived for various periods in Madrid, Florence and Paris. In 1585 he came to Salonia, where he openly returned to Judaism, and then settled in Istanbul. He hated Spain passionately, and this may have been the reason for his political activities and unsuccessful efforts to foster the development of an Anglo-Turkish entente against Spain: he had some influence at the courts of both Murâd III and Queen Elizabeth (whose physician Rodrigo Lopez was his brother-in-law). He also enjoyed considerable prestige in several other European courts, notably that of France. His diplomatic efforts played a part in nullifying Spanish attempts to secure Ottoman neutrality in the war between England and Spain, and in ensuring England’s benevolent neutrality during the successful Ottoman campaign in Hungary which culminated in the victory at Ilaç Ovası (Kerekesz) in 1503. As a reward the Sultan created him Duke of Mytilene. The grant of Tiberias, originally made to his kinsman Joseph Nasi ( João Miquez, d. 1579; see Nasi), was renewed to him, and his son Jacob (Francisco) settled there. Salomo ibn Ya’âsh died in Istanbul in 1603.


3. A noted family called Ibn Ya’âsh, reputedly descended from Ya’ây ibn Ya’âsh, a 6th/12th century
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physician in Portugal, produced physicians, rabbis
and merchants in the Ottoman Empire from the
ioth/i6th to the 2Oth centuries.
Bibliography: H. Friedenwald, The Jews in
medicine, Baltimore 1944, 691; S. A. Rosanes,
Divrei yemei Yisrael be-Togarma (ia, Tel-Aviv
1936, ii-iv (Qoroth ha-Yehudim be-Turkiyah),
Sofia 1936), ia, 70, 167-8, ii, 33, iii, 77, 104, iv,
6; A. Galante, Don Salomon . . ., 22; Jewish Enc.,
xii, 581-4; C. B. Friedberg, Bet eqed sefarim2,
Tel-Aviv 1951-6, i, B, 1013, iii, M, 3408.
(E. BIRNBAUM)
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YACISH B. CAL! B. YACISH AL-HALABI, also known as
IBN AL-SANIC, Arab grammarian, born at Aleppo
on 3 Ramadan 553/28 September 1158, died there 25
Djumada I 643/18 October 1245. He studied grammar (nahw) and tradition (liadiih) first in Aleppo,
then in 577/1181 in Mosul and finally under Abu
'1-Yumn al-Kindi in Damascus. Then he returned
to Aleppo, where he lectured on grammar and
literature until his death. Ibn Khallikan, who was
his pupil in 626-7/1229-30, gives a vivid picture
of him, and tells some anecdotes about his wit.
Other pupils of his were Yakut (i, 757, Irshdd, iii,
77 f.), Ibn Malik Djamal al-Din and al-Sharishi. Ibn
Yacish is best known for his extensive commentary
on Zamakhshari's al-Mufassal (published by G. Jahn,
Leipzig 1882-6, 2 vols.). He adheres strictly to the
doctrine of Sibawayh and the Basra school, but
discusses at length the differences between the
two schools. His style is verbose and sometimes
slovenly. For other works of his, see Brockelmann,
I, 397; S I, 521.
Bibliography: Ibn Khallikan, no. 843; Yafi%
Mir'dt al-d[indn, iv, 106; Suyuti, Bughya, 419;
G. Weil, in ZA, xix, 4; idem, in the introduction
to his edition of Ibn al-Anbari, K. al-Insdf (= Die
grammatischen Streitfragen der Basrer und Kufier,
Leiden 1913), passim.
(J. W. FUCK)
IBN YALLAS, MUHAMMAD AL-HADJDJ C!LAL
£
AL! B. MUHAMMAD YALLAS SHAWUSH, Sufi Shavkh
of the order of the Darkawa [q.v.]. Born in
1271/1855, he studied theology and law thoroughly
at Tlemcen, where he was initiated into tasawwuf by
Abmad b. Muhammad Dakkali. His other teachers
in Sufism were, successively, Muhammad al-Habri
(d. 1900) and Ibn al-Habib al-Buzidi (d. 1909 at
Mostaganem) with whom his fellow-pupil was Aljmad
al-cAlawi (or Ibn cAliwa [q.v.]), the founder of the
c
Alawiyya tarilia. In 1911, he emigrated to Damascus
with his disciple Muhammad al-Hashimi [q.v.], who
was to succeed him as spiritual leader of the Darkawae
Alawiyya in Syria after his death at Damascus on
n Djumada II 1346/6 December 1927. He was the
author of a Diwdn (printed at Damascus, n.d.) in
which he celebrated the beauty of Layla, the beloved
Divine Presence; his poems are still sung in Damascus
during the sessions of dhikr of the fukard*.
Bibliography: see the articles referred to
above.
(J--L MICHON)
IBN-I YAMlN, in full AMIR FAIOIR AL-DIN
MAHMUD B. AMIR YAMIN AL-DIN TUGHRA'I MusTAWF! FARYUMADI, the most important Persian poet
of fyifas (literally "fragments", i.e., epigrams or
occasional verses), born in 685/1287 in Faryumad
(in the district of Bayhak, the modern Sabzavar),
where his father was a small landowner and at
the same tune a director of finance (mustawfi), in
the service of the governor of Khurasan, Khwadia
c
Ala° al-Din Muhammad. Both occupations, it seems,
had been hereditary in the family from ancient

times (according to some, having immigrated from
Transoxania to Faryumad). Ibn-i Yamin received
the usual education (chiefly in medicine and literature) in his native town, whose culture at that time
stood at a very high level. Under the influence of
his father, who was himself a poet and who loved
his son dearly, he began at an early age to write
verses. The son even entered into a poetical contest
with his father. On his father's death (724/1323-4)
Ibn-i Yamin's peaceful life came to an end, since
he now became court poet, financial official, and
after a time mustawfl to cAla5 al-Din, and was later
granted the title of amir. He disliked the bustle of
court life, and disagreement arose between him and
his master, who moreover fell from favour and was
replaced by Tari Tagha'i (727-9/1327-29),^ tyrant,
under whom Ibn-i Yamin lost the greater part of
his estate, and was finally forced to give up also the
remainder. After spending the years 738-42/1337-41
at the court of the Ilkhan Tagha Timur in Gurgan,
he joined in 742/1341 the radical wing of the Sarbadars [q.v.]. The encounter with the Kurts at Zava
(743/*342) resulted in a severe defeat for the Sarbadars; the poet was taken prisoner and lost the diwdn
containing all that he had written until then. The
conquerors took him to Herat, where he was well
treated, so that he was able to write his poetry in
peace. In 747/1346, he returned to Sabzavar, from
whence however he was soon temporarily driven out,
by a crisis of the Sarbadars, to Adharbaydjan and
Baghdad. From 749/1348 he lived almost without
interruption in Faryumad in the "service" of the
Sarbadars, and even received a pension from them.
He occupied himself with farming and the writing of
epigrams. He died at the same place at an advanced
age in 769/1368.
Like all the inhabitants of Sabzavar, he was a
Shici, though not without hesitations. He was one of
the earliest poets to write of the imams and the
tragedy of Karbala5.
The question of the authenticity of the kulliyydt
and diwdns which appear under the name of Ibn-i
Yamin has not been satisfactorily solved. When the
diwdn written in his early years was irretrievably lost
in 743/1342, the poet made great efforts to reconstruct it. With the help of his own memory and
notes, and those of his friends, he succeeded in
producing a first redaction of the earlier collection
in 746/1346 and a second in 1356. Compared with
the edition of Sacid Nafisi with more than 5,000
couplets, the reliable MS 403 (Dorn) in the SaltlkovShc"edrin Library (Leningrad) consists of about
16,120 couplets according to Mulladianavi Shahristani (according to S. Imronov, however, only 13,387
couplets); the manuscript dates from the 9th/i5th
century and was copied from Ibn-i Yamin's texts.
There exist however several other manuscripts
which differ from this one and those related to it,
yet similarly bear the name of Ibn-i Yamin, but
which must belong to another poet, as has already
been recognized by CA. A. Dihkhuda. According to
the completely convincing arguments of S. Imronov,
this is the much later Shaykh al-shuyukh Ibn-i
Yamin Shiburghani (d. 1005/1596-7), a distinguished
Sufi of his day (cf. S. Nafisi, Tdrikh-i na?m wa nathr,
i, 587), whose diwdn is indeed entirely permeated by
mysticism.
Ibn-i Yamin's frasidas are certainly not of the
highest quality and are marred by mendicancy,
repetition and plagiarism. They are in praise of
65 rulers of minor importance, whose generosity
he praises in thinly-veiled appeals for money. On


the other hand, he is an unequalled master in *bī’ās*, "epigrams", to which after 757/1356 he applied himself almost exclusively (they are of course included with the earlier poems in the manuscripts which have now come to light). These epigrams are divided by A. R. Khekmat into autobiographical, social critical, didactic, philosophical, and other types. Particularly encouraging is his sympathy for the rural population, of whose joys and sorrows he had direct experience. His pen was guided by reason, though not without inconsistencies (such as a belief in free will and work). He sharply opposed flattery, untruthfulness, despoticism and foreign rule. He lived in an unsettled age, which is vividly reflected in his *kulliyāt*, which therefore represent a useful historical source. Ibn-i Yamn's literary heritage consists of collected poetical works, a *Kānāme* and short prose works (letters).
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K. Ayn, in *Shafq-i surkh*, 1964, no. 5, 33; Isfahan Public Library, of 783/1381: 8th/14th century: private collections of S. Nafti and Mahdi Bayānī; Leningrad, Saltkoff-Shčedrin library (very good MS); Tashkent, 1965, 18-19, and 95 (library of the Madjlis of Iran, no. 13271).
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**IBN YŪNUS**, Abū Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ahmad al-Šādāfī (b. 281/894, d. Monday 26 Dū‘mād 11 547/4 September 955, which, however, was actually 24 October 955 (Tuesday), a grandson of the famous early Egyptian supporter of al-Shāfī‘ī, Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-‘Alī, and the father of the astronomer (below). He wrote on Egyptian scholars and, in a separate work, on the foreigners who came to visit or settle in Egypt. Both works were much used sources of information for later authors, but they seem not to have been preserved. Only part of a supplement by Abu ‘l-‘Aṣāṣī Mīrābī b. ‘Abī b. al-Tāhān has so far been traced in a manuscript in Damascus.

**Bibliography:**
Sam’ānī, 350b; Ṣesgin, i, 357 f. (F. Rosenthal)

**IBN YŪNUS (or Yūnus)**, whose full name was Abū ʿl-Ḥasan Ṭābil b. Abī Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ahmad b. Yūnus al-Šādāfī, one of the most prominent Muslim astronomers, died in 399/1009.

Ibn Yūnus’s chief astronomical work, *al-Zīdī al-kabīr al-khābīmi* (not all of which seems to have survived), was begun ca. 380/990 and completed shortly before his death. Several long extracts have been published and translated, and it is one of the *sidīj* (sets of astronomical tables) that has been treated extensively by modern scholars. He quotes a large number of astronomical observations (eclipses and other phenomena), some made by his predecessors (many of which turn out to be erroneous), others made by himself in Cairo; they constitute the most extensive list of medieval astronomical observations presently known. Ibn Yūnus is especially careful in reporting the researches of his predecessors, and his criticisms of errors and discrepancies in their works are distinctly modern in tone.

The *sidīj* of Ibn Yūnus was analysed by Delambre on the basis of a Caussin’s publication of chapters 3-5 and an unpublished translation of most of the remaining chapters by Sédiot that has since disappeared. The observations reported by Ibn Yūnus were discussed by S. Newcomb, who was interested in their possible usefulness for determining the value of the secular acceleration of the moon. Ibn Yūnus’s original contributions to plane and spherical trigonometry have been treated by Delambre, von Braunmübl, and Schoy.

**Bibliography:**

Bibliography: Some verses of Ibn (al-)Zâbîr are quoted in dictionaries and grammatical works; the most detailed notice is in the Aghâni, xiii, 33-49, = Beirut ed., iv, 211-46; see also Dîbâ, Bayân, i, 226; idem, Bukhâlā, ed. Hâdrî, 207, 380; Ibn Kutayba, ʿâshîr, index; idem, ʿUyân, ii, 186; iii, 67, 265; Ibn Sallâm, Tâdidâb, 146; Mubarrad, Kâmîl, 222, 165; Hûstâl, Zahr, 405, 474, 817; Tabârî, ii, 231, 269, 871; Masûdî, Murâdî, v, 300-7; Marzbânî, Mûḏjdîm, 244, 470; Baghdadî, Khânîma (Bûlak), i, 345; ii, 100; Ibn al-ʿÂshîr, ii, 317; iv, 30, 272, 307; Tilbrîzî, Sharh Dîwdn al-Ḥamâsa, passim; Caetani, Annali, ii, 231, 269, 871; Nallino, Letteratura, 133, 143 = Fr. tr. 205-6, 220. (ED.)

IBN ZâFîR, Aḥâb ʿAbd Âllâh (var. Abû Ḥâshîm, Abû Djaʿfar) Muḥ. b. Aḥâb Muḥ., an Arab scholar and polygonist to whom are usually ascribed the maḥâla al-Sîkîlî (often followed by the maḥâla al-Makki) and various honorific titles. According to Ibn Khallâkîn (M. Amari, Bibliotheca arabo-sicula [=B.A.S.], Leipzig 1857, 630), he was born in Sicily (in 497/1104, according to certain biographers) and brought up in Mecca; he travelled in various countries in the East and in the Magrib and, towards the end of his life, retired to Hamât where he died in 565/1170 (var. 567 and 598). But these biographical data, and in particular his origin, birth and journeys, vary considerably in the other authors mentioned in the B.A.S. In fact, according to Yâyûṭ (Ifrîkî, vii, 102), the place where he stayed during his journeys were Egypt, Ifrîkî (in al-Mahdiyya), Sicily, Egypt again, Aleppo and Hamâta. Of this author's vast output (Ibn Zafar, in the introduction of his Sulûwîn al-mutâlâ [see below], credits himself with 32 works), only four works have survived. As for the subjects treated in those of his writings which must be regarded as lost and which, according to Yâyûṭ (op. cit., 102), were destroyed in Aleppo during the struggles between Shâjis and Sunnîs, from the few that we possess it may be deduced that they were concerned with Qur'ānic exegesis, theology, fîkâ, moral philosophy, exhortation, grammar, Aristotelian logic and lexicography (several commentaries on the Maḥkâmât of al-Harîrî). The only writings to have survived are: Yanbâh al-baydî fi tašâkîr al-ḥâlîr al-bâlîm, a long unt published commentary on the Qur'ān and, in his own opinion, the best of his writings (for the MSS, see Brockelmann, i, 352, S i, 596); Khayr al-bîshir bi-khayr al-bashir (lih. Cairo 1280/1863) on the predictions received by mankind on the subject of Muhammad's prophetic mission; Arabî nudjâbâ al-ānbî (the undated Cairo ed. belongs to 1322/1904), biographies of illustrious individuals, starting with Muhammad, and various subjects of adab (see Brockelmann, i, 352, S i, 595, and also C. A. Nallino, I manoscritti arabi ... di Torino, in Mem. Acc. Scienze, 1900, 37-8); Sulûwîn al-mutâlî fi ʿulâm al-āthâr (lih. Cairo 1278/1862-3; printed Tunis 1297/1866-7, Beirut 1300/1882-3); this Fürstenspiegel, drawn up on the model of Kailla wa-Dimna, and of which Italian, English and Turkish translations were made, must be regarded as the author's most widely known work.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, i, 352, S i, 595; the preface to the Italian translation, by M. Amari, of the Sulûwîn, Florence 1851, 1882; on the Sulûwîn, see V. Chauvin, ii, 175-87 — M. Amari, Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia, Catania 1933, iii, 735-57. Lastly, we must add that, in the Catalogue of MSS in the Mosque of al-Azhâr, a work (775, no. 2120 "Fišh Āmm") is attributed to Ibn Zafar, bearing the title Fisd al-ādîl al-muṣafârî (Muṣafârî?) fi l-muṣâbâdîn wa l-ʿâdâdîl, of which the author himself makes no mention in the list of his writings contained in the musâbdîma of the Sulûwîn.

(U. Rizzitano)
IBN ZAFIR— IBN ZAKUR 971

saldiu&yya may form a part (see Cl. Cahen, in Historians of the Middle East, 70), but of which the most important part is that which concerns the Fatimids: it was used by Ibn Khallikán and Wiistenfeld, but remains unpublished. The other titles mentioned are ABBâr al-shu'fâ', Aisâ d-siyâsa (or al-balâqga), Naftâs al-Dhakhîra (extracts from Ibn Bassâm?), Sâfî al-ghazlî fi dîshâm al-sâhir wa 'l-khâlî (abridged by al-Suyûtî), Man usiba mimman ismuh 'All, Makrûmât al-kutlûb.

Bibliography: Yâkût, Irjâd, v. 228 = U. von Wilamowitz, 30, 2; Ibn Shâhir, Fasâd, s.v.; Makkâri, Analectes, ii, 166, 176; Stèissheim, Protogeometra zu einer Ausgabe der Gedigitgeschichte, Leipzig 1911, 32 ff.; F. Bustânî, Dâ'drat al-mâ'ârif, iii, 322; Broekelmann, S. I, 533; Cl. Cahen, Quelques chroniques anciennes relatives aux derniers Fatimides, in BIFAO, xxvii (1937), 22 ff. (Ed.)

IBN AL-ZÂKKÂK, Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali b. 'A'Îyvât Allah b. Mû'tarrîf b. Salâma, Andalusian poet, born at the very end of the 5th/11th century, probably at Valencia, whence his nisba of al-Balansi, although he is sometimes, probably wrongly, given that of al-Mursi (of Murcia). The little that is known of his personal life is in part contradictory; his genealogy varies according to the writer, but the most probable is that given above. It is known that his mother was the sister of the great poet Ibn Khafaja [q.v.]; the information concerning his father is confused: Ibn 'Abd al-Malîk describes him as related to the Banû 'Abdâd of Seville [see 'ABBâDID], but states that he denied this relationship when al-Mustâmid was deposed and exiled by the Almoravids (484/1091) and that he lived in Valencia, where he was the muezin of the Great Mosque. Al-Mâkârî (Analectes, ii, 196) states that he was a poor artisan and relates an anecdote in which the son plays a part and which seems to be a legend. Nor do the early writers agree about his ethnic name: some consider his nisba to be al-Lâkîmi, which implies a purely Arab origin, others refer to him as al-Bulûgîn, making him a Berber. Nor are they consistent on the name under which the poet is known, Ibn al-Zâkka or Ibn al-Dâkka.

He first studied with Ibn al-Sîd at-Balatsawîs [see al-BALATSAWES] and probably studied poetry with his uncle Ibn Khafaja. His life was short but very happy, to judge by his epitaph, which he wrote himself. He died in 528/1133 or 530/1135, before he was forty.

Ibn al-Zâkka, whose poems, collected in a diwân, “passed from hand to hand”, very soon acquired great fame, and the Arab authorities and critics, as well as modern orientalists, regard him as one of the great poets of Muslim Spain. His poetry, according to E. Garcia Gómez, imitates Ibn Khafaja, but not slavishly; it is more restrained, perhaps less brilliant, but more refined.


(F. DE LA GRANJA)
above (cf. Alami, al-Anis al-mutrib, 24; Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, 274 and n. 2). He also studied poetry, verse, and adab, and joined the fraternity founded in Morocco by Abū `Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Naṣīr.

The method of tuition consisted often in listening to an elucidation of the same text carried out several times by the same tutor, and on occasion by several tutors. Thus, the Mukhṭasar of Khalīl was explained to him three times by Burdullu and once by Bārktu; similarly, Dīvān al-dīwānīm was explained to him by Māqāliyyah and by Bārktu. In his biographies of these poets, he knew by heart the Talkhīš al-Mīthāk, the Dīvān al-dīwānīm, the Kāfisyya and the Alīfyya of Ibn Mālik, the Mukhtar of Khalīl, the Makāmat of al-Hariri, etc., and had acquired the titles of adīb, of ḍawwāl (versed in the art of fine speaking) and of nāṣir (verifier).

According to these biographers, he was the author of sixteen works: (1) a rīhīa entitled Naṣīr asāhir al-bustān fī man adzhāzan bi l-Diwa`ara` fī Tahfīzah min fudūlah al-akhar bi l-`A`mā, Algiers 1319/1902; (2) a diwān entitled al-Rauḍ al-Sarīr fī badī al-tawaqqūth wa-munaltaka l-`Ibtid`a'; for the autograph MS, now at Rabat, see RJMA, v (1959), 189; about fifteen fragments, totalling 350 verses, are contained in his rīhīa and in `Alamī, al-Anis al-mutrib, passim; (3) al-Mu`īrī al-mubīn: annama tawfīqah al-Anis al-mutrib wa-Rawdi al-nisirin, MS. in Rabat (cf. Lévi-Provençal, Mrs. ar. de Rabat, w. 498 (2), 215) and in the library of Abu l-Diwa`ara that of al-Anis al-mutrib al-walā' al-sālih al-Maghrīb, cf. Alami, al-Anis al-mutrib, fol. 57v.; Kattāni, Salseal al-anfās, lit. Fez 1314/1906, ill. 179; RMM, xxiv, 206; R. Basset, Recherches bibliographiques sur les sources de la Salouat el-anfās, Algiers 1903, 13, no. 18; Muḥ. al-Sā`īb, al-Munḥashādi `al-`abkarrīyya, 58; E. Lévi-Provençal, Les histoires de chevaux, Paris 1924, p. 213, 2; Ibn al-Hāy al-Kattāni, Fihrist, 1314/1927, i, 130; Brockelmann, i, 26, 51, 54, 545, S 11, 684; `Abd al-Wahhāb b. Manṣūr, al-Diwa`ara` fī rīhīya Abī `Abd Allāh b. Zākūr, in al-Basa`ar, no. 348, of 6 January 1956, 2, no. 350 of 20 January 1956, 5, no. 351 of 27 January 1956, 2, no. 354 of 17 February 1956, 2; `Abd Allāh Kamūn (= Gennūn), al-Munḥashādi min shīr Ibn Zākur, Cairo 1942; idem, al-Munḥashādi fī tadabdar al-`arab, Beirut 1963, 17 (M. Ḥady-Sadok).

IBN ZAMRAK, ABŪ `ABD ALLĀH MUHAMMAD B. YŪSUF B. MUHAMMAD B. AHMAD B. MUHAMMAD B. YŪSUF AL-SURAYVI, known as Ibn Zamrak (or Zumruk), Andalusian poet and statesman, born at Granada in 733/1333. Although he was of humble origin, he devoted himself to study and received his education from famous masters, notably al-Shārfī al-Gharnāṭī and Ibn al-Khāṭīb. Thanks to the active patronage of the latter, the young poet obtained a post in the government administration of Granada. In 760/1359, when Muhammad V was deposed and welcomed at Fez by the Marinid sultan Abū Sālim, Ibn al-Khāṭīb and Ibn Zamrak followed him into exile. During this period, Ibn Zamrak pursued his studies, took part in the festivities at the court and, on occasion, wrote poetry. When, after various vicissitudes, Muhammad V returned to Granada (763/1362), he appointed him private secretary (kātib sirrīh) by a zāhir which was drawn up by Ibn Khāṭīb himself. During the following years, he often filled the rôle of court poet. In 773/1371-2, Ibn al-Khāṭīb, who until then had assisted the Naṣīrī ruler in carrying out the complicated policy of Caliph of the Almoravides in the three Andalusian cities of Cordoba, Seville, and Toledo, was dismissed. Thanks to the special favour of the landlord, the young poet was retained in Morocco (which was in a state of chaos following the assassination of Abū Sālim in 762/1361), defected and joined the Marinid sultan `Abd al-`Azīz at Tlemcen; it was then that Ibn Zamrak succeeded his teacher and patron in the post of chief minister. Ibn al-Khāṭīb, arrested in Fez, had to appear before a court of enquiry in Granada presided over by Ibn Zamrak, where he was accused of heresy, subjected to torture, and finally put to death in prison. At this stage there was no criticism of Ibn Zamrak, who continued to fulfil his duties as chief minister and court poet. But after the death of Muhammad V (793/1391), his son and successor, Yūsūf II, dismissed Ibn Zamrak and imprisoned him for nearly two years in the citadel of Almeria; restored again to office, the poet-minister was once again dismissed by the same ruler, who, as we have seen, was replaced by Muhammad b. `Aṣīm. He was re-appointed in 795/1393, but shortly afterwards, at a date not known, was assassinated on the sultan's orders.

The Dīvān of Ibn Zamrak has not been preserved, but a considerable number of poems, collected by Ibn al-Khāṭīb and reproduced by al-Maḳārī, have survived: they consist of elegies, panegyrics, and congratulations written on the occasion of religious
festivals or of important events at the court. In some of his poems there can be traced the undoubted plagiarism from him. In the panegyrics, the descriptive themes of the verses in which he celebrates the beauty of Granada and its gardens and palaces are of particular interest; some of these verses are still permanently preserved since they form a part of the decoration of the walls of the Alhambra.

The character of Ibn Zamrak provides the central theme in the novel by the Egyptian writer and teacher Subhayr al-Kalamawi entitled Tsamaa' gharabat al-ajsam (Cairo 1949).

Bibliography: The fundamental study of E. García Gómez, Ibn Zamrak, el poeta de la Alhambra, in Cinco poetas musulmanes, Madrid—Buenos Aires 1944, 169-271, has been used as a basis for this article. To the sources mentioned in it there should be added: Maakhir, Aš'ar al-r̄iyādi, Cairo 1359/1940, ii, 7-206; Ahmad Bābā, Nāyi al-lābīkādī in the margins of the Dīdān of Ibn Farbūn, Cairo 1351, 282-3; ibn al-Khatīb, al-K̄atiba al-kāmina, ed. Ibnsān 'Abbās, Beirut 1955, 282-8. The mawlidīyyāt of Ibn Zamrak have been studied by A. Salmi, in Hesprēs, iii (1956), 335-435, passim. (F. DE LA GRANJA)

IBN AL-ZARKALI [see AL-ZARKALI] and IBN AL-ZARRALA, 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Zaydān b. Ismā'īl (the last named was the famous 'Alawīd sultan who died in 1410/1727). Moroccan official and historian, born in Rabī' II 1290/ June 1873 in the imperial palace at Meknēs. He received a thorough education from the best teachers, first in his native town and then at Fez, in the mosque of al-Karawīyīn. In 1324/1906, he succeeded his father in the office of nakīb [q.v.], an ancestor the sultan Mawlay Isma'il. He died on 16 November 1946 and was buried at Meknēs in the burial chamber (tiyārīh) of the great ancestor of the sultan Mawlay Ismā'īl.

Ibn Zaydūn's works, though of great importance, are still not all published. They may be considered as the best source not only for the history of Meknēs, but also for that of the 'Alawīd dynasty. Ibn Zaydūn thoroughly appreciated the importance of sources and he succeeded in building up a large library (with a catalogue) containing a considerable number of manuscripts and archive documents. In particular, his official position enabled him to acquire and to publish some hundreds of sakīras [q.v.]. All his works are written in a clear language and set out in a very modern manner with plans, reproductions, portraits and, above all, with very complete indexes, which make them valuable and practical reference works. Among those published so far, or about to be published, may be mentioned: (1) Thāf al-ʾīlam al-nās bi-durr al-ṭarātayn, 4 vols., Rabat 1944-57; (2) qīṣās bi-Fāṣ al-ākhir, Rabat 1937; contains new facts and documents on the beginnings, at Fez, of the 'Alawīd dynasty. (3) al-ʾIzz wa l-ʾawla fi maʿālim nāṣm al-dawla, 2 vols., Rabat (Royal Press) 1961-2; through the documents here published and annotated, this constitutes an excellent source on the functioning and the life of the sultan's palace and on the mechanism of the Moroccan government. (4) al-Manāhīgī al-sawīyya fi maʿālīm mulūk al-dawla al-salāwīyya, 2 vols., to be published at the Royal Press, Rabat. Among the unpublished works is a dīwān of poems written in honour of the birth of the Prophet (mawlidīyyāt).

IBN ZAYDÔN—IBN AL-ZAYYÃT

al-Mustakfi. This poetess was not without talent but was incurably flirtatious and caused both happiness and unhappiness to Ibn Zaydûn, who wrote on the subject of her favours and her inconstancy the sincerest of all his poetic works. Her deception went even further, since it seems certain that Ibn Zaydûn’s enemy, Ibn ‘Abdûs, intrigued against him through jealousy; and then, when Ibn Zaydûn had gone away, Wallâda easily found consolation with his rival.

Ibn Zaydûn’s poetry fits admirably the description of “neo-classical”, so much so that he was given the name of “the western Buhtûrî”. Although his diwân contains a number of short occasional poems, it contains many of perfectly classical structure. The genre which he cultivates the most is probably panegyric, dedicated to one or other of his successive masters. The enmity with which he was surrounded inspired him in addition to write virulent satirical poems. Among the most moving poems are some elegies, notably those which lamented the death of the mother of Abu ‘l-Walîd Ibn Dîjahwar and the daughter of al-Mu’tâdîd.

But the most personal poems are of course those concerning his affair with Wallâda. Critics have not failed to point out the particularly languishing and plaintive character of his love poetry, as well as of the numerous poems in which he celebrated the enchanted scenes of his love. It is moreover in these poems that he appears most typically western. Some have thought to see in this languor an influence of the Christian milieu; it is more likely that they reflect the influence of the locality, and merely crystallize a general tendency of the poetry of his period.

There should be mentioned also the existence in this work of a strophic poetry of mušāyâbah type, as well as a whole series of poetical enigmas in which there appears a symbolism on the names of birds (mušâyârât). Although Ibn Zaydûn cannot be denied a certain talent in the expression of emotion, and notably of his passion for Wallâda and for his country, it must be admitted that this talent is not adequate to deal with solemn šâydâs, in which his writing remains stilted and conventional; his panegyrics remain heavy use of contrived styles. The short poems, on the other hand, give an impression of improvisation and real originality.

In addition to his diwân, Ibn Zaydûn wrote a number of epistles, the two most famous of which are the Risâla kašûfiyya, in which he puts into the mouth of Wallâda a satire on his rival Ibn ‘Abdûs (commentary by Ibn Nabûtâ—a. 768/1366—Šârî al-‘ayûn fi šarîK Risâlât Ibn Zaydûn), and the Risâla dîjdiyya, addressed from his prison to Abu ‘l-Wâlid Ibn Dîjahwar. The epistles of Ibn Zaydûn continue the tradition begun by al-Dîjahîz in his Tarîbî, and carried on among others by al-Khuwârizmî, al-Tawhîdî and al-Ḫâmâshînî.

It appears that these rasîs had more success in the East than his poems, whose originality was questioned there.


IBN ZAYLÂ, ABû MANŠûR AL-HUṢAYN B. MUḤAMMAD B. ‘UMAR B. ZAYLÂ (according to Brockelmann, I, 458, and B. Tâhîr B. Zaylât al-Iṣfâhânî in S I, 829), died, while still young, in 440/A.D. 848. A pupil of Ibn Sinâ and a member of his immediate circle, he wrote a commentary on the poetry of Ibn ‘Abî Yâsîn al-Râṣîdî (q.e., what he calls MS BM Or. 928(3)) and the greater part of which he translated to accompany his edition of this brief work (Traités mystiques, fasc. i, 1889). Mehrcen mentions also a Hebrew translation of this commentary published by D. Kaufmann, Berlin 1886. Ibn Zaylât is quoted also by H. Corbin in Avicenne et le Rêve visionnaire, ii, 148 and 150-4, and often quoted and discussed by A. M. Goichon in Le Rêve de l’Hâyâ Ibn Yâsîn commenté par des textes d’Avicenne (see index). Ibn Abî Uṣâybî (ji, 19) lists among the works of Ibn Sinâ a Kitâb Tu’tâlîth, A Book of glosses, or of notes which his pupil Abû Manşûr b. Zaylât had written down according to his instructions. It was to his questions and to those of Bahmanîr that Ibn Sinâ replied in his Mubâḥâtât (Brockelmann, S I, 827). A mathematician and an excellent musician, Ibn Zaylât wrote al-Kitât al-hâfî fi ‘l-muṣâbîth (“What should be known about music”), published in Cairo in 1964 by Sâkariyya. Yûsûf, with an introduction giving also (p. 2) references to the other authors who have mentioned Ibn Zaylât: al-Bayhâki, Ta’rîkh hukamât al-Islâm, no. 50, 99-100; Ḥâdîdî Khâlîfî, i, 862; al-Zirîkîl, ʾAlâm, ii, 278; U. al-Khâlîfî, Muṣâlîm al-mu’dâlîfîn, iv, 13; Ḥâdîdî Ṭûlân, Tu’rîkh al-ʾArâb al-ʾiṣfâhânî, 3rd. ed., 400; H. G. Farmer, A history of Arabian music, 220. In addition to his better known works, Ibn Zaylât wrote also an abridged version of the sections on the natural sciences in the Şîfâ of Ibn Sinâ, a book on the soul, and various letters.

Bibliography: In the article.

(A.-M. Goichon)

IBN AL-ZAYYÂT, MUḤAMMAD B. ‘ABD AL-MALîK, vizier of the ‘Abbâsid period. Belonging to a family of scribes and famous for his intellectual interests, Ibn al-Zayyât attracted attention for his qualities as a secretary and a man of letters, was appointed vizier by the caliph al-Mu’tasîm in about 221/833, and, with the chief hâdi Ibn Abî Du’âd, contributed to the direction of the general policy of the empire.

Remaining vizier during the caliphate of al-Wâlîk (227-32/842-7), he encouraged the caliph to impose heavy fines on several secretaries, in particular on the assistants of two Turkish leaders who were taking over important governorships in the provinces, and he acquired an unpleasant notoriety by inflicting on the culprit a particularly cruel torture, that of the tannur, an iron cylinder with spikes inside it. He quarrelled with the chief hâdi Ibn Abî Du’âd, apparently merely for reasons of personal rivalry, and it is not known what part he played in the prosecution of the miḥâba.

Although the caliph al-Mutawakkil retained him in his service when he came to power, this was only temporary: some weeks later, in Safâr 233/September-October 847, he dismissed him and inflicted on him the torture which he himself had invented. Ibn al-Zayyât died soon afterwards. During his vizierate he had tried in vain to restrain the influence of the Turkish leaders, and left behind mainly a reputation for harshness and cruelty.

(D. SOURDEL)

Ibn al-Zayyat, Abu Yacub 'Abd al-Rahman, Moroccan man of letters and jurist, known and esteemed as a hagiographer, who lived and died at Marrakush and in the region surrounding it. He was one of the companions of the famous Moroccan saint Abu l-Abbâs al-Sabti (524-601/1130-1204). He died in 628 or 629/1230-1 when he was bâdi of the Reşgâra. His body is said to have been transported to Marrâkûsh and buried in the kubba of Sidi Muhammad al-Farrân and Sidi Muhammad al-MadhûÎ (d. 560/1164), Fatrra the râjî of the town, near to the gate known as Bâb al-Qhamis.

Ibn al-Zayyat al-Tâdidî was himself as devout as the saintly personages whose fiorettî he collected in the famous hagiographical collection al-Tashawwuf ilâ rîdigîl al-tasawwuf (ed. A. Faure, Rabat 1958). Completed in 617/1221, this valuable compilation of lives of saints is, together with al-Minhâj al-wadih (c. 1130) of Ibn al-Madúsî and the Ums al-âfhârî of Ibn Kandhîd al-Kusântînî, the earliest source on the religious history of Morocco. The Tashawwuf is devoted to the saints (sâlihûn) who lived or stayed in Marrakûsh or in southern Morocco between the 5th/11th and the beginning of the 7th/13th centuries. Ibn al-Zayyat is thought to have written a second such collection covering all the holy men of the country, but of this no trace has been found. There do, however, exist copies of the very interesting notice he wrote on the victory of the Meccans at Ulûd in poems, two of which are given together with the rejoinders of Hassân b. Thâbit by Ibn Ishâk (Ibn Hishâm, 616 f. and 619 f., cf. also 636). Another poem (given by Ibn Hishâm, 703-5, together with the rejoinders of Hassân b. Thâbit and Ka'b b. Mâlik) refers to the campaign of the "trench" (al-khandaq). When the Prophet had signed at Hudaybiya the treaty with the Meccans, Uqra b. Abî Tâmî, the deputy, invited the "Ka'b, 'Abd al-Azîz, and Kâhilî b. al-Walid went to him and embraced Islam. Uthmân was, like 'Amr b. al-Azîz, a clansman of Ibn al-Zibâra, who blamed him in a poem (Ibn Hishâm, 718). To the period between Hudaybiya and the fall of Mecca belong some verses against the Meccan Mawâbîr b. Rabîh, who had attacked Sulayhî b. 'Amr in connexion with the case of Abû Basîr (see Ibn Hishâm, 751 f., and Wâlî al-Dîn al-Maârî, ed. A. Faure, Rabat 1957, 81-2). When the Prophet had conquered Mecca, ordered the execution of some persons who had harmed him by their poems and songs (Ibn Hishâm, 819, Ibn al-Zibâra fled with Hubayrî b. Abî Wahhîb to Nağrân, and returned only after Hassân b. Thâbit had assured him of the Prophet's clemency. The authenticity of the poem which he addressed to Muhammad on this occasion is (according to Ibn Hishâm, 828) uncertain. Other verses ascribed to him cannot be dated; e.g., the verses in which he praises Khuwaylî b. Wahhâb al-Dumâabi (44âhî, vii, 114), an ancestor of Abû Dhâbah (q.v.). Then we are told that he wrote on the hangings of the Ka'b some verses derogatory to the Kuraysh; the Banû Sahm were forced to hand him over to the Kuraysh, who punished him and set him free only after he had composed an oâf quoted poem in honour of Kusayy (Âyân, Zhawâidh, iv, 149; Ibn Hishâm, ii, 25, etc.); but some verses of this poem occur also in a poem of Muthrûd b. Ka'b (al-Sharîf al-Murtadâ, Amâlî, iv, 179; cf. also Ya'qûbî, i, 282). He criticized the Kuraysh on another occasion (Dumâabi, 57; 44âhî, iv, 140; Sulayhî, Rawî, i, 94) probably because they were unwilling to risk their profits by fighting against Muhammad. Sometimes verses of other poets are ascribed to him, e.g., the verses on the case of Abû Basîr (see Ibn Hishâm, 705 and 44âhî, xv, 29, 21); and Umayyâ b. Abî 'l-Sa'î (see Ibn Hishâm, 705 and 44âhî, xv, 29, 21); and Umayyâ b. Abî 'l-Salîm, noted poet ( Cf. Ibn Hishâm, 718, and Umayyâ b. Abî 'l-Salîm, noted poet). On the other hand, verses of Ibn al-Zibâra were ascribed to other poets, e.g., his poem in praise of the Banû Khâlid bint Arkâm (see al-Muhammad, Mâta'āba lafuw, ed. A. Mennor, Cairo 1350, 27, with the editor's footnote). Other verses (44âhî, i, 52; 64) show that he even satirized the patronage of Abû Bakr, the grandfather, and 'Abd Allâh, the father of the poet 'Umar b. 'Abd Allâh b. Abî Rabî'a. He also praised the Banû al-Mughrîs b. 'Abd Allâh b. 'Umar b. Mâjhâm, the strongest family within the powerful Banû Makjûm (al-Djâbis, Bayânî, i, 46, 20); for his connexion with this family, see also Ibn Hādjâr, Isbâkî, i, 149, s.v. Busr b. Sufyân). In the other poems which refer to the fights between the Meccans and the Muslims, our poet never hints at religious or ideological differences, but considers these fights only as the outcome of troubles between clans of the same tribe. He is proud of his own clan and extols its virtues. The new religion did not change his attitude; for the last information about him is that he and Dîrâr b. al-Khattâb al-Fihri visited in

Ibn al-Zibâra was sent along with 'Amr b. al-Azîz [q.v.], Hubayrî b. Abî Wahhîb and Abî 'Azâz, who also had satirized the Prophet, to the Banû 'Abd Manât and other confederates to ask them for assistance. Most of them (Wâlî al-Dîn al-Mardjûsî, i, 149) who blamed him in a poem (Ibn Hishâm, 718). To the period between Hudaybiya and the fall of Mecca belong some verses against the Meccan Mawâbîr b. Rabîh, who had attacked Sulayhî b. 'Amr in connexion with the case of Abû Basîr (see Ibn Hishâm, 751 f., and Wâlî al-Dîn al-Mardjûsî, ed. A. Faure, Rabat 1957, 81-2). When the Prophet had conquered Mecca, ordered the execution of some persons who had harmed him by their poems and songs (Ibn Hishâm, 819, Ibn al-Zibâra fled with Hubayrî b. Abî Wahhîb to Nağrân, and returned only after Hassân b. Thâbit had assured him of the Prophet's clemency. The authenticity of the poem which he addressed to Muhammad on this occasion is (according to Ibn Hishâm, 828) uncertain. Other verses ascribed to him cannot be dated; e.g., the verses in which he praises Khuwaylî b. Wahhâb al-Dumâabi (44âhî, vii, 114), an ancestor of Abû Dhâbah (q.v.). Then we are told that he wrote on the hangings of the Ka'b some verses derogatory to the Kuraysh; the Banû Sahm were forced to hand him over to the Kuraysh, who punished him and set him free only after he had composed an oath quoted poem in honour of Kusayy (Âyân, Zhawâidh, iv, 149; Ibn Hishâm, ii, 25, etc.); but some verses of this poem occur also in a poem of Muthrûd b. Ka'b (al-Sharîf al-Murtadâ, Amâlî, iv, 179; cf. also Ya'qûbî, i, 282). He criticized the Kuraysh on another occasion (Dumâabi, 57; 44âhî, iv, 140; Sulayhî, Rawî, i, 94) probably because they were unwilling to risk their profits by fighting against Muhammad. Sometimes verses of other poets are ascribed to him, e.g., the verses on the case of Abû Basîr (see Ibn Hishâm, 705 and 44âhî, xv, 29, 21); and Umayyâ b. Abî 'l-Sa'î (see Ibn Hishâm, 718, and Umayyâ b. Abî 'l-Salîm, noted poet). On the other hand, verses of Ibn al-Zibâra were ascribed to other poets, e.g., his poem in praise of the Banû Khâlid bint Arkâm (see al-Muhammad, Mâta'āba lafuw, ed. A. Mennor, Cairo 1350, 27, with the editor's footnote). Other verses (44âhî, i, 52; 64) show that he even satirized the patronage of Abû Bakr, the grandfather, and 'Abd Allâh, the father of the poet 'Umar b. 'Abd Allâh b. Abî Rabî'a. He also praised the Banû al-Mughrîs b. 'Abd Allâh b. 'Umar b. Mâjhâm, the strongest family within the powerful Banû Makjûm (al-Djâbis, Bayânî, i, 46, 20); for his connexion with this family, see also Ibn Hâdjâr, Isbâkî, i, 149, s.v. Busr b. Sufyân). In the other poems which refer to the fights between the Meccans and the Muslims, our poet never hints at religious or ideological differences, but considers these fights only as the outcome of troubles between clans of the same tribe. He is proud of his own clan and extols its virtues. The new religion did not change his attitude; for the last information about him is that he and Dîrâr b. al-Khattâb al-Fihri visited in
the reign of 'Umar their old rival 'Abdusa b. Thabit and irritated him by reciting the poems they had composed in old days against him, but had then to leave the latter's recital (Agha', iv, 140; Dhu-mahli, 60). It was just this clannishness which gave his verses an actuality even long after his death. His poems against the Banu Hashim were still popular with the Umayyads, and Yazid b. Mu'awiyah recited one of these poems when he was told that Medina had been taken by his troops (Qisaari [Guirgass], 277; Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, ii, 316, ii, 235, with additional verses in which the caliph addresses himself). Even in the story was mentioned in an edict amongst the sins of his days in Granada, respected by all the inhabitants, and visited by Abu Bakr ibn Mufawwaz and Said bin Abii Usaybi, who was reigning there at that instance he forbade hot baths (ya'fin al-adudim) they had a poisonous action. He left a number of works whose titles are mentioned by his biographers: "they are Andalusian biographies of the 6th and 3rd centuries, and in the article; consult also Bibliography: Brockelmann, i, 141, s. 215; Sezgin, i, 727; Yaqut, iii, 218-20; Dhibahli, Tabaddal al-huffaz, tabaha S, no. 124; there is a full exhibition to Shakhir's edition. (J. F. P. Hopkins)

IBN AL-ZUBAYR, ABU 'DJA'AFAR AHMAD b. IBRAHIM b. AL-ZUBAYR b. MUHAMMAD AL-'ASIMI, Andalusian traditionalist, reader of the Kuran, man of letters and historian, born at Jafar (Qayyam) in Ibn 'l-Ka'ada 629/September-October 1230, d. Granada on 8 Rabii' I 708/26 August 1308. He seems to have been particularly interested in Kuranic readings, but his biographers speak very highly of his knowledge of the Arabic language and describe him as "the muba'dadh of al-Andalus and of the Maghrib." His propensity for redressing wrongs got him into trouble in his native town, then at Malaga, whither he had had to flee; his action against a sorcerer called Ibrahim al-Fa'asari, who had a strong influence over the local authorities, obliged him to leave the town and go to Granada where he is said to have succeeded in having condemned to death the magician, who had been given a mission to carry out by the ruler of Malaga. He was at first received with honour by the amir of Granada, but later had some disagreements with him. Then his situation improved and he was probably able to devote himself freely to his teaching activities, while holding the offices of khalif and of imam at the Great Mosque, and of kadi in charge of marriages. He ended his days in Granada, respected by all the inhabitants. He left a number of works whose titles are mentioned by his biographers: Milad al-ta'wil fi 'il-muqaddib al-la'di fi l-Tanzil, al-Burhan fi i'tirab suwar al-Qur'an, al-l'Am bi-man khitam bi-h al-shuyal al-anadulasi min al-a'dum, K, al-Zaman wa l-malaham, Radd al-dhijah min vi'sah al-madjahahil, a Mu'jam, a tawil, on the Kudad of Sibawayh and finally, the only one which has in part survived, the Silat al-Sila, a continuation of the Tahmila of Ibn Ba'ghkwval [q.v.], the last part of which was published by E. Levi-Provenal, at Rabat in 1937; this work contains Andalusian biographies of the 6th and 7th/12th and 13th centuries. Bibliography: Introd. to the ed. by Levi-Provenal; Ibn al-Khatib, Itaha, i, 72; Ibn Farhun, Dhibal, Fez ed., 57; Ibn al-Kadi, Durrat al-Hijjajli, ed. Allouche, Rabat 1934-6, no. 8; Dhibahl, Huffaz, iv, 275; Ibn Ha'dar, Durar, l, 84-8, no. 232; Sayyuti, Bugaza, 126-7; Hadjiji Khalifa, i, 363, ii, 115, v, 646; Dowzi, De Abdaladis, ii, 166; Pons Boigues, Ensaya, no. 288; Brockelmann, s. II, 376-7; DM, ii, 132. (CH. PELLAT)

IBN AL-ZUBAYR, ABU 'ABD ALLAH AL-ZUBAYR b. BAKKAR... b. AL-ZUBAYR, B. AL-'ASIMI, Andalusian traditionalist, reader of the Kuran; he was appointed kadi of Mecca and died there in 256/870. Over 30 titles of works by him are quoted but of them only two are extant: al-Munafa'fihiyati, a collection of anecdotes compiled for Muwaffak, son of the Caliph Mutawakkil, and the celebrated [Diwan] Nazar's Kuraysh was written in 1306 and of its fame the second half only of Nasar Kuraysh has survived (ed. Ma'bud M. Shakir, Cairo 1381/1961). Bibliography: Brockelmann, i, 141, s. 215; Sezgin, i, 727; Yaqut, iii, 218-20; Dhibahl, Tabaddal al-huffaz, tabaha S, no. 124; there is a full exhibition to Shakhir's edition. (J. F. P. Hopkins)

IBN AL-ZUBAYR [see 'ABD ALLAH B. AL-ZUBAYR; MUS'AB B. AL-ZUBAYR].

IBN ZUHR, patronymic of a family of scholars who came originally from Arabia (Iyad) and settled, at the beginning of the 4th/10th century, at Daju Shattiba (Jattiba) in the east of Spain. Ibn Khalilikhan says of the members of this family that they were "all 'ilamad, ru'asid, bukhamad" and vintiers who reached high ranks in the entourages of princes. I. ZUHR AL-IVADI was the father of Marwan, who was the father of Abi Bakr Mu'ammad, who was famous as a juristconsult; he died at Talabira (Talaver) in 422/1030-1.

II. ABU MARWAN 'ABD AL-MALIK B. MUHAMMAD B. MARWAN B. ZUHR B. BAKKAR... B. AL-ZUBAYR. He was well versed in the Kuranic sciences and in fijah, following in this the example of his father. His own interests were in the study of the different types of sciences. He left for the East with the intention of performing the Pilgrimage, went to Kayrawan, and then to Cairo, where he spent a long time studying medicine. Ibn Khalilikanikhan relates a slightly different itinerary, stating that he went first as far as Baghdad and stopped on the way back in Egypt and at Kayrawan. Ibn al-Abbair says that he became a famous and excellent physician. Returning to his native country, he settled at Denuya (Denia), where he was welcomed by Muidjndi [q.v.], who was reigning there at that time. His fame spread to all the provinces in the peninsula. Ibn Abii Usaybija relates that he held unorthodox opinions (dar'a shahhdha) in medicine, for instance he forbade hot baths (hammaid) because they had a poisonous action (ya'fin al-adudim) and because they interfered with the composition of the humours. He died at Denia, according to Ibn al-Abbair and Ibn Khalilikanikhan, at Seville, according to Ibn Abii Usaybija, in about 470/1078 as Ibn al-Abbair surmises.

III. ABU 'L-'AZL 'ZUHR B. 'ABD AL-MALIK B. MUHAMMAD, son of the above; generally known by the mediaeval western scholars by his kunya only: Abouali, Abouli, Abulile, or followed by Zuhr: Aboelilezor, Abulelizor, Albuleizor. (1) Life. Born in Seville, he went to Cordova where he met Abii 'Ali al-Ghassani, who taught in the Great Mosque and who advised him to study the science of hadith with Abii Bakr ibn Muwaffaz and Abii Dja'far ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz. He "heard" (sama's) from Abii Mu'mammad 'Abd Allah b. Ayyub the reading of that category of hadiths which have been transmitted by the guarantors in a chain and with "a
touching of hands" (al-hadith al-musalsal fi 'l-akhd bi 'l-yad). This means that he received in the subject the most thorough education. Many scholars, before taking up one of the natural sciences or philosophy, began with a serious study of the religious sciences. Abu l-'Alā was also distinguished in belles lettres (adab). He was in correspondence with al-Ījārī, the author of the Mahāmāt. But he had a predilection for medicine. While still quite young, during the reign of al-Mu'taḍid, the 'Abbadid ruler of Seville (433/1042-68), he had studied this art which he learned from his father. He became famous in it and "eclipsed all who had preceded him with the breadth of his knowledge of it and with the wisdom he showed in making use of it, so much so that the people of the Magrib made him and his family, in this matter, a subject of boasting" (Ibn al-Abbār). Al-Mu'tamid Ibn 'Abbāb gave his patronage to Abu l-'Alā, who was always grateful to him for this, although he supported the Almoravid Yūsuf b. Tāshfin (who became master of the country in 484/1091). It is not clear whether he was Yūsuf's vizier. Wüstfeld says so (Geschichte, 89-90), but the biographers are silent on this precise point. They mention only that he took part in the administration of public affairs at an exceptionally high level. The manuscript of the Tadhkira gives him this title of sazir (so that the western writers called him Alguazir Albuleizor). Abu l-'Alā died at Cordova in 525/1130, from a nāggha, "a senile wart turned malignant" (G. Colin. Ibn Abī Usayyib, that tells us that the name given in Spain to a dūbya, which, according to Dozy, is "an ulcer, the pus of which is ichorous in whatever part of the body it appears"#, and which G. Colin, who distinguishes it from a nāggha, identifies with a gastric ulcer, while H. Jähner (in his translation of Ibn Abī Usayyib, Algiers 1958), translates it as "phlegmon gangrénieux" without questioning the assimilation of the two terms). Abu l-'Alā was buried in Seville.

(2) Works. Ibn Abī Usayyib mentions 9 works by him. Two are devoted to medical observations (mudājarrāb). The others are: "The book of the properties of drugs" (K. al-Kitābiyyāt); "The book of simple medicaments" (K. al-Adwiyya al-mufradāt); the "Explanation through witnesses of the libel" (K. al-Idāk bi-iḥṣasāt al-istīḥād) against Ibn Riddīn (cf. Ibn al-Abbar, no. 1717. The reason for this disgrace is not known, but Abu l-'Alā, having read it, found fault with it and put it aside to use the margins for writing out his prescriptions. G. Colin rightly points out that though he may not have agreed with Avicenna on every point yet he did not consider him entirely worthless, so that he took the trouble to refute his book on simple medicaments.

In the Tadhkira the practitioner's ideal is seen more clearly. Unlike the physicians of his time, whom he accuses of using medicine with insufficient precautions, he counsels prudence (ḥazm) in treatment. In the field of medicine based on the humours and on therapeutics based on the qualities of the remedies (cold, hot, dry and wet) and on their degrees, he shows the error of attempting to restore the equilibrium of the temperament by administering the remedy in too great a dose and thus setting off a reaction in the opposite direction. The corrective strength of the medication must be in proportion to the pathogenic tendency (bi-hādir ḥašah al-mayl). "How often have doctors helped on the causes of death!" he exclaims. From this arises his basic principle in treating a patient: it is necessary, so to speak, to try on the patient the simple or composite remedy, using it at first "at the beginning of the lowest degree" (fi sawā'il al-darraqj al-ūlā). Then, according to the results obtained, the physician will gradually increase its strength. It is wrong to hurry, even if one is certain of not making a mistake. As for the medicaments themselves, care should be taken to mix them with substances which are capable on the one hand of conveying them to the diseased organs, and on the other hand of correcting any harmful side-effects which they may have. These practical recommendations based the progress of the medical art on the precise observation of the effects of a treatment prudently administered, and thus experimental, which is in itself already a positive method.

IV. ABū MARWĀN 'ABD AL-MA'LĪK B. ABī L-'ALĀ ZUHR, son of the above, usually referred to under the name of Abū Marwān Ibn Zuhr (the Abhommor Avenzoar of the mediaeval West). He was born in Seville. His biographers do not give his date of birth but, from various indications, G. Colin places it in about 484-7/1092-5. He died at Seville in 557/1161.

(1) Life. He was taught medicine by his father and excelled in it an early age. He had received also a solid literary and juridical education. He does not seem to have travelled to the East, but he certainly went to North Africa. He was in the service of the Almoravid dynasty and received wealth and honours from these rulers. It was for one of these, Abū 'l-Abbar, that he wrote the Kitāb al-Iḥtiṣād (Ibn al-Abbār gives it as K. al-Iḥtiṣād), a title which G. Colin corrected), completed in 515/1121. In 535/1140, he was in prison at Marrākush, the town being in the power of Ibāhīm's brother, 'Ali b. Yūsuf b. Tāshfin (cf. Ibn al-Abbār, no. 1771). The reason for this disgrace is not known, but Abū Marwān, in his Taysīr, refers to this ruler as "the
wretched 'Ali', and in his "Book of foods" he mentions "the time of suffering which I was forced to endure by the order of kub al-Mansur [q.v.]". During the Almohad period, 'Abd al-Mu'min took him into his personal service and "had confidence in him in medical matters" (Ibn Abi Usaybi'a). He was appointed vizier. Ibn Rushd [q.v.] became his friend (but was not his pupil) and it seems that they studied some subjects together and collaborated to a certain extent. Abu Marwan died from the same disease as his father. An anecdote (given by Ibn Abi Usaybi'a) relates that when Abu Marwan predicted to a colleague named al-Far that he would die of convulsions (shandjī) because he ate too many figs, the other replied that he would die of a nagha because he did not eat enough of them. Both prognostications proved correct.

(2) Works. According to Ibn Abi Usaybi'a, Abu Marwan wrote six works: the Taysir fi 'l-muddawdāt wa 'l-ādārīr ("Practical manual of treatments and diets"), followed by a formulary, the Ḍārūmā; K. al-Aghdhiya ("Book of foods"); K. al-Zīna ("Book of embellishment"), written for his son Abū Bakr, on purgatives; Mahālia fi 'sīlah al-kutulā ("Treatise on diseases of the kidneys"); Risāla fi vīllatay al-barāz wa 'l-bahāk (letter to a doctor in Seville on white leprosy, or vitiligo, and pityriasis); Tadhkira, for his son Abū Bakr (G. Colin thinks that Ibn Abi Usaybi'a must have attributed this work to Abu Marwan in error, when it was really by Abu 'l-Āką). To this list should be added the K. al-Iktisād fi ḍārūm al-awrām wa 'l-ādārīr mentioned by Ibn al-Abbar. Of these six works there have survived the K. al-Iktisād, which dates from 515/1121; the Taysir, written between 1121 and 1162; and the "Book of foods" (between 1130 and 1162).

The first is an "abridged summary" (dīnna muḥkam-taṣara) which combines "the methods of therapeutics (ṭōb) and of prophylaxis (rubāa)". It was intended to be read in public before the ruler, and was therefore divided into equal sections of medium length (iḥtiṣād is the term for this type of division), in the same way as the Kurān is divided for the same purpose; since the Kurān has thirty of these sections, Abu Marwan's work was intended to consist of the same number, but only half of them (15) have survived. It begins with a general introduction, in which the author points out that between ḍārūm and iḥtiṣād, and between the medicine of the body and the medicine of the soul. There follows the enumeration of the three souls: the rational, in the brain; the animal, in the heart; the natural, in the liver. The two last are normally subordinated to the first. Then Avenzoar reviews the treatments of the different organs, beginning with the tongue, since it is thanks to it that man is able to praise God. The description of the diseases takes second place to the details of therapeutical measures.

The Taysir begins, after an introduction which includes some "recettes cabalistiques" (G. Colin), with a descriptive study of ailments and their treatment. It follows approximately an order which had become traditional, starting with the head and ending with the feet. But the plan is very flexible. Following his father, Abu Marwan stresses the value of exercise. His observations lead him to some original views: a description of mediastinal tumours (al-awrām alaṣṣī ṭakāḏuḥu fi 'l-ghishā waḥšīm al-saḍ al-ṣilām), book i, 16, ch. VI); of pericardial abscesses (awrām ghishā bi-ḥāl, book i, 12, ch. VII), which he was the first to describe. Also interesting are the chapters on intestinal oestions (talqī), paralysis of the pharynx, and inflammation of the middle ear. He was one of the first to recommend tracheotomy, and artificial feeding via the oesophagus for the rectum. He reports cases of ringworm caused by marsh vapours. His study of scabies should also be mentioned. He described the agent of this disease (sarcopotes scabiei), and he was among the first, though not actually the first, to do so: as has been pointed out by G. Sarton, he was preceded in this by Abmad al-Ṭabari (second half of the 10th/11th century); cf. the German translation of some passages from the K. al-Mu'dāfra al-bubšafīyya al-Ṭabari, written by Muhammad Rihār, in Archiv für Geschichte des Medizins, xix (1927), 134 and Isti, 5, 119.

The K. al-Aghdhiya deals with the various diets, with condiments, culinary preparations, and drinks. It also covers medicaments (and it is here that we find what G. Colin refers to as cabalistic medicine), as well as rules of hygiene (cf. Renaud, in Hespéris, xii).

(3) As a physician. Ibn Abi Usaybi'a relates several anecdotes intended to illustrate Abu Marwan's skill and perspicacity. He succeeded in administering a purgative to 'Abd al-Mu'min, who was averse to this treatment, by making him eat some grapes picked from a vine which the skillful doctor had watered with water mixed with purgative drugs. On another occasion, he cured a man who had an enormous belly and had intestinal trouble by pointing out that he drank water from a ewer of doubtful cleanliness: he broke the ewer and there was seen to emerge from it a frog which had slid in and grown fat there and was the cause of the illness. Ibn Rushd wrote in his Colloqet that for anyone wishing to study the treatises on therapeutics (kanānīgh), the best of all is the Taysir, which he had asked his friend to compile and which he had transcribed. While praising the Taysir only for its practical application, Ibn Rushd underlines, perhaps unwittingly but nevertheless very clearly, the type of medicine practised by Avenzoar, which was less a general science (on this point Avenzoar is not original and reproduces the system of Galen) than a very practical art of healing. Finally it should be mentioned that Abu Marwan, as an article of faith and perhaps also through conviction, seems to adhere to the Aḥāri doctrine that secondary causes are not necessary but only for the sake of God's will. He himself, stricken by the malady from which he was to die and urged by his son to try new remedies, declared: "If God wished to change this my bodily frame, He will not give me power to use remedies other than those which will carry out His decree and His will".

B. ZUHR AL-HAFDIR ("the grandson"), son of the above; born Seville in 504/1110-11 (or 507), d. 595/1198-9. He learned the Kurān by heart, and studied traditions and Arabic language and literature. He had read with 'Abd al-Malik al-Bāḏji the Mudawwana of Saḥnūn on the doctrine of Malik and the Musnad of Ibn Abi Şayba. He was outstanding in everything. He received his medical education from his father and in his turn distinguished himself in the practice of this art. He was also a poet, famous for his muwashshāhāt. He practised archery and played chess. Ibn Abi Usaybi'a describes him as a man of physical, moral and intellectual accomplishments. He enjoyed the confidence of the caliph Ya'kūb al-Mansūr who summoned him to Africa as his personal physician. When this ruler decided to have all books of logic and philosophy destroyed, he put Abū Bakr in charge of this operation, allowing him as an
exception to retain the works which were his own personal property. Abu Bakr carried this out faithfully. But Ibn Abi Usaybi'ā, who relates the matter, probably wishing to illustrate the spirit in which the great physician performed this, gives immediately afterwards an anecdote which may be summarized thus: Abū Bakr had discovered two of his students in the possession of a book of logic; he was angry and confiscated the book. But later, when he had completed the medical education of the two students, he directed them to study carefully the book which they had previously read, and it was only when he returned to them their book of logic, with the remark: "Now you are equipped to read this book and others like it!"

The vizier Abū Zayd ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Yūqān, a jealous and spiteful man, had him poisoned. He was mourned by the caliph.

Abū Bakr had been above all a practising physician. He did however write a treatise on ophthalmology. Ibn Abi Usaybi'ā and Ibn Khallikān have preserved a number of his poems, for which he had been as famous as for his medical skill.

VI. ʿAbd al-Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Ḥāfīd, son of the above, born at Seville in 577/1181-2, and died of poison at Salé in 602/1205-6, at the age of twenty-five. His body was later taken to Seville and buried beside his ancestors at the Gate of Victory. He had learned medicine from his father and he too had been initiated into the secrets of medical practice. Also with his father, he had studied the Kitāb al-Nabāt of Abū Hanifa al-Dinawari. He was attached to the service of the caliph al-Nāṣir b. al-Mānsūr. On his death, he left two sons, who both lived at Seville. The younger, Abū IʿAlī Muḥammad, studied the works of Galen.


IBN ZULAK (or ZAWLAK), ʿAbd al-Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Ibrāhīm . . . al-Laythy, born 306/919, died 386/996, Egyptian historian, the author of a number of biographical, historical and topographical works on Egypt in the time of the Ikhshidids and early Fātimids. These works, though almost entirely lost, undoubtly a good deal of subsequent historiography relating to this period. He is said to have written continuations of the works of al-Kindī [q.v.] on the governors and judges of Egypt, a book on the Māḥāna [t.v.] family of officials, and others on the ruins of the Ikhshid, Kāfūr, al-Muʿizz and, according to some, al-Azīz. A biography of Dīwarrār, mentioned in an Ismāʿīlī bibliography, is probably, as Ivanov suggests, an extract from the book on al-Muʿizz. These works are quoted extensively by Makrizī, both in the Kitāb and the Iltāwī by Ibn Saʿd, by Ibn Ḥāǧīr in his Rajī al-ʿalār (1, Cairo 1957, 2), and by other later authors. A manuscript biography of the Egyptian grammian Muhammad b. Mūsā al-Kindī al-Ṣayrafi [see IBN-AL-SAYRAFI], preserved in the Egyptian library, is ascribed to him (Cairo catalogue, v, 1348/1930, 14).


IBN ZURĀ, ʿAbd al-Iṣāb b. ʿIsāk b. Zūrā, Jacobite Christian philosopher, apostolic and translator, born at Baghdad in ʿIlī b. Ḵuzayla 311/August 924, d. on 6 Shaʿbān 398/16 April 1008 (the respective dates of 376/987 and 448/1056 given by Ibn ʿAbdāl ʿAbdār b. ʿAbdī should not be accepted, since Ibn Zūrā is mentioned by Ibn al-Nadīm (circa 377/987), and Ibn ʿAbdāl ʿAbdī himself speaks of his relations with ʿYaḥyā b. ʿAdī, d. 364/975). He studied literature, physics, mathematics and then philosophy under the direction of ʿYaḥyā b. ʿAdī [q.v.]; he seems also to have studied medicine, since Ibn Abi Usaybi'ā includes him among the famous physicians. Nevertheless he was forced to earn his living by engaging in commercial activities and trading in particular with Byzantium, which, in the opinion of Abū Hāyyān al-Tawhīdī, hindered greatly his philosophical work. Furthermore, his competitors denounced him to the authorities, accusing him of secret intrigues with Byzantium, so that he was arrested and sentenced, and his possessions were confiscated. These disasters ruined his already poor health and hastened his death.

Ibn Zūrā translated or abridged, probably from the Syriac, several works of Aristotle and in particular the Historia Animalium; he is, because of this, esteemed as a translator. However, his fame is based on a number of treatises on philosophy, theology and of apologetics, which are mostly lost.

Of the list of his works given by Ibn al-Nadīm and in the Vatican (113, 123, 127, 135): Replies to twelve other questions by the above; to the five questions of Abu Hakim Yusuf al-Buhayri; a should not be accepted, since it appears that there has survived only one translation (the Sophistical Refutations of Aristotle, Sufisfikd, ms. Paris, ar. 2346; see A. Badawi, Manṭak Aristi, iii, 737-1016), and ten or so treatises. Four of these have been published by P. Sbath (Vingt traités philosophiques et apologétiques d'auteurs arabes chrétiens du IXe au XIVe siècle, Cairo 1929); a treatise on the intellect (68-75); a letter to a Muslim friend on the existence of God (6-19); a refutation of the Awdāl al-adilla fī ʿṣāl al-dīn of Abu ʿl-Kāsim ʿAbd Allāh b. Ahmad al-Balkhī (52-8); the Risāla ʿl-Yahudi Bishr b. Fīnūs (19-52). Six others exist in manuscript, especially in Paris (BN 132, 173, 174) and in the Vatican (113, 123, 127, 135). Replies to the five questions of Abu Hakim Yusuf al-Buhayri; Replies to twelve other questions by the above; Treatise on union; a defence of the Jacobite doctrine; Questions concerning the attitude of the body during prayer, concerning vows, fasting and almsgiving; a Treatise in which he defends those who devote themselves to logic and philosophy. It should be stated that the attribution of these works to Ibn Zurā is not absolutely certain; at least two other texts have been falsely attributed to him: the
The study shows that Ibn Zur'a follows in general his teacher, Yahyâ b. 'Adî, but departs from him on points of detail, makes great use of Aristotelian logic, of Platonic or Plotinian doctrine, of the Bible and of the Fathers of the Church, in order to present, in a fairly heavy style, a cool but scholarly and rational apologetic, which only rarely has recourse to argumentum ad hominem.


IBO [see Nigeria].

IBRÂHîM, the ABRAHAM of the Bible, plays in Islamic religious history an important role as the founder or reformer of the monotheistic Ka'bah cult. He is mentioned, in greater or less detail, in 25 sûras of the Qur'ân. Moses is the only Biblical character who is mentioned more frequently, though this does not mean that Abraham is considered second to him in importance.

In two sûras, which are to be dated from the first Meccan period, there is a reference to the "leaves, scrolls" (sujiuf) of Abraham and Moses, by which presumably texts of revelation are meant (LXXXVII, 18f.; LI, 71, 96f.). In the latter passage Abraham is indicated as "who paid his debt in full". In a whole series of sûras of the second and third Meccan period it is related how Abraham attacked the idol-worship of his father (named 'Azâr in sûra VI, 74) and his people and advocated belief in one single God (XCVII, 83-98; XCVI, 69-89; XIX, 41-50; XLIII, 26-8; XX, 51-73; XIX, 16-27; VI, 74-64). Moreover, in one passage, Abraham is expressively designated of Hebron, the alleged burial place of Abraham, as al-Khallâ (founded by Moses) and introduces the Hidjra that Muhammad, on the occasion of his controversy with the Jews, pronounced the Old Testament patriarch a hânîf [q.v.] and the first Muslim, and maintained that he, together with Ishmael, the ancestor of the Arabs, built the Ka'bah and introduced the ceremonies of the Pilgrimage. Abraham — always according to Snouck Hurgronje — became the religion of pure monotheism already propagated by Abraham, priority over both Judaism (founded by Moses) and Christianity (founded by Jesus).

This thesis of Snouck Hurgronje became more widely known through a supplement which A. J. Weensinck added to the article IBRâHîM in the Encyclopaedia Biblica and provoked contradiction and denial, especially from Muslims. In the Arabic translation of EII these criticisms were expressed in a detailed commentary on the article IBRÂHîM. Some non-Muslims as well expressed doubts about Snouck Hurgronje's reasoning and conclusions. They were criticized by Youakim Moubarac, a pupil of Louis Massignon, in a special work (1958), in an attempt to mediate between Islam and Christianity; his criticism however went too far. More moderate and scientifically better grounded is the opinion of Edmund Beck (in Le Muston, lv, 1952). Snouck Hurgronje's reasoning has indeed certain weaknesses. In three sûras which are attributed to the third Meccan period (XIV, XVI, VI) there is already anticipated the role of Abraham which is characteristic of the Medinan period: In XCV, 35-41; XIV, 35-41; VI, 74-84. In one place, Isaiah is mentioned alone (XCVII, 112f., see above); in five places he is mentioned together with Jacob, who in this connexion appears as another son of Abraham and not as his grandson (XIX, 49; XXI 72; XXIX, 27; VI, 84; XI, 71; cf. XCVIII, 45-7; XII, 6, 38). On the occasions when the name of Ishmael is mentioned too, it appears without any reference to the person and history of Abra-
regarding these passages as later, Medinan, interpolations. This is however a rather questionable method. But even if it is granted that he is right on this point (the individual rācās are admittedly often made up of passages from different periods), it must be admitted that already long before the Hījirah Muhammad had esteemed Abraham as the champion of a pure monotheistic faith, so that in the period following the Hījirah it was not an entirely new function which was attributed to him. E. Beck summarizes the results of his reflections on this as follows: "Abraham had been connected with Abraham already in the Meccan period, before associating Ishmael with this patriarch. (2) Also the conception implied by the term millūt Ibrāhīm did not arise exclusively from the polemic with Jews (and Christians) which took place there and there have not removed the divergences which exist between the opinions of Muslims and non-Muslims over the figure of Abraham as presented in the Kurān. The former consider that Abraham actually was in Mecca and, together with Ishmael, built the Kaʿba there and spread the pure monotheistic faith. Non-Muslims regard this merely as a religious legend. At the present stage of the dialogue there can be no reconciliation of the two points of view.

In the statements collected above on the history of Abraham as presented in the Kurān there have been indicated only the most important themes. There are many details which could be mentioned. Among these are the rescue of Abraham from the fire into which his heathen compatriots had thrown him (XXVII, 97; XXI, 68-70; XXIX, 24); his intercession on behalf of his pagan father (XXIX, 47; XXVI, 86; LX, 4-6; IX, 114); his quarrel with the autocratic king (Nimrod, II, 258); the killing of the four birds (II, 260; cf. Genesis, xv, 9 f.); much more material exists in the commentaries on the Kurān, the histories of the prophets (Kīsās al-anbiyāʾ) and works of universal history. It is in part borrowed from Jewish sources and may for the most part be termed scholarly or pseudo-scholarly edifying supplementation. Episodes which are described with excessively fantastic details are the arguments between the believer Abraham and the pagan king Nimrod, the story of the sacrifice of Abraham's son, which was averted at the last minute (on which there remains disagreement on whether the son was Isaac or Ishmael), and the sojourn in Mecca of Hagar and Ishmael. In some cases the Islamic legend of Abraham has even influenced the later Jewish tradition. There is no need to go further into these byways here, particularly since Grumach, Bousset, Snouck Hurgronje, and Schüttinger have already dealt with them exhaustively (see bibl.). It may be mentioned in passing that the Biblical name of Abraham's father (Ṭbrāh) is correctly transmitted in the above-mentioned secondary literature (Ṭbrāh), whereas in the Kurān (VI, 74) he is called Āzar. (On this name, see J. Horowitz, Koranische Untersuchungen, Berlin and Leipzig 1926, 85 f.)

Bibliography: Abraham in the Kurān: A. Geiger, Was hat Mohammed aus dem Juden-


Ibrāhīm I b. al-ʿAqlab b. ʿSaḥ al-Ṣaḥāb (184-96/800-12), founder of the Ifriqiyan dynasty of the Aghlabids, was a Tāmirī of the clan of the Saʿd b. Zayd Maḥāt. This clan, as a result of the Muslim conquests, had settled at a very early date in Khūrāsān, where they were especially enemies of the Muhallabids, whom Ibrāhīm was later to encounter again in Egypt and then in Ifriqiya. It was thus that al-ʿAqlab, the eponymous ancestor of the Aghlabids, was born. He embraced the cause of the ʿAbbasids, of whom he was one of the most fervent supporters with Abu Muslim al-Khurāsānī. It was in their service that he fought at the battle of the Zāb (144/761), that is, the region of the Aurès mountains in the south of the present-day Constantinois. In 148/765, Ibn al-ʿAqlab was driven out by his own troops, and al-ʿAqlab replaced him at Kayrawn, beneath the walls of which he was killed during one of the numerous insurrections which continually rent the country.

His family returned towards Egypt. Ibrāhīm at this time was ten years of age. He began his education with a thorough study of the Kūfī and was one of the most brilliant pupils of al-Ṭayyū b. Saʿd (d. 795). But being descended from one of the most illustrious officers of the ʿAbbasid army, he necessarily followed the tradition of his family. He thus joined the ḡurūd of Egypt and took a fatal part in the upheavals which were disturbing the country. He took part in 174/790 in the pillage of the public treasury, taking only his exact due without anything extra, according to al-Baladīḥūrī. This action caused him to be banished by the Muhallabid
government of Egypt and obliged to live under supervision in the Zab, which was governed by another Muhallabid, i.e. by a traditional enemy of the family. In the meantime, however, he was continually disturbing Ifrikiya, Ibrahim managed to consolidate his position in the Zab, where the memory of his father was still fresh. He learned above all not to exceed the bounds of the law. Mellowed by his trials, he held himself aloof from the insurrections and, as the result of a power vacuum in the Zab (a consequence of those insurrections), he came to possess real de facto authority there. In 179/795, Harun was killed, and wise and well-meaning, Ibrahim restored law and order in the country, transformed this de facto authority into a proper investiture. Probably two years later, Ibrahim was promoted by al-Rashid, who was apparently satisfied with his services, from the rank of deputy-governor to that of governor of the Zab responsible directly to himself.

Soon a new insurrection was given him the key of Kayrawân. In Ramadân 183/October 995, Tammân, the Tammâni governor of Tuns (belonging to the clan of the Malik b. Zayd Manât, who were hostile to the Sa’d b. Zayd Manât) had driven Ibn al-‘Akkî out of Kayrawân. From the Zab, Ibrahim rushed in to restore the legitimate governor to his rights. This restoration of the status quo did not in fact receive the support of the caliphate or that of the Ifrikiyans. Therefore, for various reasons of Baghdâdi and Ifrikiyan policy, Ibrahim was invited to take the place of Ibn al-‘Akkî, and al-Rashid, in return for a favourable financial arrangement, was persuaded to confer on him the title of hereditary amir. In this way Ifrikiya acquired, peacefully and painlessly, the status of an autonomous emirate.

This easy accession to power was not, however, without difficulties for Ibrahim. He had to contend with the hostility of the fukahd* and members of the djund. He had to suffer many affronts, and use much moderation, cunning and energy in order to consolidate his régime. On his accession he built, two miles south of Kayrawân, a fortified residence, al-‘Abbâsiyya (q.v.), which, garrisoned by a strong guard of black soldiers, was to save the dynasty on more than one occasion. The first rebellion broke out (188/803), then there was another at Tripoli (189/805). But the most serious uprising was that of the djund, which was put down only with the help of reinforcements opportuneely sent by the caliph. And when Ibrahim I died (21 Shawwâl 196/July 812), his son and successor ʻAbd Allah II, who had been recalled from Tunis, succeeded to the throne from Ziyadat Allah I, was seized with panic. In fact, he easily overcame his adversaries, who did not even attempt to unite their force. He next came into conflict with the Nafusa Berbers (283-4/896-7), whose ranks were completely routed.

The despotism of Ibrahim II did not fail to provoke violent reactions. The Berbers, more exposed to it than the others, were the first to revolt (286/901-3) throughout the kingdom and were severely punished. The bodies of the victims were borne away by cartloads and thrown into common graves. Twelve years later (280/893), it was the turn of the great “feudal lords” to take up the struggle. The cause of this insurrection was the amir’s policy of subjugating powerful figures, and the most important victims were the proud warriors of the citadel of Balazma, the key to the massif of Ibn al-Tifîn, from which there began the movement which was to overthrow the Aghlabid dynasty. Ibrahim II, who at first imagined this to be a repetition of the great rebellion of the djund which had very nearly taken the throne from Ziyâdat Allâh I, was seized with panic. In fact, he easily overcame his adversaries, who did not even attempt to unite their force.

Some years later (289/902), he abdicated in favour of his son ʻAbd Allâh II, who had been recalled from Sicily, and went, surrounded by ahi al-bâsîr “perspicacious people”, and wearing the patched habit of penitent ascetics, to seek and find martyrs under the walls of Cosenza (17 Dhu’l-Ka’dâ 289/23 October 902). The amir, whose arrival spread panic throughout southern Italy, planned, it is said, nothing less than to take Byzantium by way of Rome. His reign was one of power and folly.
the growth of the illness which was consuming him, he gradually deteriorated as a ruler, and by his errors prepared the way for the triumph of the Fattahs.


Ibrâhîm, eighteenth Ottoman Sultan, was born on 12 Shawâwîl 1024/4 November 1615, the youngest son of Ahmad I [q.v.]. He spent all his early life in close confinement, in constant fear of being put to death (as four of his older brothers were); so that when Murâd IV [q.v.] died and Ibrâhîm, the sole surviving prince of the dynasty, was called to ascend the throne, only the combined persuasions of his mother Rûsûm and the Grand Vizier Kâra Mü斯塔fâ Pâsha [q.v.] induced him to emerge (16 Shawâwîl 1049/February 1640).

The capable Kâra Mü斯塔fâ remained in power for the first four years of Ibrâhîm's reign. He promoted peaceful relations with Persia and, by the treaty of Szûn (13 March 1642), renewed the peace with Austria; while in 1051/1642 Azov (Azak [q.v.]) was recovered from the Cossacks. He carried through a reform of the coinage [see SIKKA] and a new land-survey [see Tarihi; Kandîya].

During at least the first years of his reign, Ibrâhîm was capable of concerning himself with the well-being of his empire. The Grand Vizier addressed to his authority of Istanbul over refractory provincial governors (repression of the revolt of Naşûb Pâsha-žade Hüseyn Pâsha, 1053/1643). During at least the first years of his reign, Ibrâhîm was capable of concerning himself with the well-being of his empire. The Grand Vizier addressed to his authority of Istanbul over refractory provincial governors (repression of the revolt of Naşûb Pâsha-žade Hüseyn Pâsha, 1053/1643).

It was at this juncture that the seizure by Maltese corsairs of a ship carrying pilgrims to Egypt provoked the Sultan, urged on by Yûsûf, to invade Crete (Djumâddâr 6/26 January 1646). The attempt of each to win over the wayward Sultan led to the deposition of Mustafa (Shawâwîl 1055/December 1645) and to the execution of Yûsûf (Dhu '1-Hidjdja loss/January 1646).

Ibrâhîm's addiction to the women of the harem now found its culmination in his taking one of his concubines (Telli Khasseki) in legal marriage (after what he is said to have ordered the Palace of Ibrâhîm Pâsha on the Hippodrome, which was made over to the lady, to be carpeted with furs). The imposition of heavy taxes, not for the prosecution of the war but for the satisfaction of such eccentric whims, aroused increasing discontent both in the provinces (revolt of Varvar 'Ali Pâsha at Silvas, put down by Işhîr Mü斯塔fâ Pâsha [q.v.]) and in Istanbul. Various Janissary officers persuaded some members of the 'ulama to join in a plot, at first directed against the Grand Vizier Ahmed Pasha, who on 18 Ragîlab 1058/August 1648 was strangled and torn to pieces (whence his later nickname "Hezar-pâre"); and on the same day Ibrâhîm was seized and put into close confinement in the Palace, while his seven year old son Mehmedm (IV) was placed on the throne. Ten days later, however, fearing that Ibrâhîm's partisans might procure his restoration, the new Grand Vizier, Şûf Mehmed Pâsha, accompanied by the Shaykh al-Islâm (who had given a fetu-sanctioning the execution), had him strangled (28 Ragîlab 1058/August 1648).

Ibrâhîm's addiction to the women of the harem now found its culmination in his taking one of his concubines (Telli Khasseki) in legal marriage (after what he is said to have ordered the Palace of Ibrâhîm Pâsha on the Hippodrome, which was made over to the lady, to be carpeted with furs). The imposition of heavy taxes, not for the prosecution of the war but for the satisfaction of such eccentric whims, aroused increasing discontent both in the provinces (revolt of Varvar 'Ali Pâsha at Silvas, put down by Işhîr Mü斯塔fâ Pâsha [q.v.]) and in Istanbul. Various Janissary officers persuaded some members of the 'ulama to join in a plot, at first directed against the Grand Vizier Ahmed Pasha, who on 18 Ragîlab 1058/August 1648 was strangled and torn to pieces (whence his later nickname "Hezar-pâre"); and on the same day Ibrâhîm was seized and put into close confinement in the Palace, while his seven year old son Mehmedm (IV) was placed on the throne. Ten days later, however, fearing that Ibrâhîm's partisans might procure his restoration, the new Grand Vizier, Şûf Mehmed Pâsha, accompanied by the Shaykh al-Islâm (who had given a fetu-sanctioning the execution), had him strangled (28 Ragîlab 1058/August 1648).
was thus Ḥasanid through his father and Ḥusaynid through his mother, which earned him the by-name of al-Madīq (of pure blood). He was considered as the akhāyda of the Ḥashimites (‘Alids and ‘Abbāsid) as well as of the Ḥasanids, since he enjoyed great authority after his father al-Ḥasan died during the reign of the caliph al-Walid I. Ibrāhīm’s mother, Hind bint Aḥbi ʿUbayda, before marrying the ʿAlid ʿAbd Allāh, had been the wife of ʿAbd Allāh the son of the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik; she was renowned as a poet and the sources have preserved some of her verses.

The intrigues of the ʿAlids to raise one of the members of their family to the caliphate had begun very early, during the Umayyad period. At a gathering of the Ḥashimites held at al-ʿAbwāb2, after the murder of al-Walid II [g.v.], ‘Abbāsid Allāh had got all those present (except ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿṢaḥib [g.v.,] who was at that time the most influential of the Ḥusaynids) to agree that his son Muḥammad should be recognized as claimant to the caliphate; the bayʿa had thus been given to this young man, then thirty-two years of age. After this, the two brothers Muḥammad and Ibrāhīm carried out a vigorous campaign of propaganda, travelling throughout the lands of the empire, especially the farthest east, including Sind. When the ʿAbbāsid al-Saffāb ascended the throne, the frustrated ʿAlids were forced to accept the faṭīḥ accompli, but they did not give up their plans; the two brothers continued their proselytizing in secret, changing its objective and making the ʿAbbāsids the target of their accusations. Al-Saffāb scarcely heeded their activity, but his successor al-ʿUṣūr took offence at it; as Muḥammad and Ibrāhīm had not come to meet him during the Pilgrimage of 136/754 and had not rendered homage to him, he decided, in 140/758, to imprison in a dār in Medina the aged ʿAbbāsid Allāh, and shortly afterwards some other ʿAlids; they had thus all these prisoners to Kūfah, where they were thrown into a foul dungeon. He hoped thus to lure Muḥammad and Ibrāhīm from their hiding-place, but, on the advice of their father, they did not allow themselves to be inveigled into suspending their revolutionary activities.

Al-ʿUṣūr having intensified the search, Muḥammad and Ibrāhīm decided to take action against the ʿAbbāsids and began a revolt on ʿRaḍāj b. ʿAbd Allāh (23 September 762), at Medina. For details of this action, during which he was killed on 14 Ramadān 145/6 December 762, see the article MUḤAMMAD AL-NAFS AL-ZAKIYYA. Ibrāhīm had been for some time in Baṣrah, where the movement had many supporters; Muḥammad having told him in advance of his plans, he too began a revolt (5 Ramadān 145/23 November 762); his movement at Baṣrah was more extensive and lasted longer than that at Medina. Al-ʿUṣūr, alarmed by the insurrection, had gone from Baḥdād, which he was then engaged in building, to Kūfah, in order to keep control over the inhabitants. He brought in troops from al-Ẓiqla and from Syria, resorting to stratagems to make them appear more numerous than they really were, and instructed ʿAbd al-Malik b. Mūsā [g.v.] to intercept his activities in the Hijdāj, after his victory over Muḥammad, and to march immediately with his army against Ibrāhīm. The latter, master of Baṣrah thanks to the governor there, who was in sympathy with the rebels, had seized the treasury and had sent armed bands to occupy other towns and districts (al-ʿĀwāz, some towns of Fārs, Wāṣīt). When the news of Muḥammad’s death reached Baṣrah, the rebels paid homage to Ibrāhīm, who advanced towards Kūfah, where many of his supporters urged him to go, but he gave up this plan and withdrew; then, instead of awaiting at Baṣrah an attack from ʿAbd al-Malik b. Mūsā, he went to Baḥḵumrā (1 Dhū ʿl-Kaʿaḍa 145/21 January 763), where a battle took place between the ʿAbbāsid forces and the rebels. ʿIsā’s vanguard was at first routed, but this first failure soon turned to victory for the government troops. Ibrāhīm, left alone with a few faithful followers after the majority of his supporters had been scattered, was mortally wounded, and died on 25 Dhū ʿl-Kaʿaḍa 145/14 February 765. According to the source it was ʿAbd al-Malik himself who ordered his death. He was then 47 years of age. The revolt of the two brothers had thus occupied almost the whole of the second half of the year 145.

There were several causes for the failure of the revolt: Muḥammad’s hasty decision to open his campaign of insurrection at Medina, where he could find neither the means nor the forces necessary for his enterprise; the prompt reaction of al-ʿUṣūr and the challenge offered to him of first extinguishing the revolt begun in Medina and then of attacking Baṣrah with a larger number of troops; the lack of enthusiasm of the supporters of the ʿAlids. This last point is proved by the following facts: the Medinans, taken unawares, had at first sworn homage to Muḥammad, but they turned again to the caliph at the approach of ʿIsā; the supporters from other towns did not rally either to Medina or Baṣrah; the majority of the fuḥakā2 limited themselves to giving verbal approval or to providing a contribution in money, as ʿAbd Ḥanifa is said to have done; the Kūfāns were afraid and remained inactive; the Syrians drove out Mūsā, the brother of Muḥammad and Ibrāhīm, who had been sent to govern their territory; at Wāṣīt, the supporters preferred to await the result of the conflict; before and during the battle of Baḥḵumrā, there were defections, and finally an almost general dispersal. But it may be that the reason for the ʿAlid failure is to be sought not only in these last-minute occurrences but earlier, in the situation created by the accession of the ʿAbbāsids, which the ʿAlids had not properly assessed. Both sides had based their propaganda on the merits and the religion, but the ʿAbbāsids, now in power, were in fact keeping their promises. The ʿAlids therefore were hard put to it to find motives for opposition to these new rulers. While great social, political, and to a certain extent also religious, reforms were in progress, it was unlikely that the people, who had put their confidence in the ʿAbbāsids for the solution of their problems, would take part in a struggle waged against these rulers by members of their own family in the cause of a strict legitimism—all the more since it was only the Ḥasanid branch of the ʿAlids which proposed to challenge them, the other great branch, that of the Ḥusaynids, having no intention of doing so. Another reason for the lack of enthusiasm of the Muslims in general for the Ḥasanid cause was probably the fact that on the question of the divorce of Muslim women they had not yet made up their minds. But the Ḥasanid position was either not clear or open to criticism. The sources are by no means explicit on this, but there were quarrels between Ibrāhīm and his Zaydi supporters, evidently because the latter suspected, and in fact very soon realized, that their aims were not the same as those of the Ḥasanids. The Zaydis at this period formed what was in effect a political party with social objectives
Ibrahim b. 'Abd Allah — Ibrahim b. Adham

(see L. Veccia Vaglieri, op. cit. in bibliography); thus the groups describing themselves as Zaydis who joined Ibrahim in Basra demanded as a condition of their joining the campaign that, if Muhammad and Ibrahim should die, the command should go to 'Isa, the son of the martyr Zayd b. Husayn [g.v.] ; they soon fell into disagreement with Ibrahim, and wished to put a leader of their own at the head of the rebels, renouncing this project only when they feared that al-Manṣūr would take advantage of this quarrel; they nevertheless reserved the right to receive in the presence of the sultan the objections raised on a detail of ritual, on the tactics to adopt during the battle, and on the way in which provisions and money should be requisitioned. Nevertheless some Zaydis remained with the 'Alid until the end of the battle, and, when he was wounded, bravely defended his body.

Ibrahim appears to have been more intelligent than his brother Muhammad, or so it would seem from the fact that when the founders of Mu'atizzalism, Wāsīl b. 'Aṭas and 'Amr b. Ubayd, came to Medina with a group of followers of their movement to meet the 'Alid claimant to the caliphate, 'Abd Allāh (with the agreement of his advisers) preferred that they should meet Ibrahim rather than Muhammad, since, given the intelligence of the questioners, the interview promised to be an awkward one. The Makdīl (193 f.) confirms that Ibrahim made a very good impression on them. He was better educated than his brother, if not in the religious sciences at least in the field of literature, since it is reported that he spent in hiding he boldly faced great dangers...
ever, from al-Sulami onwards this legend is found firmly rooted in the accounts of Ibrahim's life. Thus the anecdote generally associates his conversion, or repentance, with his abdication; the accounts of this may be grouped under about ten different themes, e.g. that he repented after reflecting on the utter contentment of a beggar whom he saw sitting in the shade of the palace, or that he was warned by Khidr, in the guise of a fakir, of the transitory nature of this world. The best known of the themes is also the earliest, being found in al-Kalabidj (1078) and then passed into other languages: much of the factual material was lost, while the more legendary and fanciful themes were taken over and often greatly embellished. This process can be observed in Persian, Indian and Indonesian literature on Ibrahim, which has been discussed in detail by R. A. Nicholson (1960). The richest source in Persian is Farid al-Din Attar's Taghhirat al-awliya (ed. R. A. Nicholson, London and Leiden 1905, i, 55-106); translations of relevant portions of this have been supplied by A. Pavet de Courteille, J. Hallauer, Claud Field, Banky Behari and A. J. Arberry in different publications. For an example of works in Persian composed in India see Allâh Diyâh . . . Cîshî al-'Ukhmâni (d. after 1568 AD), Siyar al-âbâd, Lucknow 1877, 29-45.

On the Arabic abridgement of the Turkish biography see W. Ahlwardt, Die Handschriften . . . zu Berlin, viii, Berlin 1896, 47-9; on the Urdu poem see Garcin de Tassy, Histoire de la littérature hindouie et hindoustanie, i, Paris 1870, 101; on the Malay version see Studies in Islam, v/1, New Delhi 1968, 7-20.

Useful compilations of data on Ibn Adham can be found in two short works: in English by R. A. Nicholson in ZA, xxvi (1912), 215-20; in H. Ritter's Das Meer der Seele, Leiden 1955 (see index); and under IBRAHIM b. ADHAM in EI. For reference to pictorial representations of this saint see W. G. Archer, Indian painting in the Punjab Hills, London 1952, 79, 83, 84, 92.

(ROLLE JONES)

IBRAHIM b. 'ALI [see al-IBRAHIM]

IBRAHIM b. 'ALI b. HASAN AL-SARKKÃ', Egyptian teacher and preacher, whose father's family came from the village of Shâbrâkhâm (formerly the markaz of Zifta, now that of Kûwaynsa in Lower Egypt). He himself was born in 1212/1799 in Cairo, where he was to spend his whole life. After he had followed the course of studies at the kutdîb and then at al-Azhar (Shâfi'i rîte) until 1234/1819, his whole career was spent as a teacher at al-Azhar. His biographers give the titles of his works and only mention his zeal for work and for reading, but in fact little is known of his life, since the history of the members of the al-Azhar in the 19th century has still to be written, and the researches of Mme. Afâl Lufti Sayyd are now only beginning to provide information on this subject. He owed his fame to his gifts as an orator, being preacher at al-Azhar Mosque for over twenty years. He preached sermons on all the customary occasions and celebrations and gave

an oration in Arabic at the ceremony of the opening of the Suez Canal (Fort Said, 16 November 1869), according to 'Abd al-Rahmân Râfî', 'Aqr Isdmî, I, 102. 'Abd al-Malik b. Mutâhid al-Muhammadiyya (lit.) is a collection of sermons for all the Fridays and feast days of the year and for some extraordinary occasions (eclipses, etc.): it has a certain interest for the study of religious feeling in the 19th century. He performed the Pilgrimage in 1263/1847. On 15 Ramadân 1280/23 February 1864 he was granted a pension of 2,020 piastres (Abdin Palace archives, notice no. 37) and died on 14 Dümâd II 1295/14 May 1881, being given a semi-official funeral.

His grandson (through his daughter) Hasan b. Muhammad al-Sâkka, born in 1265/1846, was also an 'âlim and preacher at al-Azhar. He died on 24 Dümâd I 1326/24 June 1869 and was buried near his grandfather.


IBRÂHIM B. AL-ASHTAR, son of the famous Mâlik b. al-Hârith al-Nakhâi (see AL-ASHTAR and himself a soldier attached to the 'Alîad party. It is said that he had already fought at Siffin [q.v.] in the ranks of 'Alî, but his historical importance is based on his action in support of al-Mu'âhad b. 'Abd al-'Ubayd [q.v.]. In fact he seems to have hesitated before joining the 'Alî party. He then himself took the view that it was necessary for the latter to forgo a letter which purported to be written by Muhammad ibn al-Hasanîyya to Ibrahim before the latter agreed to recognize al-Mu'âhad as the agent of 'Alî's son. Ibn al-Ashtar, whose name is mentioned together with that of the famous Âqâbâbîyya [q.v.] and not Usayyâma as might be supposed from their appeal to exact vengeance for al-Husayn b. 'Ali, is famous for the defeat which he inflicted on the Umayyad troops and for the fact that he killed with his own hand 'Abd al-Malik b. Ziyâd [q.v.] and some other important adversaries, during the battle fought at al-Dâ'izir, near al-Mu'âhad, on 10 Muharram 67/ 6 August 686; the heads of the victims were sent to al-Mu'âhad, who in his turn sent them to 'Abd al-Malik b. al-Zubayr.

After the death of al-Mu'âhad (14 Ramadân 67/3 April 687) during an attempt at a sortie, during the siege of Kufa by the troops of Mu'âshab b. al-Zubayr and in the absence of Ibn al-Ashtar (who had been sent by his leader to al-Mawilî), the Zubayridy party received the support of this brave general; in spite of the efforts of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân to detach him from his enemies, he remained faithful to them, and it was while fighting in the ranks of Mu'âshab that he was killed at Maskin, in Dümâd I 72/October 691, on the eve of the battle of Dayr al-Dirâhidh [q.v.]; al-Mas'ûdi wrote a striking description of the last moments of Ibn al-Ashtar, whose body, sent over to the enemy, was later burned.

Ibrahim b. al-Ashtar is sometimes confused with Abî 'Imrân Ibrahim b. Yazid b. Kays al-Nâqâhî, a fâhî and traditionist of Kufa (50-96/670-715); see Ibn Hadij, Tahdhib, s.v.

Bibliography: Tabari, index; Ibn al-Ahkâm, sub annis 67, 72; Badîkhuri, Ansâb, index; Masûdî, Maqâmât, ii, 237 (Ibrahim was a minor in 70/689); Caskel, Djemhara, tab. 264 and Register, s.v.; Agâhâni, Beirut ed., xvii, 252; Dâ'irdâ'ir al-ma'ârisî, ii, 122-3. (Ed.)

IBRÂHIM B. DHAKÂN AN-AL-HARRÂNI, vizier of the 'Abbâsid caliph al-Hâdi. The caliph, on his accession, had appointed as vizier and chamberlain the powerful al-Rabi', but he soon replaced him by Ibrahim al-Harrani, who had been his adviser when he was governor of Djûdâd. Some historians however do not give Ibrahim the title of vizier, but refer to him only as director of finance.

Bibliography: D. Sourdel, Vizirat, index. (D. SOURDEL)

IBRÂHIM B. HILAL [see AL-SANI']

IBRÂHIM B. KÂ'LID [see ABO THAWK]}

IBRÂHIM B. AL-MAHDî, 'Abbâsid prince, born end of 652/July 779, d. in Ramadân 224/ July 839. The son of the caliph al-Mahdi [q.v.]; the letter which purported to be written by Muhammad ibn al-Hasanîyya to Ibrahim before the latter agreed to recognize al-Mu'âhad as the agent of 'Alî's son. Ibn al-Ashtar, whose name is mentioned together with that of the famous Âqâbâbîyya [q.v.] and not Usayyâma as might be supposed from their appeal to exact vengeance for al-Husayn b. 'Ali, is famous for the defeat which he inflicted on the Umayyad troops and for the fact that he killed with his own hand 'Abd al-Malik b. Ziyâd [q.v.] and some other important adversaries, during the battle fought at al-Dâ'izir, near al-Mu'âhad, on 10 Muharram 67/ 6 August 686; the heads of the victims were sent to al-Mu'âhad, who in his turn sent them to 'Abd al-Malik b. al-Zubayr.

After the death of al-Mu'âhad (14 Ramadân 67/3 April 687) during an attempt at a sortie, during the siege of Kufa by the troops of Mu'âshab b. al-Zubayr and in the absence of Ibn al-Ashtar (who had been sent by his leader to al-Mawilî), the Zubayridy party received the support of this brave general; in spite of the efforts of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân to detach him from his enemies, he remained faithful to them, and it was while fighting in the ranks of Mu'âshab that he was killed at Maskin, in Dümâd I 72/October 691, on the eve of the battle of Dayr al-Dirâhidh [q.v.]; al-Mas'ûdi wrote a striking description of the last moments of Ibn al-Ashtar, whose body, sent over to the enemy, was later burned.

Ibrahim b. al-Ashtar is sometimes confused with Abî 'Imrân Ibrahim b. Yazid b. Kays al-Nâqâhî, a fâhî and traditionist of Kufa (50-96/670-715); see Ibn Hadij, Tahdhib, s.v.

Bibliography: Tabari, index; Ibn al-Ahkâm, sub annis 67, 72; Badîkhuri, Ansâb, index; Masûdî, Maqâmât, ii, 237 (Ibrahim was a minor in 70/689); Caskel, Djemhara, tab. 264 and Register, s.v.; Agâhâni, Beirut ed., xvii, 252; Dâ'irdâ'ir al-ma'ârisî, ii, 122-3. (Ed.)

IBRÂHIM B. DHAKÂN AN-AL-HARRÂNI, vizier of the 'Abbâsid caliph al-Hâdi. The caliph, on his accession, had appointed as vizier and chamberlain the powerful al-Rabi', but he soon replaced him by Ibrahim al-Harrani, who had been his adviser when he was governor of Djûdâd. Some historians however do not give Ibrahim the title of vizier, but refer to him only as director of finance.

Bibliography: D. Sourdel, Vizirat, index. (D. SOURDEL)

IBRÂHIM B. HILAL [see AL-SANI']

IBRÂHIM B. KÂ'LID [see ABO THAWK]
...part played by certain figures of the da'wa for its achievements makes it difficult to assess the

...other declined did his choice fall, in 128/745-6, on Ibrahim, with his practical approach, his generosity...

...Abbasid revolution was a complex phenomenon, the main appeal seems to have been...

...discontented Arab settlers and collected through the dihqans [q.v.], and against Umayyad military policy, which kept the Mu'attila in the frontier area for prolonged periods (Ibn al-Khuza'i, ...of the army of Khurasan, which was advancing him appointed Kahtaba b. Shabib al-Ta'i commander...

...social... background... 140 ff.).

...also useful additional data will be found in these earlier ones when writing on the period. ...Arabskiy Anonim XI veka, Moscow 1960, fols. 255b, Arabskiy Anonim XI veka, Moscow 1960, fols. 255b, Arabskiy Anonim XI veka, Moscow 1960, fols. 255b, Arabskiy Anonim XI veka, Moscow 1960, fols. 255b.

IBRĀHĪM B. SAYABA, minor poet of the second half of the 2nd/8th century who died circa 193/809. Of obscure origin and a mawla of the `Abbāsids, he held, according to Ibn al-Mu`tazz, the office of secretary to al-Mahdi but, having once been suspected of sandaka, he was dismissed and obliged to beg for a living. Like so many of his contemporaries, he led a disorganized and even dissolute life, but he was not lacking in wit, to judge by the anecdotes of which he is the hero. Ibn al-Mu`taazz writes, in the account given by the author of the Aghdhī, that he went verses of little value which Ibnbrīhīm al-Mawsili and his son Isfrāk set to music out of friendship towards him, so that he acquired a certain degree of fame and succeeded in becoming acquainted with persons in high society; he was in fact known to al-Fadl b. al-Rabil after having been on fairly intimate terms with Yāhūb b. Khālid al-Barnakī, to whom he addressed notably (it is not clear in what circumstances) an epistle of which al-Dījahīd (Bayān, iii, 215) states that all the inhabitants of Baghād at that time knew it by heart.

Bibliography: Aghdhīh, Bayān, and Bashbāhā, indexes; Dījahshīyarī, 203 (incorrectly: Ibnbrīhīm b. Shabāba); Ibn Kūtaba, `Uyūn al-`abdāb, i, 217. Ibn al-Mu`tazz, T-`Abbābīh, 36-7; Aghdhī, xi, 5-8 (Beirut ed., xii, 80-4). (Ed.)

IBRĀHĪM B. SHAHRUKH (Abu ʿL-Fath Mirzā IBRĀHĪM SULTĀN BAḤIRUD, Timūrid prince, second son of Shahrūkh [q.v., born 28 Shawwāl 796/26 August 1394. In 812/1409-10, Ibnbrīhīm was appointed governor of Balkh and Ṭukharistān up to the borders of Kabul and Badakshān, and in 817/ 1414 he was appointed governor of Fārs, a position which he held for over twenty years up to his death on 4 Shawwal 883/May 1435. In 823/1420-1, and in 832/1429, he took part in Shahrūkh’s campaigns in Aḥbarbāyjān. In 842/1441 he annexed Khorasān to the Timurid empire.

Ibnbrīhīm had two sons: Isma`īl (died ca. 835/1432), and ʿAbd Allāh, born 27 Rajab 836/19 March 1433, who, though still an infant, succeeded his father as governor of Fārs, and was later appointed governor of Samarkand.


(M. R. SAVORY)

IBRĀHĪM B. SHIRKŪH, AL-MALIK AL-MAṢūDIR NĀṢIR AL-DĪN IBRĀHĪM B. AL-MALIK AL-MUQĀDṢĪ AD-DĪN SHIRKŪH II, cousin of Sulāḥ al-Dīn (Saladin), succeeded his father Shīrkūh [q.v.], prince of Aleppo and Damascus in Baghād 867/January-February 1240. When he became master of the province of Hims, to which at that time there belonged Tadmur, Rabba and Māsīn, the pressure of the Khuwārizmīns in northern Syria was very great. When Ibnbrīhīm learned of the defeat of the Aleppo army at Buza`ī in Rabīʿ II 638/October-November 1240, he set off northwards with reinforcements of troops from Damascus. In Baghād 638/January 1242 the Khuwārizmīns marched against Aleppo but did not attack the town and, after unsuccessful attempts to encircle it, withdrew towards the east. Ibnbrīhīm overtook them and defeated them in Shāwwal 638/ April 1241; he gained further victories over them in Ẓafar 640/ August 1242 and again at the end of 641 and beginning of 642/April-June 1244. The Khuwārizmīns seem to have been driven out of Syria.

Ibnbrīhīm b. Shīrkūh became involved in the family quarrels between Sulāḥ Ayyūb of Cairo and Sulāḥ Isma`īl of Damascus. In the spring of 642/1244 hos- tileilities broke out between Cairo and Damascus; and Nāṣir Dāwūd, the Ayyūbid prince of Karak, and Ibnbrīhīm allied themselves with Sulāḥ Isma`īl, who had the support of the Knights Templar. Ibnbrīhīm went in person to ʿAkkā to ratify the agreement with the Franks. The Franks in the Pharaoh’s Egypt, on his side, acquired the services of the Khuwārizmīns, who were ready to hire themselves to whoever offered most. On 14 Dījamād I 642/18 October 1244, there took place, to the north-east of Ghazza, the battle of Harbiyya, or Forbie, at which the Franco-Syrian allies were defeated. In the following year, Sulāḥ Ayyūb laid siege to Damascus in the ʿId-Ḥidāja 643/May 1245; six months later the town capitulated and Isma`īl received Ba`albakk in compensation. The Khuwārizmīns, dissatisfied with Sulāḥ Ayyūb, in 644/1246 offered their services to Isma`īl to re-take Damascus. Ibnbrīhīm b. Shīrkūh and Nāṣir Yusuf of Aleppo, in the pay of Sulāḥ Ayyūb, then set off southwards with a large army. The Khuwārizmīns raised the siege of Damascus and moved northwards; they were defeated near the lake of Hims on 8 Muharram 644/28 May 1246. Ibnbrīhīm reached Damascus and encamped near Nayrāb, to the west of the town, where he became ill and died on 11 Ẓafar 645/28 June 1246. He is buried at Hims beside his father. His son Abu ʿL-Fath Muṣāf, succeeded him, with the titles of al-Malik al-ʿAshraf Muṭarraf al-Dawlah, and was recognized the authority of Sulāḥ Ayyūb.


Ibrahim b. al-Walid


(Ch. Pellat)

Ibrahim b. al-Walid b. 'Abd al-Malik, Abu Iskak, son of the caliph al-Walid I [q.v.] and of a slave (Suwar in al-Yaqubl, Dayrâ in al-Masudi), was appointed as wa'îl al-'ahd by his brother Yazid [q.v.] three days after the latter succeeded to the caliphate (20 Djumada II 126/9 April 744). According to al-Tabari, this appointment was made on the insistence of the Kadiyari [q.v.], who wanted to ensure an heir to the throne who would be favourable to them. When Yazid succeeded in imposing his authority in Urdunn, Ibrahim was appointed governor (amir) of this district. After the death of Yazid (7 or 19 Dhu 'l-Hijja 126/20 September or 2 October 744), who, according to an allegation made only by al-Yaqubi, was thought to have been poisoned by Ibrahim, the caliphate of the latter was recognized only in the southern part of Syria; in the north, the inhabitants of Hiims opposed the entry of his cousin, 'Abd al-'Aziz b. al-Hadidjâdî [q.v.], whom he had appointed as amir, so that he was obliged to lay siege to the town.

Earlier, on the death of al-Walid II, Marwan b. Muhammad [q.v.], the governor of Armenia and of Adharbaydjan, had gone with an army into Djazira and had received there in secret the bay'a of the inhabitants. He planned, in order to avenge the murder of al-Walid, to march against Yazid, but instead concluded a peace with the new caliph. Following this agreement, the reward for which was the governorship of the Djazira in addition to Armenia and Adharbaydjan, Marwan was preparing to return to Armenia, when the death of Yazid and Ibrahim's accession to the throne led him to continue his march. He entered Syria at the head of the junds of Djazira and Armenia to depose the new caliph. At Halab (according to Ibn al-Athir in Kinnarîn), he defeated Ibrahim's two brothers, Bishr [q.v.] and Masrur, and took them prisoner; then he raised their bay'a of the caliphate (as sons of al-Walid II) and they swore allegiance to him. The sources differ in their reports of Ibrahim's behaviour on Marwan's entry: 'Abd al-Malik, in the battle which followed at 'Ayn al-Djârr, a place near Damascus, this army suffered a crushing defeat (7 Safar 127/18 November 744) and its leader fled to Damascus. The amirs of Damascus decided to kill the two sons of al-Walid II, al-Hakam and 'Uthman, who were prisoners, because Marwan, before the battle of 'Ayn al-Djârr, had proposed to recognize their right to the caliphate (as sons of al-Walid II) and they feared that if one of them became caliph he would take revenge on the murderers of his father. After the death of these claimants to the throne, the situation had changed, and Marwan was able from then on to advance his own candidature. When he approached Damascus, the inhabitants hastened to swear allegiance to him. The sources differ in their reports of Ibrahim's behaviour on Marwan's entry into Damascus: al-Yaqubi [q.v.] states that he hastened to recognize Marwan as the new caliph (15 Safar 127/26 November 744) in Damascus itself; according to the other historians he fled to Tadmur (Palmyra) with...
Ibrahim b. Al-Walid — Ibrahim Al-Ahdab

Sulaymān b. Hīshām and it was not until some time afterwards that he asked for and obtained amān from Marwān; this earned him the by-name of al-maḥṣūd. In any case, from the time that he gave his support to Marwān, he became a member of the caliph's suite and was treated with respect. He died on the day which marked the end of the Umayyad dynasty, i.e., in the battle of the Zāb [q.v.] (11 Dhu-mādād II 132/25 January 750); it is said that his body was found among those of the fugitives who were drowned in the river. There exist also other versions: according to al-Ṭabārī, he was Ibrahim in Syria by 'Abd Allāh b. 'All [q.v.]; according to al-Masūdī, Marwān, having seized Damascus, drove Ibrahim out and later, having taken him prisoner before the battle of the Zāb, killed him and crucified his body. Al-Dinawārī states simply that Marwān killed him on the day of his entry into Damascus.

Ishāq b. Husayn, al-Maṣūrī does not list Ibrahim's reign in the series of the Umayyad caliphs, evidently because his accession to the throne had not been unanimously recognized. Indeed it must be emphasized that Ibrahim did not play an important role in the period of anarchy which followed the death of al-Walid; the sources are completely silent on him before his accession to the caliphate and they do not attribute any importance to him during his brief reign.

**Bibliography:** Tabārī, ii, 539, 1270, 1334, 1869, 1875, 1877, 1890, 1892, 1893; iii, 41 and index; Ya'qūbī, ii, 349, 402, 403; Dinawārī, al-Abhār al-tawdīl, ed. Guirgass, 350; Masūdī, Muṣāfāt, vi, 19, 32, 50, 73, 74, 352; ix, 43; Ibn al-Aṯīr, v, 223, 233, 235, 243-6, 322 and index; Ibn Kathīr, Bīdāya, x, 13, 21-3, 43; G. Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, i, 678-55; J. Wellhausen, Das arabisch Reich, Eng. tr., The Arab kingdom and its fall, Calcutta 1927, 369, 374, 375, 376, 384; for other sources, see L. Caetani, Chronographia, v, 1599.

**Ibrahim b. Ya'qūb Al-Iṣrā'īlī Al-Turkūsī**, Spanish Jewish traveller, born in Tortosa, to judge by his nisba, is known for having made, circa 546/965, a long journey in western, central and eastern Europe. It is not clear why he made this tour: it has been suggested that he was trading in horses or in slaves, and it is not impossible that he was on an official intelligence mission for the Umayyad caliphate. He was Ibrahim in Spain by the fragment mentioned of an old writer, whether he cites him or not, or cites him through al-Masūdī, al-Ṭabārī, al-Maṣīḥi, al-Masūrī does not list Ibrahim's reign in the series of the Umayyad caliphs, evidently because his accession to the throne had not been unanimously recognized. Indeed it must be emphasized that Ibrahim did not play an important role in the period of anarchy which followed the death of al-Walid; the sources are completely silent on him before his accession to the caliphate and they do not attribute any importance to him during his brief reign.

**Ibrahim b. Ya'qūb Al-Iṣrā'īlī Al-Turkūsī**, Spanish Jewish traveller, born in Tortosa, to judge by his nisba, is known for having made, circa 546/965, a long journey in western, central and eastern Europe. It is not clear why he made this tour: it has been suggested that he was trading in horses or in slaves, and it is not impossible that he was on an official intelligence mission for the Umayyad caliphate. He was Ibrahim in Spain by the fragment mentioned of an old writer, whether he cites him or not, or cites him through al-Masūdī, al-Ṭabārī, al-Maṣīḥi, al-Masūrī does not list Ibrahim's reign in the series of the Umayyad caliphs, evidently because his accession to the throne had not been unanimously recognized. Indeed it must be emphasized that Ibrahim did not play an important role in the period of anarchy which followed the death of al-Walid; the sources are completely silent on him before his accession to the caliphate and they do not attribute any importance to him during his brief reign.


**Ibrahim b. 'Abd al-Ahdab, Manaf** (died 750/1350), a distinguished representative of Arabic culture in the 19th century. After addressing the traditional studies, he became a teacher (1264-8/1848-52), and finally became a magistrate for the Slav countries of Europe, chiefly Poland, Bohemia and the Slav Obodrites of Schwerin-Meklenburg. In addition to some details on Spain: an indication either that Ibrahim's work was more than a simple account of the European journey, or that he wrote other works besides this one. Al-Kazwini has preserved, for the Slav countries, the passages concerning Poland and the "Town of Women"; he is particularly indebted to Ibrahim, whether he cites him or not, or cites him through al-Uḍhri, for a collection of notes on the towns of western and southern Europe.

The date of the original work and the quality of the fragments which survive, notably those about the Slavs, show how greatly to be regretted is the loss of so much of it. To judge by these fragments, the account of the journey must have combined direct and oral information. Most famous among passages of the former type are the description of the abbey of Fulda, that of the salt-pans of Soest, the reflections on commerce at Augsburg or at Prague, the indications of the fact that there were found as far away as Germany Sāmānī dirhams struck at Samarkand in 301-9/1214-5. The oral information naturally includes more legend, but it is nevertheless often of considerable value, as is shown by the information collected on the Bulgars or the details concerning whale-fishing off the coast of Ireland. Finally, to reverse the point of view, the work provides an excellent illustration of how the developing Europe of that period could appear to a foreign visitor.

The fragments of Ibrahim b. Ya'qūb on the Slavs have been edited and translated (into Polish and Latin with very full documentation) by T. Kowalski (see Bbīl.). A French translation of the passages on western Europe has been made by A. Miquel (see Bbīl.). A French translation of the work of the whole of M. Canard is in preparation.

in Beirut in 1276/1859. A collaborator in the revue Thamardt al-funun and an important figure in a kind of literary circle, he engaged from this time onward in an immense literary activity which produced several collections of poems, works of adab and of grammar, rasā’il, maḥāmdāt, plays, newspapers articles, etc. Part of his work seems to be lost; other works are still in manuscript, but a dozen or so have been published, in particular the Farā’id al-lā’dī fi Madima’ al-amlāh, a poetic version of the collection of proverbs by al-Maydānī (Beirut 1312/1894, 2 vols.). The list given by Brockelmann (S III, 533) is incomplete and inaccurate (in particular the Tafsil al-ṣayḥūs ... is the work of Ibrahim’s son Sa’dīd, but that of Djabbur ‘Abd al-Nūr (Da’īrat al-Ma’ārif, vii, 170-4) seems to be nearly exhaustive. Though he was overshadowed by the great names of the Nahda (q.v.), Ibrahim al-Abdāb nevertheless played a significant role because of his sound Arabic culture, which enabled him to uphold tradition while he did not prevent his following, though still tentatively, the movement of renewal which was a feature of the 19th century.

**Bibliography:** Introduction to the Farā’id al-lā’dī by the author’s two sons, Sa’dīd and Husayn; ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Baytār, Hiliyat al-bashār fi tawākh al-karn al-ṭālith ashār, i, Damascus 1901; the bibliographical work of Zurikī, Khaliḥa, and Dāghir; the most extensive study is that mentioned above by Zīj. ‘Abd al-Nūr, who is preparing (1967), a monograph entitled al-Shaykh Ibrahim al-Abdāb. (Ed.)

**IBRĀHĪM BEY AL-KABĪR AL-MUḤAMMADI (i.e., the māmlūk of Muḥammad Bey Abu l-Dhahab) was raised to the beylicacy in 1182/1768-9; and held the appointments of amīr al-had-[d] in 1187/1773-4 and daftardār in 1189/1773-4. When Abu l-Dhahab went on campaign against Shaykh Zahir al-Umar (Muḥarram 1189/March 1775), he left Ibrahim as his deputy in command of Cairo. On his death, the ascendancy in Egypt passed to his retainers (the Muḥammadiyya) headed by Ibrahim and Murad Bey, the former becoming shaykh al-balad. The characters of the two men were strongly contrasted, Murad being headstrong, bold and ruthless, while Ibrahim was of a conciliatory but less decisive nature. Murad’s plot to assassinate Bey, which had hitherto abstained from the competition for ascendancy in Egypt, had hitherto abstained from the competition for ascendancy in Egypt, and client of the late Ali Bey. Murad, being headstrong, bold and ruthless, while Isma’īl Bey, the former becoming shaykh al-balad. The exactions of the grandees and the latter resumed the position of Shaykh Ibrahim al-Abdāb. The political situation remained unstable, since the Muḥammadiyya owed their return to a conspiracy organized by Hasan Bey al-Djuddāwī, the head of the ‘Aliwiyya (i.e., the māmlūk of ‘Ali Bey). Murad again fomented factional hostility; the ‘Aliwiyya were expelled from Cairo and proscribed (Djumādā I 1191/July 1777). Isma’īl was, however, unable to maintain himself in power. Murad and Ibrahim re-entered Cairo, and the latter resumed the position of Shaykh al-balad (Muḥarram 1192/February 1778). The political situation remained unstable, since the Muḥammadiyya owed their return to a conspiracy organized by Hasan Bey al-Djuddāwī, the head of the ‘Aliwiyya (i.e., the māmlūk of ‘Ali Bey). Murad again fomented factional hostility; the ‘Aliwiyya were expelled from Cairo and proscribed (Djumādā I 1192/June 1778). The duumvirs, however, failed to dislodge them from Upper Egypt, where they were joined by Isma’īl Bey, and in 1195/1781 Murad ceded much of the south to them. Late in 1197/1783 factional struggles among the Muḥammadiyya in Cairo culminated in open hostilities between Murad and Ibrahim. In Shawwal 1198/September 1784 Ibrahim was evicted from Cairo, and Murad assumed sole power. They were reconciled, and Ibrahim was restored as shaykh al-balad in Rabī’ II 1199/February 1785. Meanwhile the state of security and condition of agriculture in Egypt had seriously declined. The Pilgrimage caravan was ill-provisioned, and in 1198/1783-4 and 1199/1784-5 failed to visit Medina. At this point the imperial Ottoman government intervened with the despatch of an expeditionary force to Egypt under Dješā’īrī Ḥāzīn Ḥasan Pasha (q.v.), bearing a demand for arrears of tribute and dues to the Holy Cities, and a formal censure because of the failure of the Pilgrimage caravan to reach Medina. The duumvirs, after vacillation, decided on resistance (in particular the Tafsil al-ṣayḥūs ... is the work of Ibrahim’s son Sa’dīd, but that of Djabbur ‘Abd al-Nūr (Da’īrat al-Ma’ārif, vii, 170-4) seems to be nearly exhaustive. Though he was overshadowed by the great names of the Nahda (q.v.), Ibrahim al-Abdāb nevertheless played a significant role because of his sound Arabic culture, which enabled him to uphold tradition while he did not prevent his following, though still tentatively, the movement of renewal which was a feature of the 19th century.

**Bibliography:** Introduction to the Farā’id al-lā’dī by the author’s two sons, Sa’dīd and Husayn; ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Baytār, Hiliyat al-bashār fi tawākh al-karn al-ṭālith ashār, i, Damascus 1901; the bibliographical work of Zurikī, Khaliḥa, and Dāghir; the most extensive study is that mentioned above by Zīj. ‘Abd al-Nūr, who is preparing (1967), a monograph entitled al-Shaykh Ibrahim al-Abdāb. (Ed.)

**IBRĀHĪM DERWĪSH PASHA** (1812-96), Ottoman general, was the son of a certain Ibrāhīm Aqha, one of the a’yan (q.v.) of Loča (Lovets, in Bulgaria). Entering the army as a volunteer, he was soon commissioned; he was promoted to bībāsīl in 1232/1816-7 and to mūṣīr (“general”) on 28 April 1826. He was in command of operations in Montenegro [see karađağ], and in 1865, as commander
of the Fourth Army, accompanied Ahmad Djewith Paşa [q.v.] in the pacification of the Koan area of the Taurus. After failing to prevent the spread of the revolution in the Crimea, he was dismissed. His most illustrious service was performed during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-8, when, as commander of the army defending Lázistn, he repeatedly beat off Russian attacks and successfully held Batumi [q.v.] until the armistice—the only Ottoman general undefeated in this war. He then occupied a succession of posts: governor of Diyarbakır and of Selânîk, minister of the Grand Vizier’s Staff, the special commissioner to Egypt. He died on 22 June 1896 and is buried by the turbe of Sultan Mahmûd on Divanyolu.


(M. ÇıhâreddinTekindâğ)

**İBRAHİM EDHEM PASHA,** Ottoman Grand Vizier under the sultan Abd al-Hamîd II; born probably in Chios in 1818 (?) of Greek parents, he was bought as a slave by Khusrev Paşa [q.v.] and sent to France in 1827 to receive technical training. After graduating in Paris as a mining engineer in 1839, he returned to Istanbul and was nominated to the Şehâr-ya ‘Asheri (High Military Council) with the rank of Colonel. After serving a few years in Anatolia as chief engineer of mines, he was called to Istanbul in 1263/1847 to be appointed to the Palace army staff. Promoted *Mirasîdî* (Brigadier-general) in 1264/1848 and *Ferîk* (Lieutenant-general) three years later, he was removed from his military post in 1271/1855 owing to a palace intrigue, although maintaining his position as a member of the *Medjdî-i TanÎmidî* (Council of Reforms), to which he had been nominated in Muharram 1271/October 1854. On 26 Rabî‘ I 1273/24 November 1856 he was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs with the rank of vizier in the cabinet of Muşîruf Reşid Paşa [q.v.]. On his dismissal on 8 Rabi‘ II 1279/25 September 1857 he returned to the *Medjdî-i TanÎmidî*. On 29 Divânîdâ I 1276/ 24 December 1859 he became Minister of *Commerce* in the cabinet of Mehmed Rûşhûd Paşa. Dismissed on 9 Muharrâm 1278/17 July 1862, he was reappointed three times to the same office in the following fifteen years. Meanwhile he served as Minister of Public Works, of Public Instruction, and of Justice, as governor of Tûrâhâ and Van, as a member of the Şehâr-ya Dâlet (*High Council of State*) etc. Appointed ambassador to Berlin on 5 Rabî‘ I 1293/31 March 1876 he remained only a few months abroad, being nominated Ottoman deputy delegate to the Conference of Constantinople which was entrusted with the settlement of the Balkan Crisis. His firm attitude at the conference won him the confidence of the Miranda and Vanzo, as a member of the Şehâr-ya Dâlet (*High Council of State*) etc. Appointed ambassador to Berlin on 5 Rabî‘ I 1293/31 March 1876 he remained only a few months abroad, being nominated Ottoman deputy delegate to the Conference of Constantinople which was entrusted with the settlement of the Balkan Crisis. His firm attitude at the conference won him the confidence of the Milošević, and was promoted to the Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. After the Young Turk Revolution, he was appointed ambassador to Italy. This was a period of great political instability in Istanbul, marked by the formation and fall of five ministries in the first eighteen months after the revolution.


**İBRAHİM HAKKI PASHA** (1863-1978), Ottoman statesman, diplomat, and Grand Vizier (1910-11), was born in Beşiktaş. He was the son of Remzi Efendi, who had been *mutasarrîf* of Saâd in 1879 on his return from a Turcu-Russian war of 1877. Nevertheless his contribution to the modernization of Turkey is worthy of mention. The foundation of a modern printing press (*Mabûsa-i Âmirî*) near the Topkâp Palace during his period as Minister of Public Instruction in 1853 and the introduction of the decimal system of measurement into Turkey during his presidency of the Council of Public Works in 1869 are important achievements in this respect. His articles on geology published in the *Mîrîdî-i hafla* (1862) greatly helped the diffusion of Western science among the Turkish intellectuals. His sons *Othmân Hamdî* [q.v.], İsmâ‘îl Gâlib [q.v.] and Khalîl Edhem Eldem [q.v.] contributed also to the development of arts and scholarship in Turkey. (E. KURAN)

**İBRAHİM DERWÎSH PASHA**—İBRAHİM HAKKI PASHA
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When Husayn Hilmi Paşa [q.v.] resigned on 28 December 1909, there was speculation as to who would succeed him. Hakki Paşa was amongst the candidates under consideration. He was appointed on 12 January 1910 because of his political neutrality, which made him acceptable to the Unionists as well as to the conservatives. Not being a partisan of any political group, Hakki Paşa was able to bargain with all sides and demand absolute freedom of action in forming his cabinet. One of his first acts as Grand Vizier was to appoint Mâhmut Şawkat (Şevket) Paşa—the Generalissimo who administered martial law and dominated Turkish politics—Minister of War, thus bringing him under cabinet control.

Hakki Paşa's grand vizierate of twenty months was a period of external peace. Internally, however, the conflict between the Committee of Union and Progress [see ITTİHAD WETERAKKI DJEM HARBI], Abdul Hamid, she will overlook the little things as long as she remembers the big. The incidents of his office were correspondingly numerous. Now the incidents of his office were correspondingly numerous. When Ibrahim Hakki Pasha had collected, in addition to the hadiths he had, nothing on this matter (cf. Timurwali, i, 210 and a Hanbali Biddya, i, 26; contrary to the hadith, ii, 212; and cf. Ya'qubi, Uzma, ii, 112. On his connexion with Shâfi’îm: Subkî, ʻIbâdât, i, 26; contrary opinion in Ibn Kâhir and Ya'qubi, who made him a Hanbal (Mir'ât al-qâmîn, ii, 210 and Bidâyâ, ix, 70). The Ta'âlî’îl Bâğîdîl of al-Khatîb, vi, 27, has nothing on this matter (cf. Tadhkira, ii, 162).

Bibliography: Brockelmann, S 1, 188; main source: Yakût, Uzma, ii, 112. On his connexion with Shâfi’îm: Subkî, ʻIbâdât, i, 26; contrary opinion in Ibn Kâhir and Ya'qubi, who made him a Hanbal (Mir'ât al-qâmîn, ii, 210 and Bidâyâ, ix, 70). The Ta'âlî’îl Bâğîdîl of al-Khatîb, vi, 27, has nothing on this matter (cf. Tadhkira, ii, 162).

IBRâHîM HâKÎ PASHA [see KECÎBOYNUZU IBRâHîM HILMI PASHA].
IBRAHIM AL-IMAM — IBRAHIM LODI

IBRAHIM AL-IMAM [see IBRAHIM B. MUHAMMAD].

IBRAHIM KHAN, the ancestor of the Ibrahim-Khanzade family, was the son of Selim II's daughter Esma'lik Sultan (d. 993/1585) by his first marriage to the Grand Vizier Sokollu Mehmed Pasha [q.v.]. According to a late tradition (Hadith al-Dawamni), i, 38), perhaps based on the misconception that the sons of princesses were not allowed to live [see Dama'd], his birth was at first concealed. He first appears as Kaptali-begi, in Mubarram 1099/September 1594. By 1099/1610 he was beg-begi of Bosna—a promotion which convinced contemporaries of his elevation to Mememehmed II's enactment that sons of princesses should not rise beyond the degree of sandjak-begi (cf. Kanan-nam-i Ali 0uthman, TOEM supp. 1330, p. 29); his appointment to this and other high governorates was, it is said, a reward for his presenting to the Sultan the property on which his father's palace in the At-Meydan stood, a site needed for the building of the Mosque of Ahmed I (Barozzi-Berchet, Relazioni, i, 151). He died after 1091/1621-2.

His descendants, the Ibrahim-Khanzade, formed, like the Ewrenoszade and the Turkhaiizade, one of the historic families of the Empire, although they never filled important positions in the state. His grandson Ali Beg is mentioned frequently by the chroniclers (Rashid, ii, 301; Hammer-Purgstall, ix, 563, no. 2696; de La Motraye, Voyages, i, 320). Towards the end of the 18th/19th century the legend arose that if the Ottoman dynasty were to die out the Ibrahim-Khanzade family would succeed and that hence the Sultans were bound to respect the life of every member of it (de La Motraye, Voyages, i, 261 f.; G. von den Driesch, Historische Nachrichten..., Nürnberg 1723, 137; D. Cantemir, The History... of the Ottoman Empire, London 1734, 107; C. W. Lüedeke, Beschreibung des Türkischen Reiches..., Leipzig 1771-8, i, 202, ii, 63). They had their residence in the suburb of Eyyub on the Golden Horn, and until recently acted as mutesville of the wakfs of their ancestor Sokollu Mehmed Pasha [Djedwed, Ta'rîkh, vi, 198].

Bibliography: besides the works cited in the text: Si'dili-i 0uthmanî, i, 99; C. White, Three years in Constantinople, ii, 307; M. Tayyib Gökiligün, art. İbrahim Han, in JA, with further details on İbrahîm’s career and other members of the family, based on references in unpublished chronicles and in Ottoman archive sources.

IBRAHIM LODI was the last of the Lodi Sultans of Delhi, who was defeated and slain on the battlefield of Bābur [q.v.] in the historic first battle of Pānpat in 933/1526. His death opens the chapter in the annals of India as it marks the end of the Dihli Sultanate [q.v.] and the beginning of the Moghul rule which was to last for more than four centuries.

The eldest son of Sikandar Lodi (reg. 924/22 November 1517, one day after his father’s death. Since he was distrustful and ungenerous, the nobles did not like the idea of Ibrahim coming to the throne but were obliged to accept him as such. In token of their displeasure they contrived to divide the kingdom into two parts and to set up Ibrahim’s younger brother Djalal Khan as the ruler of the Sharki province of Djuawnpur [q.v.]. Sensing trouble in this move of the nobles, Ibrahim took immediate steps to end this disarray and deprive Djalal Khan of his newly acquired power. Apprised of Ibrahim’s designs, Djalal Khan raised the banner of revolt but could not withstand the might of the Sultan’s army and fled to Gawâ螺lor, where he took refuge with Bâkramaghît, son of the great Mân Singh who had bravely contested with Sikandar Lodi so long. This prompted Ibrahim to attack and besiege Gawâ螺lor. However, while the siege was still in progress Djalal Khan was captured and taken to Hânsl, where he was imprisoned along with other rebellious Afghan nobles. Djalal Khan subsequently died in prison.

Suspecting disaffection on the part of the grandees of the empire, Ibrahim indulged in acts of capricious tyranny, thus alienating the sympathies of most of the experienced and loyal servants of his father and “driving them into the arms of an invader”. Two leading nobles, Mîyân Bîhâs, a former chief minister of Sultan Sikandar, and A’âm Hamûyûn Sarwânî, the ruler of Kâîlî, were put to death in prison at the instigation of the Sultan. Their fate alarmed other nobles, who began to look to their own safety. Many of them rebelled, so that chaos and anarchy reigned in the land. While the Sultan was still busy suppressing the rebellions, the Pandjâb under Dawlat Khân Lodi, son of Tâtâr Khân Lodi, also revolted; this prompted the Sultan to summon the refractory governor to Delhi. Sensing trouble, Dawlat Khan instead sent his son Dilâwir Khân to the Court; but this merely roused the anger of the Sultan, who put Dilâwir in prison for some time. There he saw many other nobles suffering torture and indignity, and having seen the small reward accorded to loyalty he apprised his father, on his return to the Pandjâb, of Ibrahim’s true designs. Convinced of the dooms that might befall him if Ibrahim continued to occupy the throne, Dawlat Khân invited Bâbur to attack India, little realizing that his act would prove a turning point in the history of the sub-continent, sounding the death-knell of the Pathan empire and ushering in the establishment of a new alien dynasty.

On learning of Bâbur’s advance Ibrahim marched out with a huge army said to number more than a million to meet the invader. The two armies met at Pânpat; Bâbur’s artillery, and his superior tactics and strategy played havoc with the enemy. Ibrahim put up a heroic resistance but was no match for the skillful and experienced Turk. He died with his crown on his head and adorned with all the insignia of royalty. He had ruled for some nine years.

After the battle Bâbur ordered his men to search for Ibrahim’s body. It was found lying amidst the local villagers, who looked upon the last Lodi Sultan as a martyr and began to venerate him as a saint. We have it on Bâbur’s testimony (cf. Bâbur-nâmâ, Eng. trans., 541, 478) that the queen-mother did not take the death of her son with good grace. Although generously treated by Bâbur, she plotted to poison him; but her plans miscarried and Bâbur was saved. The conquest of the last Lodi Sultan brought no peace for the local villagers, who looked upon the last Lodi Sultan as a martyr and began to venerate him as a saint. We have it on Bâbur’s testimony (cf. Bâbur-nâmâ, Eng. trans., 541, 478) that the queen-mother did not take the death of her son with good grace. Although generously treated by Bâbur, she plotted to poison him; but her plans miscarried and Bâbur was saved. The conquest of the last Lodi Sultan brought no peace for the local villagers, who looked upon the last Lodi Sultan as a martyr and began to venerate him as a saint. We have it on Bâbur’s testimony (cf. Bâbur-nâmâ, Eng. trans., 541, 478) that the queen-mother did not take the death of her son with good grace. Although generously treated by Bâbur, she plotted to poison him; but her plans miscarried and Bâbur was saved. The conquest of the last Lodi Sultan brought no peace for the local villagers, who looked upon the last Lodi Sultan as a martyr and began to venerate him as a saint. We have it on Bâbur’s testimony (cf. Bâbur-nâmâ, Eng. trans., 541, 478) that the queen-mother did not take the death of her son with good grace. Although generously treated by Bâbur, she plotted to poison him; but her plans miscarried and Bâbur was saved. The conquest of the last Lodi Sultan brought no peace for the local villagers, who looked upon the last Lodi Sultan as a martyr and began to venerate him as a saint.
IBRAHIM LODI — IBRAHIM MÜTEFERRİKA


IBRAHIM AL-MAWSİLİ, Abû Isḥāq, one of the greatest musicians and composers of the early ʿAbbāsid period, b. 125/742 in Kūfā, d. 188/804 in Baghdad. His father Māhān (a name which Ibrahim changed into Maṣūr) and his mother Dōḡhār hailed from Arḍajān in Pars, and had come in Baghdad. His father, his mother took him to her brothers, in whose care he was brought up, but he ran away because his relatives would not permit him to study music.

He went first to Mosul—hence his nisba al-Makki and Siyat and profited from Abi 'l-Dāwra patron of music. Here he met the musicians Fulayh b. Abi Ṭalib, who both later went over to Ibrahim b. Dāwra and his brother Layth, a Magian at Ubulla. Soon Ibrahim attracted the attention either of Muhammad b. Sulaymān b. ʿAll or of his brother ʿAll; shortly afterwards he was called to the court of the caliph al-Mahdī, a great patron of music. Here he met the musicians Fūlayh b. Abi Ṭalib and ʿAllāya b. ʿAllāya b. ʿAmr b. Bāna, who were both later forced to leave to Ibrahim. Ibrahim conquered himself by setting to music a poem which Abu ʿl-ʿAtībiya had composed not long before under similar circumstances. Yet Ibrahim remained all his life addicted to wine. When al-Mahdī became caliph in 165/785 he summoned Ibrahim and it was very generous to him. It is said that he received, besides his monthly remuneration of 10,000 dirhams, (Aghdnī, v, 154-58); Taʾrikh Baghādī, vi, 175-8; Fīrisṭī, 140: Ibn Khallīkān, no. 9; H. G. Farmer, History of Arab music, index; E. Neubauer, Musiker am Hofe der frühen Abbassiden, Frankfurt am Main, 1965, 182 f. (J. W. FOCK)

IBRAHIM MÜTEFERRİKA, Ottoman statesman, diplomat, founder of the first Turkish printing press, and a pioneer of reform policy, was born in Kolozsvar (Cluj) in Erdel (Transylvania) of Christian parents. His family name and his Christian name are not known. He was probably born between 1670 and 1674. So far no Ottoman source has been found which provides information on the Christian phase of his life; but on the basis of a statement made by the Catholic Hungarian nobleman Czézarnak de Saussure, who met Ibrahim in Turkey in 1732, when he was there in the company of Ferenc Rakóczı, Ibrahim is believed to have been educated at the college of Kolozsvar to become a Calvinist minister. In the light of this assumption Ibrahim has traditionally been represented as a Calvinist convert to Islam; but on the basis of the short auto-biographical account given by Ibrahim in his unpublished Risāle-i Islāmîyye (MS: Esad Ef. 1187), N. Berkes has concluded that Ibrahim was not a Calvinist but a Unitarian. Unitarianism was very strong in Transylvania at the time when Ibrahim was born. This is clearly shown by the fact that the Unitarian controlled Hüquqiy and were also supporting Transylvanian independence from the Habsburgs. With the termination of the Ottoman protection of Transylvania and of Unitarianism and the ascendency won by the Catholic church when the Habsburgs occupied Kolozsvar, the Transylvanian Unitarians were no longer allowed to study the works of Servetus and David. The belief that Ibrahim had been a Calvinist is probably due to the fact that during the years when he was a theological student the college where he studied belonged no more to the persecuted and clandestine Unitarians but had been given over to the Calvinists. Ibrahim relates in his treatise how he secretly studied anti-trinitarian texts (and possibly Servetus' Biblia Sacra) and realized that the coming of the Prophet Muhammad had been predicted in those parts of the Bible which had been purged or falsified by the upholders of the doctrine of the Trinity. He relates also how he attained hidāya, thus implying that he had been converted to Islam before he actually "turned Turk".

Cezârınak de Saussure again seems to be responsible for the origin of the traditional account of his conversion to Islam. According to this account, neither convincing in itself nor supported by any evidence coming from Ibrahim or from any other
original source, he was captured by Turkish troops during an encounter between Austrian and Turkish forces and later was sold as a slave; having fallen into the hands of a cruel master, and unable to expect that his poor relatives would ransom him, he performed turn Muslim. More probably, İbrahim fled from Habsburg rule in Transylvania and in 1691 joined the forces of Toköly Imre, who, in alliance with the Ottoman army, was fighting against the Habsburgs to procure his restoration in Transylvania. Toköly probably saw İbrahim as a liaison officer with the Turks. In fact, this remained his chief function in his subsequent career in the Turkish service.

How İbrahim acquired Ottoman and Muslim culture and whether or not he studied at the Enderûn [q.v.] is not known. But he seems to have been taken into Ottoman service and to have become a member of the bureaucracy, later receiving promotion. His Risâle-i İslâmîyye, written about ten years after his embracing Islam, is not a treatise written to defend Islam, as Karacson and others following him have claimed, but seems to have been written to prove the link between his early Unitarianism and his passage to Islam. It does not yet contain any idea of the need for reform in the Ottoman institutions, a theme to which he seems to have turned only later. On the contrary, the treatise is a passionate condemnation of Catholicism and of the temporal power of the Papacy. It also reiterates his firm belief in the eventual victory of Islam over the Catholic world, since Muhammad’s monotheistic Islam was destined to be a superior religion, whose coming was predicted by Jesus himself. The argument must have been appealing to the Ottomans, who had entered into the second phase of their struggle against the Catholic world.

İbrahim’s career in Ottoman service and his diplomatic work seem to have begun after the composition of this treatise. He was elevated to the position of permanent müfteferrika [q.v.], and became a special counsellor and envoy of the Ottoman Sultan. İbrahim seems to have abandoned his interest in religion and theology by the time he entered this service. He took part particularly in diplomatic negotiations with Prince Eugène. In 1128/1716 he served as the Ottoman commissioner with the Hungarians who were assembled in Belgrade to promote their struggle, supported by the Ottomans, for independence. In 1132/1720 he was appointed liaison officer to Prince Ferenc Rákóczi, who had come to Turkey in 1717 from France, and with French support, to wage a joint struggle against Austria. İbrahim seems to have occupied his position until Rákóczi’s death in 1735, although his function probably became merely honorary when Rákóczi’s activities came to an end following the failure of his attempts to arouse the support of the Hungarians under Habsburg rule. İbrahim continued to be sent with further diplomatic missions. In 1140/1727, when he was dispatched to the Palatinus of Kiev for negotiations in connexion with the Polish treaty; he was one of the promoters of a Turkish-French alliance against Austria and Russia during the years 1150-2/1737-9; in 1151/1738 he conducted negotiations on behalf of the Ottoman government and the anti-Austrian Hungarians for the surrender of the fortress of Orsova to the Ottoman forces. He also took an active part, together with the Comte de Bonneval [see ÅHMAD PASHA BONNEVAY] in promoting Turkish-Swedish cooperation against Russia. In 1156/1743 he was sent also to Dagestan on a diplomatic mission.

İbrahim’s fame in recent years relies less on his state service and diplomatic activities than on his major contributions to the Turkish intellectual and cultural awakening. He took a leading and active part in the attempts at reform initiated in the early part of the 12th/18th century. Following the Treaty of Passarowicz (1131/1719) the idea of introducing European military practices was born. İbrahim was probably one of those who not only promoted the idea but also supplied information which he had obtained from his observations. Very likely it was he who inspired the first memorandum given to Ahmed III arguing the necessity of military innovation and the employment of European officers to train the Ottoman army.

But the enterprise which has made his name memorable is his establishment of a Turkish printing press. The idea seems to have been in the air in 1719; and when Mehmed, known as Yirmisekiz Çelebi, was sent to France on a diplomatic mission, he is shown by French sources to have been already convinced of the necessity and the permissibility of the innovation. The Grand Vizier İbrahim Paşağa, Mehmed Çelebi, and the latter’s son Sa’dî Eldendi (later Pasha and also an envoy to France), and the Shaykh al-İslâm encouraged and supported İbrahim in opening the press and 1140/1727. In an essay entitled İlahi al-İjâba İbrahim made a plea for the enterprise with a brilliant exposition of the losses incurred by Islamic learning from the absence of the art of printing among the Muslims and of the great benefits its establishment would bring to the Muslims and to the future of the Ottoman state. He was not interested in printing theologically controversial writings and of the temporal powers of the “religious institution”. The alleged opposition to the opening of the printing press does not seem to have been motivated by religion but rather by the economic interests of copyists and calligraphers. İbrahim’s major interest in printing was still in line with his political and diplomatic career as well as with his interest in Islamic reform. The works he printed in his press were all related to secular matters, such as language, history, geography, and the natural and physical sciences [for details see MATBA A]. In addition to his pioneer work as a printer he was also an editor, a compiler, a translator, and a writer. He also prepared a number of maps, printed the majority of them, and prided himself on being a geographer and cartographer.

In 1144/1731 İbrahim wrote his Usâl al-İhâm fi nizâm al-ulum in order to show the causes of the decline of the Ottoman power in Europe before the Christian states, to describe the modern forms of government, their military methods and organization, and finally to propose ways to remove the existing aberrations of the Ottoman system and to reform them (printed Istanbul 1145/1732; Fr. tr. by Baron Reviczki, Traité de la tactique, Vienne 1769). He placed prime importance upon the use of modern sciences, particularly upon the knowledge derived from new geographical explorations and upon the importance of the use of intelligence information to be obtained about the conditions of the European nations and their military forces. If he was not the first to draw attention to the consequences of the geographical discoveries and of the encirclement of the Ottoman empire by sea power, he was certainly the first to warn the Ottoman authorities of the future consequences of the modernizing trend in
Russia under the leadership of Peter the Great. Ibrahim died in 1158/1745 and was buried in Ghiyasa.

**Bibliography:** a bibliography of the books printed at Ibrahim's press will be found under matba'a. On Ibrahim Muteferrika: Çeçen Arif, "Ibrahim Muteferrika's Printed Books," in "Libraries of the Ottoman Empire: A Selection of their Collections," ed. Ahmet Aydin (Istanbul, 1999). Muteferrika also established the first Ottoman press in 1744/1259, and his influence was instrumental in the development of modern Turkish printing. His works include a great many books, including the famous "Ibrahim's "Husn Al-Ishq," a love poem that is still popular today. Muteferrika's contributions to the arts and sciences were significant, and his legacy continues to inspire new generations of Turkish scholars and artists.
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IBRAHIM PASHA, the eldest son of Muhammad ʿAll [q.v.], general, and viceroy of Egypt. He is often described as Muhammad ʿAll's "adopted" son. Amina, a relative of his foster-father, the governor (تورک) of Kavalla in Macedonia, was certainly a divorced woman when Muhammad ʿAll married her in 1787, and it cannot be denied that Muhammad ʿAll had a certain preference for his son Ṭūsūn, who died on 28 September 1816; there was certainly also a rivalry between Ibrahim and Ṭūsūn. The year of his birth is decisive, however, and this is usually given as 1789 (but occasionally also as 1786). In the older authorities like Ḫaṭārī we find no hint that he was not Muhammad ʿAll's real son. When his position in Egypt had been somewhat secured, Muhammad ʿAll in 1805 sent for his two sons Ibrahim and Ṭūsūn, and in 1809 for his wife and the younger children, Ismāʾīl and two daughters. In 1806 Ibrahim was sent with the Kapudān Paşa to Istanbul as a hostage for the tribute promised by his father; after the departure of the English fleet from Alexandria in 1807 the Porte sent him back. In 1807 Ibrahim became deßferdâr. After the great massacre of the Mamluks in 1808, Ismaʿīl was sent by his father to Upper Egypt. He drove the remnants of the Mamluks into Nubia, subdued the Bedouins, and in the following years, Ibrahim Pasha took part in training the new troops (نیزد کاک) and in preparing the expedition. Ibrahim Paşa was sent to Sinnâr as commander-in-chief, and expedited the procurement of slaves and their transmission to Egypt. Falling ill with dysentery, he returned to Cairo early in 1822 (R. Hill, ʿIyāḥ i ʿl-ṣūdān 1820-1821, London 1959, 11-12).

In the following years, Ibrahim Paşa took part in training the new troops (سپاهی شهاد) and organizing the European army trained on the European model and ample supplies of war material, at the end of July 1824. The capture of Navarino and his entry into Tripolitsa practically brought the Peninsula under his control. February to April 1826 were devoted to the siege and capture of Missolonghi. After the intervention of the Great Powers had been rejected by the Porte and Muḥammad ʿAll, the naval battle of Navarino [q.v.] took place, in which, in October 1827, the greater part of the Egyptian-Turkish fleet was destroyed by the allied fleets of Great Britain, France and Russia, and finally Muḥammad ʿAll was forced by the British Admiral Codrington, who appeared before Alexandria, to recall his son and the Egyptian troops. Ibrahim arrived in Alexandria on 10 October 1828.

In 1831 Ibrahim Paşa was entrusted by his father with the conduct of the Syrian campaign. On 1 November he arrived with his troops in Palestine. After a six months' siege he obtained the surrender of ʿAkkâ, on 27 May 1832, after previously gaining victories over the Paşa of Tripoli and Aleppo on the plain of Zar'a south of Hims. Ibrahim's subsequent march march through Syria and Asia Minor was made possible by his victories over the advance guard of the Turkish army and his capture of Aleppo at Hims on 8-9 July, over the main Turkish army under Ḥusayn Paşa in the pass of Baylān at Alexandretta (29 July), and over the Turkish army under Raṣḥīd Paşa at ʿAyn Ṭaʿār (21 December). These victories showed the superiority of the Egyptian army, Ibrahim's skill as a leader, and the cleverness of his policy of uniting the various groups in Syria under one banner by the cry of "liberation from the Turkish yoke" and of winning to his side the influential Amir Baṣḥīr ʿĪṣā ibn Ṣāḥib of Lebanon. Ibrahim Paşa advanced as far as Kūtāh-āya. There in May 1833, not without pressure from the European powers, a treaty was signed between the Porte and Muḥammad ʿAll, by which Syria and Adana were ceded to the latter. Ibrahim received from the Sultan the title of muḥaṣṣal of Adana, and his father appointed him to administer the new territory. The application of a centralized administrative and bureaucratic control, which was Muḥammad ʿAll's instrument of government in Egypt, aroused the resentment of the diverse populations of Palestine, Lebanon and Syria (cf. W. R. Polk, The opening of south Lebanon, 1793-1840, Cambridge, Mass., 1963, 106-40). Sporadic but increasingly serious armed revolts broke out, provoked particularly by Ibrahim's measures of conscription and
of impounding arms. The enhanced status of the Christians alarmed the Muslims. The intervention of the powers, whose negotiations led to the Treaty of London (7 May 1840, the Quadruple Alliance), altered the situation. Hoping for support from the French, Muhammad 'Ali rejected the demand that he should evacuate Syria as far as 'Akka and confine himself to the hereditary pashalic of Egypt. No support was given to him, and the coast of Syria and Egypt were blockaded by the allied fleets. Ibrahim was in a difficult position between the forces which they landed and the hostile people of the Lebanon, who stirred up against him. After the capture of 'Akka by the British Admiral Napier and the latter's negotiations with Muhammad 'Ali in Alexandria, the latter was forced to agree to the evacuation of Syria on 22 November 1840. On 29 December, Ibrahim left Damascus with his troops and returned to Egypt via Qehazza, sending a portion of the army home via 'Akba under Sulayman Pasha.

In the years that followed, Ibrahim Pasha was mainly concerned with the administration of Egypt. His interest in and knowledge of agriculture is praised. He was several times in Europe, sometimes visiting watering-places to improve his health. Owing to his father's senility, Ibrahim formally assumed the governorship of Egypt on 2 September 1848, having received the sultan's firman some weeks earlier. He predeceased his father, however, on 10 November 1848, and was succeeded by his nephew, 'Abbâs Hilmi I [q.v.]. Through his son Ismâ'îl (reg. 1863-79) he was the progenitor of the former khedivial and royal family of Egypt.

**Bibliography:** No full-length study of Ibrahim Pasha has yet been made, and the primary sources for his career have not been systematically investigated. These include: (A) 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Djabarti, ʿAǧīzīb al-ʿalām (1920); (B) Archival materials, especially in Cairo and Istanbul (see P. M. Holt (ed.), Political and social change in modern Egypt, London 1968, 28-51). Selections of documents have been published: (i) on the Syrian phase by Asad H. Rustum in [anon.], Hurâb 'Ibrâhîm Bâghâ al-Mâni fi Sûrây wa ʿr-ʿAmdâlî, Cairo [1927], and A corpus of Arabic documents relating to the history of Syria under Mehmed Ali Pasha, Beirut 1929-34; (ii) from the archives of the European states on various phases of Muhammad 'All's rule in a series of volumes published under the auspices of King Fuâd I (see Précis de l'histoire d'Égypte par divers historiens et archéologues, iii, Cairo 1933, 375-6); (C) the writings of expatriates and travellers, many of whom were French (see Jean-Marie Carré, Voyageurs et écrivains français en Égypte, Cairo 1956, 169-323). Information on Ibrahim Pasha may be found scattered in numerous modern works concerned primarily with Muhammad 'Ali Pasha, of which the following are a selection: H. Dodwell, The founder of modern Egypt, Cambridge 1931; 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Râfî, ʿAbd Muhammad 'Ali, Cairo 1951; Helen Anne B. Revill, The agricultural policy of Muhammad 'Ali in Egypt, Cambridge, Mass., 1961.

Ottoman archive material is used by Şinasi Altundag, Kâtâl al-Mehmût Ali Pasha isyanı: Musî melesi 1832-1843, Ankara 1945.

For Ibrahim Pasha in Syria, see Asad J. Rustum, The royal archives of Egypt and the origins of the Egyptian expedition to Syria 1832-1842, Beirut 1936, and The royal archives of Egypt and the disturbances in Palestine, 1934, Beirut 1938.

**Ibrahim Pasha, Candarlı** [see Candarlı].

**Ibrahim Pasha, Damât, (?1010/1601), Ottoman Grand Vizier. Ibrahim Pasha, according to Peçevi (ii, 284), was of Bosnian origin. The Venetian sources refer to him as "di nazione schiavone" (Alberi, iii, 241-2, 367-8) or "di Chersego" (Alberi, iii, 432; cf. also Soranzo, 10: "nativo della Provincia di Herzezovina"). Perhaps the most exact indication is that of Minadoi, who describes Ibrahim Pasha (Historia, 266) as "di natione schiavone, del luogo detto Chiâncii, una breve giornata discosto da Ragusa". Minadoi obtained his information from "Crestoforo de Boni", who was interpreter to the Venetian consul in Syria, Giovanni Michele, and, like Ibrahim Pasha, a man of Slavonic descent from the region near Ragusa. De Boni had become acquainted with Ibrahim Pasha when the latter was operating against the Druzes of the Lebanon in 993/1585 (Minadoi, Historia, 277). As to the birth date of Ibrahim Pasha, no precise evidence would seem to be available. Minadoi (Historia, 266), writing not long before 1588 (the date of the first edition of his work), sets the age of Ibrahim Pasha at about thirty-two years. The statements made in the relazioni of the Venetian baili at Istanbul (Alberi, ii, 357 and iii, 290, 367-8, 432) suggest that Ibrahim Pasha was born circa 1550 A.D.

Ibrahim Pasha entered the imperial palace as a child of the devshirme [q.v.]. He rose to the office of râhîddâr and, on the accession to the throne of Murâd III in 982/1574, became silâhâdar and thereafter, in 988/1580, Agha of the Janissaries. He was made Beglerbeg of Rûmûl in 990/1582 and, while holding this appointment, had a large share in the organization of the festivities which Murâd III, in the summer of the same year, gave in order to celebrate the circumcision of his son, the future Mehemmed III. The year 990/1582 saw also the betrothal of Ibrahim Pasha to ʿÂyishâ, a daughter of Murâd III, and his advancement to the rank of vizier. Ibrahim Pasha was sent out in 991/1583 to become Beglerbeg of Mîşr (Egypt). On his return from Egypt through Syria in 993/1585 he undertook a campaign against the Druze chieftains of the Lebanon. Soon after his arrival in Istanbul—an event that he marked by a lavish presentation of gifts ("şâhîkeشت-ı aşım") to the Sultan—he received in marriage the princess ʿÂyishâ. The exact progression of Ibrahim Pasha in rank and in office during the next few years is not wholly clear. There is mention of him as fifth vizier (Venetian relazioni of 1583; Alberi, iii, 241), as fourth vizier in 994/1587 (Alberi, iii, 290), as fourth vizier (Venetian relazioni of 1585; Alberi, iii, 290) and as third vizier (Şolâkzâde, 609 —narrating events of 993/1585). The Venetian relazioni of 1585 also note that Ibrahim Pasha had been second vizier (cf. novani Moro (1590) in Alberi, iii, 367 and B. Anzoni I. senzo (1592) in Alberi, ii, 357).

Ibrahim, du. ng these years, s ved for a short while as Kapudâ, i.e., Hâg, an admiral of the Ottoman fleet (Mâdidâ Khâlîfâ, Tûfâb. -îhâr, 140; Danîs-
IBRAHIM PASHA, DÂMAD — IBRAHIM PASHA, KARA

The accession of Sultan Mehmed III in 1003/1956 brought İbrahim Pasha once more to the rank of second vizier (Hâdiji Khalîfa, Fedâiâlçe, i, 10). At this time the Ottoman empire was involved in the great war (1001-1015/1603-1606) with Austria. The departure of the Grand Vizier Ferhâd Pasha (q.v.) on a campaign against Wallachia in Şahbân 1003/April 1505 saw İbrahim Pasha, as second vizier, appointed to be Kâtîm-makâm of the Grand Vizier at Istanbul.

Oh the death of the Grand Vizier Kâğıtâ Sinân Pasha in Şahbân 1004/April 1506 İbrahim Pasha was raised to the Grand Vizierate. He was to hold the office for a little less than seven months. During this brief period of time the Ottomans captured from the Christians the important fortress of Eğri (q.v.), i.e., Eger (Erzûl) in Hungary (Muharram-Safar 1006/September-October 1506) and defeated the forces of the Emperor Rudolf II at the battle of Háç Ovasî (Mezö-Keresztes) fought in Rabî' I 1009/October 1506. After the battle Cîlçîlazâde Sinân Pasha (q.v.) was made Grand Vizier, but the office was bestowed once again on İbrahim Pasha a few weeks later in Rabî' II 1009/December 1506. He was dismissed, for the second time, from the Grand Vizierate in Rabî' I 1010/ November 1509 and re-appointed to it, for the third time, in Dümâdâ II 1007/January 1509, holding the office now until his death two and a half years later.

İbrahim Paşa, as Grand Vizier and as serdar, i.e., general-in-chief, took command of the Ottoman armies engaged in the Hungarian war. The campaign of 1008/1599 had amongst its main objectives the repair and strengthening of the frontier fortresses and to this end İbrahim Pasha not only conquered the local Hungarian population, which had suffered much in the course of the long war, to a more favourable attitude towards the Ottomans. İbrahim Paşa, having wintered at Belgrade, led his forces in 1009/1600 against the Christian fortress of Kanizsa (q.v.) and, after a short siege, accepted its surrender in Rabî' I 1009/ October 1600. This notable success marked, however, virtually the end of his career. He died at Zemun, near Belgrade, on 9 Muharram 1010/10 July 1601.

İbrahim Paşa is described in the sources as a man of handsome appearance (Alberî, iii, 242-2; Minados, 266: "bello di sembiani"), generous (Alberî, iii, 432), subtle of intellect, but deceitful (Alberî, iii, 290 — cf. also Pecêwî, ii, 229-231) and even "leggero di cervello e vario" (Alberî, ii, 357), not a sagacious figure nor apt for high command (Zeri, iii, 432: "non e riputato prudente, ne atto a supremo commando" —relazione of Matteo Zane, dated 1594) — though his undeniable success in the Hungarian campaigns of 1596, 1599 and 1600 would seem to call into doubt this last judgement of Matteo Zane.


V. J. PARRY

IBRAHIM PASHA, KARA, Ottoman Grand Vizier under Mehmed IV, was born in 1030/1620, in a village near Bayburt, of a Muslim family. He first appears as a levend (q.v.) serving under Abaza Hasan Pasha (q.v.); when Abaza Hasan's rebellion was crushed (1069/1658) he took service under a succession of prominent figures, firstly Firari Mus- tfâ Pasha and finally Kara Mustafa Pasha, whose kethâydâ he became. Helped by the Paşa's influence and enjoying the confidence of the Sultan he now began to rise rapidly in the service of the state. He was appointed firstly külük and then büyük mir- akbîr, in Rabî' I 1082/August 1671 (Râşîhî, i, 255); then when his patron Kara Mustafa became Grand Vizier (1087/1676) he himself was made third vizier (1088/1677), later second vizier (1089/1678), and then when the Sultan became Grand Vizier (1091/1684-5) in order to remove him from the court; but İbrahim immediately procured himself the further post of kâ'înmakâm to the Grand Vizier, thus ensuring his continued presence at the capital. The Grand Vizier succeeded in having him dismissed from both posts and demoted to fifth vizier (10 Shaw- wâl 1089/25 November 1678: the date given in Safine- tû 'l-vuzera, ed. Parmaksizoglu, Istanbul 1952, 39, is erroneous), but İbrahim’s influence over the Sultan was not weakened; he became successively fourth and third vizier, and, on the outbreak of the war with Austria, Kara Mustafa found it prudent to reinstate İbrahim's growing intimacy with the Sultan, had him appointed Kapûdan Paşa (17 Rabî'â 1088/13 November 1677) in order to remove him from the court; but İbrahim immediately procured himself the further post of kâ'înmakâm to the Grand Vizier, thus ensuring his continued presence at the capital. The Grand Vizier succeeded in having him dismissed from both posts and demoted to fifth vizier (10 Shawâl 1088/25 November 1678).
IOO2 IBRAHIM PASHA, KARA — IBRAHIM PASHA, NEVSHEHIRLI, favourite of Grand Vizier Ahmad III [q.v.], was born at Mısırhara (now Nevşehirli), the son of a certain Ali Ağa; since he is said to have been about 70 years old when he died in 1717, his birth may be dated to about 1647. In 1685 (so Rashid, ii, 6) he was dismissed. He asked permission to go on the Pilgrimage, but his enemies warned the Sultan that this was merely a cover for him to stir up trouble in Anatolia, by returning to the "Djelali" activities that had occupied his early years; his property was confiscated, he was exiled to Rhodes (Rabi‘ II 1097/March 1686), and he was soon after executed (Sha‘bān 1098/June 1687).

Bibliography: The two principal works for Kara İbrahim Paşa's career are Rashid (i, 290-293), and for his further career Abdi, Ankara (TTK) 1943. General histories: Hammer-Purgstall, vii, passim-, Zinkeisen, GOR, 129, 189, 50, pp. 906-8, where further references are given.
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Bibliography: The two principal works for Kara İbrahim Paşa's career are Rashid (i, 290-293), and for his further career Abdi, Ankara (TTK) 1943. General histories: Hammer-Purgstall, vii, passim-, Zinkeisen, GOR, 129, 189, 50, pp. 906-8, where further references are given.
IBRAHIM PASHA, NEVSHEHIRLI — (AL-)IBRAHIM


māni, 1, 123-4; ‘Uṣūl-māni, (1385-1400); Hadībat al-

wuzarā’, 29 II.

Studies: Ahmed Refik, Dāmād İbrahim Paşa, samālinda ʿUṣūl ve Nevşehir, in TOEM, xiv/3 (80) (1340), 155-85; Münir Aktepe, Dāmād İbrahim Paşa devrinde İle, in TD, iv/7-vii/9 (1953-4); idem, in TM, xi (1954), 130-35 (on "tulipomania"); idem, Pir Araştırma isyanı, 1730, Istanbul 1958 (with full bibl.); idem, Nushehirli Dāmād İbrahim Paşa’ya did iki va’ifiye, in TD, xi/15 (1960), 149-60; M. L. Shay, The Ottoman Empire from 1720 to 1734 as revealed in despatches of the Venetian Bashi (Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, xxvii/3), Urbana 1944. The above is an abridgement of the article Nushehirli İbrahim Paşa in IA, fasc. 92, 234-9 (with further bibliography in the text). (M. MUNIR AKTEPE)

IBRAHİM PEÇEWI [see PEÇEWI].

IBRİHİM ŞEH İŞIK, the third of the salṭūm al-ġarbār, the name given to the rulers of the state of Dijawnpur [q.v., regnant 804-44/1402-40]. He and his elder brother Muḥārak Şehār ‘Karanfūl’, whom he succeeded on the Dijawnpur throne, were the adopted sons of the eunuch Malār Malik Sarwar, the first sultan, and they are generally supposed to have been Habāshī [q.v.]. Ibrahimī succeeded to a kingdom of considerable extent, from Koyī (later ‘Aļgarf) and Hāwā [q.v.] in the west to Bihār and Tirhut [q.v.] in the east, an area of about the size of Austria. It was Ibrahimī who did most to make Dijawnpur the important state it became, both by force of arms and in the cultural sphere. He set his sights high, aiming at the capture of Dīhil itself, marching on it in 809/1407 and annexing Kannawād and Sambhal [q.v.] on the way, and was deterred from making a final assault on Dīhil only by the receipt of the news that Mūsā id-Dīhilī had marched to the aid of the Dīhil sultan. He was unsuccessful in his attacks on other possessions of the Dīhil sultanate, including Bayānā, south-west of Ağa, and Kalp [q.v.], which it is said that he misfortune to attack in 834/ 1431 just as al-Ḥakam Shaḥrī [q.v.] of Mālāwā had the same idea. From this time he intervened on several occasions in the affairs of the Bengal sultanate [q.v. in Supplement], according to one account of the Hindū usurper Rādājī Gānsēh to bring up his son in the Islamic faith with the support of the Pāndās ḡayḥā Ḋur Kūṭb al-ʿAlām [q.v.]; and on his invasion of Bengal in 836/1432 the Bengal sultan sought help from Timūr’s son Shaḥ Rūkh. He en-

forced order throughout his own dominions, and in spite of his failure to bring the Dijawnpur sultanate any fresh territories he was recognized as one of the wielder of the greatest power in northern India. His reign is especially distinguished for his great patronage of art and letters, which earned for Diawnpur the title of ‘Shīrāz of the east’; the liberal condi-

tions of his court attracted scholars and litterateurs from all over the Islamic world, and important liter-

ary works, as well as works in kalām and fikh, were produced in Dijawnpur. He grazed his capital with many fine buildings, of which the Afālā madrasā is the principal survivor (see Dijawnpur).

Bibliography: See Dijawnpur and Shahrkāids. (J. BURTON-PAGE)

IBRİHİM ŞEH İŞIK [see ŞEH İŞIK].

IBRİHİM AL-YAZIDĪ [see AL-YAZIDĪ].

(AL-) IBRİHİM, Muḥammad al-Beṣīr, Algerian reformist scholar and writer, born 13 Shaw-

wāl 1306/12 June 1889 at Bougie. He showed at an early age signs of great intelligence and his childhood and youth were spent in concentrated study. Already at the age of fourteen he had studied, at the school run by his uncle, Muḥammad al-Makki İbrahimī, the Kur'ān and the main classical literary and philo-

sophical works. In 1912, on his way to the Hijāz, he stayed for three months in Cairo, where he followed courses at al-ʿAzār and at the Dār al-Waʿīl-īrshād which Raṣūlī had just opened on the island of Rawdā. At Medina, Beṣīr İbrahimī pursued more advanced work in taṣfīr and in ḥadīth, began to study genealogies, and carried out research in public and private libraries. And it was at Medina that he be-

came the friend of Ibn Bādis [q.v.]. For three months the two young scholars devoted their attention to considering projects for religious reform and for the renewal of Arabic studies in Algeria.

After spending two years (1917-18) at Damascus as a professor at the Madrasa Sulṭāniyya, İbrahimī returned to Algeria, where he immediately set to work, with Ibn Bādis, to propagate reform and lay the foundations of an Arabic national culture. Their efforts led to the foundation of the Association of Algerian Muslim ‘Ulamā’ in 1931, to the organization of a system of free Arabic education, and to the formation of a reformist Arabic press (the principal organs of which were al-Shāhāb and al-Baṣīrī).

On the death of Ibn Bādis in April 1940, İbrahimī became the leader of the Algerian reformist move-

ment, to which he imparted (at least after the end of the Second World War) the character of a move-

ment pursuing nationalist aims. The claims he made for his people, over a period of about ten years, may be summarized under three headings: the separ-

ation of the Muslim religion from the state, the independence of the Muslim judicial system, and the official recognition of the Arabic language. He also worked ceaselessly for the spread of free education in Arabic, under the auspices of the Association of ‘Ulamā’.

In order to meet its constantly increasing educa-

tional obligations and to enable its best pupils to proceed to a higher education in Arabic, the Associa-

tion of ‘Ulamā’ sought financial and academic help from the other Arab countries, which led them to send the ḡayḥā İbrahimī on a mission to the East in order to carry out on the spot the necessary enquiries and negotiations (1952). He did not return to his own country until 1962.

During his stay in the East, İbrahimī acted as spokesman for Algeria conceived as an Arab and Muslim nation. He was also able to take part in the religious and intellectual life of the countries in which he stayed (Egypt, Syria, Irak, the Hijāz, Kuwait, Pakistan) and was finally recognized everywhere as one of the outstanding figures of contemporary Islam. In 1961 he was elected as an active member of the Cairo Academy of the Arabic Language.

On his return to Algeria, ḡayḥā İbrahimī lost the support of the first leaders of independent Algeria because of his political views, which were based on the Islamic principle of the żārīj [q.v.], and his advocacy of "a city of justice and liberty". He died in Algiers on 19 Muharram 1378/5/20 October 1959.

Beṣīr İbrahimī was, with Ibn Bādis and Taqīyīb
IBRAHIM, one of the chief architects of Muslim reformism in Algeria. A distinguished orator and writer, and a scholar in the traditional Islamic disciplines, he may be considered as one of the last great representatives of classical Arabic culture.

Ibrahim's works are quite substantial, but, apart from his editorials from al-Baṣira, collected under the title of 'Uyun al-Baṣira ( Cairo 1963, 693 pp.), they are still unpublished. They include (1) ten or so short works on linguistic questions (al-Tasmiya br-‘r-masdar; al-‘Silāf a‘lāf ‘alā faw‘al; al-Nukhbat wa-l-nufdydt; or terms of the form ‘al-wu‘ala; al-‘Irād al-wūl-huqūd; Babāyīa fi al-arba‘iyin; ‘l-lahājja al-‘aammiyya al-dājāriyya; Rīsīla fi maḥbāri al-burīs wa-l-faṣḥā bi ḥayw al-arba‘iyin wa-l-‘aammiyya; a supplement to treatises on verbs, amthul; etc.); (2) some religious studies (Hikmat maḥrūhiyya al-saḥābi li-s-Līlām; Shu‘ab al-‘Imām); (3) a play: Kitāb. (a) Kāhinān asrar (al-Lakāhen); (4) an immensely long urdūsā (36,000 verses). This "epic" (makhnāmeh), as it is described by the author, covers the history of Islam and of Algeria, as well as the various aspects of the social and religious life of the Muslim community of Algeria.


IBRAIL, from the Rumanian Brâila, town of Wallachia (Tarā Rūmānāsāc) on the left bank of the Danube, about 20 km. south of the point where it is joined by the Siret; an important trading town situated at the junction of several trade routes. In the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries, Brâila had connections with Brăilea in Transylvania and Lemberg in Poland. Its port was visited not only by boats from the commercial towns on the Danube but also by ships from the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. Even in the 10th/16th century, when the Bosphorus and the Black Sea were controlled by the Porte, an average of 70 or 80 ships anchored regularly there. During Mehemmed II's campaign against Vlad Tepeş, prince of Wallachia, an Ottoman fleet disembarked troops at Brâila (866/1462), but the town was not taken until Radu I (945/1538), following the campaign of Suleyman the Magnificent against Moldavia. Radu Paisie, prince of Wallachia, was obliged to surrender it to the Sultan (945/1538), who appropriated also a fairly extensive territory surrounding the town. Once Brâila had become part of the Ottoman Empire, its new masters concerned themselves with its organization. There exists a 18th/19th century collection of regulations covering various aspects of economic and social life, taxes, land laws, etc. Under the Ottomans Brâila became a centre of supplies from which products from Wallachia were sent to Istanbul. For three centuries its history merges with that of other Danube commercial ports annexed by the Ottomans: it became the main object of the Rumanian princes in their struggles against the Porte. In 582/1574, the Moldavian prince Ioan cel Cumplit burned the town but was unable to take the fortress. In Radu I (1003/March 1595), Mihai Viteazul of Wallachia, at war with the Porte, forced the garrison to capitulate, but his assassination caused Brâila to be returned to the Sultan. Prince Miheșuna, taking arms against the Sultan, occupied it for a brief period in 1069/1659. During the Russo-Turkish wars Brâila was taken and then returned again to the sultan. During a further war it was taken by the Russians on 6 June 1828 and finally ceded to Wallachia by the Treaty of Adrianople in 1830. It later became the centre of the activities of Bulgarian emigrants which paved the way for the independence of Bulgaria.


IBRI [see YAHUD].

IBRI, a town in Oman (‘Umān [q.v.]) in eastern Arabia. Ibrī is the capital of al-‘Zahir, the highland district stretching from the inland slopes of the mountain range of al-Hadjar westwards to the sands of al-Rub‘ al-Khali. The town lies in the great wadi coursing down from the mountains to the sands near the point where its name changes from Wādī al-Kabīr to Wādī al-'Ayn. Higher up in the wadi are the towns of al-Sharkīyyah and Djabal al-Kawr, beyond which one comes to Nazwa, until recently the capital of the Imamate of Oman. South of Brī are members of the tribe of Banu Hud; however, now have their headquarters in al-Hamra near Nazwa and al-Sharkīyyah, who trace their origin from the tribe of the Abar. The Qaisirīn, however, now have their headquarters in al-Hamra near Nazwa and al-Sharkīyyah, while the residents of Brī are the Banū ‘Amran, who constitute the strongest tribe. The nomads sell the famous camels of Oman and buy the products of local handicrafts and imports from abroad. Agriculture flourishes, with the date and fruit groves being...
perhaps the largest in Oman on the inland side of the mountains. Among the fruits are mangoes, peaches, apricots, quinces, bananas, oranges, pomegranates, plums, and grapes.

As the former district capital under the İbshi inmāte, İbri is said to have the biggest İbadi mosque in Oman. The town has also been occupied at times by Wahhābīs. In 1251/1836, when the British naval officers Wellsted and Whitelock approached İbri as the first Europeans to visit this region, the place was full of Wahhābīs and the travellers were forced to turn back. In 1375/1955 the British journalist J. Morris, who came to İbri in the train of Sa'ūd b. Taymūr, Sultan of Muscat, encountered none of the old xenophobia.

**Bibliography:** Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Sālimi, Nahdat al-a'yan bi-surriyyal 'Ummān, Cairo 1380; J. Wellsted, Travels in Arabia, London 1838; Admiralty, A handbook of Arabia, London 1918; J. Morris, Sultan in Oman, London 1957.

**İBRİSHI** (see İBARI).

**İBRİUH,** Sp. Ebro. Most writers in Arabic on the topography of Spain mention the river Ebro, but they are generally limited to the conventional information that it rises in the mountains of Nabarra or the Rūm, passes through Tudela (Tuṭšā) and Zaragoza (Sarākṣaṣa), and reaches the Mediterranean a little below Tortosa (Ṭurṭūṣa). The Muslims never controlled the headwaters of the Ebro and were consequently vague about them. The same is true of the Duero, to the extent that Zuhri states that the Ebro and Duero share a common source. Sometimes other riverin towns, as Calahorra (Kalāhurra), Mequinenza (Miknāsā), and Flix (Illiṣ), and affluents, as the Gállego (Duḷḷiṣ), Diliṣ, Diliḷ, Segre (Ṣiṣkār), and Cinca (Nahr al-Zaytūn), are mentioned. Both 'Abd al-Mun'īm al-Himyari and İbn Sa'ūd know the river for Ebro without giving its name. Babri is aware of the etymological connexion between İbria (İbāriya) and Ebro. Zuhri states that gold is found in it (without saying where) and adds the enigmatic information that for 100 miles, from Tudela to Mequinenza, and again from Flix to Tortosa, they employ lanterns (yata'anggan I-sar PNG) on the river bank.

As a former district capital, İbri is said to have the biggest İbadi mosque in Oman. The town has also been occupied at times by Wahhābīs. In 1251/1836, when the British naval officers Wellsted and Whitelock approached İbri as the first Europeans to visit this region, the place was full of Wahhābīs and the travellers were forced to turn back. In 1375/1955 the British journalist J. Morris, who came to İbri in the train of Sa'ūd b. Taymūr, Sultan of Muscat, encountered none of the old xenophobia.

**Bibliography:** Standard geographical writers s.v.; Zuhri, K. al-Diqāḥiyah, Algiers Bib. Nat. MS. no. 1532, ff. 43a, 51b, 68b (ed. M. Hadd-Sadok, in Bī'ir. Or., xxi (1968), index).

**İBİSHLI,** Bahā al-Dīn Abū 'l-Fāţīr Muḥam-mad b. Āḥmad b. Maḥṣur, Egyptian writer (790-after 850/1358-after 1446), a author of famous antho-logy. He was born in a village in the Fayyūm, Abshiyah (whence the reading al-İbshīhī for his nisba, which is also pronounced al-İbshaybīhī), but he lived most of his life at Mahāla al-kubrā or in the neigh-bouring small town of Naharrij. He went quite often to Cairo, where he was able to receive lessons from Djiläuft al-Dīn al-Bulbinkī, the son of the Shafi'i doctor of the same name (Brockelman, S II, 139). He is said to have had as a student al-İbīkBī' (ibid., 177), the opponent of İbn al-Fārij, and İbn Fahīd (ibid., 225). His reputation is based on the Mustafrafi fi kūl fann mustasraf, one of the most famous antho-logs of the 9th/15th century (more than ten eds., at Būlāk and Cairo; Fr. tr. G. Fl. Rat, Paris-Toulon 1902) but, according to al-Sakhlwī, Daw, vii, 109, he wrote also a work of edification entitled Awaḥkh al-İbshīhī links the various categories of Arabic literature to the oral and popular culture gives to his rather clumsy work the value of direct testimony. A Turkish translation (Istanbul 1261-3/1845-7) made by Ekmeklīzde Āḥmad, under the auspices of Mehmed Es'ad (İnâmzade), demonstrates the popularity which was enjoyed under modern times by a work which succeeded in assembling "in a brilliant style, Kur'ānic quotations, prophetic sentences, philological difficulties, comic anecdotes" (Turkish preface); a short treatise (1-29) by the translator refers to the fundamental values of Islam (the divine unity, the five pillars of worship, respect for the poor and for the saint).

The nisba al-Ibshihi belonged also to other persons: (2) an Egyptian Malīki jurist and man of
letters, Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Mūsā (834-987/1430-92). He owed his literary education to the Mālikī scholar Abū al-Yazīd al-Mu'ayyad, and his juridical education to the classical Mālikī writers: Abū Zayd, Sīdī Khalil, the Kādī 'Iyāḍ. He was an expert in Kūfī antigraphy, and may have been the pupil of Tāhir b. 'Arabshāh (Brockelmann, S II, 21). (2) A ʿAbd al-Mu'min ʿAbd al-Dīn Al-Bahādīrī, also known as Abū al-Yazīd al-Qā'im al-Wālī, who received his education to the classical Malīkī writers: Abu Zayd, Ali (d. 892/1487), who gained a certain fame for his scholarship and the many journeys he made. He was known also by the names of Ibn Harfūsh and Ibn Saḥābī. He had dealings with al-Sākhawī, who accused him of plagiarsim and of producing an unauthorized version of his work of hadīth, al-Makhdūd al-Bāṣanah (Brockelmann, S II, 31; Saḥābī, Dauv, i, 157).

**Bibliography:** Brockelmann, II, 56, S II, 55. (J.-C. Vadey)

---

**Iṣḥār Mustafā Pasha** [see Iṣḥār Mustafā Pasha].

**Ibtīdā**[^1], introduction, prologue, a term in rhetoric. In Kazwini’s Talḥīḥ al-misfakh (published under the title Maut al-talḥīḥ, Cairo n.d., 125 and 127), its extended version, the Īḍāh (ed. Muḥ. ʿAbd al-Mu'min Ḵᵛāḏqālī, vi, 145-50, 154), and the various works based on the Talḥīḥ, the ibtīdā is defined, along with the tahlīlīts, “transition” [q.v.], and the nasīḥa, “conclusion” [q.v.], as one of the three sections of the poem or composition which should receive particular attention and should conform to certain criteria of style and content. In the opening line of a poem complicated syntax should be avoided and the two hemistichs should be closely related in sense; in the case of a panegyric, it should not contain anything that could be interpreted as an evil omen or an improper allusion to the ruler or dignitary to whom the poem is addressed, etc. In poetry as well as in prose the author may earn distinction by observing the bardat al-īstihlāl, “the skilful opening”, by which is understood an introduction that contains an allusion to the main theme of the work.

This theory, in particular the reference to the bardat al-īstihlāl, reflects a tendency on the part of Kazwīnī and his followers to emphasize the importance of thematic unity and restrict the use of the conceptions of the ḥakīmat al-Ārbaʿ, the nadīma, etc. Of special interest are the chapters in Ibn Al-Ṭabīṣī’s al-Maṣḥal al-sāʿir (ed. Muḥ. Muḥyī l-Dīn ʿAbd al-Hamīd, ii, 235-58) and Ibn Ḥidjdī’s al-Kāsīma (Cairo 1304, 3-20), which give much attention to the ibtīdā in prose. In dealing with the Kūrān, some authors regard the letters found at the beginning of some surās as models of ibtīdā. For the ibtīdā in oratory see ḫutba. **Bibliography:** Ibn al-Muqaddas, K. al-Badīʿ, ed. Kratchkovsky, 75-77; Abū Ḥilāl al-ʿAskari, K. al-Sīnād al-sayyīd, Cairo 1952, 431-7; Ibn Ṛasīq, al-Umda, Cairo 1909, i, 145-50; Ibn Abī l-Īsba, Badīʿ al-ṣarār, ed. Hifī Mub. Sharāf, 64; Shams al-Dīn Muḥ. b. Kays al-Rāzī, al-Muṣāfah fī maṣādir asghār al-anjam, 378-9; Shurāb al-tahliḥīs, Cairo 1937, iv, 529-35, 543-7; Taftazānī, al-Sharḥ al-muṣawwaf, Istanbul 1330, 477-9, 482; Šuyūṭī, ʿUlūd al-dījmān, Cairo 1939, 172-3, 175; ʿAbbāsī, Maʿṣūḥī, Cairo 1457-8, iv, 224-48; Mehren, Die Rhetorik der Araber, 142-4; Rücker-Pertsch, Grammatik, Poetik und Rhetorik der Perser, 258, 358. See also Ṣawāw.[^2]

---

**Içil**[^3], mountainous province in southern Turkey, situated on the western spurs of the Taurus on the Mediterranean opposite Cyprus. The chief town is today the port of Mersin; its administrative districts are Mersin, Anamur, Gümüş, Mut, Silifke and Tarsus. The province is bordered to the north by the province of Konya, in the north-east by that of Niğde, in the east by Adana and in the west by Antalya. The main river is the Göksu [q.v.] (Kailyakdno/Sailep), which rises in the Bolkar Dağ and flows below Silifke into the Mediterranean.

In antiquity the borders of “Stony Cilicia” (as this territory, also called Isauria, was called to distinguish it from the neighbouring “Flat Cilicia”, i.e. the plain of Adana) were considered to be in the west the promontory of Korakesion (Alanya) in the east the valley of the Lamus (Lamas suyu). In the Byzantine period the territory formed, from the 9th century, a part of the military frontier against the Arabs under the name of Seleukeia. In the time of the Crusades the kingdom of Little Armenia fortified the towns there, among them Anamur, Sechín and Kelenderis on the coast and Ermenek [q.v.] and Lauzad inland. The Seljukus, under ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kaykāwûs I and especially under ʿAlī al-Dīn Kaykobād I, occupied by about 625/1228 the majority of these castles (many of them today are either without names or not yet identified) as far as Silifke, whose citadel Camardesium was occupied by the Knights of St. John. The newly-conquered “Seljuk-Armenia” was given the name of “Wilayat-i Arman”, the province was also called the “Wilayat of Kamar al-Dīn”, after its first Seljuk governor. The immigration of numerous Oğuz tribes soon made the “Province of Armanak” into a pronouncedly Turkish territory which, after the division of the Seljuk state belonging to the western half of Rûm, soon became the main territory of the Turkish princes of Karaman, who gradually succeeded in capturing all the fortresses (especially Ermenek and finally also the town of Silifke) from the Seljuks and the remaining Armenians and Crusaders. From this province as a centre, which, as the “inner part” of their principality, was called il-il (i), the Karamanids built up their dominion. There are references from the 8th/14th century to the Vasark-Türkmenens as being their neighbours and allies, among whom, in 853/1449-50, the militant Şafawid Şaykh Djuwān [q.v.] disseminated his propaganda (emirs: Ḥamza b. Kara ʿIsā, 837/1477; Uyuz Beg, circa 875/1470-80; ʿUyūsuf Beg Vasārak, governor of Kemākhs for Şah Ismāʿīl, fell in the battle of Câldırân [q.v.] in 920/1514). In Zeyne, a kasāba of Iç il, there died in 862/1457-8 the founder of the Samşândângi order, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn All. Il-iç also provided the Karamanids with a refuge when they came into conflict with the Ottomans from the end of the

---

[^1]: Enderun [q.v.]
[^2]: See also NAHW.
[^3]: See also IPSHIR
ICIL — ID AL-ADHA

8th/14th century. From 799/1397, and especially from the middle of the 9th/15th century, they retired often used as synonyms. It is not yet clear whether tash iil means originally "outside land" or "stone land"). Its last strongholds, the fortresses of Silifke, Ermenak and some others, recovered with the aid of the Crusaders under Mocenigo, did not fall to the Ottomans until after Mehemmed II's victory over Uzun Hasan, in the autumn of 878/1473. The Cypriots had lost in 852/1448 their last town on the mainland, and the Mamluks, to whom Alaya [see ALANYA] had belonged for some time from 830/1427, retreated from the coast of Icil in 888/1483, the district was allotted as a sandjak to the newly created Ottoman vilayet of Karaman, its administrative centre being Silifke. After the conquest of Cyprus in 979/1571, the Ottomans placed Icil under their new eyalet of Kibris, in which they resettled yursik [q.v.] from there. The district still contains remarks on the summer pastures of the Turkmen of Icil [Tohar, Küçük Cimen, Seki yaylaları]. The tribesfolk, among whom, as Faruk Sümer has shown, well-known Oguz tribal groups were to be identified, were still predominantly nomadic. During the efforts to sedentarize them, refractory yursik were again settled in Cyprus in 1124 and 1126/1712 and 1714. In the 18th century, the sandjak appears repeatedly as an arsalik [q.v.] of dismissed Grand Viziers. From 1831, Icil belonged to the eyalet of Adana. Evliya's itinerary, which still awaits detailed investigation, contains remarks on the summer pastures of the Türkmen of Icil [Tohar, Küçük Cimen, Seki yaylaları]. The tribesfolk, among whom, as Faruk Sümer has shown, well-known Oguz tribal groups were to be identified, were still predominantly nomadic. During the efforts to sedentarize them, refractory yursik were again settled in Cyprus in 1124 and 1126/1712 and 1714. In the 18th century, the sandjak appears repeatedly as an arsalik [q.v.] of dismissed Grand Viziers. From 1831, Icil belonged to the eyalet of Adana. Under the Republic Karamanogullari and Silifke (Şahbeddin Tekindag), with references to the geographical literature and to the Arabic, Persian and Turkish sources. (B. Flemming)

ICONOGRAPHY [see §6a].

ID, festival. The word is derived by the Arab lexicon from the root *soldi* and explained as "the (periodically) returning". But it is in fact one of those Aramaic loanwords which are particularly numerous in the domain of religion; cf. for example the Syriac *iddi* "festival, holiday".

The Muslim year has two canonical festivals, the *`id al-adha* [q.v.] or "sacrificial festival" on 10 Dhu 'l-Hijja and the *`id al-fitr* [q.v.] "festival of breaking the fast" on 1 Shawwal. The special legal regulations for these are dealt with in the following articles. Common to both festivals is the *salāt al-`idayn*, the festival of public prayer of the whole community, which is considered *sunna*. In many ways it has preserved older forms of the *salāt* than the whole community, or even the Friday *salāt* (although in other points it has come to resemble the latter) and in its general style much resembles the *salāt* for drought and eclipses. It consists only of two rak`as [q.v.] and contains several more *tāhkir* [q.v.] than the ordinary *salāt*. After it a *khawba* [q.v.] in two parts is delivered. It has no *adhan* [q.v.] and no *iḥāma* [q.v.]; as in the oldest times, the only summons to it is the words *al-salāt jiḏma* [q.v.]. It should be celebrated in the open air on the *musalla* [q.v.], which is still often done, though now mosques are frequently preferred. The time for its perfor-

mance is between sunset and the moment when the sun has reached its zenith.

At both festivals, which in practice last three or four days, *`id* clothes are on new or at least his best clothes; people visit, congratulate, and bestow presents on one another. The cemeteries are visited, and people stay in them for hours, sometimes spending the whole night in tents. These more popular practices are more usual at the *`id al-fitr* than at the *`id al-adha*; the festival of breaking the fast is much more joyfully celebrated because the hardships of Ramadan are over, so that at the present day the "minor festival" has in practice become of much greater importance than the "major festival".


*`ID AL-ADHA* (also called *`id al-kurban* or *`id al-nabir*) "sacrificial feast" or *`ID-AL-KABIR* "the major festival", in India barring *`id (bakra `id), in Turkey *bıyık bayram* or *kurban bayram*. It is celebrated on 10 Dhu 'l-Hijja, the day on which the pilgrims sacrifice in the valley of Minā [see *AL-NDHA*], also for all Muslims as a *sunna*. It becomes a necessary duty (*wajib* only by reason of a vow (*nadh*).

On the public prayer and the usages at the festival on this holiday see 'ID. Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned for the article 'IDn, the books of fikhi in the chapter on nushiya, (E. MITTWOCH) 'ID AL-FİTR, "festival of the breaking of the fast" or al-'id al-saghir "the minor festival", Turkish kılık bayram or şeker bayram, is the festival celebrated on ŞShawwal and the following days. If the Muslim has not paid the zakat al-fitr before the period of fasting, he is legally bound to do this on ŞShawwal at the latest and is recommended to do it before the public prayer (salât) which is celebrated on this day (see 'ID). As this festival marks the end of the hardships of the period of fasting, it is, although called the "minor", celebrated with much more festivity and rejoicing than the "major festival"; cf. 'IDn. Bibliography: The books of fikhi in the section al-kâtâ fi'l-fihib and the bibliography to the article 'IDn (E. MITTWOCH) 'AL-'IDAFA [see AL-ASTUR-LAB]. 'IDAFA, infinitive of the verb adâfa (iîâ) "to unite (with)", has become a term in Arabic grammar. In the Kitâb of Sibawayhi it has at first a very wide meaning: it is inserted into the theory of the di'arr (genitive) [the Kûfans say khafa] set out in Chapter 100. There we find: "al-Di'arr is found only in nouns that are muddâf ilâyhi, that is, "that have received an adjunction", the mu'dfâ being that which is "added". It is the idâfa, the fact of having united one term with another, that requires the di'arr (Mufassâl, § 110), but the "operator" of this putting into the di'arr, the 'âmi, is the harf al-di'arr (preposition), mu'rât (intended) (Ibn Ya'âshî, 304, lines 11-12; Şharî al-Kâfi'îa i, 256, line 3 a f), expressed or understood (mu'a'ddar). Thus the idâfa always implies a harf al-di'arr; as far as Sibawayhi is concerned, see his distinctions in Ch. 100. The theory of the di'arr sets idâfa within very wide boundaries: as soon as there is a noun in the genitive (ma'djârî), there is idâfa: marârî bi-sâydlîn, "I passed by Zayd"; the verb marârî (1st term: mu'dâfî) is linked, united with "Zayd" (and term: mu'dâf ilâyhi), and the instrument of this idâfa is the harf al-di'arr; the preposition bi- (see Sibawayhi, i, 178, lines 1-10). Note that Sibawayhi extended the idâfa even to the nisba: ii, Ch. 318; equally Ibn al-Sarrâjî, 126. The determination of one noun by another noun in the di'arr also comes into this framework: ghuulâmîn saydlîn, "Zayd's young slave": ghuulâmî (1st term: mu'dâfî) is linked, united with "Zayd" (and term: mu'dâf ilâyhi), and the instrument of this idâfa is a harf al-di'arr, mu'addâr, unexpressed, but leaving its trace: the di'arr of the mu'dâf ilâyhi. In fact, ghuulâmîn saydlîn is thought of as implying the harf al-di'arr: li-, which is present in: al-ghulâmîn 'l-ladîhîn bi-sâydlîn, "the young slave belonging to Zayd" (cf. Ibn Ya'âshî, 303, line 23). According to the context, the Arab grammarians assume the presence of: li, min or even fi. The latter case continued to be employed for the theory of the di'arr, e.g.: Mufassâl, § 110 and Ibn Ya'âshî, 303.4. In common usage the word was limited to expressing the relationship of the determining of one term by another term, the determinative complement (the Hebrew "construct state"). European grammars thus translate idâfa as: "annexation", as did S. de Sacy (Gr. Ar. *, Paris 1831, ii, § 235); the term was also listed by J. Marouzeau in the Lexique de la terminologie linguistique, 21. Arab grammarians called the determination by the determinative complement: idâfa ma'dhâ, "pure" (Ibn al-Sarrâjî, 60), idâfa ma'nâsiyya, "semantic" (Mufassâl, § 111; Ibn al-Hâjîjî, Şharî al-Kâfi'îa i, 252), idâfa ma'dhâ wa-ma'nâsiyya (Al'ifsiyya, verse 390), idâfa tâ'âbîyya, "true" (Ibn Ya'âshî, 305, line 12). It expresses different relationships: possession, material, etc. (see de Sacy, ibid., § 98-9, or W. Wright, Ar. Gr. 3, ii, § 76). The two terms, closely joined, cannot be separated one from another: the first term of the di'arr does not denote the determination: in the dual and the sound plural the terminations -ni, -na are omitted: the second term (al-μu'dâf ilâyhi) is in the di'arr, e.g.: Ibn 'un 'l-mâlîkî, "the son of the king", in the dual: ibnâ 'l-mâlîkî, "the sons of the king", and in the plural: banâ 'l-mâlîkî, "the sons of the king". Both are definite or indefinite together: ibn 'un 'l-mâlîkî, "the son of the king"; ibnâ 'l-mâlîkî, "a king's son". Semantically there is a difference: ta'sîfî in the first case, that is, the indication of a definite being; takhsîs in the second: the indication of the category of a given being (see, among others, Al-Durjîânî, Ta'sîfî, 18). This takhsîs can be (for us) the equivalent of an adjective, e.g.: himârî 'uqâdîn, "a wild ass", but this does not alter the character of the Arabic construction. Another idâfa also exists. One can say, with an adjective, al-radžûl 'l-hasan u 'l-hasan 'l-mâlîkî, "the man (or: a man) with a beautiful face"; one says more frequently (using the di'arr), in the same sense: al-radžûl 'l-hasan u 'l-wadîhlî, or radžûlîn 'l-mâlîkî, "a king's son". One can use an active participle (followed by the di'arr in place of the verbal construction with the na'b), e.g.: ba'shîkh 'wa-tî'î muštîmî 'l-ma'dâfî (Kur'ân, XXII, 56-33), "announce the good news... and to those that accomplished the prayers"; ... 'addîn bâlûqî 'l-kha'âshî (ibid., V, 96/95), ... a sacrificial beast that arrives at the Ka'bah". The second type requires the use of the di'arr; the Arab grammarians consequently included it in the idâfa, but they declared it ghâyr ma'dhâ, "impure" (Ibn al-Sarrâjî, 60), lafṣiyâ, "verbal, formal" (Mufassâl, § 111; Ibn al-Hâjîjî, Şharî al-Kâfi'îa i, 252; Al'ifsiyya, verse 390); it is a simple way of expressing the same sense metaphorically: la tâ'âfîl ilâm takhsîf 'l-lafṣî, as Ibn al-Hâjîjî says (Şharî al-Kâfi'îa, i, 256), and presupposes no harf al-di'arr; but what is its 'âmiî (see Şharî al-Kâfi'îa, i, 251, line 13 f). In Arabic this idâfa lafṣiyâ must be carefully distinguished from the true one: the construction contains an important difference: the first term, as we have seen, can take the article; in addition, the function is different: determination in the true idâfa, qualification in the lafṣiyâ, and, one must add, a limited qualification: radžûlîn 'l-mâlîkî, first a man is qualified by "beautiful", by the complement in the di'arr, then this beauty is limited, here, to the "face" (cf. Ibn Ya'âshî, 306, lines 20-2). The construction is important: with an adjective it is a normal method of description in Arabic. It is used in ancient Semitic. But, where Arabic distinguishes the two idâfas in grammatical construction, ancient Semitic uses the same method for both: the construct state, the genitival relationship (see C. Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, ii, Berlin 1913, § 171 f; for Hebrew, see, especially, P. JOIÔON, Grammaire de l'Hebrew biblique, Rome 1923, § 129 l).

The term ʿidafa (ʿidāfa) is used loosely in New Persian for the exclamatory particle -i (strictly hasra-ya ʿidāfa) which serves to connect a nominal form with a following determinative, be it descriptive, appositive, anaphoric or reflexive, 'the long (NP) thing of which the second component is made, or to thing of which the second component is compared: (i) TURKISH LANGUAGES.

The Turkish ʿidāfa construction (ʿidāfa terkihi) is made up of two components: (1) the governed noun (muṣaf sf.yeh) or complement element (muṣimmm, talaṣṣalim/talaṣṣalatun unsur); (2) the governing noun (muṣaf) or complemented element (talaṣṣalim unsur). In Turkish ʿidāfet, in contrast to the Arabic or Persian ʿidāfa, the governed noun regularly precedes the governing noun.

The Turkish ʿidāfa is based: (1) on the possessive relationship, and (2) on the qualifying relationship between two nouns.

The possessive ʿidāfa, which in modern Turkish grammars is referred to as iṣṭiklal grupjukhası (possessive group/annexation), iṣim talaṣṣalimlamamsı (noun annexation/complement), may be divided into two categories: (1) definite ʿidāfa (iṣiyinis ʿidāfa, beṣīris iṣim talaṣṣalimlamamsı); (2) indefinite ʿidāfa (iṣiyinis ʿidāfa, beṣīris iṣim talaṣṣalimlamamsı). The differences between the two categories are: (1) in the definite ʿidāfa the governed noun is placed into the genitive: bâhešmin ṣapsı 'the gate of the garden', in the indefinite ʿidāfa it stands in the indefinite (suffixless) case: bâheš ṣapsı 'garden-gate'; (2) as seen from the foregoing example, the definite ʿidāfa establishes a loose, temporary relationship between the components; in the indefinite ʿidāfa this relationship is close, permanent, similar to that of the components of a compound noun; (3) in the definite ʿidāfa both components keep their stress, while in the indefinite ʿidāfa only the first component is stressed. In both categories the governing noun takes the possessive suffix of the third person, except that if the first component is singular in number, the noun of the first or second person, the second component takes the possessive suffix of the first or second person: ben-im ev-im 'my house', sis-im ev-imis 'your house' (colloquially also benism ev, etc.).

In the qualifying ʿidāfa two nouns are juxtaposed without change. The first component indicates the thing of which the second component is made, or to the one of which it is compared: spîk gümîch 'slip shirt', çelik irade 'iron will'. In recent Turkish grammars this type of ʿidāfa is dealt with in the chapter on sfuat taksims (adjective annexation) or sfuat talaṣṣalamsı (adjective complement).

Syntactically the ʿidāfa construction is treated as a unity, declensional endings being added to the second component: miṣāridin sapta-sı 'the hat of the teacher', gül-2 (acc.) of the dative sg. miṣāridin 'in his hat, hat', taş köprü-den 'from the stone bridge'. The plural suffix can be added to the first component only in the possessive ʿidāfa: oğretmenler-in vazyeti 'the duty of the teachers' and oğretmenler klub-i 'teachers' club'. If meaning requires a further possessive suffix to be attached to the indefinite ʿidāfa, the first possessive suffix is dropped: para şanta-sı 'purse', para şanta-m 'my purse', para.


An *idda can be a component of another *idda contract: "without the university's permission, a newly married woman's husband may not give her a new *idda; she must be given the right to her former *idda before the present one is concluded."

Already in the Old Turkish inscriptions of the 8th century A.D. the whole system of *idda is developed, except that the genitive suffix is less frequently used today, and the possessive suffix in the indefinite is also often omitted: *sadda, *ba‘gina, *kahna, *shukri, *ważira, etc.


IDAM [see HAMD, WAĐI AL-].

IDAM [see kātī].

IDAR, name of a fortified town in northern Gudjrāt, 100 km. north-east of Ahmedābād, and of its surrounding territory, largely mountainous. The former ṛaḍās of Idrar were in the 8th/14th century a constant thorn in the flesh of the first governors in Gudjrāt of the Dhilli sultanate, and military action was almost always required to collect the tribute the governors exacted. After Gudjrāt became an independent sultanate Ahmad Shāh I was similarly troubled, and the strength of Idrar, so near his newly founded capital of Ahmedābād, was a cause for concern. He consequently built another new garrison town, Ahmdnagar (now called Hitnagar), some 20 km. below Idrar as a base of operations against it, and waged continuous warfare on the ṛaḍās from 829/1425 to 831/1428, when the ṛaḍās at last sought peace and promised tribute. The agreement was generally broken, however, and it was not until 831/1428, when the Idrar garrison was completely withdrawn, that Ahmad's son Muhammad I renewed the attack in 850/1446, on which occasion the ruler bought peace by giving Muhammad his daughter in marriage. In the reign of Muzaffar II the powerful Maharāna Sāngrām of Cītāwar had established a usurper on the throne of Idrar. Such interference in the affairs of a feudatory state could not be tolerated even by the mild Muzaffar, and the rightful heir was restored by a Gudjrāt army. Sāngrām was, however, incurred at insults offered to his name by the Gudjrātīs fawqīddār [q.v.] at Idrar, and raided the border towns, including Idrar, in 925/1519, before being defeated by a large Gudjrāt army and compelled to pay reparations.

In Mughal times there were often similar clashes at first between the Idrar rulers and the Mughal army commanders, who expelled the Hindu rulers from time to time; and in 984/1576 the ṛaḍās did not submit to the Mughal armies until defeated in pitched battle. After this, affairs quietened down, although in 1018-9/1609-10 we hear of the ṛaḍās of Idrar being called upon, under the usual agreement with tributary rulers, to furnish a contingent of 2000 horse for the defence of Gudjrāt against the depredations of the

Nizām Shāhī armies under Malik ‘Abnar. In later times, when the Mughal empire was breaking up and the province of Gudjrāt was under the sāhādār of the Mahārānās of Gudjrāt, the latter gave Idrar in debt to his brothers, establishing a new Rādırūt dynasty of rulers there. The later history of Idrar is not relevant to the affairs of Islam in India.

Bibliography: See GUDJRAT. For the history of Idrar state under the Marāthās, see Imperialis Gazetteer of India, xxii (1908), 352-5.

IDARA, the common name in modern Arabic, Persian, Turkish, etc. for administrative term appears to have acquired its technical signification during the period of European influence. Islamic administration is discussed in the articles on administrative departments and services (bāb-i-šāh, bāYT A-MĀL, BĀRT, DĪWĀN, DĪWĀN-I HUMĀYŪN, istifā’, kālam, SāNūN, RAWK, τΑΥΡΙΡ etc.); on officers and functionaries (‘AMĪL, ‘AMĪD, DAFTĀR, ṛAḌĀR, KĀNĪ, SĀĪNĀ, MUṢHIB, . . . MUṢI‘IF, MUSTAWF, RĀṬ, NĀRĪ, RĀṬ’s ADITT, wAKĪL, WĀṢĪTA, WĀZĪR, etc.); on scribes (kāTĪB) and civil servants (mā‘mūN); on administrative documents, records, and accounts (DAFTĀR, DIPLOMATIC, inŠĀM, MUḤĀSABA, RASĀ‘I, SĪDĪJ). Provincial administration is discussed in articles on officers (‘AMĪR, BEGLEGĪRI, kĀ’TIM-MĀRĀM, MUṢIR, MUṬAṢARRĪF, SĀNĐI–BEY, WĀLĪ, etc.) and on territorial sub-divisions (bA‘LET, kĀṢĪF, kūRĀ, NĀḤĪYA, niYĀBA, MAMĀLAKA, RUSTĀR, SĀNdI–D, TASSŪD, UṬRÀN, VILĀYET, etc.). On police matters see ‘ASAS, DARĪQA, SHIHNA, SHURTA; on the introduction of the modern apparatus of government, see HUKUMA, TANZĪMĀT. (ED.)

‘IDDA, from the verb ‘adda, "to count, enumerate" (days or menstruations), Arabic term for the duration of widowhood or, rather, the period of abstention from sexual relations imposed on a widow or a divorced woman, or a woman whose marriage has been annulled, before she may re-marry. In pre-Islamic Arabia the institution is thought to have been unknown with regard to a divorced woman. The Kur'ānic provisions on which it was based were not always respected during the early years of Islam (J. Schacht, Origins, 181) although at a very early date the jurists added conditions to the Islamic provisions on which it was based. In many sub-divisions of the ‘idda there should be added a third: childbirth. In fact the ‘idda of a woman who is pregnant at the time that the marriage is dissolved ends with her accouchement. We shall deal first with this case, which is the simplest.

(1) For a woman who is pregnant, whatever the reason for the ending of her marriage (the death of her husband, divorce, annulment), the ‘idda lasts until her accouchement and ends with it, even if it
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follows very closely after the end of the marriage. Scarcely any except the "Twelver" Shi'is and the Zaydis prolong the 'idda in the case of a widow only, beyond the accouchement until the expiry of the period of 4 months and 10 days stipulated by the Kur'an for all widows indiscriminately. They maintain that this period of delay is established not merely to avoid a confusion in establishing birth, but also out of respect for the memory of the deceased; they do not consider it fitting that a widow should be able to re-marry too soon after her husband's death merely because in the meantime she has given birth to a child.

(2) For widows who are not pregnant and for divorced women who are either too young to menstruate or who have reached the menopause, the 'idda is counted in months and days.

(a) A widow must observe a retreat of 4 months and 10 days after her husband's death. This figure, the reasons for the adoption of which are not very clear, is that which appears in the Kur'an (II, 234); widows are obliged to observe this retreat whether or not the marriage has been consummated and whether or not they have reached the age of puberty, the only condition being that the marriage has been validly concluded. Here again the idea of avoiding uncertainty of birth gives place to that of social and family propriety.

(b) Divorced women who are either too young or too old to menstruate are obliged to observe a retreat of three lunar months (Kur'an, LXV, 4).

(c) Divorced women and those whose marriage has been annulled and who are of menstruating age "shall wait by themselves for three kura'" (Kur'an, II, 226).

The word kura' (pl. of kura) in the Kur'anic text has given rise, from the beginning of Islam, to a controversy among the commentators. Some understand it to mean the inter-menstrual periods, or, according to their terminology, the periods of "purity" which come between those of menstruation. This was the opinion which prevailed in the Sha'abi and Maliki schools and among the Djaa'ari Shi'is. But the Hanafis, the Hanbalis and the Zaydis consider the word kura' to be synonymous with menstrual iddah or iddah (mara' al-wud'), that is, to the "waiting time". This is why the Hanafis have specified in the calculation of the duration of the 'idda, according to whether the word kura' is given the first or the second meaning.

Although widows are forced to abstain from sexual relations whatever the circumstances, i.e. even when their marriage has not been consummated, the law is different for divorced women and for those whose marriage has been annulled. Muslim law insists that they observe an 'idda only when the marriage has been consummated, and even, in Sha'abi law, truly consummated, this school rejecting the theory of khulwa in which consummation is presumed to have occurred if a husband and wife have been alone together in a place where it would have been possible for them to have had sexual intercourse. Since all the other schools admit the presumption of consummation, the question arose as to whether this presumption is an absolute one. According to the majority of Hanafi, Maliki and Hanbali writers, khulwa does not cause consummation to be presumed, and so does not involve an obligation to observe 'idda, except when there exists no insurmountable obstacle to the consummation, such as the emasculation of the husband or a vaginal occlusion in the wife.

The writers are always careful to mention the various hypotheses which lead successively from one method of calculation to the other. There is, for example, the case of the wife under the age of puberty who reaches puberty during the period of the 'idda, calculated in months; there is also that of the divorced woman whose divorce can still be revoked who becomes a widow during the 'idda, the marriage not having yet been finally dissolved; she is subject from the date of her husband's death to the retreat prescribed for widows.

It would be too long to list all the eventualities provided for. It should merely be mentioned that the woman who has been definitively divorced (bd'in) must always observe a period of retreat counted by menstruations, even if her husband happens to die during her retreat, since her widowhood then occurs after the dissolution of her marriage. It is only in a case where the divorce is pronounced in articulo mortis (mara' al-maudi) that the wife, whose right to the inheritance is then not lost, must observe the longer of the two periods of retreat.

(3) Date of commencement of the 'idda. When a marriage has been legally concluded, the 'idda begins from the moment the marriage ends, that is from the husband's death or from the pronouncing of the divorce, even if the wife does not know of it. Formerly (before the modern laws on the publicity which must be given to divorces) it sometimes happened that a wife did not know that she had been divorced. In such a case she might observe the whole of her 'ida without being aware of it. The annulment of a marriage on the other hand, or a husband's decision to separate himself from his wife for a particular reason, must be reported to the wife. In such a case it is from the moment that she hears of it that the 'idda begins.

(4) The 'idda calculated by menstrual or inter-menstrual periods gives rise to many practical difficulties which the jurists have not always been able to solve satisfactorily. These difficulties arise from the fact that, in the last resort, reliance has to be placed on the statements of the interested party herself. She might be tempted to lie, either in order to prolong the waiting period, claiming to have had no menstruation, or at least no third one, or, on the other hand, in order to shorten it by maintaining that her menstrual periods were very brief and came very close together. The first type of behaviour was particularly frequent among Hanafi populations. In fact, Hanafi law allows the irrevocably divorced woman (bd'in) to retain the whole of her nafaka (maintenance) throughout the period of her 'idda. This explains why those who had no prospect of re-marrying delayed in announcing the occurrence of the third menstrual period which, by concluding the 'idda, thus deprived them of all nafaka. It is only in modern legislation that this device is prevented by fixing a maximum period of one year, after which the wife, although still considered to be in retreat if she has not announced her third menstrual period, has nevertheless no longer the right to maintenance (Egypt, Sudan). Certain countries (Ottoman and Jordanian law, Syrian code) fix a definite maximum of nine months or a year to the retreat itself. Deception of this nature is much less frequent among the Sha'abis and the Maliks, who allow the bd'in divorced woman only the right to remain in the husband's house during the period of retreat, without any right to food or clothing—a fairly miserly concession which does not encourage them to prolong the period of their retreat.

Deception practised for the opposite reason, how-
ever, was foreseen by the classical writers. This is when a divorced woman, having already received another marriage, wishes to be married to a man, and her prospective husband will be discouraged by having to wait too long, pretends that the menstrual and inter-menstrual periods are shorter than they actually are. In Ḥanafi law (the opinion of Abū Ḥanīfa has prevailed on this matter) the 'idda may never be for a period of less than 60 days. The minima fixed by the other schools vary from 30 to 39 days. It should be noted in this connexion that in Mālikī law the woman's word alone is not sufficient, even though she adheres to the minimum of 30 days fixed by this school for the total of the three menstrual periods. In these circumstances she must be examined by two women.

(5) The 'idda for a female slave is governed by special rules, of which a brief indication is sufficient. A female slave who is merely a concubine must observe a period of retreat equal to one menstruation or of one month, according to whether she is or is not of menstruating age, commencing from the time when she becomes the property of a new master if he intends to have sexual relations with her, or if there occurs a change in her legal status. This is known as istiblā' [q.v.]. But a slave may well be married, in which case she must observe, in the same circumstances in which the 'idda is imposed on a free woman, a 'idda, the duration of which, by application of the "rule of the half-rate", should be half as long as that of a free woman. In other words, the 'idda of a slave who is a widow would last for two months and five days, and that of a divorced woman not of menstruating age for one and a half months. As it is not possible to halve the period of three menstruations which is insisted on for the divorced free woman, it was decided that the 'idda of a divorced slave who is of menstruating age should consist of two inter-menstrual periods (Ṣḥāfi'ī and Mālikī law) or of two menstruations (Ḥanafī and Ḥanbalī law), the only exception being an umm wulad, who as such is treated as a free woman.

(6) The rights and the obligations of a woman who is observing a 'idda vary according to whether she is a widow or a divorcée. A widow with no children has the right to full maintenance (nafaka), even if she is pregnant. On this point all the schools agree. There exists a case without children and a new marriage contract (nafaka) is necessary and the payment of a new dowry is necessary and the payment of a new dowry. This is the solution recognized by the majority of the schools; only the Mālikis and the Shāfi'is base their rule on a decision attributed to the caliph Ṣa'īd (but which he is said to have reversed), state that after a marriage has become null and void and being entered into during a not yet completed 'idda, the wife "is to be eternally forbidden" to the second husband.

(8) Modern legal codes, from the Ottoman Family Law of 1917 to the Iraqi Code of Personal Status of 1959, have devoted much attention to the institution of the 'idda, but without departing significantly from the principles of classical Muslim law. All of them have preserved the two Kur'ānic waiting periods: 4 months and ten days for a widow and 3 menstrual or inter-menstrual periods for a divorced woman of menstruating age, except that in the Tunisian Code of Personal Status (art. 35) the three menstruations have been replaced by a fixed period of three months. The few modifications made to the classical law (particularly by the Ḥanafī countries) are concerned with the calculating of the duration of the 'idda by menstruations. They tend to fix a maximum and a
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minimum period within which the three menstruations of the wife must occur. It is thus that it is laid down by the Ottoman law of 1917 (art. 140) and the Jordanian law of 1937 (art. 102) that the ‘idda may not be prolonged beyond nine months. In Egypt, the Sudan, and finally in Syria, they have preferred not to fix a maximum limit to the ‘idda of the divorced woman who is of menstruating age, while stipulating nevertheless that she may not claim maintenance for longer than twelve months (Egyptian Law no. 20 of 1929, art. 17; Sudanese Judicial Circular no. 28 of 1927, art. 64, and the Code Statut civil of 1928, art. 84), for longer than nine months, after the ending of the marriage. The effect of these measures has been to put an end in practice to the abuse of the law by certain divorced women claiming to have had no menstruation for many years in order to continue to receive maintenance. In some countries the minimum duration of the ‘idda, calculated in menstruations, has been fixed at three months.

**Bibliography:** The subject is always given a separate chapter in the great treatises of fikih. There may be consulted, for ‘Hafani law, Zayla'i, Tabyin al-hab'a, Cairo 1911, ii, 26-38; for Shafi'i law, Shiraz, Al-Muhammadi (ed. Halabi), ii, 142-55; for Maliki law, Dardir Dashtii, Al-Sharh al-kabir (ed. Halabi), ii, 468-502; and the exhaustive study in comparative law by Ibn Kudama, Al-Muf., iii, 468-88. For Shafi'i law, see Syed Ameri Ali, Al-Muhammedan Law, Calcutta 1928, 340, 353-4. A good summary of the subject is presented in Kuduri, Muhkasar, tr. Bercher and Bousquet, Le Statut personnel en droit musulman, 156 ff. For the law previous to the formation of the juridical schools, see J. Schacht, The origins of Muhammadan jurisprudence, 185, 197-9, 215-6; Y. Linant de Bellefonds, Traité de droit musulman comparé, Paris-The Hague 1965, ii, nos. 712 to 721 and 880 to 885. See also talak. (Y. Linant de Bellefonds)

**IDFÜ** [see **ADFÜ**]

**IDGHÁM** (idghâm), infinitive of the verb adghâm "to make (a thing) enter (another)"; in Arabic grammar: al-idghâm izza'h harf 'a harf, "idghâm is making a harf enter a harf" (L.A., xvii, 298), and: in the Shafi'i school: *idghâm* = 'l-harf and *idghâmuth*, according to the pattern *sawālah* (ibid.). whence the use of idghâm and *idghâm* in the same sense; the first is a term of the Kufans, the second of the Basrans (Ibn Yaqi'n, 1456, 156 ff; see also Talâk).

The Arab grammarians distinguish: *idghâm al-mithlâyin*, *idghâm al-mutakhârbiyyân*. The contraction of two consonants into one is a preliminary to the law of *idghâm*, as preliminary to it:

in a dislike of repeating the same consonant consecutively when the separator is a short vowel. Sibawayh speaks clearly on this subject (ii, Ch. 408, § 735); texts cited and translated in Etudes de Phonétique arabe, in MUSJ, xxvii (1949-50), 258, and *Traité de philologie arabe, i, § 503*; in this ginate (harf muta'ddadda), the Arab grammarians recognize a duality of harfs and not single one harf (that we should call long; see *Traité, § 4*); for the doctrine of Radî al-Dîn al-Astarabâdî, see *Sh.Sh., iii, 233*, lines 12-3 and 16. In vocalization of texts the harf muta'ddadda receives the sign *shaddâ* or *shâdâ* (W. Wright, *Ar. Gr.*, i, 140).

The Arab grammarians see the cause of *idghâm* in the duality of repeating the same consonant consecutively when the separator is a short vowel. Sibawayh speaks clearly on this subject (ii, Ch. 408, § 735); texts cited and translated in Etudes de Phonétique arabe, in MUSJ, xxvii (1949-50), 258, and *Traité de philologie arabe, i, § 503*; in this ginate (harf muta'ddadda), the Arab grammarians recognize a duality of harfs and not single one harf (that we should call long; see *Traité, § 4*); for the doctrine of Radî al-Dîn al-Astarabâdî, see *Sh.Sh., iii, 233*, lines 12-3 and 16. In vocalization of texts the harf muta'ddadda receives the sign *shaddâ* or *shâdâ* (W. Wright, *Ar. Gr.*, i, 140).

The Arab grammarians see the cause of *idghâm*...
word and in *infis'il* and *iddighâm al-mutakdribayn* in the case of *infis'il*, the *i* of the form *iftâala* broadcast as *iddighâm* (*Muṣn.*, § 733; see Ibn Ya'qîb, 1458, lines 4-6).

2). *iddígâm, iddíghâm*; the Arabic word, without vocalization, can be read in either way; the verbs *adghâma* and *iddaghama* can also be read in either way in all their "tenses", when unvocalized. How can one distinguish, in editions, the first, original vocalization from that which is due to the initiative of the editor? The edition of the *Kûbâb* (Paris) vocates *Lâb* for *iddghâm* (ll. 452); was this Siba'wîhî's pronunciation?

**Bibliography:** in the text; works cited in abbreviation: Sibawayh, *Kûbâb*, ed. Paris 1884-5; *Muṣn.*, Zamakhshârî, *Mu'fassal*, ed. J. P. Broch (Christiania 1879) and *Sharh* of Ibn Ya'qîb, ed. G. Jahn (Leipzig 1882); *Sha-Sh.*, Radî al-Dîn al-Asrârâbghî, *Sharh al-Shâfi'ya* (Cairo 1358/1939). The easiest account to consult is that of the *Muṣn.*: § 732 for the conditions of *iddighâm* and § 735 f. (with the corresponding commentary of Ibn Ya'qîb). Strâîrî, at the end of the *Sharh* of the *Kûbâb*, adds two chapters, one on the *iddighâm* of the Kûfâns (he gives phonetic terms peculiar to al-Farrâbî), and the other on the *iddighâm* of the *Kûrâ*: *H.* (H. Fleisch) *IDHâ'A*, modern Arabic term for "broadcasting" (*broadcastâr = muḥdhâr*, microphone = *miṣhtâr*).

Broadcasting in the Islamic world was inaugurated in Turkey in 1925, three years after the establishment of regular transmissions from London. In most Islamic lands however its growth was delayed by their dependent political and under-developed economic status. In Egypt, for example, broadcasting began in 1934 and at the time of the 1932 revolution its output was only 15 hours daily, with a total transmitting power of 73 KW. With the subsequent upsurge of national sentiment and economic development it rose by 1966 to 130 hours daily with a transmitting power of nearly 6,000 KW (statement by Deputy Premier for Guidance and Culture in *al-Idhâ'a wa'l-Talâfisîyôn*, 28 March 1966). In 1964 Turkey was again an innovator in the Islamic world when she set up an independent Broadcasting Corporation subject to direct government control. This Corporation was financed by licences and advertising, but deficits were underwritten by the government. Elsewhere in the Islamic world broadcasting output was under direct government control, many hours being dedicated to the exposition of government policy, official statements, and verbatim reports of speeches by the Leader. Long recordings were broadcast of the trial of the leaders of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt in 1954-5 and of that of former ministers in Iraq in 1958-9; the session of sentencing in November 1958 was relayed "live", as were the opening and closing sessions of Subandrio's trial in Indonesia in 1966. Though advertising on the air is permitted in many countries, underdevelopment makes it a less valuable source of revenue than in Europe or America. The main broadcasting categories are the same as elsewhere. The *Kûrâ* plays a great role in religious broadcasting, and in the UAR continuous recitation from 4-9 hrs. and from 12-21 hrs. was introduced in April 1964. Friday services are also broadcast, and religious talks and recitations, particularly in Ramadân. In Saudi Arabia broadcasting was long limited almost entirely to news and instructive and religious talks. States with large Christian minorities broadcast occasional Christian services. The

UAR, Turkey, and some other countries have cultural programmes adapted to differing intellectual levels. Standards of news broadcasts are related to those of the local press and news agencies; those of light entertainment to the existence of a cinema industry.

Many Muslim lands consist of vast territories in which the population is concentrated in limited areas, widely separated by tracts of desert or, in the case of Indonesia, by sea. Illiteracy is in general high, and in many cases independent nationhood is a recent acquisition. Broadcasting is thus exceptionally valuable on account of its diffusing information and ideas, creating a common national spirit, and spreading an educated form of speech. But the geographical characteristics at the same time necessitate an exceptionally heavy capital expenditure to ensure the clear reception which is essential for effective broadcasting. In Indonesia a network of regional stations, carrying their own programmes, has been set up, but in general the organization is highly centralized. The density of listening sets was enormously increased in the decade from 1955 to 1965 by the introduction of transistor sets. In the Middle East, which is predominantly Muslim, sets were estimated by the BBC (*Handbook*, 1967) to have risen in that period from two to twelve million—roughly one to every ten of the population. In the South Asian Muslim world the figure was far lower.

Most Muslim states cater for their national minorities in the minority language concerned; as Iraq for Kurds; Iran for Turcomans, Assyrians, Armenians, Kurds, Azerbajhanis and Arabs in Ahwaz; Morocco and Algeria for Berbers. Mali broadcasts in French, Bambara, Sonraie, Peul, Sarakole, Wolof, Tamachech (Tuareg Berber), and Hassani Arabic. Most cater also for resident foreign minorities, as the UAR for English, French, Germans, Italians, and Greeks. Some also direct broadcasts in the home language to their nationals abroad; as Lebanon to South America and West Africa, Jordan to South America, and the Turks to their emigrant workers in Germany.

Where a language is being modernized or given a more national flavour, as with Turkish and Urdu, broadcasting has a special importance; and in the Arab world for spreading a universally used form of Arabic.

Most Muslim states direct broadcasts, in the language of the people addressed, to one or more great powers directly concerned with the area and to neighbouring states. To be successful, such broadcasting involves heavy expense for the engagement of suitable, probably foreign, staff, and for powerful transmitters and if possible medium relay stations. Standards of language and content must rival those of the receiving country and, to be politically effective, the ideas expressed must appeal to at least a significant section of the population. Where these conditions are fulfilled, and only then, broadcast campaigns have effectively stimulated latent popular feeling. Radio warfare has been waged between Indonesia and Malaysia, and between the UAR and Iran. It has occurred frequently within the Arab world, where it is facilitated by the common language. It took place between Morocco and Algeria during the fighting in autumn 1963, but the most frequent protagonist has been the UAR, with its powerful transmitters, its developed news services, its relatively developed culture and, in the political field, the appeal of its pan-Arab and socialist policies to an important section in every Arab state. The UAR
in fact comes sixth in the list of external broadcasters with 589 hours weekly in some 30 languages, including African. This compares with 1,381 hours from the USSR; 909 from the Voice of America; and 663, in about 40 languages, from the BBC. Iran, apart from local languages, broadcasts in Russian, French, English, Urdu, Turkish and Arabic. Pakistan and Turkey each broadcast in twelve or more languages. Of lesser powers, Somalia after acquiring two 50 KW transmitters from the USSR in 1960, three years after independence, set out "to make its voice heard in the world" with six hours of daily transmission in Somali; 1 hour in English; and 1 hour each in Italian, Amharic and Swahili; 10 minutes in Galla, and occasional broadcasts in Dinka.

The example of broadcasting from abroad to Islamic lands was set by the great powers, just before and during the second world war. The Italian Fascist régime introduced broadcasting in Arabic in 1933. Great Britain did the same in 1938 and Nazi Germany in mid-1938; the latter specialized in scurrilous and violent propaganda. Later the USA and, in 1943, the USSR added their voices. Broadcasts in Arabic from Paris began before 1939; they include dialect transmissions for Algerians in France. Those for overseas reached their maximum during the Algerian fighting, after France ceased to control local broadcasting in other Arabic-speaking countries of North Africa. Later they were much reduced. By 1966, 45 states, Muslim and non-Muslim, were directing broadcasts in Arabic to Arab countries; 20 in Persian to Iran; 17 in Indonesian to Indonesia. The BBC alone broadcast for 12 hours daily in Arabic (ten from April 1967) and received some 80,000 letters from Arab listeners in the course of that year. The first Arab state seriously to organize external broadcasting was Syria, under the Shishakli régime (1930-4). Syria and the UAR introduced Hebrew broadcasts to Israel, which in turn broadcast in Arabic to the Arab countries and to its Arab minority and to its neighbours.

Professedly indigenous clandestine stations come and go, particularly during crises. A few have been genuine, but in general they have been directed from abroad by communist, Western or outside Muslim states. The cost of installing and producing television has limited its introduction in the Muslim world, though in Asia, and in Africa north of the Sahara, most Muslim states had by 1966 at least some service, and many encouraged the purchase of sets by customs remissions or other means. Except in the UAR the service was virtually restricted to the capital or a few large cities. In Iran private companies supported by advertising revenue provided services in Teheran and many large cities. In Iran private companies supported by advertising revenue provided services in Teheran and many large cities.

When the Arabs invaded al-Ahwaz in 1763, they penetrated via Ramhurmuz to Idhadj and made peace with the local lord, Tirawayh, leaving him in possession of power. But the town had to be conquered again in 21/642 after the battle of Nihâwand, and in 26/647-8 a rising of the people of Idhadj and the local Khurrazadh and other. By the end of the second millenium B.C. (see the detailed description of pre-Islamic antiquities by M. Streck in E.P., s.v. Mål-AMr). In Sâsâni times, the district was included in the territories of the Islamic world, the Arabic-speaking countries of the urban south. Conquered by the caliph al-Muwaffak in 298/910, and by the governor of Idhadj, Ahmad b. Dinar, to reinforce al-Muwaffak's army for the final assault on the Byzantine capital of Constantia. The town was destroyed in 312/925, though partly rebuilt in the 12th century, and though reckoned by the geographers to be in the warm or hot zone, the nearby mountains gave it a pleasant and healthy climate; the winter snow from these mountains was gathered and exported from Idhadj to the torrid, low-lying parts of al-Ahwâz (cf. Mukâaddasî, 414; Yâkût, Buldân, i, 416; Mustawfî, Nushai al-hâlíû, tr. Le Strange, 74). The district was also frequently subject to earthquakes.

Idhadj (the vocalisation Aydhadj is also found) was a populous and prosperous place in pre-Islamic times. There are many Elamite remains in the vicinity, mostly dating from the end of the second millennium B.C. (see the detailed description of pre-Islamic antiquities by M. Streck in E.P., s.v. Mål-AMr). In Sâsâni times, the district was included in the territories of the Islamic world, the Arabic-speaking countries of the urban south. Conquered by the caliph al-Muwaffak in 298/910, and by the governor of Idhadj, Ahmad b. Dinar, to reinforce al-Muwaffak's army for the final assault on the Byzantine capital of Constantia. The town was destroyed in 312/925, though partly rebuilt in the 12th century, and though reckoned by the geographers to be in the warm or hot zone, the nearby mountains gave it a pleasant and healthy climate; the winter snow from these mountains was gathered and exported from Idhadj to the torrid, low-lying parts of al-Ahwâz (cf. Mukâaddasî, 414; Yâkût, Buldân, i, 416; Mustawfî, Nushai al-hâlíû, tr. Le Strange, 74). The district was also frequently subject to earthquakes.
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Dulaf; the same in Kazwini, *Ālār al-bilād*, ii, 201). *Idhadj* seems to have flourished in Buyid times, and the near by the town of Sūsan were the winter residences of the Hazaraspids, their *yāyālāk* or summer-quarters being further to the north on the upper Zanda Rūd and the Kārūn headwaters. It is at this time that the name for *Iḍhadj* of Māl-Amīr or Māl-i Amīr “the Amir’s property” comes into use, and gradually replaces the older designation. The newer term may be connected with the residence there of the Hazaraspids, as is probably the name of the *Iḍhadj*-Iṣfahān road, *Ḍadda-yi Atābeg* “the Atābeg’s road”, in use till modern times. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa passed through the town twice in the course of his travels, once in 727/1327, during the reign of the Atābeg Ṣūrāṭ al-Dīn Āḥmad, and again in 748/1347, during the reign of Muzaffar al-Dīn Ahrāsīyāb II b. Āḥmad. He praises Āḥmad’s piety and asceticism, and says that he built 400 hospitals for travellers in his territories, of which 44 were in the capital *Iḍhadj* or Māl-al-Amīr (he uses both these names); Ahrāsīyāb, on the other hand, was a drunkard (*Travels*, ii, 30-42, tr. Gibb, ii, 287-94).

The Timūrid ʿAbūr b. ʿAbd al-Rūkh *q.v.* ended the line of Atābegs in 827/1423, and the region of Māl-al-Amīr fell into the hands of Baḥātīyārī chieftains. The town itself now became deserted and drops out of history, but its site is marked by a large mound and several lesser ones (see Jéquier, *Description du site de Mālamir*, in *Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse*, Paris 1901, iii, 1, 133-43).

The district of *Iḍhadj* was agriculturally prosperous during mediaeval Islamic times, since there was a fair rainfall and dry-farming was possible. Its specialities included grapes, citrus fruits, melons, pistachios and the variety of cardamom whose juice was used as a remedy for gout. The existence of many mines is mentioned by Kazwini, but of the granites of Khurasan, and even, it is said, the famous *Iznik* *al-maḥd* for them, for example, the acceptance of a gift free of encumbrances. They have not the power, even if authorized (by the minor’s guardian), to conclude transactions which involve a definite loss (*al-tasarrufūf al-ḍarrā al-maḥd*). The most typical example of these completely forbidden transactions is that of making gifts. There remain the legal transactions which are as likely to bring a loss as a gain. This category includes the majority of contracts dealing with their patrimony: selling, renting, loan, etc. In these cases the *wāli* in the case of a minor, or the judge in that of a spendthrift, must intervene.

Their intervention is envisaged by the Ḥanafī *fākhabā*, and also by the Mālikīs, as occurring after the transaction, according to the principle *al-idḍa* *fi ′l-iṭtaḥda* ka *fi ′l-iḥtibād* (Sarakḥī, *Mabūsī*, xxiv, 182), “ratification afterwards is equal to authorization beforehand”. But there is nothing, theoretically, which forbids the guardian or the judge to grant his authorization in advance, or at the same time as the transaction is concluded by the incapable person. When the usual procedure of ratification afterwards is followed, the transaction, before the approval of the guardian or the judge has been given, is considered to be *maḥkūf*, “in suspense”, neither invalid nor truly valid; it can only be made fully effective by ratification. The Shāfīʿīs do not permit semi-incapable persons to complete such transactions (sales, renting, etc.), which are the exclusive province of the *wāli*. They consider that these transactions can be neither authorized nor ratified; they must be concluded by the guardian himself on behalf of the minor. The Ḥanbalīs reject the process of ratification afterwards and insist on prior authorization if a *wāli* allows a minor to carry out a transaction which he is capable of carrying out himself.

(b) A minor who is no longer a child (except in Shāfīʿī law), and also a slave, may be authorized to take part in a commercial transaction; he then becomes *maʿṭāsh*: *al-bgir al-maʿṭāsh* or *al-adʿ al-maʿṭāsh*. In this case the authorization is necessary, given beforehand. It is very rarely given express but usually tacitly, when the *wāli* or the master allows the minor or the slave to trade without raising any objection. The early *fākhabā* questioned the regularity of such acts, and considered that this authorization was not valid, in that in such cases the slave was merely a virtual, except in the case of a judge, who must always give his express approval. The Shāfīʿī school, with its rigid principles, could not admit that a minor could be authorized to trade; their attitude to a slave was of course different. This school has remained in general faithful to its first doctrine; however, the exigencies of modern life led certain Shāfīʿīs of Khurṣān, and even, it is said, the famous Imām al-Haramayn, to attempt to modify it, tending to consider valid an authorization to trade granted to a minor.

The question of the extent of the authorization given to a minor or to a slave and whether a *wāli* or a master can impose a limit on it is decided differently by the different schools. The Ḥanafīs and Mālikīs consider that this authorization is the equivalent of a complete withdrawal of prohibition, which is not subject to qualification. The Shāfīʿīs and the Ḥanbalīs (so far as concerns a slave at least) regard it as a type of procurement and consider it to be the duty of the granter of the procurement to fix the limits of it, as in the general law regarding procurations.

**Bibliography:** The *idān* or *idāza* granted in respect of one single transaction to a minor who was reached years of discretion is studied in
the works of fiqh in the chapter on incapacity (hadir). Examples are Kasānī, Badd al-sanā', Cairo 1327, vii, 171 ff., and Ḥaṭṭāk and Mawrāq, commentaries on Khall, Cairo 1329, v, 63 ff. Among modern writers, see Şubbi Mahmasāni, Naṣāriyyat al-Šāmta li-`l-mawdūdāt wa-`l-`uwdād, Beirut 1948, ii, 106-7. The "authorized" minor and slave generally form the subject of a special chapter in the works of fiqh; e.g. Marghinānī, Ḥidāya, iv, 3 (ed. Ḥalabī). On the "authorized" slave, see also Jutic, Jutic, 1321, Musulmanu, ii, 352-6. See also Kudūrī, Mukhhāṣar, tr. Bouquet and Bercher, 224-30; and Y. Linant de Bellefonds, Traité de droit musulman comparé, Paris-The Hague 1965, i, no. 108-9 and 309-11. (Y. Linant de Bellefonds)

**IDJAR** (a), literally "making definite, binding, due (adādīb)\textsuperscript{1} is in Islamic law the technical term for the offer which, together with the acceptance (habāl [see bān?]), is one of the two essential formal elements which for the juridical analysis constitute a contract, which is construed as a bilateral transaction. Offer and acceptance can be expressed verbally (also in the form of compliance with an order, e.g. by the words "sell me" and "I sell you herewith"), or by the conclusive acts of the parties, e.g. the silent exchange of goods if that is the local custom, at least if the objects exchanged are of small value. The bilateral contract between the etymological meaning of the term and the function of what it designs, because the offer can always be withdrawn before it has been accepted (and, according to a Meccan doctrine which was later taken up by al-Şāfī, the so-called khāydr al-madājīs, even after it has been accepted, as long as the two parties have not separated). This leads to the conclusion that the bilateral contract of consent, which is quite isolated among the laws of antiquity, was preceded by a unilateral one, which is well known from other systems of law. If this is so, the change from the unilateral to the bilateral construction must have been made at some early date in the formative period of Islamic law.

**Bibliography:** Besides the treatises of fiqh, from Shaysbānī and Saraḵshī onwards, the chapter on **IDJAR**, see also Madżalla (the Ottoman civil code), art. 404 f.; Ghazzālī, Wafidī, Cairo 1318/1900, i, 136 ff.; Ibn `Abdūn, Radd al-muḫṣar, v, 2 ff.; Ibn `Aṣīm, ṫabba, text and Fr. tr. Houdas and Martel, Algiers 1901, ii, 179 f.; Ibn Kūḏama, Muḫnī, Cairo 1367/1947, v, 397 f.; Ibn Nūḏaym, al-Bahr al-rūḥī, Cairo 1333/1914, vii, 297 f.; Tabbah, Propriété privée et registre foncier, Beirut 1947, i, 259 f. (E. TYAN)

**IDJAR**, the granting of protection (diwār [q.v.]]) to a stranger according to ancient Arab practice. This form of protection was especially important for those who travelled about, because it was also used in other cases. The diwār (pl. diwarān) is mostly the person protected, but may also be the protector (as in Sūra VIII, 48/50; Muṣafādaṣṣīyat, 760, 18). To ask for protection is istidjara (Sūra IX, 6). The granting of protection was announced publicly (cf. Zaynab's **IDJAR** of her former pagan husband in Ibn Ḥāmāḥ, 469); and thus, when `Uṯmān b. Māḍūn wanted to renounce the **IDJAR** of al-Walīd b. al-Muğhrīa for that of God, al-Walīd made him declare his renunciation publicly to show that he was not alleging inadequate protection on the part of al-Walīd (ibid, 243). It was a point of honour to protect the diwar as effectively as one protected one's own kin (cf. Abū Tammān, Hamāsā, 422; Nöddke, Delectus, 40), and shortcomings in this could be made up in a turn-taking. Normally a request for diwar had to be accepted (Sūra IX, 6; Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, ii, 99), and the granting of diwar by one member of a group would be accepted by other members; in connexion with Zaynab's **IDJAR** Muhammad said that protection granted by the least of the Muslims (adnh-hum) was binding on all. Two men refused diwar to Muhammad on his return from al-Ṭā'īn the grounds that their position in the tribe of Kuyyayn was such that they were entitled to do this, since one was a hālīf and the
other belonged to a clan outside the central group (al-Tabari, i, 1203). The Kur'an (XXIII, 88/90; cf. LXXII, 22) applies this conception to God, and says: “He gives precedence (yu'dafir) but none grants protection against Him (lā yu'dafir ‘aṣāri‘, ‘aṣāri‘). Among contemporary nomads such as the Ruwala? there is a similar term ḥasār, but this indicates a mutual relationship between members of different tribes by which each grants protection against his fellow-tribesmen (A. Musil, Manners and customs of the Rovala Bedouins, New York 1928, 267-9; H. R. P. Dickson, The Arab of the Desert, London 1949, 126-32). Contact for protection would seem to have been dependent on actual physical contiguity.

This may be the touching of a tent-pole, or even coming within some yards of the tent, or the touching of a child of the family; but even lesser contacts may make protection obligatory, for example, when the camel-saddles of two men touch, or when a man uses a vessel belonging to another (cf. S. Fraenkel, Das Schutzrecht der Araber, in Orientalische Studien T. Nöldeke grundzüge, Giessen 1906, 293-301). There does not seem to be a hard and fast line between the ḏiṣr and the ḏakhir, the suppliant who “enters to seek protection. The latter is more prominent in Musil’s description of the Ruwala? (op. cit., 441-8; but cf. mention of neighbour, 460) and also in H. R. P. Dickson’s (op. cit., 133-9). The rights of the ḏakhir vary from tribe to tribe (cf. Dickson, 139), but are usually only for a limited period.

The eating of someone’s food constitutes a claim for protection, so long as some of the food remains in one’s body, and this period is considered to be three days. This applies particularly to the person who has the status of ḏafṣ, “guest”. Hospitality is highly regarded by the desert Arabs, and a stranger travelling in the desert (unless obviously an enemy) is offered lodging and the best food available. If he chooses to do so, he may remain for three days, and for a further three days (while the food remains in him) he is under his host’s protection (Musil, op. cit., 455-70; Dickson, op. cit., 118-22, 190-1).

Proximity to a sacred place gives protection. In the ḥaram or sacred area round a sanctuary animals and plants were protected as well as human beings (Wellhausen, Reste, 78). Kusayy and Ḥāṣim respectively speak of the remoteness of the ḫūrān. Another Ibn Ḥighām (83, 87) and it is also said that, when men become Muslims, they become God’s ḏiṣr ‘under His ḏhīmma, “protection”. A person who takes refuge at the grave of a great man or saint is known as ḏiṣr al-ḥabr, and often is effectively protected since otherwise the dead person would be dishonoured (cf. Goldziher, Muh. St., i, 237-8, Eng. tr. i, 215-7, with further references).

Bibliography: Wensinck, Handboek, s.v. “Diṣr”, “Guest”; references in Fraenkel, op. cit. (W. Montgomery Watt)

‘IḌJĀZ, literally “the rendering incapable, powerless”, since the second half of the 3rd/9th century technical term for the inimitability or uniqueness of the Kur‘ān in content and form. The numerous descriptive definitions do not, after the 4th/10th century, show significant divergencies. Ṭahānawi, Kashshaf ʿiscīlāt al-fumūn, Calcutta 1854-62 (written ca. 1158/1254), somewhat surprisingly, does not include the term; but the opening passage of his article on muṣṣīla, pp. 975-7, implies the character of ‘iḍās as action or failure to act not to be accounted for by habitual natural process coupled with a “challenge”, tabāḥdī, which is not taken up and at any rate does not result in anything “matching” the object of the challenge, ‘ādam al-muṣṭaṣrāḍ (see below). The Muslim theologian who most recently devoted an extensive treatise to this topic, Muṣṭafā ʾṢāliḥ al-Rafīʿī (d. 1937), ‘iḍās al-Kur‘ān wa l-badā‘a al-nabawīyya (Cairo 1345/1926), explains (7th ed., Cairo 1382/1961, 156): the ‘iḍās is two things combined, viz. the insufficiency of human strength to attempt a “confirmatory miracle”, muṣʿīla, and the persistence of this inadequacy through the ages. Theological formulae tend to represent a summation of analytical labours and to embody the results of disputes extending in many cases over centuries; in that of the ‘iḍās, the decisive discussions took place between ca. 750 and 1000 A.D.

Two factors combined to make the uniqueness of the Kur‘ān crucial within the never fully systematized dogmatics of Islam: the necessity to prove the mission of the Prophet and the necessity to secure such an incontrovertible authority for Muslim doctrine, law and more. These interlocking needs could, in the atmosphere of the period, be met only by establishing the transcendent or miraculous character of the document of revelation and the singularity or miraculousness of the historical Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh revealing it. The concept of the miracle as testimony, muṣʿīla (q.v.), designed to confirm the veracity of a prophet and carefully defined per se as well as over against the ḥaramat (q.v.), the consensus which God allows to happen through His lesser “friends”, was developed to identify the Kur‘ān as the muṣʿīla of Muḥammad. It implied the supernatural nature of the Revelation which had, from the beginning, been the primary postulate and justification of Muḥammad’s preaching.

To view the Kur‘ān in toto as a miraculous intrusion (or a series of intrusions) of the divine and, hence, the unrepeatable into human experience spurred rather than blocked the question regarding the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about the precise nature of the properties which set it apart from all other literature—this word being taken in the widest possible sense and including the books embodying earlier revelations. Supported by the complementary doctrine of Muḥammad’s ummīyya or illiteracy, the prophecies of future events, mundane and eschatological, paralleled by information about
of the Book; that an element of opinion was being injected into the valuation of the revealed text and thereby, to the more critical or the less pious, a direct challenge presented to denigrate or even match it — had however become apparent even sooner. Those weaknesses had already been countered (although a measure of refinement and elaboration of the argumentation was to follow in the 14th/15th century) by the concept of the tabaddi, or challenge. Based essentially on Ḫurān XVII, 90 and X, 90, where it is stated that ḫṣāṣṣa, or how they try to combine their efforts, are incapable of producing anything equaling as much as a single sūra of the Book, the ẓidjāz was substantiated by the pagan Arabs' failure to take up the challenge, a failure explicable solely by the realization on the part of those greatest masters of the word which the world had ever seen, motivated as they were by hatred of the new faith, by loyalty to the old and by artistic pride, that such an undertaking would be beyond them. (So already Ḏāibī, Ḥujjādī al-mubawwān, in Rasāʾīl al-Ḏābiḥīs ed. H. al-Sanābī, Cairo 1352/1933, 143 ff.; tr. C. Pellat, Arabicche Geisteswelt, Zürich and Stuttgart 1967, 78-80, who deals with the subject in a routine manner, suggesting that he is treating a familiar line of reasoning).

But once again, historical fact — for attempts to match the Kur'ānic style were indeed undertaken — and have turned successful with the vulnerability of a proof based on historical incident and subjective judgement would modify the argument. Reliance on tabaddi was supplanted by the doctrine of the sarfa, the "turning away". (Cf. as an intellectual precedent to the concept of sarfa, Lactantius (ca. 240-324 A.D.). Div. Inst., IV, 5: aevos esse arbitrator divina providentia, ne scire possent veritatem, "God made Himself the arbiter of history, so that they might not know the right way of finding the truth"). With the abandonment of the claim to literary inimitability as such and the recognition of the ability in potentia of the Arab rhetoricians of Muhammad's day victorious-ly to rise to the tabaddi, the miracle was perceived as consisting in God's preventing the competent from taking up the challenge altogether. So already al-Naṣṣāmī; cf. Bouman, Conf. lit., 22. Although the sarfa insists on the intrinsic excellence of the Ḫurān and particularly on the outstanding quality of its ḥṣāḥa; it is this level of stylistic perfection which prevented a muḍrador in spite of the indubitable occurrence of the tabaddi (cf. e.g., Muḥṣīni, ed. Amin al-Ḵhūlī, Cairo 1380/1960, XVI, 247; esp. also the long discussion, 264 ff.; no special act of God by way of a sarfa was required to inhibit the pagan Arabs from attempting to match Revealing (this is implied throughout and set forth explicitly at 322 ff.).

Muslim tradition identifies a comparatively small number of outspoken critics of the Book. Ǧīdāb b. Dīrahm (executed in 335/947) is generally named as its first detractor. Deprecation was, on occasion, accompanied by the attempt to match the revealed text by something artistically equivalent or better. The more popular perception of the artistry of the Kur'ānic text rather than the Ḫurān promulgated by the counter-prophet Musaylima (Musaylima) set an uncomfortable precedent. It is possible that the celebrated Iranian convert, the great stylist Ibn al-Mukaffa' (q.v.) (d. 320/737 or 324/741), actually did try his hand at such a muṣārada, but it found impossible to complete his task — a fate shared by some other writers to whom tradition attributes the same ambition. (Cf. M. Guidi, La Lotta tra l'Islam e il Manicheismo, Rome 1927, XVI, 64-5, 72; I. Goldzihver, Muḥammadanische Studien, ii, 403-4; Tahali, Chinese, tr. from the Persian version of a book by H. Zotenberg (repr. Paris 1958), iv, 450-2.) Bashshār b. Kurdī (d. 166/783) is quoted as freely comparing to its disadvantage Kur'ānic with contemporary verse and as having boasted of having personally surpassed sūra LIX; a similar statement is attributed to Abu 'l-Ṭā'ātiyya (d. 321/933), with reference to sūra LXXVII. Among the Muťażalla, Abū Mūsā Ǧābīb b. Sāhilb, better known as al-Mudārī (not al-Mudārī as Rāgī consistently writes, op. cit., e.g., p. 161), a contemporary of Būqīr b. al-Muṭāmīl (d. between 310/923 and 223/840), whose student he was, and of Abu 'l-Ḥushayl al-Ṭalīfī (d. ca. 223/840), is singled out as a sceptic in regard to the uniqueness of the Holy Book. The bitterest scoffers at the Kur'ān would seem to have been Ibn al-Rawandī (d. 295/897 or 297/912), parts of whose attacks on the new faith, by loyalty to the old and by artistic superiority, are coupled with the postulate that grammar was to be judged by the Ḫurān text rather than the Ḫurānic text by the tradition of classical grammar;
The major works marking the development of the *idjaz* concept and the researches supporting it have been brought together by Abdul Aleem, "Ijazat u-Shar'iyya," in IC, vii (1934), 64-82, 215-83, and G. E. von Grunebaum, A tenth-century document of Arab literary theory and criticism. The sections on poetry of al-Bābilīnī's Ijāz al- Qur̲ān, Chicago 1950 (with bibliography). The first systematic treatments carrying the word *idjaz* in their title which have been preserved—the oldest, by Muhammad b. Yazid (or Zaid) al-Wāsītī (d. 306/918-9), is lost—were concerned above all with the literary uniqueness of Revelation, the leading interest of both al-Tāhirī, al-Rummānī (d. 384/994) and Muhammad al-Khāṭābī (d. 386/996 or more probably 388/998). Outside the circle of "specialists", too, the tracing of poetic imagery in the Kurʿān, besides, the apology for the "low" style of the Bible is merely part of an educational problem—what to do with secular erudition within Christianity; whereas in Islam, the central position of the Kurʿān, as the focal point and justification of grammatical and literary studies, was, theoretically at least, never contested from within the believing community.

In another respect, however, Islam has come very close to Christian teaching (or, at any rate, Christian sentiment). In identifying the Kurʿān, i.e. the *fact* of revelation, as the *muqāṣa* of the Prophet it approaches very nearly the insight into the nature of the revelation which made Jesus refuse "to grant Him, which would have taken its place outside Revelation: this proof, moreover, would have been ineffective, and would not have provoked genuine faith, but at the most a gross superstition" (R. Mehl, *La condition du philosophe chrétien*, Paris-Neuchâtel 1947, 119; Eng. tr. by E. Kushner, *The condition of the Christian philosopher*, Philadelphia 1963, 127), which it must be admitted is precisely what happened whenever in Christianity or in Islam this insight of the central figure of the faith has been disregarded.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references in the article: T. Andrae, *Die person Muhmds in lehre und glauben seiner gemeinde*, Upsala 1917, 94-10; A. S. Tritton, *Muslim theology*, London 1947; J. Bouman, *Le conflit autour du Coran et la solution d'al-Bdqilldni*, Amsterdam 1959, with bibliography; H. Stieglecker, *Die Glaubenslehre des Islam*, Paderborn, Munich and Vienna 1962, esp. pp. 371-408; W. Madelung, *Der Imam al-Qāsim Ibn Ibrahim und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen*, Berlin 1965, 124 ff. (G. E. von Grunebaum *Idjāza* (A.) authorization, licence. When used in its technical meaning, this word means, in the strict sense, the third of the eight methods of receiving the transmission of a hadīth [g.v.] the various ways are set out precisely in W. Marçais, *Taqrīb*, 115-26). It means in short the fact that an authorized guarantor of a text or of a whole book (his own work or a work received through a chain of transmitters going back to the first transmitter or to the author) gives a person the authorization to transmit it in his turn so that the person authorized to transmit it in his turn so that the person authorized can avail himself of this transmission. But beyond this narrow definition there is in fact involved the principle, fundamental in Islam, of the pre-eminent value attached to oral testimony, a principle which has been maintained through all the fictions to which *idjāsa* and the other methods of transmission have given rise from a very early date and which still today continue to influence Muslim traditional thinking. It is this that gives its ideological and historical importance to the very full documentation contained...
in the isndds ("chaines de témoignages fondamentales"); L. Massinon, in the samd* ("certificates of dates and places and details of the names of the persons who formed links in the transmission—which precede, frame or follow not only the texts of hadith, of fiqh or of tafsir, but also theological, mystical, historical and philological works, and even literary collections, of both prose and poetry. Separate from the texts there appear the systematic lists of authorities (mu'adjam, ma'qyubah, hijab, fahraas q.v.), which form in themselves a well developed branch, still flourishing and so far insufficiently exploited, of the work of the traditional Muslim scholars. In spite of the very serious reservations which had been made from the beginning, notably by the imam al-Shafi'i (d. 204/820), with regard to transmissions not guaranteed by the direct study of the text transmitted and the effective meeting between a transmitter and a receiver capable of understanding the text, yet practices, supported when necessary by appropriate state-meats of casuistic reasoning, has always tended towards the acceptance of facts and increasing indulgence: a general idjazah without the hearing of the texts, an idjazah conferred on young children who have not yet reached the age of reason, even to those still unborn, an idjazah obtained as the result of a short interview during journeys whose aim was not exclusively study, or the Pilgrimage, an idjazah requested and granted by letter without any personal contact between the authority and the candidate. Among the fictional idjazah, those which were moreover of social and political significance, were those conferred at their request on rulers or on high state dignitaries. Examples of idjazah in verse exist from the second half of the 3rd/9th century (al-Khaṭl al-Baghdadi, Kifāya, 250), and these very soon became couched in turgid rhetoric (see below).

Among the "Twelver" Shi'i the idjazah obtains its authority from the infallible imams whose hadiths are scrupulously transmitted by their faithful supporters (see H. Laoust, Les schismes dans l'Islam, Paris 1905, 303).

In Persian and in Ottoman Turkish (in the latter as a composite word, idjazet-nâmé, iscàsetnâmè) the term has come into common use to mean "certificate of fitness" (to teach).

Bibliography: al-Khaṭl al-Baghdādi, K. al-Kifāya fī 'ilm al-risāla, Haydarābād 1357/1938, especially 311-55; see also idem, Takyīd al-'ilm, ed. Youssef Eche (al-Shafi'i, Damascus 1949; an unpublished treatise by al-Silafi (d. 576/1180), K. al-Ważīfa fī dhihr al-mujadda wa 'l-mu'djida (MS Chester Beatty Arabic 8574, fols. 1-20), analysed by G. Vajda in Bull. de l'Inst. de Rech. et d'Hist. des Textes, no. 14, 1956; Mirzā 'All Ta'kī, al-Ijazāt, containing Licenses to learned men, Lucknow 1861/1869. On the subject of the superior value as proof of the spoken over the written word: L. Massinon, Études sur les "Isnads" ou chaines de témoignages fondamentaux dans la tradition musulmane haghiqienne, in MLanges Félix Grat, i, Paris 1946, 385-420 (= Opera Minora, ii, Beirut 1963, 61-92); R. Brunsvichg, Le système de la preuve en droit musulman, in Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin, xviii, La Preuve, Brussels 1964, 169-86. On the idjazah and the related documents in general: I. Goldziherr, Muh. St., ii, 188-93 (this study is the basis of his article in ET); reservations made by F. Seegm, GAS, i, 1967, 53-84, must be taken into account);
That the poetic form was popular for the *ijaza* as well as for the request for an *idjaz* (istid'd*) is shown by the poems composed in *Ma'ālid al-Adaab* (i, 638, 715, 743 ff.). *Ijaza* also occurs in *Sa'f* al-Din al-Hillī's *Dīwān* (Damascus 1297/1879, 481-3, for his own poems) and a late example is found in *Shīrānī's* *Hadībat al-afhrāb* (Būlāk 1282/1866, 76).

*Ijaza* as a technical term in prosody occurs as a synonym of various terms for faults in the rhyme [see art. ǦRIF]. As a term in rhetoric it is used when a poet builds some lines or even a whole poem on a single line or hemistich suggested by somebody else, often a ruler (but cf. Dozy, *Suppl. s.v. *ajzā*). It is also used when two poets compose alternately a hemistich or one or more lines of the same poem, often in the form of a contest, in which case we also find the term *tamāli* (or *manāla*, *ilmāli*, *TA*, v, 227 below). Other terms occur either as synonyms or to indicate different forms of *tamāli*. The interpretation of these terms given by Ibn Ṣafir in his *Baddī* al-Baddī*uh* (Būlāk 1278/1862 and on the margin of 'Abdāši, *Ma'dāsh al-tanāji*, Cairo 1316/1898) does not seem to have been generally accepted.

The connexion of parts of ‘Idj with Persian culture is noteworthy, and may partly explain the type of heresy to which they were prone. At Kfā al-‘Abd al-Mughīrah b. al-‘Idjīlī was executed as a heretic in 119/737 and Abū Manṣūr al-‘Idjīlī (see ‘Idjīlīyya) in 122/739. The well-known Abū Muslim (q.v.) is thought to have been a slave attached to ‘Idjīlī.

Bibliography: Yākūt, Muṣjam, index; Tabāri, index; Aḥkāmī, index; Caussin de Perceval, Essai, ii, 173-81, 270, 449, 592, 603; li, 404.

(W. Montgomery Watt) ‘Idjīlī, Abū Dūlah (see above b. 953).

‘Idjīmā’, the third, and in practice the most important, of the bases of Islamic religious law, according to the classical theory (see usul), its. In it is the unanalytical agreement of the Umma on a regulation (ḥukm) imposed by God. Technically it is "the unanalytical doctrine and opinion of the recognized religious authorities at any given time". Statement of the problem: the idea of idjīmā as a source of law, as proving in an intangible and definitive way the validity of a ḥukm (W. M. Watt, Islam and the integration of society, London 1961, 203), was a result of the need to perpetuate a truth given by the Kur’ān and corroborated by the Sunna of the Prophet. Arguments arose among the faithful after the death of the Prophet who, during his lifetime, was the "proof" (ḥudūd), and point of reference in legislative matters. The need began to be felt for a binding principle which would ratify a custom, as yet vague and undefined, which was being called upon to systematize itself at the same time as it was expanding and coming under attack from both Shi’is and Khāridjīs. The idea became defined and was given its theoretical formulation with the elaboration of the wa‘l al-fikhr, i.e. in the 2nd/8th century. The definition of idjīmā as a source of law then raises the question of the probative validity (ḥudūd al-ṣiyya) of this concept.

Denied by the Khāridjī (al-Baghdādī, Usul, 19) and by al-Naẓām (ibid., 19-20), this validity became the object of long discussions in the classical treatises on wa‘l al-fikhr. Whether it is the Hanāfi idjīmā extending the consensus of the Umma to all the Believers or the idjīmā of Ibn Hazm limiting it only to the Companions of the Prophet, the procedure is always the same: it consists of basing the proof deduced from the classic tradition of the idjīmā on a passage from "Kur‘ān or Tradition giving a reason in plain language" (Hourani, 19). This procedure clearly illustrates the exigencies of Islamic jurisprudence.

The rationalism of the Mu‘tazilīs, with its tendency to ethics rather than logic, amounts, where idjīmā is concerned, to no more than a deontology addressed to the personal convictions of the believer.

The primacy of reason (al-‘abī ḥabī al-sam‘), repeatedly expressed by ‘Abd al-Djabbār (Muḥānī, xii, 378 and passim; ‘Abd al-Wahhab (Muḥānī, xvii, 17 ff.; ‘Abd al-Husayn, Mu‘tama’d, ii, 460) is enshrined in the principle of ‘that which is best’ (al-aslāh), which can limit even the divine will. In the field of idjīmā, rationalism was obliged to make way for the strictest fideism, since reason is no more capable of deciding the inerrancy (‘ijmā) of a group of people than of guaranteeing that an individual is always exempt from error in his words and his deeds. ‘Abd al-Djabbār thus takes over the objection of al-Naẓām, who, thoughfrequently named elsewhere (Muḥānī, xvii, 22, xv, 361, 392 and passim), is not mentioned in connexion with idjīmā (compare Muḥānī, xvii, 138 and Mu‘tama’d, 458). Thus the bayāt affirms unequivocally: "As for demonstrating the legal validity of idjīmā by a process of reason, that is impossible" (‘a-performance, ‘a-performance, ‘a-performance, ‘a-performance, ‘a-performance).

In modern times, parallel with a classical and conservative trend represented by ‘Abd al-Wahāb Khalīl, there is developing a modernist trend inherited from the reformism of Muḥammad ‘Abdūh (Hourānī, 39-43) by the Pakistanī, Kamāl Fārūqī. In his recent work (Islamic jurisprudence, Karachi 1962), F. Khāridjī does not re-examine the theoretical problem of the proofs on which the validity of
idjmāʿ is based. Like Muḥammad ʿAbduh, he thinks that the scriptural proofs establish, though in a limited sense, the legal authority for the consensus of the Umma (Hourani, 43). But beyond this, he attempts to assure that idjmāʿ is a specific result of a critical analysis of the concept of iṣma. In showing that the ʿisma [q.v.] (infallibility) of the Umma is circumscribed and defined by divine infallibility, K. Fārābī illustrates the relative nature of the former and tries to adapt the concept of the legal validity of idjmāʿ to the necessities of the modern world and the exigencies of the socio-political system of which the Believer is a part.

Development: As the concept of idjmāʿ developed, the dispersion of the faithful from Medina became greater and the Muslim world expanded, the solutions to the problem became more diverse. The concept of "favourable acceptance" became more worked out and the idea of a certain de facto agreement led to a theoretical definition of idjmāʿ differing according to the schools.

The point of departure for this development is given by the Kitāb Ikhtilāf Mālik wa ʿl-Ṣāḥīfī (Kitāb al-Umm, vii, 177-83). Al-Ṣāḥīfī called into question the idea of the consensus of Medina by showing the obscure and imprecise nature of the concept of "the usage of Medina". He substituted the assertion of a basic truth, upon which, as far as law was concerned, the infallibility of the unananimous pronouncements of the Umma rested, for the Mālikī idjmāʿ, which merely affirmed an existing fact. The principle was stated in legal terms, although not based on law.

The Riḍāliya of al-Ṣāḥīfī, this scholar's only work on the subject, should be regarded as the resumed of a system of thought developed through oral discussions. This is the characteristic of the primitive religious law which was "a doctrine of essentially oral transmission" (H. Loust, in EI, s.v. ʿĪṣām ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd b. Ḥanbal, 274a). We must make a jump of three centuries to reach the degree of systematization which is achieved by the Mustasfaʿ al-Ṣāḥīfī.

With the ʿIlāmī fi ʿusūl al-ʿākhlām of Ibn Hazn, we find ourselves faced with a work on ʿusūl al-ḥukm in which idjmāʿ is treated as a juridical source needing a foundation and raising technical problems to be solved. For Ibn Ḥazn, idjmāʿ is limited to that of the Companions of the Prophet. A system which makes the use of oral pronouncements and ignores the exclusive use of proof texts can only allow idjmāʿ which is derived from a revealed text about the revelation is interrupted, then the divine promise should persevere in the truth would become void. It is, therefore, necessary to assert that the idjmāʿ of the Umma is certainly a source of truth (sawīb) by virtue of divine generosity, and that its object is to preserve the religion of Allāh". For these theologians idjmāʿ draws its validity from itself; it is held to be an autonomous juridical source (al-Sarakhsi, ʿUṣūl, i, 295).

The definition of the Imām al-Ḥaramayn, the teacher of al-Ghazālī, is narrower. According to him, the faṣih alone is competent in the matter (Kitāb al-Waraṣāḥī). His disciple, al-Ghazālī, explains it in detail: idjmāʿ is the agreement of the community of Muḥammad, in particular on all religious questions (Mustasfaʿ, i, 110). This community of Muḥammad forms a whole within which two categories must be distinguished; those who are definitely concerned in idjmāʿ (al-āṣirr, i, 115), i.e., every mutadhid whose juridical opinion is held to be valid (ḥal al-ḥall waʾl-ʾakāl), and those of whom note is certainly not taken (al-wādhik fiʾl-nafy), i.e., children who have not yet reached intellectual maturity (tamyīz), foetuses and lunatics. Between these two well-defined categories there is an intermediate zone of uncertainty, on the subject of which various problems arise: the questions of the rôle of the ordinary believer (al-shāmī al-mukallaf), the "innovator", who takes a position contrary to idjmāʿ, the "Followers" (ībārīn [q.v.]), younger contemporaries of the Companions and those opposed to them, the minority who oppose the majority who make up idjmāʿ.

From all the solutions put forward, it is possible to extract a constant of Sunni thought; idjmāʿ is the agreement of all the believers in general, and in particular that of those qualified, to whom was entrusted the task of taking the decisions in juridical matters.

Method: Once the question of the constitutors of idjmāʿ has been settled, the question of the method by which they reach agreement may be asked. This agreement can be made by word or deed, it can be explicitly stated or silent. The Ḥanafis, who distinguish between the conscious (ral-ʿākhlām) and the unconscious (rukūʿ in and the strict rule (ʿazima [q.v.]), consider tacit idjmāʿ to be valid only with regard to a concession, while for establishing a strict rule idjmāʿ definitely stated or expressed by an act is necessary. The Ḥanafis, indeed, are the only ones to allow tacit idjmāʿ (see the Kashf al-ʿāṣirr, a commentary on the ʿUṣūl of al-Bazdawi, iii, 946: "... the concession is based on necessity and it is necessity, which makes idjmāʿ out of tacit agreement"), while the Zāhiris, in their literalism, refuse it categorically. The Ṣāḥīfīs, like al-Djuywānī, al-Ghazālī and al-ʿĀmilī, allow it as idjmāʿ but with certain reservations. "It is idjmāʿ", al-Ghazālī tells us, "provided that this tacit agreement is accompanied by indications of approval on the part of those who are silent" (Mustasfaʿ, i, 121). It is difficult indeed to give the same probative value to silence as to a definite statement (ibid, 121).

But what is the value of an agreement which, without being formulated, is expressed by an act? Can it be held as valid inasmuch as this act, carried out by the majority of Believers, takes for granted at least the idjmāʿ of the élite, just as an act of the Prophet indicates his approval of that act? Put in another way, does the infallibility of the Umma

idjmāʿ is understood only those who have not adopted pernicious doctrines (ahwāʿ) and innovations (bidaʿ); and, if the Umma should find itself subject to error when the revelation is interrupted, then the divine promise would become void. It is, therefore, necessary to assert that the idjmāʿ of the Umma is certainly a source of truth (sawīb) by virtue of divine generosity, and that its object is to preserve the religion of Allāh". For these theologians idjmāʿ draws its validity from itself; it is held to be an autonomous juridical source (al-Sarakhsi, ʿUṣūl, i, 295).

The definition of the Imām al-Ḥaramayn, the teacher of al-Ghazālī, is narrower. According to him, the faṣih alone is competent in the matter (Kitāb al-Waraṣāḥī). His disciple, al-Ghazālī, explains it in detail: idjmāʿ is the agreement of the community of Muḥammad, in particular on all religious questions (Mustasfaʿ, i, 110). This community of Muḥammad forms a whole within which two categories must be distinguished; those who are definitely concerned in idjmāʿ (al-āṣirr, i, 115), i.e., every mutadhid whose juridical opinion is held to be valid (ḥal al-ḥall waʾl-ʾakāl), and those of whom note is certainly not taken (al-wādhik fiʾl-nafy), i.e., children who have not yet reached intellectual maturity (tamyīz), foetuses and lunatics. Between these two well-defined categories there is an intermediate zone of uncertainty, on the subject of which various problems arise: the questions of the rôle of the ordinary believer (al-shāmī al-mukallaf), the "innovator", who takes a position contrary to idjmāʿ, the "Followers" (ībārīn [q.v.]), younger contemporaries of the Companions and those opposed to them, the minority who oppose the majority who make up idjmāʿ.

From all the solutions put forward, it is possible to extract a constant of Sunni thought; idjmāʿ is the agreement of all the believers in general, and in particular that of those qualified, to whom was entrusted the task of taking the decisions in juridical matters.

Method: Once the question of the constitutors of idjmāʿ has been settled, the question of the method by which they reach agreement may be asked. This agreement can be made by word or deed, it can be explicitly stated or silent. The Ḥanafis, who distinguish between the conscious (ral-ʿākhlām) and the unconscious (rukūʿ in and the strict rule (ʿazima [q.v.]), consider tacit idjmāʿ to be valid only with regard to a concession, while for establishing a strict rule idjmāʿ definitely stated or expressed by an act is necessary. The Ḥanafis, indeed, are the only ones to allow tacit idjmāʿ (see the Kashf al-ʿāṣirr, a commentary on the ʿUṣūl of al-Bazdawi, iii, 946: "... the concession is based on necessity and it is necessity, which makes idjmāʿ out of tacit agreement"), while the Zāhiris, in their literalism, refuse it categorically. The Ṣāḥīfīs, like al-Djuywānī, al-Ghazālī and al-ʿĀmilī, allow it as idjmāʿ but with certain reservations. "It is idjmāʿ", al-Ghazālī tells us, "provided that this tacit agreement is accompanied by indications of approval on the part of those who are silent" (Mustasfaʿ, i, 121). It is difficult indeed to give the same probative value to silence as to a definite statement (ibid, 121).

But what is the value of an agreement which, without being formulated, is expressed by an act? Can it be held as valid inasmuch as this act, carried out by the majority of Believers, takes for granted at least the idjmāʿ of the élite, just as an act of the Prophet indicates his approval of that act? Put in another way, does the infallibility of the Umma
guarantee its conduct as well as its statements? The Shafi’is refuse to adopt this position for, they say, it is impossible to verify whether or not the totality of a people carries out an act unanimously. This assumes a complete record of the Believers and of their conduct. Although silence may sometimes be considered an indication of approval of a statement, and consequently regarded as tacit agreement, idjma is based on an act cannot be considered valid because of the difficulty of verification. Silence, indeed, may be ascertained directly through the absence of any opposing statement, whilst the act of silence obtained except by a continuous control, which would obviously be impossible to effect. Here again the Hanafis differ from the rest of the Sunnis and allow the validity of agreement about an action when the action concerns the whole body of the Believers, as for example agreement about the prohibition of adultery or usurious sale.

The opinion of the community, whether silent, signalled by an act (or by an abstention), or stated in words, is in time. Since idjma is the juridical source which mitigates the interruption of revelation with the death of the Prophet and allows the formulation of solutions to new problems which might arise, it is conditioned by the passing of the various periods during which the consensus is formed. This conditioning process raises an important question: does the formation of the consensus require the disappearance of the generation or not? For the Malikis and the Zahiris this is no problem, but what about the Shafi’is, Hanafis and Hanbalis? According to al-Âmidî, his master al-Shafi’i, Abû Hanîfa, the Ash’aris and the Mu’tazilis did not consider the extinction of the generation a necessary condition for the formation of idjma. For Ibn Hanbâl, this formation is subject to the total disappearance of the generation (cf. al-Âmidî, İhkal, i, 307 ff.).

It follows from this that the first group idjma is valid even if it is not unanimous and simply expresses the opinion of the majority (idjma al-akhtâr). As with the question whether the statements of the “Followers” should be taken into consideration, so the group which does not consider necessary the disappearance of the generation does take into consideration the statement of the Follower, if he had been a muqtahid and had opposed the Companions before they had become mu’dalâ &. It is otherwise for the Mu’tazilis; for al-Dhuwayni (idjma, i, 123) refuses to place any importance on the disappearance of the generation. Given that the generations overlap and that it is impossible to distinguish the end of one from the beginning of the next, the statements of one generation cannot be rounded off without, in so doing, “finally closing the gate of idjma”. Al-Ghazâlî (Mu’tasîfî, i, 121) to all intents and purposes had resolved the question by stating: “For idjma to be formed, it is enough that agreement should have taken place, even if only for an instant”.

Rôlê: The opinions of the jurists concerning the role played by idjma are varied. For some of them it could decide all religious questions. This is the opinion of al-Ghazâlî. There are, however, religious questions which are not subject to a legal ruling and on which idjma cannot provide a decision, because they depend directly upon the revelation which provides the basis for idjma. Arguments based on idjma can only be used to demonstrate religious truths which do not themselves prove the legal validity of idjma, e.g., the statement that the vision of God in the next world is not spatial, or the denial of the existence of a second God.

For al-Dhuwayni idjma is agreement on a bukm sharî’i. In general, the opinion of the jurists is guided by this bukm attributed to the Prophet: “You are better judges than I in temporal affairs. I am a better judge than you in what concerns your religion”.

Besides, it is agreed that an error in a temporal matter cannot incur the charge of impiety (kufr), but is simply considered as due to ignorance (gibâl). To sum up, the role of idjma is to decide in juridical questions of theory or practice concerning, in one way or another, the behaviour of the Believer, in so far as he is subject to the rules of conduct laid down by God and His Prophet. Thus it is said that idjma has a part to play as dâllî sharî’i in the field of mu’samâât (q.v.) but has no probabilistic value in those of ‘ibâdât or ‘ibtadâ. These latter, indeed, provide the basis for idjma and biyâs, that biyâs which, together with idjma, is, for the Hanafi a means to arrive at idjma, provided the muqtahid possesses the moral guarantees demanded by idjma: integrity and honesty. For these, his mind must not be inquisitive (dâllî) or blinded by the passion (kauz) which inspires pernicious doctrines (al-Bazdawi, op. cit., iii, 957). However, idjma and ra’y are only required in special cases. In these cases, it falls to the muqtahid to settle the affair, whilst when it is a question of usûl al-din, the ordinary Believer should be heard along with the muqtahid (al-Bazdawi, op. cit., iii, 959).

The Shafi’is are more guarded for, al-Ghazâlî says (op. cit., i, 123), any solution given by means of idjma or biyâs is only a probable opinion and liable to error and divergence, which destroys the infallibility of the Umma and its unmitigability. Besides, agreement cannot be reached through biyâs since, in their deliberations, the muqtahids may adopt different principles. It is otherwise for the Mu’tazilis; according to Abu’l-Husayn, for example, idjma is the rational striving of the muqtahid as an intelligent person (sâlih), not the preserve of the recognized muqtahid as such (Mu’samâd, ii, 489, 490-1; Muşenî, xvii, 224-8). This seems to have been the opinion of their master Wâsîl (al-Âmidî, İhkal, i, 326) opposed by al-Âmidî (wa-fihî biyâs).

From all this, then, it appears that the main principle is that of unanimity; biyâs and idjma are for the Sunnis— with the exception of the Zahirîs who also allow only necessary agreements— to be considered not only that their conclusions are unanimous. Idjma is a source of truth only when it appears as the agreement of the statements of the whole community. The infallibility of the Umma resides in its unanimity.

With K. Fârîkî and his followers contemporary Islam is in the process of seeking a theoretical justification for the calling into question of classical idjma (Hourani, 59-60); not innovation, but renewal of an obsolete idea which, to be effective, must be freed from the straitjacket of formal concepts in which it had been imprisoned by the discussions of the muqtahidÎs of the classical period.

Of the 3rd/9th century the idea began to gain ground that only the great scholars of the past, and not the epigones, had the right to idāth. By the beginning of the fourth century (about A.D. 900), the point had been reached that the initial generation of all schools felt that all essential questions had been thoroughly discussed and finally settled, and a consensus gradually established itself to the effect that from that time onwards no one might be deemed to have the necessary qualifications for independent reasoning in law, and that all future activity would have to be confined to the explanation, application, and, at the most, interpretation of the doctrine as it had been laid down once and for all. This "closing of the door of idāth", as it was called, amounted to the demand for takūlḏ (q.v.), the unquestioning acceptance of the doctrines of established schools and authorities. A person bound to practise takūlḏ is called muḥallid. See further Section II.

II. According to the classical doctrine of Islamic legal theory, idāth means exerting oneself to form an opinion (pām) in a case (baṣiyya) or as a rule (ḥukm) of law (Lišān, iv, 109, lines 19 ff.). This is done by applying analogy (kiyds) to the Kurān and the sunna. The muḥallid is one who by his own exertions forms his own opinion, being thus exactly opposed to the muḥallid, "imitator", who, as Subki in his Dām al-dawāndī* says, "takes the saying of another without knowledge of its basis (dallīl)". For thus applying himself he would, according to a tradition from the Prophet, receive a reward even though his decision were wrong; while, if it was right, he received a double reward (see ḥatta'). The duty and right of idāth thus did not involve inerrancy. Its result was always pām, fallible opinion (cf. R. Brunschvig, in Studi orientalisi- ti in onore di Giorgio Levi Della Vida, i, Rome 1956, 61-82). Only the combined idāth of the whole Muslim people led to idāmā, agreement, and was inerrant. On the controversy as to the possibility of error in muḥallidān see Taftāzānī on the Ābd al-Wāsīn of Nasafi, ed. Cairo 1321, 143 ff. But this broad idāth soon passed into the special idāth of those who had a peculiar right to form judgments on disputed points which must be followed by others. At this point, and from the nature of the case, a difference arose between theology (kalām) and law (fiḥ). Even to the present day many theologians assert that takūlḏ does not furnish a saving faith; see for example, the Kīfyaṭ al-arawānī of Fadālī, passim, and the translation in D. B. Mac- Donald's Development of Muslim theology, 315-51. But all canon lawyers for centuries have admittedly been muḥallidān of one degree or another. When later Islam looked back to the founding of the four legal schools (madhdhib), it assigned to the founders and to some of their contemporaries an idāth of the first rank. These had possessed a right to work out all questions from the very foundation (cf. ṭafāl), using Kurān, sunna, kiyds, istiḥsān, istiṣḥāb, etc., and were muḥallidān absolutely (muḥaṣf). Later those who played the same part within the school (ifi-l-madhāb), determining the fūri as the masters had settled the broad principles (wāṣil) of fiḥ and had laid down fundamental texts (muṣāf). If the view so stated was found implicitly in a nass of the founder of the madhdhib, it was called a wadāj. Still later and inferior were those who had a right only by their knowledge of previous decisions to
answer specific questions submitted to them; these were called muṣṭafihūn bi 'l-fatwā, "for giving legal opinions". All muṣṭafihūn had been in a sense muṣṭafis, givers of fatwās; but they were thus officially, such was the formal and generally accepted position. But from time to time individuals appeared who, moved either by ambition or by objection to recognized doctrines, returned to the earliest meaning of iǧtihād and asserted the right to form their own opinion from first principles. One of these was Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328; cf. H. Laoust, *Contribution à une étude de la méthodologie canonique de...* B. Taymiyya, Cairo 1306, 19 ff.). Another, but a very heretical one, was the Emperor Akbar (q.v.); Goldziher, *Verlesungen*, 311. In Shī'ite Islam there are still absolute muṣṭafihūn. This is because they are regarded as the spokesmen of the Hidden Imām (cf. C. Frank, in *Islamica*, ii (1926), 171-92). Their position is thus quite different from that of the *uṣūlā* among Sunnis. They freely criticize and even control the actions of the Shāh, who is merely a *locum tenens* and preserver of order during the absence of the Hidden Imām, the ruler of *iʿāra ilā dīnī* (cf. E. Eliaš and N. K. Keddie, both in *Studia Islamica*, xxix (1969)). But the Sunni *uṣūlā* are regarded universally as the subservient creatures of the government (Goldziher, *Verlesungen*, 215-8, 233, 285).


III. The question of iǧtihād and taklīf continued in the subcontinent of India. Inspired less by this discussion than, to a certain degree, by the doctrine of Ibn Taymiyya and of his disciples, there arose, from the 12th/18th century onwards, individuals and schools of thought who advocated a return to the pristine purity of Islam, such as the Salafīyya (q.v.), who may be called Reformers, and others, from the last decades of the 19th century onwards, who laid the emphasis on renovating Islam in the light of modern conditions, and who may be called Modernists (see ʿulāmāʾ al-ṭarīqīn). Both tendencies reject traditional taklīf and some Modernists, in particular, combine this with extravagant claims to a new, free iǧtihād which goes far beyond any that was practised in the formative period of Islamic law. But the recent reshaping of institutions of the ʿilāmīya by secular legislation in several Islamic countries takes its inspiration from modern constitutional and social ideas rather than from the essentially problematic character of the legitimacy of iǧtihād and taklīf. Whereas this problem has largely lost its relevance

in the field of "civil" law, it has retained its full importance as far as the religious duties of Islam in the narrow meaning of the term, such as fasting, are concerned.


IDMĀR

IDMĀR is the infinitive of the verb ʿaḏmar/yaḏmir, "to conceal". The Arab grammarians use it when speaking about an unexpressed grammatical element, supposedly existent and active; it can thus be translated as "imply". The opposite is iḍār, from the verb ʿaḏhara "to reveal". A good example of the two is supplied by Ch. 50 of Sibawayhi. One can say (1, 107): al-ḥabīb al-ḥabīb, "the small boy, the small boy". With iḍār of a verb in the dānār requiring the naṣb of the substantive, or, with iḍār of this verb: la ṭawāṣṣaš al-ḥabīb, "do not tread on the small boy". This verb ʿaḏmar is used thus in all the "tenses": perfective, imperfective, etc. (so too with ʿaḏhara). The infinitive iḍār is particularly to be noted; it appears in the title of 14 chapters of the *Kādhī*. Since Sibawayhi, this verb has formed part of the grammatical vocabulary, e.g.: al-Ẓāmakhshāri, *Mufassal* (ed. Broch.), *yanāṭis bi-an muḍmar* (§ 411), "is put into the naṣb by means of an understood". In this sense of "imply" iḍār joins takdīr; but takdīr, as the instrument of a method—the system of ḥiyās—has a wider use; it extends as far as the admission of a supposition (see H. Fleisch, *Tradit.*, i, 7).

The verb ʿaḏmar, in the *Kādhī*, has a particular use, derived from the sense of "to conceal", signifying: "express by a personal pronoun", e.g.: 1, 344, line 13, for ʿaḏmar; 1, 190, lines 10-11, for muḍmar, tuḍmir. This use is continued, e.g.: al-ʿaḏmar bāb iḍār al-ḥākīr (al-Ḍūrjānī, *Ṭārīfī*, 18). In the *Kādhī*, iḍār refers to the personal pronouns: huwa, hiya, etc. (1, 188, lines 1-2); by means of them "you conceal (tuḍmir) a noun", known beforehand to the listener (al-ḥākīr, lines 5-6). Sibawayhi uses for this purpose: ʿalāmāt al-ʿaḍmar, "the sign of expression by means of personal pronouns"; e.g.: the titles of chapts. 205, 210, 213. For the separate pronouns, the ʿalāmāt al-ʿaḍmar is said to be ṣāḥira, "expressed"; for the affixed pronouns, al-ʿaḍmar has no ʿalāmāt ṣāḥira (1, 188, lines 4-8). He calls the demonstrative pronouns (1, 218, lines 22-3) al-ʿaṣma al-μuḍμaḥa. Ibn al-Ṣarrādī, (al-Mudhjar fi li-nākhab, Beirut 1935/1965) refers to the personal pronouns as al-muṣnā (al-muṣnāyda) (74); they are divided into: muṭṭasīl (affixed) and muṭṭafīl (separate). He does not omit ʿaḏmar (32) or muḍmar (55, 65), and he includes (76) in the muṣnāyda, the maṣūliyya (declarative pronouns) and the maṣūliyya (relative pronouns); iḏār is very frequently found as a synonym for al-μuḍμaḥa (personal pronoun) (see ʿaḏmar in *EI*). This is the usage of Ibn Mālik in the *Alfitiya*.
The philosophical usage of the word often derives from any one of the etymological meanings of the root \( \text{idmdr} \): from '(aldfca) re-joining, meeting, catching, grasping. And then, more generally, comprehension (syno-

- **Ar. Gr.** Lexique grammatical, see also W. Wright, Ar. Gr., i, 105 B and D. The Lexique grammatical of the Kitāb Sibawayhi, in preparation by G. Troupeau, will give details of the use of \( \text{idmdr} \) in this Arabic. (H. Fleisch)

**IDOL, IDOLATRY** [see \( \text{sanam}, \text{wazhanniya} \)].

**IDRĀK** means, in general, sensory perception and then, more generally, comprehension (syno-

- **Bibliography** in the text; see also W. Wright, Ar. Gr., i, 105 B and D. The Lexique grammatical of the Kitāb Sibawayhi, in preparation by G. Troupeau, will give details of the use of \( \text{idmdr} \) in this Arabic. (H. Fleisch)
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**IDRĀK** means, in general, sensory perception and then, more generally, comprehension (syno-

- **Bibliography** in the text; see also W. Wright, Ar. Gr., i, 105 B and D. The Lexique grammatical of the Kitāb Sibawayhi, in preparation by G. Troupeau, will give details of the use of \( \text{idmdr} \) in this Arabic. (H. Fleisch)
one opposite to another (for example, a cold body becomes warm), whereas the information which makes the soul aware of the perceptible form is not the result of a movement of this sort but is a perfecting of the soul (sittahd), that is making the actual potential of the soul which does not cause it to pass, in its essence, from one opposite to another. Thus the soul grasps directly the perceptible forms, without these forms having to engender themselves in it from their opposites. "The result of this is that the soul feels itself and not the idea ... when we mean the most immediate act of perception, in which there is no intermediary" (Fa-hiya) (idrdk al-nil fi finashih). Consequently, even at the level of perception, idrdk has, according to this doctrine, a character of immediacy which confirms its intuitive value.

Al-Kindi, in his "Treatise on Definitions" (Rasat'il al-Kin'di al-falsafyya, ed. Abä Kida, Cairo 1950, i, 165, 167), had already defined the intellect ('abh), the imagination (tawahhum, fanafdyyl, takhayyul) and perception as the faculties which "grasp" (mudrika) forms: "Perception is the existence (inniyya = Dasein) of the grasp (idrdk) by the soul of forms endowed with matter, in their matter (suwar dhawdt) in an affection of the soul and gives it a perfection (cf. the lexicographical meaning of "reaching its maturity"). It is the perceptible form in the soul which is intentional, the close form being turned towards the distant form; it is not idrdk itself. An intentional idrdk would express rather this other meaning of the root: "to rejoin, meet, overtake".

Al-Ghazâlî, on the other hand, attributes to idrdk a dynamism which extends its scope to the things themselves. The heart (hulb) has, he says, three sorts of "expeditionary troops" (dunyd): the will, the motive power of the limbs of the body, and the thought, which is that which is only the inclination itself of them, as spies do (al-mudrik al-mutafarrif li'l-asghy 'al'djawdista). These are the five senses. "These troops are spread (mabthûtah) throughout specific organs, and this is expressed by the terms learning ('ilm) and idrdk" (Ihyâ', Cairo, iii, 5). In fact al-Ghazâlî conceives the feelings as linked to two fundamental vital functions: the acquisition of what is useful and the avoiding of what is harmful. Hence his military metaphors. The subjective side (the "close form" of Ibn Sînà) in perception is thus completely directed towards an encounter with the things on the frontier of the body, and idrdk is no longer the grasp of something affecting the soul which reflects its external cause; it is the direct grasp of the nature of this cause in the form in which it manifests itself in the place where it acts and whether it acts on the body. The form of an edible fruit is grasped neither in the soul nor in the eye, but on the tree so that one is able to go and pick it there. If the form is felt in the soul, one no longer has a cognitive sensation but the grasp of an affective state, pleasure (ihsan) or pain (alam). From this point of view, idrdk is divided, at the sensory level, into what may be called on the one hand external, localized and cognitive perceptions, and on the other hand perceptions which are internal, non-localized or badly localized and affective.

This difference in the conception of idrdk arises from the fact that the falsâdiya presents it in relation to the degree of abstraction from what it grasps, in a hierarchy of knowledges which culminates in intuition of the intellect. On the other hand, al-Ghazâlî, having a theologian's approach, considers primarily the concrete situation of conscious man in this world below (dunyd), a situation directed towards the religious values of ātin, according to a perspective in which true knowledge is more a means than an end.

Al-Tahtânawi (Beirut ed., ii, 484) summarizes the question of idrdk in these terms: "For the philosophers (hukamâ), this word is synonymous with knowing, in the sense of a form which, deriving from a thing, presents itself to the intellect, without specifying whether this thing is abstract or material, particular or universal, present or absent, whether it is realized in the mudîr himself, or in an instrument. In this meaning, idrdk embraces four divisions: the act of perception (ikds), of imagining (lakhayyul), of supposing (tawahhum) and of understanding (fa-abdkl). Some limit the word idrdk to the particular meaning of ikds, and it is then more particular than the word 'knowing' . . . ."

Finally, al-Tahtânawi mentions that in the terminology of the Sîfs idrdk is of two sorts: the idrdk basî (simple), which is the grasp of the existence of God together with the forgetting both of this grasp and of the fact that it is the existence of God which is grasped (this is therefore idrdk in a state of ecstasy involving a total loss of consciousness of self); idrdk murakkab (composite) accompanied by the awareness of this grasp and of the fact that it is the existence of God which is grasped. It should be mentioned that the mystics do not speak, any more than the philosophers do, of a grasp of God's essence, which is impossible, but of a grasp of His existence. To the extent to which perception produces an awareness of the existence of a thing, this idrdk murakkab of the mysteries would be analogous to a sensory knowledge. This recalls the question of the vision of God after death. Probably the eyes do not grasp it: id rdrik al-absâr, but there could occur a grasp with the whole of man which would therefore be reduced to a grasp of the existence [of God]. And indeed, some have claimed that although the colour black is visible, this is not because it is black in colour, but because it exists. Thus, although the existence is already the specific object of sensory vision, it is possible a fortiori to conceive of a non-sensory idrdk which would be a "vision" of the existence of God (on this question, cf. Fathalla Kholeif, A study on Fakhr al-Din al-Razi and his controversies in Transoxiana, Beirut 1966, 118 f. and p. 16 of the Arabic text).

Bibliography: In the article.
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(a. s. bazeer ansari)

idris, person mentioned twice in the kur’an (second meccan period): xix, 5756-58/57, “and mention in the book idris; he was a true man (siddik), a prophet. we raised him up to a high place”, and xxi, 85-86, “and (make mention of) isma’il, idris, brahim (moses), nuh, and we admitted them into our mercy; they were of the righteous” (tr. a. j. arberry). among the explanations suggested for this name, obviously foreign and adapted, like the name iblis [q.v.], to the pattern if’i, may be mentioned that of casanova (in ja, cciv, 358, followed by torrey, the jewish foundation of islam, new york 1933, 72) which connect it with “eva” (under the greek form eva, a corruption of andreas and referring either to the apostle andrew (t. nøldeke, in za, xvii, 84 ff.) or to a person with the same name, the cook of alexander the great who achieved immortality by accident, according to the romance of alexander (r. hartmann, ibid., xxiv, 314 ff.) in any case, the brief references in the kūr’ān have been sufficient for later muslim legend, often filled out with material from apocryphal biblical and rabbinical sources, to identify him with characters in the bible and the apocrypha who ascended into heaven: most frequently with hānōkî (enoch, arabic spelling akhnûkhî), more rarely with eliyyā (ilyās) or al-khîrî (ka’bîrî). on the other hand, as a result of the syncretism practised by the hermetists, the astrologers and the alchemists, whose speculations are not easy to distinguish from one another and whose ideas tend to become identical, especially among the “sabeans”, idris has been introduced into the genealogy of the “hermes” (hirmis [q.v.], pl. harāmisc), this thread can be traced from abū ma’asghar (k. al-uluf), whose sources have not yet been identified, to ibn abī usaybi’a, not to mention still later compilations. similarly idris has been credited with a number of wise sayings, and muslim mystic ibn al-ʿarabî describes him as “the prophet of the philosophers”; a number of works were attributed to him (ibn sabîn [q.v.] wrote a commentary on one, cf. ḥādīṣī ḥalīfa, ed. flügel, iii, 599, no. 7170); he is credited also with various inventions, arts of divination like geomancy and saʿārdagā [q.v.], and with useful arts, particularly that of writing (which again connects him with hermes and with the babylonian god nābû) and that of making garments (an attribute granted by balʿam unto the iranian myth of gayomār); this reputation assured him a place among the patron saints of the craftsmen’s guilds and the representative figures of the futuwma [q.v.]. sunni legend generally places idris between adam and noah; it makes him the recipient of a number of revelations in the form of holy books (suḥuf); it relates how he entered into paradise while still alive, never to leave it again (this is an idea which, in the jewish aggada, is attached to the 3rd century palestinian rabbi, yehoḥu’a ben levi); the prophet is said to have met him during his ascension to heaven. the shi’i legend concerning him (ibn

Bibliography: ‘All shir kâni, mabâdî al-šârârârâr, karachi 1957, 11-2; idem, Tuhfat al-łikrâm (bomay bád), iii, 43; Bādâ’ni, Mundâdhab al-lawdârâr (apud Mabâlî al-šârârâr), 62; storey, li/ii (3), 654 (very imperfect information); H. i. Sadarangani, Persian poets of sind, karachi 1956, xiv, 18, 35-42, 48-9; idrâki beglâr, Canfarar-nâma, karachi 1956, especially preface by the editor, the foundation of islam, (ed. hyderabad 1964, 36, 236, 297-8. (a. s. bazeer ansari)
Bábuyá, d. 381/991) is a combination of Biblical stories of Elijah (I Kings XXI, XVII and XIX; II Kings VII) adapted to the theory of ghyba [q.v.].


...
concubine named Kanza, of the Berber tribe of the Nefza, who was seven months pregnant and gave birth to Walila in Rabi 803 (August 791) to a son, also named Idris. To distinguish them, the first was called Al-Akbar and his son Al-Ashgar, or, as a hypocorism, Al-Azhar. Rāshid (see preceding article) had persuaded the Berbers to wait for the birth of the child and, if it was a son, to proclaim him as imām. When this happened, Rāshid acted as regent and served the young prince as tutor and mentor. In 805/806, Ibrahim b. Al-Aghlab instigated the revolt of Rāshid b. 'Abd Allah and had the Matghara Zawagha, in a place called al-Makarmada, and found-ranch of the High Atlas and seized Neffis, then Fas, which was inhabited by some Zanata, the Banū Izghaten, settled on the right bank of the wadi Fas, which he once again had allegiance sworn to him; he was now a strong prince, at the age of ten, at the time of his death, he settled on the right bank of the wadi Fas, which was inhabited by some Zanata, the Banū Izghaten, and where his father had founded the fortified military camp of Garwawa, the beginnings of Madin'at Tlemcen. He remained for some time in this town, and he restored the mosque of the Chorfa, where his tomb still remains, until the 9th/i5th century, in Radjab 841/1437-8, he was buried at Walila, beside his father. It was not until the age of 38, after an effective reign of 22 years. He died as the result of an accident, at Fas or Walila, in Djumada II 213/September 828, at the age of 38, after an effective reign of 22 years. He was buried at Wallàla, beside his father. It was not until the 9th/15th century, in Radjab 841/1437-8, that for reasons connected with the defence of Islam against the Christian invaders and the prestige of the holy town of Fas, founded by Idris, his body was removed and opportunely rediscovered there in the mosque of the Chorfa, where his tomb still remains the object of veneration by the Moroccans.


IDRIS, historian of Yemen [see al-SHARIF ABU MUHAMMAD IDRISI B. 'ALLI].

IDRIS B. AL-HASAN, Ismaili historian [see Supplement to al-ABU IDRISI, Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Abd Allah Muhammad b. Abd Allah Idrisi b. Al-Ali bin Al-Abban, called also al-SHARIF AL-IDRISI because of his exalted lineage, owes his fame to a work of descriptive geography entitled Kitâb Nawzat al-mushâfi fi khirār al-jahâf, which was produced on the orders of Roger II, the Norman king of Sicily, as a key to a large silver planisphere which the author himself had made. For this reason the work was also called Kitâb Rudjîr (the Book of Roger) or Al-Kitâb Al-Rudjîri. According to information found at the end of the six complete manuscripts which have survived, the book was completed in 548/1154, and this is the only certain date known in the life of Idrisi. Biographical notices on him are rather rare, and according to F. Pons Boigues this is to be explained by the fact that the Arab biographers considered Al-Idrisi to be a renegade, since he had lived at the court of a Christian king and written in praise of him in his work. Some western writers state that he was born at Ceuta in 493/1100 and that he studied at Cordova (hence the by-name of Al-Kurtubi). He states in his book that he travelled a great deal in Spain and in North Africa. The circumstances with led him to settle in Sicily at the court of Roger II are not known, nor are the details of the last days of his life and of his death, which some state to have occurred in 560/1165.

The Sicilian Arab poet, Ibn Bashrûn (or Bishrûn), his contemporary, states that al-Idrisi had written for William I another geographical work entitled Raud al-unis wa nuzhat al-nafs, of which up to now no certain trace has been found. According to Reinau and Rommel this information is indirectly confirmed by the fact that the content of the citations from al-Idrisi given by Abu 'l-Fidâ in his Takhwim does not tally with the corresponding passages of the Book of Roger. It is worthy of note that Abu 'l-Fidâ refers to a work which he calls in his introduction Kitâb Al-Sharif Al-Idrisi fi 'lamâdik wha Al-Masâlik. At the beginning of this century, J. Horovitz discovered in Istanbul the manuscript of a work by
al-Idrisi entitled *Uns al-muḥāḍi wa raʾūs al-ṣūqāḍi* or, according to another reference found at the end of the manuscript, *Raʾūs al-ṣūqāḍi wa Ṽu Ṽu al-muḥāḍi*. C. F. Seybold, in his article on al-Idrisi in *EI*, states that this is a summary of al-Idrisi's second geographical work written for William I, whereas J. H. Kramers thought that it was an extract from the "great Idrisi" written in 588/1192 and rewritten a century later, since it contains the addition of a brief description of an eighth climatic zone south of the Equator and a reference to the author Ibn Saʿīd, who was alive circa 670/1270. This abridgement is known usually as the "little Idrisi", the name given to it by K. Miller, and later adopted generally.

In addition to the complete text of the Book of Roger there exists an abbreviated text in which here and there sections have been cut, apparently without any precise motive. The fact that this text has been thus abbreviated has made it difficult to evaluate: to give only a few examples, it has been called in turn "estratto spoglio" (Schiaparelli), "résumé superficiel" (Seybold), "incomplete abridgment" (Kramers) and "extraits maigres" (Leleuel). This abridgement, which was included among the first secular Arabic works printed by the Medici press in Rome [see *Mathäx*] in 1592, has the title *Kitāb Nuḥuṭ al-muṣṭakāb fī Ṽab Ṽar al-⊃a⌈a][...]m al-⊃a⌈a][...]m wa Ṽb al-Salān al-⊃a⌈a][...]m wa Ṽb al-Madāya wa Ṽb al-⊃a⌈a][...]m*. This Medici edition was translated into Italian in 1592, has the title *Kitāb al-ʿĀdwa al-mufradāt* and was edited by the Italian polygraph B. Baldi, this unpublished translation being now in the University of Montpellier, and into Latin in 1619 by the Maronites Gabriel Sionita and Joannes Hesronita. This Latin translation was published in Paris with the title *Geographia Nubiensis*, id est accuratissima totius orbis in septem climata divis descrip[...]onis continens praesertim exactam universae Asiae et Africae, rerumque in his cactenus incognitarum explicationem. The manuscripts of this abridgment do not mention the author, which is why a copyist's error in transcribing *ardunā* ("our country") instead of *arduhā* in a passage on Nubia led to the work's being attributed simply to a "Nubian". Many studies have been published based on various parts of the Medici text.

Of the Book of Roger there exist two abridgements. The first, entitled *Diwān al-aḥāḍr min al-raʾaw al-miṣfār*, discovered in Cairo in 1893 by Vollers, was abridged by a certain Ḥāfīz Shīhāb al-Dīn Abmad al-Maṭrī. The fact that he had the same name as the historian al-Maṭrī caused this manuscript to be erroneously attributed to the historian; it was for a long time thought to be an abbreviation of a geographical encyclopaedia entitled *Raʾaw al-miṣfār fī khobar al-aḥāḍr* compiled by Ibn ʿAbd al-Munʿim al-Ḥimyārî [q.v.]. The second abridgement of the Book of Roger, whose author, an Arabic-speaking Armeni-an, named it simply *Kitāb al-dīgrāfiya (sic) al-kulliyya ay fārat al-ard*, was discovered at the beginning of this century by E. Griffini in a private collection in Tunis.

The maps (some of them in colour) which illustrate the text and which are found in a certain number of manuscripts as well as in the Istanbul manuscript of the "little Idrisi" are of especial interest. There is, in general, one for each section of the seven climatic zones, plus a planisphere in the introductory chapter. The majority have been published by K. Miller in his *Mappae arabicae*.

In his introduction of the Book of Roger, which has been hoped for since the end of the 18th century, is now finally being undertaken by an international group of scholars, each dealing with the part on which he is a specialist, under the auspices of the Istituto Italiano per il Medio e l'Estremo Oriente at Rome and under the direction of a committee consisting of G. Tucci, E. Cerulli, G. Levi Della Vida, F. Gabrieli, L. Vegacia Vagliari, A. Bombaci and L. Petech. An editorial committee is based at the Istituto Universitario Orientale of Naples.

There should also be mentioned a second original work which is attributed to al-Idrisi: a treatise on simples entitled *Kitāb al-Dīğmāʾ li-ḥaḍāṭ al-nahāḥi or Kitāb al-Muṣāfra al-Awāya al-mufarrada*, the manuscript of which was discovered in 1928 by H. Ritter in the Fatih library in Istanbul. Although the manuscript is incomplete and has many lacunae, the importance of this work, which is often mentioned by Ibn al-Baytār and which was thought to be lost, has been demonstrated by M. Meyerhof, who states that al-Idrisi succeeds in giving synonyms for each drug in a great number of languages, sometimes as many as twelve.
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See also DJUGHFAYYAH, at p.584a. (G. Oman)

İDRİSİDS (Adārīṣa), Moroccan dynasty of descendants of 'All b. Abī Tālib, founded in 172/792 by İdrīṣ I (q.v.), who was succeeded by his son, İdrīṣ II (q.v.). The decadence of the dynasty was to commence with the latter's death. He left twelve sons: Muḥammad, Abnād, 'Ubayd Allah, İṣā, İdrīs, Dja*far, Hamza, Yaḥyā, 'Abd Allāh, al-Kāsim, Dāwūd, 'Umar. His eldest son, Muḥammad (no. 3 in the table), succeeded him and, on the advice of his grandmother Kanza, divided the kingdom among the eldest of his brothers, he himself retaining the capital of Fās. Al-Kāsim received Ṭanḍāj and its dependencies, including the town of al-Bagā; 'Umar received the countries of the Šīnḫādja and of the Għumāra of the Rīf; Dāwūd the country of the Haw- wāra, to the east of Ṭāzā; Yaḥyā, Dāy and its dependencies; İṣā, Wazekār and the northern Tāmesnā, with Šālā (Shalla); Hamza, al-Awliyya, the territory of Walī; 'Ubayd Allah, the south with the country of the Lāmta and its dependencies. The other princes who were too young to rule remained under the tutelage of their eldest brother and of their grandmother. At the same time, Tlmenč (Agādir) remained the fief of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, the cousin of İdrīs II.

This division immediately produced rivalries. İṣā, ruler of Wazekār, revolted against Muḥammad, who appealed to his brother al-Kāsim, ruler of Ṭanḍāj, to go and punish the rebel. Meeting with a refusal, he entrusted the task to 'Umar, ruler of the Rīf, who attacked Wazekār and drove out İṣā, who was forced to take refuge in Šalā. 'Umar then marched on Ṭanḍāj to punish the insubordination of al-Kāsim; the latter, defeated, had to flee towards Azayla (Arzila), near which he settled. As a reward, 'Umar was given the governorship of Ṭanḍāj and ruled over his own domain and that of his brother until his death, at Fadjīdī al-Farās in the country of the Šīnḫādja, in Shawwāl July-October 835. His body was transported to Fās for burial. On Muḥammad's orders, his apanage passed to his son 'All b. 'Umar.

Muḥammad survived his brother by only seven months and, after a reign of over eight years, died, in Rabī'I 221/March-April 836, at Fās and was buried there. He had appointed to succeed him his son 'All (no. 4), aged nine years. The Awraba and the Berber tribes were aware of the intention of the father, and the chiefs of the tribes acted as regents until he came of age. He was endowed with great qualities and succeeded in organizing the country, pacifying it and ensuring the stability of the state. He reigned at Fās for thirteen years and died in Rajad 234/January 849.

He was succeeded by his brother Yaḥyā (no. 5), during whose peaceful reign there came to settle in Fās many immigrants from al-Andalus and Ifri kiya. The town, which soon became too small for its population, was to have many new buildings added, in particular the two great mosques of Fās, that of the Karawīyyīn and that of al-Andalus, both founded in 243/859. Yaḥyā died in 249/863 and was succeeded by his son, Yaḥyā II (no. 6), who showed no aptitude for rule and proceeded to share out his domain yet again: the family of al-Kāsim received Tandja and its dependencies, including the town of al-Bagā; the family of al-Kasim received the west side of Fās together with the government of the territories of the Lūwa-ta and Kutāma tribes; ʻUsayn, Yaḥyā's maternal uncle, received the territory to the south of Fās,
up to the Atlas mountains. Yahyā led a dissolute life and was forced, as the result of a scandal, to flee from his palace and take refuge in the district of the Andalusians, where he died in 252/866, the circumstances of his death being unknown. He had married a daughter of his cousin 'Ali b. 'Umar (no. 7), ruler of the Ghumara, and when 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Sahl al-Dhahami, a powerful citizen of Fās, took advantage of the general discontent to seize the power for himself, Yahyā's widow appealed for help to her father, who seized the quarter of the Karawiyīn and restored order. Thus the power passed from the family of Muhammad to that of 'Umar. During 'Ali b. 'Umar's reign a Sufri Kharidjī, 'Abd al-Razzāk, revolted in the mountain district of Madyūna to the south of Fās. After several battles, 'Ali was defeated and forced to leave the town to take refuge with the Awraba. 'Abd al-Razzāk occupied the Andalusian quarter, but the quarter of the Karawiyīn refused to submit to him and summoned as ruler Yahyā (III) b. al-Kāsim (no. 8), named al-Mīkdām.

With this prince the power changed again to another family. He succeeded in taking the Andalusian quarter, from which the usurper fled; he reigned years later, in 315/927, through the treachery of the governor of Fās, he fell into the hands of Mūsā and was killed.

Having become the sole ruler of the western Magrib, Mūsā pursued the Idrīsid as far as their fortress at Ḥadījat al-Nasr in 317/929, and then threw off the authority of the Fātimid caliph at the instigation of the Umayyad ruler of Spain who, after seizing Mālīka in 314/927, had just taken Ṣabta (Ceuta) in 319/931. The Fātimid caliph then sent his general Ḥumayd b. Yaṣāl, and Mūsā was defeated. The Idrīsid family took advantage of this to raise the siege of their fortress and to destroy the Zanāta troops. Once the Fātimid forces had left, however, Mūsā once again recognized the suzerainty of the Umayyad caliph and, this time, the Fātimid general Maysūr, who was sent to punish him, put him to flight and the Idrīsids pursued him until he was killed. The Idrīsids then established themselves in the Rif in the north-west of the country, where they ruled, sometimes acknowledging as suzerain the Umayyad caliph, and sometimes the Fātimid. Al-Kāsim Gannūn (no. 11) ruled in the name of the latter until 337/948-9. His son, Abu l-ʿĀysh b. Ahmad (no. 12), ruled in the name of the Umayyad 'Abd al-

ed for a long period over the whole kingdom and fought against the Sufris. He was killed in 292/905, during a battle, by Rabīʿ b. Sulaymān, a general of Yahyā b. Idrīs b. ʿUmar (no. 9).

The civil war then became complicated by threats from outside: the kingdom was attacked by the Fātimids of Ifrīkiya. Yahyā b. 'Abd Allāh (no. 1), 'Abd Allāh b. ʿUmar (no. 2), Idrīs II b. Idrīs I (no. 3), Muḥammad b. Idrīs II (no. 4), ʿAli b. Muḥammad (no. 5), Yahyā I b. Muḥammad (no. 6), Yahyā b. Yahyā (no. 7), ʿAli II b. ʿUmar (no. 8), Yahyā III b. al-Kāsim (no. 9), Yahyā IV b. Idrīs b. ʿUmar (no. 10), Muḥammad b. Idrīs II (no. 11), al-Kāsim Gannūn b. Muḥ. b. al-Kāsim (no. 12), Abu l-ʿĀysh b. Ahmad b. al-Kāsim Gannūn (no. 13), al-Hasan b. al-Kāsim Gannūn (no. 14), and the governor of Fās, he fell into the hands of Mūsā and was killed.

Having become the sole ruler of the western Magrib, Mūsā pursued the Idrīsids as far as their fortress at Ḥadījat al-Nasr in 317/929, and then threw off the authority of the Fātimid caliph at the instigation of the Umayyad ruler of Spain who, after seizing Mālīka in 314/927, had just taken Ṣabta (Ceuta) in 319/931. The Fātimid caliph then sent his general Ḥumayd b. Yaṣāl, and Mūsā was defeated. The Idrīsid family took advantage of this to raise the siege of their fortress and to destroy the Zanāta troops. Once the Fātimid forces had left, however, Mūsā once again recognized the suzerainty of the Umayyad caliph and, this time, the Fātimid general Maysūr, who was sent to punish him, put him to flight and the Idrīsids pursued him until he was killed. The Idrīsids then established themselves in the Rif in the north-west of the country, where they ruled, sometimes acknowledging as suzerain the Umayyad caliph, and sometimes the Fātimid. Al-Kāsim Gannūn (no. 11) ruled in the name of the latter until 337/948-9. His son, Abu l-ʿĀysh b. Ahmad (no. 12), ruled in the name of the Umayyad 'Abd al-

The Idrīsid dynasty

1. Idrīs I b. ʿAbd Allāh [Rāshid, regent]
2. Idrīs II b. Idrīs I
3. Muḥammad b. Idrīs II
4. ʿAli b. Muḥammad
5. Yahyā I b. Muḥammad
6. Yahyā b. Yahyā
7. ʿAli II b. ʿUmar
8. Yahyā III b. al-Kāsim
9. Yahyā IV b. Idrīs b. ʿUmar [Fātimid governor, Mūsā b. ʿAbī l-ʿĀfīya]
11. al-Kāsim Gannūn b. Muḥ. b. al-Kāsim
12. Abu l-ʿĀysh b. Ahmad b. al-Kāsim Gannūn
13. al-Hasan b. al-Kāsim Gannūn

The civil war then became complicated by threats from outside: the kingdom was attacked by the Fātimids of Ifrīkiya. Yahyā b. ʿAbd Allāh (no. 1), ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar (no. 2), Idrīs II b. Idrīs I (no. 3), Muḥammad b. Idrīs II (no. 4), ʿAli b. Muḥammad (no. 5), Yahyā I b. Muḥammad (no. 6), Yahyā b. Yahyā (no. 7), ʿAli II b. ʿUmar (no. 8), Yahyā III b. al-Kāsim (no. 9), Yahyā IV b. Idrīs b. ʿUmar (no. 10), Muḥammad b. Idrīs II (no. 11), al-Kāsim Gannūn b. Muḥ. b. al-Kāsim (no. 12), Abu l-ʿĀysh b. Ahmad b. al-Kāsim Gannūn (no. 13), and the governor of Fās, he fell into the hands of Mūsā and was killed.

Having become the sole ruler of the western Magrib, Mūsā pursued the Idrīsids as far as their fortress at Ḥadījat al-Nasr in 317/929, and then threw off the authority of the Fātimid caliph at the instigation of the Umayyad ruler of Spain who, after seizing Mālīka in 314/927, had just taken Ṣabta (Ceuta) in 319/931. The Fātimid caliph then sent his general Ḥumayd b. Yaṣāl, and Mūsā was defeated. The Idrīsid family took advantage of this to raise the siege of their fortress and to destroy the Zanāta troops. Once the Fātimid forces had left, however, Mūsā once again recognized the suzerainty of the Umayyad caliph and, this time, the Fātimid general Maysūr, who was sent to punish him, put him to flight and the Idrīsids pursued him until he was killed. The Idrīsids then established themselves in the Rif in the north-west of the country, where they ruled, sometimes acknowledging as suzerain the Umayyad caliph, and sometimes the Fātimid. Al-Kāsim Gannūn (no. 11) ruled in the name of the latter until 337/948-9. His son, Abu l-ʿĀysh b. Ahmad (no. 12), ruled in the name of the Umayyad 'Abd al-
port, in order to seize power once again. He was defeated and taken prisoner by the Umayyad general sent by al-Manṣūr, then assassinated on the road to Cordoba (1055). This caused the fall of the Idrisid dynasty. For more than two centuries, the Idrisid dynasty died out. Later, a branch descended from the Banu ʿUmar succeeded in establishing at Malaga a kingdom which lasted for slightly more than twenty years [see RAMMŪDĪDS].

In Morocco today there exists a large number of sharifs descended from the Idrisids [see SGURĀFA]. In 1280-81, the Banu ʿUmar dynasty died out. Later, a branch descended from the Banu ʿUmayyad general ʿAbd al-Ḥamid, Alexandria 1958, 194-6 (tr. Fagnan, 149-55); Ibn ʿUqīr, i, 82-4, 210-4, 235 f. (tr. Fagnan, i, 96-9, 303-10, 344 f.); Ibn Abī Zarʿ, Rāwū al-ḥurūs, lith. F. n.d., 4-63 (tr. Beaumier, 9-130); Yahyā Ibn Khaldūn, Bughyat al-nawwād, ed. and tr. Bel, 7-9, 103-10; Dākhān, Zahrat al-ās, ed. and tr. Bel, 7-27, 34 f., 84 f.; 115-17; al-Qārī, ed. Cusa, 4-13; Lavoix, Catalogue des monnaies musulmanes de la Bibliothèque Nationale, ii, Espagne et Afrique, 337-493; Fourmiz, Berbers, i, 496-504; ii, 13-21, 154-9, 219-20, 286-8, 293-5, 299-303, 325-6, 363-5; G. Marçais, La Berbérie musulmane, 116-26; H. Terrasse, Hist. du Maroc, i, 107-28. (D. EUSTACHE)

IDRISĪYYA [see TĀRĪKA].

IDṬIRĀR, “compulsion, coercion”, as opposed to ikhtiyār, “freedom of choice”. Although the term itself, in its masdar form, does not belong to the language of the Qurʾān, the verbal use of the VHIth form is of relatively frequent occurrence there. The idea is that of an absolute necessity (ifṣīḍr); if he acts of “free choice”.

In one of his best analyses of human action, al-Ghazālī defines “free” actions man by means of acquisition (kasb).

In conclusion: in later ʿAshrārītī kalām the term ifṣīḍr is reserved rather for an action that, of itself, cannot not take place; it comes about bi-l-idfīḍr. But all three are alike, he says (ibid., 219), with respect to the actual nature (baḥša) of the compulsion (ṣīdrīr) or the coercion or obligation (ṣīb) that determines them. Al-Ghazālī’s conclusion, in fact, conformity with the ʿAshrārītī system but following a more highly developed psychological analysis, is that, in any case, of “chosen” action, the decision of the will necessarily follows the judgment of the intellect, and that, accordingly, man is “compelled to free choice”, maḍghār “ala l-ṣīdrīr (ibid., 220). A “natural” action occurring through ητήτηρ is purely determined; divine action is itself purely free; human actions are in an “intermediate position”, compelled to free choice. This is why the “people of the truth” (aḥī al-ḥaṣk) defined “free” actions of man by means of acquisition (kasb).

In the classic theme of the “channels (or “sources”) of knowledge” (ṣīb) in their different kinds of knowledge. In this way, ʿAshrārī already distinguished between necessary (ṣīdīrīr or ητήτηρ) knowledge, which asserts directly and compulsorily on the mind, and acquired (ṭiṣṭīb) knowledge (see W. Montgomery Watt, op. cit., 41-2, 132 and ref.). We find the same distinction in the ʿAshrārītī school, e.g., al-Bākīlānī, Ṭamḥid, 7-8. Necessary (ṣīdīrīr) knowledge is that which every man is compelled to admit, such, says al-Bākīlānī, is the sense of ητήτηρ. In the classic theme of the “channels (or “sources”) of knowledge” (ṣīb) the idea of “necessary knowledge” is regularly rendered by ṣīdīrīr.
The nisba is Ḩārāt. The tribesmen, who are nomads, range through the sayḥ or steppe east of the south-eastern corner of al-Rubī‘ al-Khalī. One of the landmarks in this district is Kārāt al-Khīrīt (al-Sulāḥī Hill). West of the hill is Wādī al-Ummayr, one of a number of valleys which run down to the quicksands of Umm al-Samīm [q.v.]. North of al-Ḥārāt is the tribe of al-Durūf [q.v.], while to the east are sections of al-Dījānāba [q.v.] and the tribes of Āl Wāhiha [q.v.] and al-Hikmān. Other sections of al-Dījānāba and the tribe of al-Ḥarāṣīs [q.v.] border on al-Ḥārāt to the south.

The tradition of al-Ḥārāt holds that the tribal ancestry was Ḥārāfī (a name still used in Arabia for a dust-coloured she-camel), a sister of ʿAmīr and Kaṭḥīr. Ḥārāfī, who had no husband, was got with child by an ʿAlīfīr (a sand devil, with no doubt an echo of ʿIrīlī). ʿAmīr was bent on killing his wayward sister, but Kaṭḥīr intervened to save her, and she gave birth to a son who was named ʿAlī. This tradition points to a blood relationship between al-Ḥārāt and the tribe of al-Ḥarāṣīs [q.v.] for ʿAlīfīr is Kaṭṭīs, the latter of which is the dominant tribe in the hinterland of the region of Zufār [q.v.] to the southwest of the range of al-Ḥārāt. The people of al-Ḥārāt believe that their forebears came from Ḥabarūt in western Zufār.

The three main sections of al-Ḥārāt are Bayt Ḥāmūda, al-Mazānīwā (pronounced mazānīwa, with the singular Muṣaynīwī), and al-Maḥākīkā (pronounced maḥākkī, with the singular Muḥāyykīkī). The members of the tribe belong to the Hūnāwī (Southern Arab) faction in Oman, but they enjoy the special privilege of being allowed to travel unmolested, along with anyone accompanying them, in ʿIrīlī (Northern Arab) territory. The tribesmen of al-Ḥārāt, like their neighbours of al-Dījānāba and al-Ḥarāṣīs, call themselves Sunnis. Other powerful neighbours, such as Āl Wāhiha and al-Durūf, are ʿĪbādis or mainly so.

**Bibliography:** Interviews with members of al-Ḥārāt, supplemented by brief references in Admiralty, A handbook of Arabia, London 1916-7; G. Rentz, etc., Oman and the southern shore of the Persian Gulf, Cairo 1952; W. Theisger, Arabian sands, London 1959. (G. Rentz)

**IFLĀR** (see EFLĀR).

**IFLĪLĪ** (see IRIFLĪLĪ).

**IPNI**, formerly called Santa Cruz de Mar Pequeño, a former Spanish enclave, about 600 square miles in area, on the coast of southern Morocco, situated between 28° 54' 3" and 29° 38' 10" N. Spanish rights in the area, where Spain held a trading post from about 1476-1524, were based upon the treaty of Tetzān (1860). They were recognised by France in 1912, but actual occupation was not affected until 1934. Its capital, Sidi Ifni, was formerly the seat of a single centralized administration for Africa Occi-

dental Española, but in January 1958, following the repulse, in the previous November, of an invasion by Moroccan irregulars, it became a separate pro-

vince from Spanish Sahara, each having its own military governor. Ifni is semi-desert in the south and its undeveloped resources are insufficient to maintain its population of about 40,000. With no significant exports, it was an economic liability to Spain and entirely dependent upon Morocco, where nearly half the male population found work as migrant labour. There has been no effective Hispanization. Claims to the territory advanced in 1538 by Morocco appear to have been supported by the leaders of the indigenous population, the seven tribes of the predominantly sedentary, Berber-speaking, Ait Ba-Amran. In December 1965, a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly called upon Spain to accelerate the decolonization of Ifni. Further pressure followed. Agreement between the Spanish and Moroccan governments for the transfer of sovereignty to Morocco was reached in January 1969.


**IFRAGHA**, a confederation of Touareg tribes consisting of about 17,000 persons who live in the southern Sahara between latitudes 17° and 21° N. at the north-east extremity of the republic of Mali. They inhabit the fairly low mountains of the Adrar [q.v.] and especially its valleys and its surrounding depressions. The Adrar is a dense massif, of crystalline and granitic rocks, less than 1,000 metres high, bordered to the west and is bounded to the west and the south by small sandstone plateaus. The wādis flow almost every summer during the rainy season (136 mm. at Kidāl) and sometimes join the Tilemsi to the west. The valleys and depressions are fairly rich in vegetation (acacias, tamarisks and tropical types of plant); the water there is fairly shallow and the pasturage relatively rich.

The region was probably at first inhabited by Songhai negroes, to whom are attributed the ruins of some villages. It is then thought to have been for a long time disputed between the Touareg, the Moors and the Songhāl. The Touareg Ifoghas became and remained masters of the country, which was an important crossroad of caravans routes to the Niger (Gao), Agadès, the Ahaggar and the oases of the north, particularly Touat.

The Ifoghas, like the other Touareg, are fair-skinned, speaking Tamakht (a Berber dialect) and are nomadic shepherds and caravaneers. They are however less poor than the Touareg of the north (Ahaggar and Azdjer); their line of descent is not through the women and their social structure is somewhat different: they have neither “warriors” nor slave tribes. They travel in small groups with their goatskin tents and their sheep and goats over fairly short distances, entrusting most of their ca-

mels, which travel farther afield, to keepers. In spite of the advent of lorries, they still trade by caravan with the oases of Touat and Tidakelt, from which they obtain dates, and increasingly with the Sahel area, whence they obtain millet and rice. Their only fixed points are the very small palm-grove of Tessalit, in the north-west, and the administrative centre of Kidāl in the south; Kidāl is the only market, its stall-holders being Mzabis and “Arabs” from the north.

**Bibliography:** R. Capot-Rey, Le Sahara français, Paris 1953; H. Bisso, Les Touareg de l’Ouest, Algiers 1888; M. Cortier, D’une rive à l’autre du Sahara, Paris 1908; Th. Monod, L’Adrar Ahnet, Paris 1932; H. Kaufmann, Wirtschaft und Sozialkultur der Iforas Tuareg, Cologne 1946; see also TAMÄRIN.

**IFRÄGHA** (or AFRAGHA), the Arabic form of Fraga, name of a small town (pop. ca. 9000) in NE Spain 30 kms WSW of Lérida. The old part of the town is situated on the steep left bank of the R. Cinca some 18 kms above its confluence with the Ebro. Practically no traces of Muslim rule survive.

Fraga fell into Arab hands presumably when Mūsā
b. Nuṣayr took Saragossa in 96/714. Thereafter it may be assumed to have shared the fortunes of Saragossa, being rarely mentioned by name in the histories. At the beginning of the 6th/11th century it may be assumed to have been under the governance of Yāḥyā b. Ghaṣṣiḥya [see Ghaṣṣiḥya, Banū]. In 528/1134 Abū I-Humayr mentions Yāḥyā b. Ghaṣṣiḥya, who had already taken Saragossa in 512/1121. He tried to take Fraga but was soundly beaten by Yāḥyā. In 543/1149 the town was seized by Ramūn Berenguer IV, Count of Barcelona, and Muslim rule there came to an end.

Idrisi places Fraga with Jaca, Lérida, and Mequinenza in the province of Zaytūn, a name which he applies also, as does al-IIimyāri, to the Cinca. Al-Illimyāri also gives a few details on the battle in 528/1134. Yāḥyā gives correctly the date of the fall of Fraga to the Catalans but his short entry is otherwise a singular concentration of errors. Kāzwrīnī describes the warren of tunnels in which the inhabitants took refuge in time of trouble.


Banū İFRAN (or İFRAN, İFRAN, İFRAN, UFRAN, IFRAN etc.), the most important branch of the large Berber tribes of the Zanātā (Zanātā). According to the writings, now lost, of three Berber genealogists used by Ibn Khaldūn, namely Sābīk b. Sulaymān al-Maṭmātī, Hānī b. Masdūr al-Kūmī and Kāhlān b. Abī Luwā, the Banū İfran are descended from Ištīlān (also Yaqūt), son of Misrā, son of Zākiyya, son of Wardīr (or of Warṣīk), son of Adīdāt. According to the same tradition, Zākiyya was the brother of Dammār (Demmer), the eponymous ancestor of the Berber tribe of that name, while the sister-tribes of the Banū İfran, descended from Ištīlān, were the Maghrāwā, the Banū İrniyyān and the Banū Wasiṃ. Along with this tradition, which seems to have been generally adopted in Berber circles during the Middle Ages, Ibn Khaldūn also transmitted another, which appears to be far more authentic, since it derives from an İfrānid informant. It was taken by Ibn Khaldūn from the Djamhara of Ibn Ḥāzm (q.v.), who reproduced it from the account given by the Spanish historian Yūsuf al-Warrāq (or Muḥammad b. Yūsuf Ibn al-Warrāq), d. 361/973. This last-named scholar took his account from Ayyūb, son of Abū Yazīd Maḥşīl, b. Kānddā (q.v.), whom he had met in Cordova, where Ayyūb had been sent by his father on a mission to the Umayyad caliph 'Abd al-Raḥmān III. Now this second tradition regarding the origin of the Banū İfran, which may be called the "tribal" tradition, does not differ greatly from the first as known from the writings of al-Maṭmātī, al-Kūmī and Kāhlān b. Abī Luwā. According to Ayyūb, the Banū İfran were descendants of İrfi, son of İštīlān, son of Misrā, son of Zākiyya, son of Warṣīk (or Warṣīh), son of Adīdāt, son of Addāt, son of Dīnā, the eponym of all the Zanātā tribes. We may add that the İfrānid tradition transmitted by Ayyūb also regards the Banū Maghrāw (Maghrāwā), the Banū İrniyyān and the Banū Wasiṃ as sister-tribes of the Banū İfran, and Dammar as the brother of Zākiyya. Lastly, according to the İbbālī Tradition Abī Zaka-riyyā b. al-Wardānī (after 504/1110-1), the Banū İfran and the Banū Wasiṃ were kinsmen, and together formed the tribe (or rather confederation) known as the Banū Turks. According to Ibn Khaldūn, the name İrfi, the eponym of the Banū İfran, derives from the Berber word irt meaning "cavern" (in modern Berber dialects irtʃ/3frə/3frə, and the corresponding diminutives irtʃi etc., mean "grotto", "cavern", "hiding-place").

The earliest mention of the Banū İfran (who were unknown to the Greek and Latin writers of antiquity and even to Byzantine authors of the 6th century, writing in Greek or Latin) occurs in the period of the Muslim conquest of North Africa, that is to say the second half of the 1st/7th century. At that period, they were the largest and most powerful tribe of the great Zanātā family. According to Ibn Khaldūn, there were branches of them in İfrījīya, the Aures and the central Maghrib. Later, towards the end of the 1st/7th century, the Banū İfran appear as one of the most important tribes of eastern Barbary. With the Maghrāwā and several other Berber tribes of the Zanātā branch and that of the Butr, they then joined the great Berber confederation headed by the tribe of the Djarāwā commanded by the Kāhīna (q.v.), at once queen and prophetesses. At this period the Djarāwā apparently inhabited the Aures, and the main body of the Banū İfran occupied the regions adjacent to what is now Tunisia. The Banū İfran were so closely attached to the person of the Kāhīna that a Berber tradition quoted by Ibn Ḥābarī makes İfran, the ancestor of this tribe, the father of the Kāhīna. It is moreover very probable that the Banū İfran originally were merely a confederation of sections of various east-Berber tribes, apparently formed in the second half of the 6th or the first half of the 7th century A. D. In fact, the name Banū İfran is as yet not mentioned among those of most of the east- Berber tribes dealt with in the Johannes of Coripus (6th century), a well-known low-Latin source which gives an almost complete list of the peoples inhabiting the eastern part of Barbary at the time of the country's reconquest by the Byzantine Empire.

The Banū İfran properly speaking, the nucleus of the future confederation of that name, were originally, it seems, no more than a somewhat insignificant tribe who had succeeded in placing themselves at the head of a number of frations of Berber tribes at the time of the Byzantine domination or during the disturbed period of the first Arab invasions of Tripolitania and İfrījīya proper. The region originally inhabited by this people was in western Tripolitania, the hypothetical homeland of all the Zanātā tribes (ard Zanātā, "land of the Zanātā") according to the accounts of Arab traditionists of the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries, by Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam in his description of the conquest of the Maghrib). The Zanātā tribe then occupied not only the interior of western Tripolitania but also the country surrounding the town of Sabra (the ancient Sabratha), on the coast, where they are mentioned in 125/741. The territory occupied by the Zanātā was bordered on the East by the ard Hawwārā "land of the Hawwārā", which included all the central part of Tripolitania. Now it was on the borders between these two lands, in the modern district of Yefren, that the Berber tribe of the Banū İfran (or Yafān) dwelt, being thought by some to form part of the Zanātā and by others to belong to the Hawwārā. Nothing is known of the earliest history of these Banū İfran, who first appear in Arabic sources at about the middle of the 3rd/9th century as the eastern neighbours and rivals of the Nafsa. It is quite probable however that these Banū İfran of western Tripolitania were merely the remnants of the large Zanātā confederation of the same name who had continued to live in the Yefren after the emigration of the main body of that confederation further to the West, towards what is...
now Tunisia, probably at the time of the conquest of Tripolitania by the Arabs. As has been said, Ibn Khalidūn connects the name of Ifri, the ancestor and eponym of the Banū Ifran, with the Berber word ifrī “cavern”. If this etymology is correct it may be supposed that the confederation of the Banū Ifran (or rather its nucleus) owed its name to the fact that the Zanāta elements which it included originally lived in cave dwellings. Now it is known that the mountainous districts situated in the interior of western Tripolitania and south-eastern Tunisia, like Maghila, Dālā, Butnah, and the buttoned steppe of agyrān, abounded in cave dwellings both old and new (cf. J. Despois, Djebel Nefousa, 202-6), and there is nothing against the hypothesis that it was in this part of the ārd Zanāta that the Banū Ifran had its origin. A thorough analysis of Berber and particularly Ifranid traditions seems to confirm this identification of the tribe’s original home. Thus it seems possible to connect the Iṣlītan (Yaṣlītan, sister-tribe of the Banū Ifran) with the town of Zillīt, situated on the coast of Tripolitania, east of the ruins of Leptis Magna, in the country that belonged in the Middle Ages to the Hawwārā. The name of Misrā, the grandfather of Iṣrī in the same traditions, must be connected with that of the Misrātī tribe, held by mediaeval Berber genealogists to belong to a branch of the Hawwārā and occupying the most easterly part of the coastal zone of the ārd Hawwārā, in central Tripolitania. The principal centre of this tribe, in the Middle Ages, was the town of Suwāyqāt Ibn Māṭḥūd, today called Misratah. It is not far from these two places in Tripolitania that the district of Yefren, the home of the Ifran/Yafra in the 3rd/5th century, is situated. The name of the great-grandfather of the Banū Ifran, that is to say Zākīyā, seems to indicate that among the Berber tribes which formed the confederation of the Banū Ifran there were some fractions of the Luwāṭā [g.v.], a tribe which, at the time of the conquest of North Africa by the Arabs, occupied the ancient Marmarica and Cyrenaica. It seems indeed that the name Zākīyā is repeated in the name Arzākīyā, which was according to al-Bakrī the principal locality in the oasis of Awjīlā/Djalo, situated in the heart of the Luwāṭā country. It is very probable that this name is composed of two elements, -zākīyā which is a common Berber noun, perhaps meaning ‘sheep’, and -ār-. The Berber genealogists, and Ar-... This second element recurs in the name of the ancient Libyan tribe of Arzugītani (Ar-zug-itani), identical with the Zuweges of Herodotus and the Zawīgā of the Arab historians. It is probably related to War-, the element preceding several Berber tribal and personal names (cf., e.g., Warraydān, from the Arabic proper name Zayydān), the significance of which has not yet been fully explained (see T. Lewicki, Études ibadites nord-africaines, 45-6).

Tripolitania.—The Banū Ifran of western Tripolitania, a large tribe of the confederation of that name, which remained in the same place after the emigration of the main body of that people to what are now Tunisia and the Aurès, in the 3rd/5th century were a tribe of sufficient strength to fight the Nafusi on the one hand, and to maintain in Tripolitania, the Ifranīs. We know that they were Ibādīs, without however being supporters of the Rustamid imāms of Tāhert. They supported the cause of the Ibādī leader of Tripolitania, Khālaf b. al-Sambū, who had revolted against the Banū Rustam. Later, in the 5th/11th century, the Khālafī sectarians still formed part of the population of Yefren, along with the Nukkāris (it will be seen later that, in the first half of the 4th/10th century, Nukkāris became the national religion of the eastern branch of the Ifranī tribes). In the 6th/12th century, the Yefren sectarians were converted to the form of moderately orthodox doctrines of the Ibādī-Wahlīs, former supporters of the Rustamid imāms. Nominally subject to the various dynasties which in turn ruled eastern Barbary, the people of watani Yafriyan, “land of Yafrem”, endeavoured to preserve their independence under chiefs who bore the title muḥammad and belonged to the family of ‘Abn b. Ḥarīz, for a considerable period of time (cf. J. Despois, Etudes ibadites, II, 204-7). Indeed, these leaders still played a considerable part in the confederation of the Banū Ifran, but later they broke away to form a separate tribe. It was from these Maghila, united with the Banū Ifran, that ‘Abū Kurra al-Ifrānī (in some sources called al-Maghib) originated, the leader of the Banū Ifran in Ifrikiya and the central Maghrib, and also the supreme leader of the North African Sufris at the beginning and towards the middle of the 2nd/8th century. He was in command of the Ifranī tribes apparently from the year 131/748-9. In 124/741-2, when the Sufrī leader ʿAbd al-Wāḥid marched on Kayrawān, ‘Abū Kurra al-Maghib, according to ‘Abd al-Hakkām, was in command of the vanguard of his army. At this time the main body of the Banū Ifran was probably still in Ifrikiya, near the Aurès, which formed the centre of the Kāhīna’s state. It may be supposed that this tribe took part in the Sufrī rising of the Warafīdjūmā, who occupied the town of Kayrawān in 133/757. When, in 131/748-9, the Ibādī imām of Tripolitania, ‘Abū l-Khaṭṭāb ‘Abd al-Aṣlā b. al-Samb al-Maṣāfīrī, expelled the Warafīdjūmā from Kayrawān and made Ifrikiya a province of his state, the Sufrī Berber tribes of that country, like the Banū Ifran of the Ifrikiya and the central Maghrib, began to move towards the central Maghrib. This movement must have assumed the nature of a mass migration after 144/762-3, that is to say after the reconquest of eastern Barbary by the Arab general Ibn al-Ashāth, who thus became the common foe of all Berber sects—Khāridīs, Ibādīs and Sufrīs—in North Africa. It was apparently at this period, between 140/757-8 and 144/761-2, that the main body of Ifranī tribes, commanded by ‘Abū Kurra al-Ifrānī al-Maghib, emigrated to the central Maghrib.

Little is known of the history of the branches of the Banū Ifran who continued to inhabit Ifrikiya after the emigration of the tribes led by ‘Abū Kurra. Ibn Khālidūn claims that there were two Ifranī tribes in this province, the Marandjīs and the Banū Warkī (Warkò). These tribes inhabited the country lying between Kayrawān and Tinā, in the Bilād al-Diarī, and the Aurès massif. It seems that these tribes were soon converted to Ibādīsm, having adopted the doctrines of the Nukkāri sect. It was from the Banū Warkī (the name of this tribe is perhaps the same as Arkū, in al-Idrīsī the name of a locality on the route leading from Lorbeus to al-Masalla) that ‘Abū Yazīd Makhīd b. Kaydād traced his origin, the leader of the Nukkārī revolt which almost destroyed
FIAM

Fatimid domination in North Africa. A branch of the Warku inhabited Sadāda (now Sdada) in the Bilad al-Dirādī, in immediate proximity to the Banū Wāsīn (also called Banū Wargla). It seems however that, save for this fact, conditions in the central Maghrib were little changed. The Zanata was smaller than that of the Banū Ifran; it co-operated with the latter in their war against Ibn al-Ashā'īt [q.v.]. This army was placed under the command of al-Aghlab al-Tamimi who, after setting up his headquarters at Tūbna in the Zāb, tried to attack first Tlemcen, then Tangier, but was compelled by the Berbers to withdraw. Soon the Ifranī and Ibadī Berber tribes formed a coalition in which the Banū Ifran, still under the command of Abū Kurra, played a considerable part. In 150/767 Abū Kurra's army appeared before the walls of Kayrawān, and in 151/768 he himself came with 40,000 Idrānī horsemen to lay siege to the town of Tūbna.

Not a great deal is known of the Idrānī state of Tlemcen after the siege of Tūbna. It is however very probable that friendly relations were maintained with the Idrānī kingdom of Banū Rustam [q.v.] in Tāhert, which bordered on Tlemcen. The first ruler of Tāhert, Abū al-Rahmān b. Rustam, who governed the town from 160/776-7 or 162/778-9, even allied himself with the Banū Ifran by marriage, since he probably married a daughter of the ruling family of Tlemcen. From this union was born Abū al-Wahhāb, the second Idrānī imām of Tāhert. This marriage must have taken place in about 148/765-6 at the latest, since in 167/784-5, at the time of the death of Abū al-Rahmān b. Rustam, Abū al-Wahhāb was already an adult and a member of the council of six empowered to choose the future imām from its own members. Curiously enough, another member of the same council was Abū Kudāmā Yāzīd b. Bandi al-Ifrānī, a cousin and supporter of Abū al-Wahhāb, who later became one of the founders of the Nukkārī heresy. He conducted a long war with Abū al-Wahhāb, probably relying mainly on the Banū Ifran; in the end he died in battle, killed by Alflab, son of Abū al-Wahhāb, in about 188/803-4 or shortly afterwards. At that time, the Idrānī state of Abū Kurra had already ceased to exist for some years. It seems moreover that control of Tlemcen, which was then inhabited by the Banū Ifran and the Maghrawa, had passed after the death of Abū Kurra into the hands of Maghrawa leaders belonging to the dynasty of the Banū Khazar, this dynasty being destined to play a considerable part in the history of the Maghrib. In 173/789-90 (or according to certain historians, in 174/790-1), at the time of the conquest of that country by Idrīs I [q.v.], the founder of the dynasty of the Idrīsids, Muhammad b. Idrīs, the ruler of a small town of Tlemcen, came before the conqueror and, thanks to his prompt submission, obtained security for himself and for all the Zānās tribes of the central Maghrib. It was Sulaymān, brother of Idrīs I and later hereditary ruler of that town, who became the Idrīsī governor of Tlemcen; it seems however that, save for this fact, conditions in the central Maghrib were little changed. The Zanāta
tribes in the country continued to recognize the supremacy of the Maghrawa, which had long replaced the supremacy of the Banū Ifran. Thus the Maghrawa, who in the days of the confederation of Berber tribes ruled over the central Maghrib, remained once more one of these tribes after the Djarawa, now recovered their importance. But the rivalry between the Idranid and the Maghrawa leaders was long to continue in the central Maghrib as well as in the Maghrib al-Aṣğā, and it was only with the conquest of the whole of the Maghrib by the Almoravid army that this discord was finally brought to an end, with the disappearance of the states created by the Banū Ifran and the Maghrawa. The Idranid tribes of the central Maghrib, for their part, certainly succeeded in retaining much of their independence after 173/789-90, though of course under the control of Sulaymān and the Maghrawa leaders. At the time of the Idrisid domination of the Maghrib, the Banū Ifran were already Sunnī, having abandoned their earlier Sunnī beliefs at some point of time now difficult to determine. In any case the Ibāḍi Berber genealogist al-Birzālī, who supplied Ibn Ḥażm (5th/11th century) with information regarding the Zanata tribes in the Maghrib, believed that the Banū Ifran had always been Sunnī and appeared to know nothing of their Sufri past.

The Idranid kingdom of the central Maghrib makes its appearance in the historical sources after the expulsion of the Idrīsid rulers from Tiemcen by the Fātimids, which took place in 316/928. The Sunnī Idranid tribes of the country took no part in the Nukkārī revolt of Abū Yazīd Makhlād b. Kaydād al-Idranī, although it is not impossible that their leaders may have helped him to get in touch with the Umayyad government in Cordova and that it was from their territory that Abū Yazīd's son Ayūb set out for Spain, when entrusted by his father with a political mission to ʿĀbd al-Rahmān III. In any case, during the war between Abū Yazīd and the Fātimids, the numbers and strength of the Banū Ifran in the central Maghrib remained unchanged. At that time their leader was Muḥammad b. ʿAṭāb al-Idranī, whose power was restricted solely to the Idranid tribes in the neighbourhood of Tiemcen, while the town itself had, since the fall of the local Idrīsid rulers, once again become the capital of the Maghrawa and was the stronghold of the Banū Ifran. At this period the Banū Ifran's domination of this part of North Africa was for a time destroyed. The command of the Zanāta tribes of the central Maghrib, so relentlessly harried by the Fātimids, once again reverted to the Maghrawa, that is to say to Muḥammad b. ʿAlṣāy al-Idranī, who was governing Fez in the name of the Umayyad caliphs of Spain. This leader even succeeded in reconquering the town of Tiemcen from the Fātimid state, between 360/970-1 and 370/980-1. It seems however that the dynasty of Yaṣlā b. Muḥammad eventually recovered from the defeat of 347/958-9 and continued to reign over the Idranid tribes of the central Maghrib. Rulers drawn from this family were still in control there, with Tiemcen as their capital, in the first half of the 5th/11th century. At the time of the invasion of the Banū Hilāl, the master of Tiemcen was prince Bālḥīt, whom Ibn Khādān describes, in one passage in his book, as an Idranid and, in another, as a descendant of Muḥammad Ibn Khazār, that is to say as a Maghrawa. Be that as it may, he had as his vizier an Idranid general, who died in a battle against the Banū Hilāl in 450/1058. At that period the Banū Ifran shared their rule over the Zanāta in the central Maghrib with the Maghrawa and two other large Berber tribes, the Wāmnāni and the Banū Hilān. Bālḥīt was succeeded by his son al-Qabbās, who was reigning in Tiemcen at the time of the conquest of the central Maghrib by the Almoravid army.
tial of the Zanata leaders. In 369/979-80, the family of Ya'la b. Muhammad, still loyal to the Umayyads of Cordova, had to flee before the army of Bulukkîn b. Ziri, the Fatimid governor of Ifrikiya, who not only seized the central Maghrib but also penetrated as far as Fez and even Sidjûlnâs. But Yaddu b. Ya'la, who was among the fugitives, returned to the central Maghrib only after Bulukkûn had left for Ifrikiya, as did some other rulers of the dynasty of Ya'la who succeeded in restoring the state of Tlemcen. He settled in al-Magrib al-Aljâa and in 379/990-1 was appointed governor of the province for the Umayyad dynasty, with his base at Fez, formerly the territory of the Maqrwâ (from the time of the rule of Mu'âammad b. al-Kâshây). It was probably at this time that a certain number of families of the Banû Ifran settled in Fez, whose descendants were still living there, with other sections of the Zanata tribes, in 462/1069-70, when the army of the Almoravid Yusuf b. Tâgjûn seized the capital of al-Magrib al-Aljâa. However, the Umayyad government, fearing that Yaddu b. Ya'la's power might become too great, decided to offer support simultaneously to Ziri b. 'Atiyya, one of the amirs of the Maqrwâ. As a result, the old rivalry between the Banû Ifran and the Maqrwâ, previously allayed by the alliance concluded between Ya'la b. Mu'âammad and al-Kâshây b. Mu'âammad Ibn Khazar and his son Mu'âammad, was revived after 40 years of harmony. In 379/990-9 or 381/992-3, Yaddu b. Ya'la openly revolted against the Umayyad government, which had appointed Ziri b. 'Atiyya to govern Fez. The result of this conflict was the war waged by Yaddu against the combined forces of the Umayyads and the Maqrwâ. The latter finally prevailed, and Yaddu was obliged to seek refuge in the Sahara, where he died in 383/993-4. His successor as ruler of the tribe was Habbu's, son of his brother Ziri b. Ya'la. Habbu's was murdered by his cousin, the Ifranid amir Abû Yaddas b. Dûnâs, who was however compelled to flee soon afterwards. Hammâma, brother of Habbu's, then assumed the leadership of the Banû Ifran. He led the tribe against the town of Shâla (Salé) in the province of Tadla, capturing the town from Ziri b. 'Atiyya, together with part of Tadla that depended on it, and setting up a new Ifranid state of Ya'la named al-Hamâmâ. This kingdom lasted until the conquest of Morocco by the Almoravids. Hammâmâ died after 406/1015-6 and was succeeded by his brother Abu 'l-Kâmîl Tamîn, who, having to fight against the anti-Muslim kingdom of the Barajawât, was obliged to make peace with the Maqrwâ of Fez. However, war broke out once again in 424/1033, and Abu 'l-Kâmîl even succeeded in capturing Fez; it was only in 429/1037-8 that he was driven out by the Maqrwâ. Forced by the Maqrwâ, Abu 'l-Kâmîl had to withdraw to his kingdom of Tadla, he lived there until his death in 446/1054-5. It was apparently in the reign of Abu 'l-Kâmîl that the Ifranid dynasty of Salé also took possession of the large commercial town of Aghmat, previously held by the Maqrwâ origin. But soon the conquest of this part of the Maqrwâ by the Almoravid army, which captured Aghmat in 449/1057-8 and invaded the country of Tadla in the following year, ended the existence of the kingdom of Salé. The Ifranid rulers of the country perished and their state was annexed to the kingdom of the Almoravids.

The Banû Ifran of Tadla were not the only Ifranid branch to be established in the western part of what is now Morocco. Certain Ifranid families seem to have begun to penetrate into this region long before the state of Salé was founded. Thanks to the account left by Zam'mir, who in 352/966 was ambassador for the king of the Barghâwâta (in the province of Tamessna) to the Umayyad caliph al-Hakam al-Mustansir, we know that, among the Muslim-Berber petty tribes under the authority of the kings of the Barghâwâta, there was also an Ifranid tribe. This seems to be a reference to a fraction of the Banû Ifran who emigrated from the central Maghrib after the collapse of the Ifranid State of Ya'la b. Muhammad in 376/987-8. Spain.—The first wave of Ifranid emigrants came to Spain in 347/958-9, after the death of Ya'la b. Mu'âammad and the fall of his kingdom. This group, led by Ibn Khûrâ, son of Ya'la b. Mu'âammad's uncle, was given a very cordial welcome in Cordova. Another branch of the Banû Ifran settled in Spain towards the end of the 11th/12th century. This consisted of a fraction led by the Ifranid ruler Abû Yaddas b. Dûnâs who, after killing his cousin Yaddu b. Ya'la and attempting unsuccessfully to seize command of all the Ifranid tribes of al-Magrib al-Aljâa, fled to Spain with his three brothers and a numerous body of supporters. According to Ibn Khûlûn, this emigration occurred in 383/993-4 or 382/992-3. Abû Yaddas is said to have acted in concert with the Umayyad government of Cordova, which was anxious to remove the family of Yaddu b. Ya'la from supreme command over all the Ifranid tribes of Al-Magrib al-Aljâa and to replace it by another ruling family, more closely linked with the interests of the Umayyad dynasty. The Umayyad government welcomed the emigrants. All the fighting men of Abû Yaddas were enrolled in the Berber forces in Spain, and their leader was granted a considerable sum of money and several fiefs (1442). Later, in 400/1009-10, Abû Yaddas, together with all the Berber forces, is found supporting the cause of the caliph al-Mustâ'in in the war he fought with his predecessor al-Mahdi. He died in a battle on the banks of the Guadari; descendants of his held high rank in the Zanata forces in Spain. At the period of the mulk al-fawâqîh, Yâhâb b. Abû al-Raamsân, the son of Abû Yaddas' brother-al-Âtîfâ, entered the service of the Hammûdiid dynasty and was given the post of governor of Cordova. Another branch of the Ifranid dynasty was played a considerable part in Muslim Spain in the first half of the 5th/11th century. In 405/1014-5 he succeeded in driving from the town of Ronda the governor, Abû Kurra, another brother of Abû Yaddas, who played a considerable part in Muslim Spain and, in the name of the Umayyad dynasty, and established himself there as an independent prince. In addition to Ronda, his principality included the town of Taciruna (Tacoarona). If Ibn al-Khâthib is to be believed, Abû Nûr obtained this territory from Sulaymân b. al-Hakam b. Sulaymân b. al-Nâsir, who divided certain provinces of al-Andalus between the leaders of six Berber tribes which had settled in Spain. In 443/1051-2, with various other Berber leaders, Abû Nûr was forced to recognize the supremacy of the 'Abbâdîds of Seville. He died soon afterwards, in 457/1065, and was succeeded by his son Abû Nasr, who reigned until 457/1065, when he was murdered by a traitor acting with the connivance of the 'Abbâdî government.

It is quite probable that a section of the Banû Ifran settled in the neighbourhood of Mazarrón, in the province of Murcia. There is there a "diputación" called Ifre, a name which C. E. Dubler has connected with that of the Banû Ifran (or Ifrin, the vocalization adopted by this scholar). It seems however that the
modern Ibre owes its name not to Ibran but to Ifri — the eponym of this tribe, according to the traditions of the mediaeval Berber genealogists. Moreover, it is not impossible that the modern Spanish place-name derives, not from the name of the tribe of the Banū Ibran or its eponym, but directly from the Berber word i'frîn —caverne".

Sicily. —It is possible that some families of Irandj origin may have lived in Sicily, which was closely linked with Ifrikiya from the 9th/10th century, and that certain warriors belonging to the Banū Ibran and deriving from branches of the Ibranjya and the Banū Wārkhā may have made their way there with Aghlabid and Fāṭimid troops. Among the inhabitants of the town of Corleone mentioned in a mediaeval source, there is in fact a reference to a man bearing the name Ibn Abī Yafran and probably of Ibranj stock.


This is based on the report of a returned prisoner of war called Ḥārūn b. Yaḥyā (q.v.) who, to his description of Rome, append a brief note on Ibranjya and Britain. The latter "is ruled by seven kings"—obviously a belated allusion to the already defunct Anglo-Saxon heptarchy. Rather fuller information was available to Mas'udī, who refers to the Franks both in the Murādī (iii, 66-7, 69-72; ed. and tr. Ch. Pellat, §§ 910-1, 914-6) and in the Tanbih (B. G. A., viii, 22 ff.; 176 ff., etc.). The Franks are, he says, descended from Japheth; they are numerous, courageous, well-organized and well-disciplined people, with a vast and unified realm. They have some 150 cities, with Bawira (? Bariza) as capital. Alone among Muslim authors of his time, Mas'udī gives a list of the Frankish kings from Clovis to Louis IV, based, he tells us, on a book prepared by a Christian bishop for the Andalusian heir-apparent (later Caliph) al-Ḥakam in the year 328/939. He came across a copy of this book in Egypt in 336/947.

Diplomatic contacts between the Franks and the Caliphate were few, and have left little trace. The famous exchange of embassies between Charlemagne and Ḥārūn al-Rašīd is known only from a Frankish source; if it happened at all, it was of insufficient importance to attract the attention of the Arabic chroniclers, and no mention of it. Barthold has indeed rejected the whole story as inauthentic (Sōkeninmāy, vi, Moscow 1966, 342-4, = Khrisantsky Vostok, i (1912), 69-94; for an opposing view see F. W. Buckler, Haruna 'r-Rashid and Charles the Great, Cambridge 1931; cf. F. F. Schmidt in Isl., i (1912), 409-11; Barthold, Soč, vi, 432-6 = Khris. Vostok, iii (1913), 263-296; W. Ebermann, in Islamica, iii (1927), 233-5; S. Runciman, Charlemagne and Palestine, in English Historical Review, i (1925), 606-9; Madjī Khāḍdūl, al-Silāt al-dīlahumādīthayyay bayna Ḥārūn al-Rašīd wa-Sharīlamān, Baghdad 1939; G. Musca, Carlo Magno ed Harun al-Rashid, Bari 1963). The first definite report of a Frankish embassy to Baghdad dates from the year 293/906 when, according to al-Ḍahābī's wa'l-tubāf, by al-Awhabī, an embassy arrived at the court of the Mu'tafif from Bertha, daughter of king Lothair II of Lorraine and wife of Adalbert the Rich, March 293/906, in Enstitusu Dergisi, ii (1956-7), 115-45; G. Levi Della Vida, La corrispondenza di Berta di Toscana col Califfo Maulud, in Rivista Storica Italiana, lxvi (1954), 21-38; idem, Aneddoti e svaghi arabi e non arabi, Milan-Naples 1959, 26-44. The envoy, a
eunuch from North Africa, brought a variety of gifts, and a letter in the Frankish script, 'resembling the Greek writing,' but strangely for some search, a Frank was found working in the clothing store, who read the letter and translated it into Greek, which was then translated by Isbâk b. Hunayn from Greek into Arabic. Some eighty years later Ibn al-Nadîm drew on this passage for his note on the Frankish script, included in his discussion of writing, and adds that he had often seen this script on Frankish swords (Führer, ed. G. Flügel, Leipzig 1871, 20; on the 13th/19th reputation of European swords among the Muslims see A. Zeki Valdii [Togan], Die Schweuer der Germanen nach arabischen Berichten des 9-11. Jahrhunderts, in ZDMG, xc (1936), 15-37).

By far the most important known visitor from the Muslim lands to Europe in this period was Ibrâhîm b. Ya'qûb [q.v.], a Spanish Jew from Tortosa who travelled extensively in Frankish Europe ca. 354/965, probably on some sort of official mission for the Umayyad Caliph of Cordova. Ibn Ya'qûb's own account is lost, but is known from quotations by later geographers, especially Bakrî and Kâzëwînî. This is the only personal description of Western Europe for the Muslims, a matter of practical necessity, and not just of intellectual curiosity. It is therefore the more remarkable that they should have continued to show so little interest. In the East, the Muslim chroniclers have much to say about the Crusaders, whom they paraded, in their splendid attire, across the lands of Islam as far as Herat (cf. the verses cited by Z. V. Togan in Türk Dili ve Edebiyatî Dergisi, iii (1939), 535). By the 14th century however this attitude was dangerously out of date. Even the rapid growth of commercial and diplomatic relations after the Crusades evoked only a limited practical interest. In about 741/1340, Şihâb al-Dîn al-'Umari included two Western kings, of Spain and France, in his list of the sovereigns with whom the Sultan of Egypt corresponded, with a few details and the correct style and form of address for each. A later revision, the Ta'ârikh adds a few more names, and Kalkâshandî provides a much fuller list of European states and rulers, with some information about each ('Umari, al-Ta'ârikh bi 'l-mustafâl al-gharîb, Cairo 1312, 60-5; Kalkâshandî, Şubh al-a'âsh, viii, 33-53).

The Ottomans had dealings with Franks of various kinds from an early date—as merchants, as enemies, as neighbours, as diplomatic visitors. In Greece they conquered Frankish principalities; at Varna in 1444 they captured Frankish knights whom they paraded, in their splendid attire, across the lands of Islam as far as Herat (cf. the verses cited by Z. V. Togan in Türk Dili ve Edebiyatî Dergisi, iii (1939), 535). By the 16th century they were involved in extensive and complex dealings with European states. Ottoman interest in Christian Europe, though far from overwhelming, is noticeably greater than among earlier religions. The Muslims no longer had good reason for withholding from the Franks the scholarly interest which they had shown in the Greeks, Persians, and Indians. By the 8th/14th century however this attitude was dangerously out of date. Even the rapid growth of commercial and diplomatic relations after the Crusades evoked only a limited practical interest. In about 741/1340, Şihâb al-Dîn al-'Umari included two Western kings, of Spain and France, in his list of the sovereigns with whom the Sultan of Egypt corresponded, with a few details and the correct style and form of address for each. A later revision, the Ta'ârikh adds a few more names, and Kalkâshandî provides a much fuller list of European states and rulers, with some information about each ('Umari, al-Ta'ârikh bi 'l-mustafâl al-gharîb, Cairo 1312, 60-5; Kalkâshandî, Şubh al-a'âsh, viii, 33-53).
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the additional meaning of "land of the Ifrandi")

In the writings of the Arabs of Spain and the Maghrib the term Ifrandj (also often Ifrani) with the additional meaning of "land of the Ifrandi") denotes any of the Christian peoples with whom the writers are acquainted. The more usual term is Rûm, or for Peninsula Christians Djallika (see djallika) or Baghawt (q. v.). There appears to be no distinction between Ifrandj and Rûm, and though particular writers may be suspected of using them in specific ways it is impossible to be certain; writers certainly vary among themselves and it would be unsafe in any particular case, without corroborative evidence, to draw any definite conclusions solely on the basis of the use of the term Ifrandj. Thus Ibn al-Abhár says that in 624/1227 the Ifrandi took Alácer do Sal (Hulla, ii, 290). The account in the Raúd al-múlût (s.v. Kašr Abî Dánis) has Rûm. The author of the Raúd al-birjáda simply has al-sudawdaw (which is a common usage). The Christians concerned were here Portuguese assisted by German crusaders. The natural supposition that Ifrandi in principle means "the Franks" is not supported by the actual usage of historical writers. For instance Ibn al-Khāṭīb (67/11, ii, 23) refers to a Christian king in north-western Spain as one of the kings of Ifrandi, but also to a raid on būlâl al-Rûm which is clearly the Narbonne region (s.v. ifrandj, ii, 22). The earlier use of the word Ifrandj by a Spanish writer seems to be that of Ibn al-Kûtiyya (d. 367/977) who applies it to the inhabitants of the Saragossa region (p. 133).

This vagueness of terminology reflects a vagueness of knowledge, itself perhaps the result of a lack of curiosity, shared even by those who profess to give specifically geographical information. The rather scanty and confused corpus of material furnished by this class of writers does however show clear signs of a notion that Ifrandi = Franks. One strand of the web of tradition, distinguished by the use of the term al-ard al-kabîra for the continent north of the Pyrenees, has its earliest representation in the Tabâbât al-umum of Sâ'id al-Andalus (Cairo n.d., 83). Sâ'id equates Ifrandi al-ulumâ with al-ard al-kabîra but distinguishes it from Ifransa. Sâ'id's contemporary Bakri (fl. 460/1069) and others after him such as 6'Abd al-Mun'im al-Hajjâdi (1266-1345) and others use similar phrasing but omit the reference to Ifransa (Bakri, Djiughrîfiyat al-Andalus wa-Uribîa, ed. 6'Abd al-Râhman al-Hâdîjî, Beirut 1968, 66-7; al-Raúd al-múlût, s.v. Ifrandi). This is seemingly a native tradition owing nothing to the Orient, but another major strand is that found in its earliest form in Masâu'dî (Murdûsî, iii, 67; ed.-tr. Pellat, § 911). Notable features of Masâu'dî's account are that the Ifrandi are distinct from the Djiillîkiya—i.e., they are not inhabitants of the Peninsula—and their capital is Paris. Both Bakri (471 f.) and 6'Abd al-Mun'im (s.v. Ifrandi) use Masâu'dî's material with some additions of unknown provenance but neither writer handles his material in such a fashion as to convince the reader that it has been brought up to date or collated with the other information. Thus although the article Ifrandi in al-Ruad al-mul'îd (s.v. Ifrandi) contains a probably coherent account of France, the article Burdûl (Bordeaux), otherwise accurate, places that city in Djiillîkiya; and Barcelona is stated (s.v. Bar-şalâna) to be the residence of the king of Ifrandi. None of the extant travellers' accounts—Ghazal, Turufi, Rabî b. Zayd alias Recemundo—provides any information on the Ifrandi/Franks.

The picture of Western Europe which emerges is that of a vast, cold, but fertile land extending northwards to the limits of habitation and hemmed in on the east by mountains and forests in or beyond which dwell the 6'arash. The Christian Ifrandi, though unhygienic in their habits, are hardy and good fighters. For long they owed allegiance to one king, whose capital is, or was, Paris or Lyons. So vague and fragmentary is this picture that one may with justification express the thought that the term "Ifrandi" does not represent fully the information on western Europe available to the Muslims of Spain.

Bibliography: In the text.

(J. F. P. Hopkins)

AL-IFRANDJ (Ifrandi, Ufrani, etc.) 6'Abd Allâh Muhammâd b. al-Hâdîjî Muhammâd b. 6'Abd Allâh, called al-Saghir, Moroccan historian and biographer, born at Marrûkhç ca. 1080/1669-70. 
His father belonged to the Berber tribe of the Ifran or Ufran, which was settled in southern Morocco, or in the vicinity of Abu 'l-Dja (Boujead). Towards the end of his life he was an imām and preacher (khātib) in the Yusuфи mosque (or Madrasat Ibn Yusuf) at Marrakesh; he died in either 1516/1743 or 1517/1745 (G. Deverdun, Un registre d'inventaire et de prêt... daté de 1712/1745... in M. A. Boularès and M. Allouche and M. Regragui, Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de Rabat, 2e série, i, 192-1953), Rabat 1958, index. (G. DEVERDUN)

IFRĀTI, IFRĀṬ FĪ'L-$IFA [see MUBALAGHA].

IFRİKIYA, the eastern part of the Maghrib, whence the name adopted by some modern historians for Eastern Barbary.

The term Ifrīkiya is undoubtedly—whatever the Arab writers say—borrowed from the Latin Africa, so the origin of the Arabic word must be sought in the etymology of the Latin term, a question which, from the most ancient times to today, has continued to defeat scholars. What is certain is that the term Africa, and the other forms derived from the same radical Afr (pl. Afrī), are attested in the Latin sources well before the fall of Carthage; it is known in particular that the elder Scipio (235-183 B.C.) received after his victory over Hannibal at Zama (202 B.C.) the by-name of “Africanus”; the adjective africus is also attested many times in a period before the fall of Carthage (146 B.C.), whose territory, annexed by Rome, was called Provincia Africa, “or, through omission of the substantive, simply Africa” (Gsell, Hist. ancienne, vi, 2). This Provincia Africa was the country of the Afri, a term which, after having been applied to the natives of the territory occupied by Carthage and even sometimes used to distinguish them from the Poeni or the Carthaginians, had ended by embracing also the latter—as may indeed be inferred from the by-name of the conqueror of Hannibal. These are the only definite facts on the matter.

After this there are few precise indications on the origin of the term Africa, and there is no unanimity of opinion on the matter. Fournel, in 1875, declared unequivocally: “I have no hesitation in saying that it is absolutely unknown” (Bersers, i, 23); Gsell, some decades later, stated: “It is better to admit our ignorance on the origin of this name” (Hist. ancienne, vii, 5); and we are no further forward today. Nevertheless, from ancient times to today, there have been advanced a number of theories, in varying degrees ingenious or convincing, which may be classified into two main groups.

1. The mythical etymologies. From remotest antiquity, a certain number of explanations, all based on the genealogical myth of divine or heroic origin entertained in the ancient world, have been put forward. For example Africa was considered to be the country of the children of Afr, the son of a “princess Libya, either a native, or a daughter of Jupiter, or of Neptune, or of Epaphus” (d’Avezac, Afrique, iv); or else the son of the Libyan Hercules; or of Cronos and Philyra; or of Abraham and Keturah; or the grandson of Abraham and the leader of an expedition to Libya, etc. (for the sources, see Gsell, Hist. ancienne, vii, 4).

The Arabs, certainly not completely ignorant of these legends, which were probably fairly widespread in the country they had just conquered, themselves showed no less imagination. They adopted mainly a system of etymology which consisted—under the influence of one hand by the ancient myths and based in addition on the model which had allowed them to propound the existence of an Arab race, that is by supposing the existence of an eponymous ancestor named generally Ifrīkīs (= Africs), or sometimes Ibrīgīs, who gave his name to the Ifrīkians and to their country. This explanation, later taken up with variants by most of the Arab chroniclers and geographers, represents in fact one single tradition which had been collected and disseminated by Highäm b. Muhammad al-Kalbi (d. between 204 and 605/819-21) [see al-KALBI].

It should however be noted that Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam (187-257/803-71), who belonged to a family of serious faḥifs and mubaddaḥīs and who was the author of the earliest written source on the history of the conquest of the Ifrīkīs, does not mention this explanation in his work, probably advisedly. Ibn al-Kalbi is considered by serious traditionists as not to be trusted (Yāḥyāt, xiii, 287-8). Ibn Khaldūn, with his well-known critical approach, mentions it in his Muqaddima (16) only as an example of the “false tales” (al-ābāhṭ or al-ābāhṭa) with which his predecessors had padded out their works. And when he reproduces it later (Tibar, ii, 95, 108, 170), he does
so without taking any responsibility for it, or clearly indicating his reservations about it (ii, 170).

Ifrîkiya or Ifrikiya is of course always presented by the chroniclers relating, as a purely Arab hero. His history is always in some degree linked with the origin, still obscure, of the Berbers [q.v.], whom the Arabs generally described as Ca-naanite or Himyarite orientals. Ifriki, whose genealogy is given with a number of variants, is presented as a powerful king of the Yemen, contemporary with Solomon; he is said to have conquered the Maghrib, to which he gave his name, and established permanency there certain south Arabian tribes. Al-Bakri, Al-Dhahiri (d. circa 279/892), following Ibn al-Kalbi, refers to him as Ifriki b. Kayb b. Sa'yi al-Himyari, and the same descent is given in Ibn Khaldûn. But he is also sometimes given, among others, the name of Ifriki b. Abrah b. al-Râfiqh (al-Mas'dlik, c. 21); Yakût, i, 228).

The Arab chroniclers put forward also another explanation, equally mythical, in which however the hero who gave his name to Ifrikiya became a Biblical character. According to this explanation, which echoes the Greco-Jewish legend related by Josephus (Tissot, Exploration, i, 389, note 5), this hero was Ifriq (= Epher), son of Abraham and his second wife Faṭfûrâ (= Keturah) (al-Bakri, Mas'dlik, 21); or else Fârik b. Baysar b. Nub (Noah) (Yakût, i, 228). Other genealogies, equally Biblical, are suggested by Ibn Abi Dinar (Mu'nis, 19).

2. The philological etymologies. Other explanations, based on the Arabic root FRK (= to separate) which is detected in “Ifrikiya”, have also been advanced by al-Birûnî (d. after 442/1050, cited by Yakût, i, 228), al-Zabidi (TA, vi, 46), and Ibn Abi Dinar (Mu'nis, 19); they explain that Ifrikiya was so called “because it separates Egypt from the Maghrib” (farâkât ba'na Misr wa 'l-Maghrib), according to Leo Africanus (tr. Epaullard, 3), because it is separated from Europe, and partly from Asia, by the Mediterranean.

A number of other etymologies, all by philological derivation, some ancient and others suggested by modern scholars, have been worked out from Latin, Greek or Semitic roots. The name “Africa” is made to derive: from the Latin Africa ( Ausonia, = the Hot), an etymology suggested by Isidorus (“Africam quidam inde nominatam existimant, quasi apricam, quod sit apera caelo vel soli et sine horrore frigoris”) and Servius (see Tissot, Exploration, i, 289, note 2; Gsell, Afrique, vii, 3, note 8), and mentioned also by Ibn Abi Dinar who, linking the Latin word to an Arabic root, writes: “Ibn al-Shabbât, citing various sources, assures us that Ifrikiya was called Ibrifya (= Africa), a word derived from barîk [brightness], because its sky is cloudless” (Mu'nis, 19); or from the Greek word a-phrîko (a-deprived of cold) (see d'Avezac, Afrique, 4); or from the semitic root FRK.

M. d'Avezac (Afrique, 4-5), after mentioning that the word Africa had been regarded as representing “a territory rich in spices, the country of palm-trees and the divided country, the land of Barqah”, adds: “But how artificial these various conjectures appear beside the very simple statement of Suidas, that Africa was the ancient name of Carthage itself... and the basic etymology of this early name of Carthage is simply and naturally supplied by the language of Carthage itself, referring to Abyrqaq as a "separated" settlement, a colony of Tyre; and the Arabs came, by a regular derivation, to refer to the region dependent upon this ancient Afryqah as Afryqah”.

This explanation, which was adopted by de Slane and rejected by Carette, Tissot, and Gsell, involves two main difficulties: (a) Firstly, it is not absolutely certain that Carthage had the name of “Afryqah” in ancient times. The isolated attestation of Suidas (Carthago, quae Africa et Byrsa dixta fuit) is that of a late author (9th-10th centuries A.D.) whom many consider unsound. It is therefore not conclusive (Fournel, Berbers, i, 24, n. 2; Gsell, Afrique, vii, 3, n. 2). (b) Furthermore, to the difficulties of derivation is added the fact that the word Afir or its derivatives, which are probably not Latin words, have not been found in any Punic inscription, either in the time of Gsell (Afrique, vii, 4) or today.

It was therefore natural to consider other etymologies taken from Berber words: from ifri (cave); or from the Itrun [q.v.]; or from the name of the tribe of the Awrigha.

The last etymology was first suggested by Carette, prompted by the derivation of the word Libya, used by the Greeks, and which originally referred to the country of the Lebou or Luwata. Reasoning along the same lines, he wrote on the origin of the term Afrika: “It was probably for the Phoenician colonists of Carthage what the name of Libya had been for the Greek colonists of Cyrene... a name borrowed from the people with whom they first came in contact, and already traditionally in use in the country; a name earlier even than that of Libya, since the settlement of the Carthaginians was earlier than that of the Cyreneans” (Recherches, 309-10).

After adding that “this origin of the name of Africa is not based on any documents”, but that it nevertheless seemed to him “probable”, he attempts, with the help of some rather tenuous proofs, to establish that the Awrigha must, in the remotest antiquity, have inhabited the territory occupied by Carthage. Under the domination of the latter, “this tribe of the Aourîra [= Awrigha] may have been destroyed or dispersed, except for one single group, the Haouara...” (Recherches, 311).

This explanation was adopted by Vivien de Saint-Martin and by Tissot, who identified the Awrigha with the “Afrika” of the Arab geographers, and with the “Afrika” of Corippus. Carette knew today that this identification is hazardous. Furthermore, Carette's explanations are based only on the most fragile of hypotheses. In the absence of definite facts, and if one is not (with the prudence of Fournel or Gsell) to admit that one knows nothing, it seems that the least hazardous hypothesis remains that which makes the term Africa (= Ifrikiya) derive from the Semitic root FRK. Indeed, since the Romans could neither have found the word in their own language nor have borrowed it from the Greeks (who called Ifrikiya “Libya”), they can have received it only from their predecessors, the Carthaginians, whose heirs they had become through the fortunes of war. The “Land of Africa” or the Provincia Africa—the Ifrikiya of the Arabs—referred first of all in fact to the territory which had been conquered by Carthage and fallen under the authority of Rome. This is the only fact which is indisputably established.

Since the Arabic script does not indicate all the vowels, there exists some uncertainty about the spelling of the word Ifrikiya. The compilers of some dictionaries reproduce the word without vocalization, and give no indication of how it is to be read (Kâmâs, iii, 275; Sîdîkî, iv, 1543). In Ibn Durayd (d. 321/933),
the word is vocalized thus: Ifrifciyya (ṣamhara, i, 126), without any indication whether this vocalization is that of the Arabic or the Dámtara. Ibn Mas‘úr (la, x) states that it should be read Ifrifciyya (mukhafṣafat al-yā‘); and al-Zabádíl (TA, vii, 46) adopts the same spelling. He stipulates that it should be read (bi-l-hár ... wa-hiya mukhafṣaf). These two writers also add that the plural of Ifrikiyya is Afarīk, and quote two verses of al-Abwās (which are not an absolutely conclusive proof). Ibn Abi Díná(r, the word is sometimes spelt Ifrīkiyya (ṣamhara, i, 267). One page before this, however, the same al-Baladhref makes ‘Amr b. al-‘Áṣ write, in a letter addressed to ‘Umar: ‘We have reached Tripoli, a town separated from Ifrikiyya by nine days’ march’. Al-Warraq (4th/10th century), the source of al-Bakri (Masálik, 21), considered that ‘the boundaries of Ifrikiyya extend, in length, from Barka in the east to Tangiers the Green, called also Mauritania, in the west. In width, its boundaries extend from the sands which mark the beginning of the country of the Black People (al-Sudan)” (see also Yakut, i, 228; al-Himyari, Rawd, fol. 75; Ibn Abi Dínár, Mu‘nis, 20). Thus all these writers regarded Ifrikiyya as comprising the whole of the Maghrib. This idea, as a result of political vicissitudes, became progressively modified in other authors.

T. S. (307) states: ‘Ibn Khurradabghih (d. circa 272/885), who divides the inhabited world into four parts, adopts the Greek terminology to describe the African continent; he calls it Libya (= Libya) and includes in it Egypt, Abyssinia, the country of the Berbers, etc. (Masálik, 24-5). He reserves the term Ifrikiyya for the Aghlabid kingdom, of which he lists the main towns (Masálik, 6-7). This tendency to limit Ifrikiyya proper, at the most to the kingdom which was that of the Aghlabids, re-appears in most of the other geographers (Ibn al-Fákhi (d. circa 290/905), Buldán, 30-1; al-Iṣṭakhrí (d. circa 350/961), Masálik, 33; Yákút (d. 626/1229), i, 228; Márarkshí (d. circa 647/1249), Mu‘gabir, 273, 433-42). This kingdom extended from the west of Bougie to a few parangans from Barka (al-Ya‘kibú, Buldán, 215).

Sahdún (d. 240/850), however, considered that ‘the Ifrikiyya extend from Tripoli to Tobna’ (apud al-Dáwwádí, Amudá, in Mél. Lévi-Provençal, ii, 409). For al-Mu’kaddási (d. circa 375/985) ‘the first district (frura) on coming from Egypt is that of Barka; next come Ifrikiyya, the districts of Táhárt, of Siyádmá and of Fás, then Sús al-Aská’ (Ahsan al-takásim, 4-5), and he mentions, among the towns of Ifrikiyya, Djazarat Bání Zagháriyya (Algeria), Mattáqis (Mittála) and Ashir, that is to say, regions over which the Aghlabids never had any authority. It should finally be noted that Yákút fixes its western limits, according to some, at Bougie or al-Milána, whereas Ibn Abi Dínár states that in his time (end of the 11th/17th century) the word Ifrikiyya was hardly used any more, except of the plain of the Medjeda as far as Béja (Mu‘nis, 20). This last usage has still not entirely disappeared from the Bedouin language of Tunisia.

In short, Ifrikiyya was sometimes confused with the whole of the Maghrib and sometimes considered as a geographically separate region. It may be said that the geographical Ifrikiyya consisted essentially of the ancient (Númidia) Proconsularis and Byzacena, which formed the nucleus of it, to which were later added Tripolitania, the Númidia of the Aures, and even a part of Sittifán Númidia. Upon this geographical concept was superimposed an administrative concept. Because of this Ifrikiyya tended to be confused, in the writings of the chroniclers, with the territory which in the Middle Ages was ruled in turn from Kayrawán, from Mahdiyya or from Tunis, a territory which expanded or contracted according to the vicissitudes of history. This explains the often ambiguous use of the term, the implication of which becomes clear only in relation to the context and the period.


IFRÎKIYA — IFRÎT

Siecle, in SI, xxvii (1967), 88-94; see also ALGERIA, BERBERS, LIBYA, MOROCCO, TUNISIA.

(M. TALBI)

*IFRÎT*, sometimes connected with *ijfrît*, wick-ed, is an epithet expressing power, cunning and in-subordination. In spite of its aberrant form, the word seems to be of Arabic origin. The lexicographers consider it to derive from the verb *'afara*, "to roll someone in the dust" and, by extension, "to bring low".

The word is used rarely in Arabic poetry of the time of the *Hîdja* and is found only once in the Kur'ân. To Solomon's request that he should be brought the throne of the queen of Sheba, "an *ijfrît* of the *djinns* said, 'I shall bring it to you before you can rise from your place'" (XXVII, 39). From all the evidence, and as is also confirmed by the beginning of verse 40 of the same sâra, the epithet is not there used of a special category of *djinns* but in the sense of "rebellious". A *hâdîth* attributed to Muhammad and reported by Abû Hurayya uses the same expression: "*ijfrît min al-*djînns*" (Muslim, *Sabîl*, Cairo 1334, ii, 72; cf. al-Damiri, *Haya'usân*, Cairo 1319, i, 173).

After its use in the Kur'ân, the word became more widely used: in its substantive form, it came to mean a class of particularly powerful chthonian forces, formidable and cunning. It would, however, be difficult to state exactly its implication because of the ambiguity of the term *djinns*, which is applied to everything hidden and veiled from sight, and includes demons as well as *mârid*. The latter word, which is also found only once in the Kur'ân (XXXVII, 7), is used there also as an adjective and means strictly "rebel" (cf. Kur'ân, IV, 127, XXII, 3). But in its turn it ended by being used of one particular class of fantastic beings from the nether regions, which are difficult to distinguish from the *'afârît*. The Islamic theologians must soon have felt the necessity of providing a clearer definition of these rather obscure and shifting notions. The majority of the commentators considered both the one and the other to be rebellious and wicked demons. Al-Djâhîz provides more precise definitions. According to him, the *shayâbân* is a renegade *djînns* who sows discord and does evil; one who is strong enough to perform difficult tasks, carry heavy burdens and overhear what passes in the upper regions (cf. Kur'ân, XXXVII, 6-10, LXXII, 8-9) is a *mârid*; one who is more powerful still is an *ijfrît* (*Hayawan*, Cairo 1356, i, 291). In fact, the difference between these infernal beings is not a qualitative one at all; it is solely a matter of their varying abilities to perform marvels.

From this general point of view, the popular tales are in agreement with al-Djâhîz. But they often represent the *mârid* as superior to the *ijfrît*; he is even forty times stronger than him (Sayyîb b. *Dhî Yazan*, Cairo n.d., iii, 155). He has at his command a thousand auxiliaries, *awm*; each auxiliary has under his orders a thousand *shayâbân*, each of whom is in command of a thousand *djînns* ("”Thousand and one nights", no. 995). Nevertheless this superiority is not always asserted. It can happen that the *ijfrît* dominates its rivals from afar (Sayyîb, ii, 133, 286 ff.). The storytellers even add a subtle remark which is certainly surprising: the *djînns and the *ijfrît* are endowed with the same strength; but the *djînns surpasses the *ijfrît* in its power to assume different forms, which the latter is incapable of doing (Sayyîb, iii, 155). However, in the "Thousand and one nights" the *ijfrît* appears to humans in the most varied forms (nights nos. 14 and 22). The same is true of the *mârid*, which transforms itself into a bird, a snake, a woman, etc. It would be difficult to establish a real distinction between the two main types of the Arab chthonian genera. Moreover it is not unusual for editors to use indiscriminately the terms *ijfrît* and *mârid* (nights nos. 3, 4, 672, 674, 675; Sayyîb, i, 45, 49, 97, 127), which leads to the conclusion that they are synonymous. In fact they certainly come from the same mould, so that it is possible for the same description to serve for both.

In the popular tales, the *'afârît* takes the form of a woman (Sayyîb, ii, 102). It is formed basically of smoke (night no. 3; Sayyîb, ii, 2), which allows it to contract and to insert itself into a jar (night no. 3). When it is wounded, smoke emerges from its wounds (Sayyîb, i, 50, 97), although, in the Kur'ân, the *djînns* are created of "clear fire" (LV, 15). It has wings which it unfolds when it takes flight (night no. 179; Sayyîb, i, 50). It haunts ruins (night no. 399) and lives under the ground (nights nos. 6 and 184; Sayyîb, i, 47), which is its true habitat. In spite of its great power, it is possible for man to enslave it, with the help of God and by means of magic. The sharpest weapons have no effect on it (Sayyîb, ii, 287); in order to wound or kill it, it must be bewitched (Sayyîb, i, 43, 162).

On the moral plane, the *'afârît* are not fundamentally evil. One of them takes pity on an unfortunate husband terrorized by his wife (night no. 901), another allies himself with an *ijfrît*, to give help to a young girl who is being forced to marry a hideous hunchback (nights nos. 21 and 22). However, it is wickedness that predominates among this species of renegades. They carry away men's daughters (Sayyîb, i, 96) and will stop at no misdeed. It is from among them that the magicians choose their acolytes. But there are also believing *'afârît*, who do good and carry out God's purposes.

Like all the *djînns*, the *'afârît* are divided into males and females, but the *'ijfrît* (nights nos. 2 and 22) sometimes seems to be more powerful than the male (Sayyîb, i, 94). They marry among themselves, and it is possible for them to marry humans (nights nos. 2 and 659). Their social organization is an imitation of that of the Arabs. They are divided into tribes and clans and ruled by kings who sometimes go to war (nights nos. 652-9): Their conception of honour is inspired by that of the Bedouin; they are obliged especially to carry out blood vengeance (Sayyîb, ii, 160, 167).

The term *ijfrît* may be used of humans, and even of animals. It then expresses cunning, ingenuity and strength (*al-Kâmûs al-mubîh* and LA, art. *'afâra*). In contemporary Islam it always has the meaning of "powerful and formidable demon". In Egypt, together with this general meaning (Lane, *Manners and customs of the modern Egyptians*, London 1895, 232), which gives supremacy to the *mârid* (A. Amlîn, *Kâmûs al-mûrîd* fi ahkâm al-*djinns*, Cairo 1953, 355), it means also the ghost or spirit of a person deceased (Lane, *ibid.*, 236). In the Arabic dialect of Syria, it means both a chthonian genie and a man who is intelligent and resourceful.

Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the article, the main works on *djinna* may be consulted: *Shihbîl*, *Ahâm al-murûd* fi akhâm al-*djinns*; Kazwînî, *'Afârît* al-＊makhkabât*; N. T. Nîma, al-*Djinns* fi 'l-adab al-*arabî*, Beirut 1961; J. Henninger, *Geisterglaube bei den vorislamischen Arabern*, in *Studia Instituti Anthropos*, xviii (1963). It should be mentioned in passing that Wensinck
rejects the Latin etymology of the word dìn and considers, with Wellhausen, that it is of Arabic origin (The etymology of the Arabic dìn, 506, in Mededelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2 reeks, Deel IV, Amsterdam 1920). See the discussion in J. Chelhom, Les structures des sacrés des Arabes, Paris 1965, 70.

IFRÈKLUS [see hureklus].
ICHÀR, verbal noun of the fourth form of the root w.d.h.r. (?), meaning here an exemption or a privilege with respect to taxes. The classical 'Abbasid administration used this term both for the privilege, and for the land which was covered by this privilege, of having to pay only one single tax payment, directly to the Treasury and not through tax-collectors. The districts of Mārdj and Karajj in western Iran are regularly referred to as al-İgharayn even after they had lost the official status which earned them this name. In the following centuries the term ıkähr disappeared, becoming absorbed in that of ıkähr [g.] which gradually broadened in connotation.

Bibliography: References to Kudama, Miskawayh, Șābī, the Ta'rīkh Kumm, etc. in F. Lekkogard, Islamic taxation, Copenhagen 1950, index; A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and peasant, index; C. Cahen, L'évolution de l'Iqta', in Annales ESC, 1953, 23-30. (C. Cahen)

IGHARGHAR [see ıkährghar] in Tunisia, is a Saharan add to the north of the massif of Hoggar (Abaggar). Its most important tributary is, on the west, the Taghmet n-Akh. The basin of the Igharghar runs from the volcanic massif of Atakor, in the south, to the plateaus of primary sandstone of the "Tassilian enceinte" (Emmidin and Tassili of the Azdjer), surrounded by the granitic and metamorphic mountains of Tefedest and Turha. The Igharghar and its tributaries flow, usually intermittently, at the most once a year and their waters do not usually reach as far as Amguid. To the north of Amguid a secondary flow seems however to take place along the gorges which cross the hamada of Tinghert. Then the bed of the Igharghar disappears in the dunes of the great eastern Erg. It may perhaps have had a longer course during the wet spells of the Quaternary Age via the Gassi Touil and the Oued Righ to as far as it dhikr, "as for the production of 'l-*adam al-asli); XX, 113, Fakhr al-Dm al-Razi considers why the term al-ihdth al-ghayr zamdth, the act of bringing into existence a thing that does not exist at an earlier time (la* haddha min ghayr taghayyur la-hadatha min İd-shay*). He defines takawwn (establishment in being) as a production that follows a change (huddth lābī* l-taghayar-yur). Immediate and absolute huddth or ihdth is inconceivable to him.

For the senses in which Ibn Sinâ uses ihdth, in comparison with ıkähr, sunn and takawwn, A. M. Goichon, Lexique de la langue philosophique d'Ibn Sinâ, should be consulted, as should also La distinction de l'essence et de l'existence d'après Ibn Sinâ (see the index under h.d.t.) and the Livre des Directives et Remarques (trans. of the Ta'hrār, notes to pages 373, 377, 380), both by the same author. Apart from the general sense of "produce", Ibn Sinâ gives many precise philosophical senses. He distinguishes between al-ihdth al-samâni, the act of bringing into existence a thing which did not exist at an earlier time (fi zamân sâbîb), and al-ihdth al-qarâr samâni, the bringing into existence of a thing that does not contain that existence in its essence, not at one time to the exclusion of another, but at any time. Since time is not generated through generation in time, but through immediate creative production (ıkähr), the Creator (muhdth) is anterior not in time, but by essence. Then again, every effect (ma*wâl) is muhdth, for it draws its existence from something else. In this sense, ihdth consists in bringing into existence an essence which, in itself, is merely possible, and the muhdth is thus the contingent, not in the
sense that it could equally exist or not exist, but in the sense that, when it exists, it does not exist, but in the sense that, when it exists, it does not exist, but in the sense that, when it exists, it does not exist, but in the sense that, when it exists, it does not exist, but in the sense that, when it exists, it does not exist. Then, showing that it is impossible to take this verse literally, he interprets it by a ta‘wil and says that it indicates "the speed with which divine power enters upon the bringing into being of things: God creates (yuḥkilh) them, but not with reflexion, taking precautions or experimentation." Kun, then, relates to Avicenna's sense of ibdā‘, conformably with the first word of the verse, "be," in fact, however, there is no need to distinguish between two kinds of action, in the case of the creation of the world by God; it may be said that iḥdāth, with reference to the Creator, is an ibdā‘, inasmuch as it denotes the immediate action of the first Cause. When the first cause, however, produces, through an intermediary, secondary causes, iḥdāth is the term that applies, and it must then be distinguished from ibdā‘.

When we leave fa‘la, the inheritor of the metaphysics of matter and form, and move to Ashā’irite theology, which is founded on the idea of the discontinuity of time and that of the reality of bodies, creation ex nihilo is more easily justified as the only logical solution of the contingency of creatures. Al-Bākiliṭānī distinguishes the knowledge of the kādim, the object of which is God, from the knowledge of the muḥdath, the object of which is the world (fi‘lām). The beings of the world are divided into bodies which are compound, substances each of which is an atom (jauhār munfarid), and accidents (a‘rād), which exist in bodies and in substances. Everything that is not God is muḥdath. Bodies, being compound (mu‘alaf), are necessarily produced in being: the same, however, is true of substances and accidents. The demonstration of this, in which Al-Bākiliṭānī makes use of the notion of substance (in his reasoning he no longer mentions substances, and replaces them by bodies, doubtless because the argument, which can be more easily grasped at the level of the compound, is for him equally valid for the simple), is as follows: accidents are realities which come into existence (haydāthā‘): when one is produced, motion, for example, another, rest, is destroyed. Bodies cannot, however, exist before their accidents exist, for, in their composition, the parts that compose them have certain accidental relationships of proximity of distance. Thus, if bodies do not precede accidents, which are muḥdathā‘, they are themselves necessarily created. It is apparent that atoms, also, cannot exist without being in a place, in rest or in motion and in some relationship with one another, all of which determinations are accidents, since they are variable. Thus the singular substances do not precede accidents, and they are created. Al-Bākiliṭānī defines muḥdath as a being that derives from not-being (al-ma‘madījā‘ an al-adām). Now, as an accident cannot subsist by itself in two successive moments of time, iḥdāth is, broadly speaking, a continuous creation, just as much for a‘rād as for jauhār. Substance is not a being that, once it exists, subsists by the laws of its nature alone. God makes it exist (iḥdā‘) and subsists (iḥbā‘), as al-Rāzī shows in many passages of his Mafīth al-ghayb, especially in the commentary on the sura of the Tawbah. Thus we may say that, in the minds of the theologians, iḥdāth is, relative to creation, both iḥdā‘ and iḥbā‘. ‘Abd al-Kāhir al-Baghdādī presents the same idea as al-Bākiliṭānī in his K. Usul al-Din. The radical opposition of kādim and muḥdath is of Mu’tazilī origin. This school understands iḥdā‘ in the strict sense of the creation of existence, to the exclusion of essence. The Mu’tazilī wish thus not to banish from creation all exemplarism. The way that this problem of theirs is dealt with, however, is outside the terms of reference of a study of iḥdā‘. It should be noticed that the idea of iḥdā‘ can be distinguished from that of ḥkāl, in that it refers rather to the newness of the thing created, whereas ḥkāl denotes the actual act of the creator. In absolute terms, a muḥdath whose muḥdāth does not exist can be conceived of. But, as Ibn Hazm points out, if the Creator is all-sufficient (mūjīd), "God constantly causes every existing thing to exist throughout its existence," Ibn Hazm agrees with al-Naẓārī in stating, in opposition to Ashā’irite atomism, that continuous creation is not a succession of iḥdā‘, in which, at every moment, a creature's existence is renewed after having been destroyed, but an action that continues uninterruptedly as long as the creature is to survive: "wa-līmad la‘miyyāt mā yūjīd fi bālī ṣabil abāda‘ wa-in lam yuṣhī biḥl al-‘īzāt" (Fiṣāl, v, 55).

(R. Arnald)
who are already in Mecca assume the *ihram* for the *hadîdî* in Mecca itself, but they are obliged to leave the holy ground (fraram) of Mecca if they propose to assume it for the *umra*. In this case they will go for preference to al-Dîjîrînâ or to Tanîmî (the present-day masâqîdì *Ahsâja*).

Pilgrims travelling by boat put on the holy garments while on board, when their boat draws level with the appropriate *mihâj*. Those travelling by air do so at the place from which they board the plane for Djûddâ.

The garment for men consists of two pieces of white seamless cloth. One (*isâr*) is worn round the loins and falls to the knees like a wide loin-cloth. The other (*ridât*) is draped round the upper half of the wearer's chest. This type of garment, which must formerly have been in common use, is still worn today by the Afars (or Danâkîl) in the deserts at the foot of the mountains of Ethiopia towards the Red Sea as well as by some Somali tribes of the coast. The costume is completed by sandals (or, if need be, shoes which leave the ankles uncovered). Men's heads must be bare. In addition a sunshade may be used and papers or items of value may be carried in a leather shoulder-bag. There is no special garment for women, but propriety demands that they wear long sleeves, fairly long skirts and, nowadays, a kind of kerchief and head-veil.

The minutiae, and the differences between the juridical schools, are such that it is impossible to enumerate all the details here. Before entering that state of *ihram* the pilgrim usually performs a major ablation (*ghusl*) and has his hair and his nails cut and his armpits shaved. It is permitted at this stage to use a perfume which leaves no trace, as did the Prophet when he made his Farewell Pilgrimage. Two traditional *rakâs* are performed (*sunna*). After this the pilgrim recites many times the *taâbiyya* (*g.v.*).

The jurists lay down the following points: it is forbidden to the *muhâram* to wear any sewn garments; he must refrain from arguments, from hunting, from perfumes, and from cutting his hair and his nails. It is permitted to wash himself and to scrape his skin in moderation, but without causing any superiority arising from worldly attributes.

In an entirely different context, the expression *taâbiyya* refers to the *tabîr* with which the ritual prayer begins, and which puts the worshipper into a temporary state of special relationship with God.


* * *
Pilgrim in *ihram* dress.
owner do in order to be considered to have put to use a piece of land hitherto considered as vacant ... ottoman, Cairo 1906; see also D. Santillana, Istituzioni di diritto
musulmano, i, no. 69.

(Y. LINANT DE BELLEFONDS)

A person who has been authorized to put to use a piece of land (in Hanafi or Imami law) or who, on his own account (in the other systems), chooses a piece of waste land, with the intention of putting it to use, must begin by defining the limits of the land which he is undertaking to exploit. This is tadždîr, so called because the first procedure is to set stones along the length of each boundary in order to fix the extremities of the area to be brought into use. Any other method of delimitation—such as putting up barriers, or digging a well to water them; but the digging of a well in order to irrigate the land would be an act of išyâ‘—is not in itself “putting to use” and hence does not confer ownership; on this point the ğuqâdah of all the schools agree completely; but this delimitation nevertheless forms the first step towards a real putting to use of the waste land. It should be stressed here that the importance of this first stage varies greatly according to whether Hanafi doctrine or that of the other schools is involved.

A. In Hanafi law, because for the actual išyâ‘ the authority of the ēmām is always insisted upon, the simple formality of delimitation, even although carried out without authorization, confers on the person performing it a sort of de facto monopoly, since he could be supplanted only by an actual exploiter provided with the (very unlikely) authorization of the ēmām. This “monopoly” lasts for at least three years. This was in fact the period which, in accordance with the sayings of Ḥanûr, was granted to the exploiter in order that he might complete the bringing into use of the land whose boundaries he had already marked out. Once this period had expired, unless the ēmām granted him a further extension of it, the land was taken from him to be given to a more diligent exploiter. But if the putting to use was completed within the three years, the occupant of the land became the absolute owner of it. Apart from this, Hanafi law is not very exacting over the conditions of this putting to use. The ħanâfi writers (only the later writers it is true) consider that these conditions will depend on the exploiter’s final intentions for the waste land. If the land is desert and he intends to exploit it merely by irrigating it, for example by digging a well; if he plans to live there, it will be enough for him to build the four walls of a house (Hanafi law does not insist that this house should have a roof). As the logical conclusion of the reasoning which makes the conditions of the putting to use depend on the use which is finally to be made of the land, it could be admitted that the mere erecting of a fence constitutes a real putting to use, when the possessor has decided to use the land considered as waste land simply for grazing sheep.

B. In the doctrine of the other schools, tadždîr has much less weight than in Hanafi law, because of the fact that the išyâ‘ itself is not subject to an authorization. If it is assumed that the person who has performed it only a priority of claim, and this only of a moral kind, in the sense that it has no legal sanction and that nobody is forced to respect it except as a matter of conscience (diyâna). The result is that if a person other than he who has marked the boundaries were to manage to put to the land to use before him, this other person would be considered as the real owner of the land, and the right of priority of the person who had done no more than define the boundaries would lapse. All the same, this moral right was, at certain periods, strong enough for the ħanâfî Ibn Ḫûdâma (Mughrī, v. 519) to have no hesitation in including it among the possessive rights invested on the death of someone who has already marked the boundaries of, but not yet acquired ownership of, a piece of land. To make up for the uncertainty of tadždîr as conceived by the non-Hanafi writers, the latter are more exacting than the ħanâfîs on the conditions of the putting to use. They recognize, it is true, that there exist no absolute rules concerning it and that what is understood by putting to use (išyâ‘) is merely the use of the waste and uncultivated part of each country, taking into account the geographical situation and the nature and quality of the land to be put to use. Nevertheless, one rule is common to them all, that which, based on the literal meaning of the word išyâ‘, classes as putting to use only those actions which “bring new life” to the dead land, the mere fact of having exploited it not being, properly speaking, a putting to use; thus Ḭāḥil (Mughrî, v. 519) spoke on išyâ‘ al-mawdû‘ as putting to use only those actions which consist of fencing in the land, grazing animals, or digging a well to water them; but the digging of a well in order to irrigate the land would be an act of išyâ‘. On this point, the Mâlikî rule is based, with a few very slight differences, on the same principles as that of the Ḫâfî, Hanâfî and even Imami schools.

With the passage of time, the idea of išyâ‘ or acquiring property by putting to use became of decreasing importance, in proportion as there disappeared masâ‘îl lands, which almost everywhere were losing their character of res nullius to become state lands. This phenomenon was particularly evident in the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman code of land laws of 1858 devoted only two articles to the restoration of waste land (articles 103 and 104), whereas a whole section of it was reserved for miriyâ‘ or state-owned land. It is true that later, in 1877, the Maggêla (q.v.) was to lay down detailed rules on the matter (articles 1270 f.) on the basis of the rules of Hanafi law. Thus for išyâ‘ proper, a previous authorization was still necessary (as in articles 103 and 104 of the Code of land laws), but for tadždîr authorization was not expressly demanded by the Maggêla; from this it was deduced in general that (in conformity with the old and less developed systems) the authorization was not indispensable, and that thus, in practice, it was possible to circumvent quite easily the principle that the putting to use must be preceded by an authorization from the ēmām.

Bibliography: All the works of fiḥh include a chapter on išyâ‘ al-mawdû‘; in the great work by Ibn Ḫûdâma, al-Mughrî, Cairo 1367, the question is dealt with on pages 513-5, and then on pages 538-44 of vol. v. Besides the general treatises of fiḥh, there may be consulted the following works, all very early: Abû Yusûf Yaḥyâ (d. 182/798), Kitâb al-Kharâjî, Bûlâk ed., 1302 (Fr. tr. by Fagin, Le Livre de l’Impôt foncier, Paris 1921); Yaḥyâ b. Ādâm (d. 202/817-8), Kitâb al-Kharâjî, Cairo 1347, 84 ff. (Eng. tr. by A. Ben Shemesh, Taxation in Islam, i, Leiden 1958); Ibn Sâlim (d. 224/839), Kitâb al-Amâwi, Cairo 1353; Mâwardî, al-ʿAkhâm al-sulûmîyya, Cairo 1909 (Fr. tr. by Fagin, Les Statuts gouvernementaux, Algiers 1916). For Ottoman law, N. Chiha, Traité de la propriété immobilière en droit ottoman, Cairo 1906; see also D. Santillana, Istituzioni di diritto musulmano, i, no. 69. (Y. LINANT DE BELLEFONDS)
Al-‘Iqāb was the historical sequel to the Almohade victory over Castile in the battle of Alarcos (al-Arak) 18 years earlier (9 Shabān 591/18 July 1194). After that great victory, Ya‘qūb al-Mansūr, the third Almohade Caliph, strengthened the stronghold of Calatrava, the seat of the intrepid knights of the Order of Calatrava. In the following years Almohade forces ravaged the region of Toledo, so that Castile felt that it could not ultimately resist the Muslim pressure if it remained alone: to survive, it had to gain the support of the other Christian kingdoms of the Peninsula.

This was the aim that Alfonso VIII of Castile endeavoured to attain after Alarcos. He managed to arrange matters with his rivals Sancho VIII (the Strong), king of Navarre, and Pedro II of Aragon, but had no success with Alfonso IX of Leon. However, he was able to secure for Castile the support of the most prominent knights of the Peninsula, such as Alvaro Núñez de Lara, Diego López de Haro and his cousin Lope Díaz, together with their powerful following. At the same time he sent a delegation to Pope Innocent III, asking him to summon a Crusade against the Muslims of Spain. The Pope agreed, and promulgated bulls asking the bishops of Italy and Western Europe to preach the crusade and urge people to enlist against the Muslims, with a promise of complete forgiveness of their sins in return.

In the meantime things had considerably deteriorated on the Muslim side since the death of Ya‘qūb al-Mansūr (22 January 1199). He was succeeded by his 13-year-old son Muhammad, surnamed al-Naṣir. The real authority in the empire passed into the hands of his uncles, none of whom was capable of sustaining the responsibilities they had assumed. The only capable man near the throne was Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Waḥīd b. Abū Ḥafs Inti (al-Hintātī), one of the founders of the Almohade movement. When al-Naṣir grew older, he endeavoured to concentrate power in his own hands with the help of a group of selfish and intriguing viziers such as Abū Zayd ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Yuwaggān, Abū Saʿīd ibn Dājīmī and Abū Muḥammad b. Muḥammād. Moreover, al-Naṣir was a conceited young man, who endeavoured all the time to conceal his personal loyalty. When al-Naṣir had him executed on the spot. This rash action cost the Muslims dear, because the Andalusian contingents, dismayed by this injustice towards their most prominent general, decided to abstain from fighting when the battle came. The Muslims then advanced to Baeza and from there they laid siege to the fortress of Salvatierra, which was used as a base for operations by the Order of Calatrava. Encouraged by this initial success, they advanced westwards. They left the site of the present Santa Elena behind and pitched their camp some 4.5 km. to the west. They occupied the mountain canyons that pierce the craggy eastern wing of the Sierra Morena and especially the strategic pass of Losa. Making good use of the hilly plain (that looks like a sea with waves), the Muslims arranged themselves in good order: the hosts of the Caliph marched the main central force, while the contingents of the Andalusians formed the right flank, supported by the Order of Calatrava which was used as a base for operations by the Order of Calatrava. The Muslim forces cannot have surpassed 200,000, half of whom were muṭāfa’wāt. Right in the middle of the regular
troops stood the tent of 'the Caliph on a mound surrounded by huge chains fastened to iron poles. Outside these chains stood the force of the 'abid, the special guard of the caliph bearing their long javelins.

The Christian forces were by no means fewer in number than the Muslims, and they had more cavalry and were far better equipped and trained. They tried to make their camp on the heights of Moradal that dominate the mountain pass (Puerto) of the same name. From there they could overlook the whole Muslim camp, but the position was too arid to support long occupations for a long time. Descending to the plain near Úbeda and climbing again, they marched westwards to occupy the oval tableland called La Mesa del Rey, which also dominated the plain where the Muslims were and had the advantage of easy descents to the plain from both its east and west.

They began the attack early in the morning of Monday 15 Şa‘ar 609/16 July 1212. Their left wing advanced on the muftawwi‘a of the Christians, but were driven back with losses. They then managed to attack from the east, and a picked force of their cavalry charged the Andalusian contingents. To their surprise, these began to flee. Their unexpected flight was followed by that of the a‘rāb and the aghzd. Very soon the Almohade regular troops were left without cover, and all the weight of the Christian forces fell upon them. They steadfastly held their position, but were outnumbered and soon their ranks were penetrated. At the same time the Christians charged the muftawwi‘a again and routed them, taking advantage of the panic that assailed the Muslims. Soon Count Álvaro Núñez de Lara and his knights opened a wide gap in the Muslim ranks and reached the circles of the 'abid, followed by the kings of Navarre and Aragon. Al-Nasir had barely time to flee with a few of his men, to Baeza and then to Jaén and Seville. The rest of the Muslim forces were cut to pieces, and the number of the slain was enormous. To complete the catastrophe, Alfonso VIII soon occupied Baeza and Úbeda and slaughtered there in cold blood some 60,000 Muslims.

This was the last great battle fought by the Muslims in Spain. Its repercussions on the future of Muslim Spain were worse than the defeat itself. It definitively broke the last of these Muslims and dissipated the myth of the power of the North African troops. From that day onwards, Islam in Spain was always on the defensive, merely trying to delay the relentless Christian advance. The blow was beyond repair for the Almohade empire. The huge number of the fallen of the Almohade troops as well as the manifest incapacity of al-Nasir and his men sealed the fate of the Almohades. Al-Nasir could not survive his ignominious defeat for long. A short time after his return to Marrakush he shut himself up in his palace, to die gloriously on 22 December 1213, some 17 months after al-ıkāb.


**IKĀLA,** an agreement which cancels, wholly or in part, a previous agreement between the same parties. The transaction is treated by the fikrâ of the chapter on sale; the authors devote to it long expositions, because of the favour with which fikrâ regards all methods of mitigating the obligatory nature of a contract. As is said in a ḥadîth: “For him who annuls (abdal) a sale which the other party regrets [having concluded], God will annul his sins on the day of the Resurrection”. When Muslim jurists consider the subject of sale, they ask themselves first what is the juridical nature of this contract. Is it the islâla a rescission by fakhr, or a re-sale by the buyer to the first seller of the object which he had already acquired? The question is not without practical importance. If it is a question of a rescission by fakhr, this can come into effect at any moment, either before or after the buyer's taking possession of the object; there does not exist in this case the possibility of a third person's pre-empting it, since the operation does not involve a new transfer of ownership; and, in principle, when the islâla refers to the whole of the previous agreement, the seller must return the same sum as he had received. But if the islâla is regarded as a re-sale by the buyer to the first seller, it must then lead to consequences diametrically opposite to those above, although the Mâlikî, who maintain this view, give a separate place to the islâla which is concerned with foodstuffs.

The Shâfi‘î, Hanbali and Imâmi schools consider the islâla to be, indisputably, a fakhr, a retroactive rescission of the sale; the Mâlikî school considers it to be, in general, a re-sale; the Hanafis, following the teaching of Abû Ḥanîfâ, make a distinction: so far as concerns the relations between the two parties, it is a rescission; but as far as third parties are concerned, it is a re-sale, which will not however be vitiated by the introduction of a forbidden stipulation. This solution, obviously prompted by the desire to protect third parties, has been criticized on the grounds of principle. Ibn Ḫūdâmâ, in his treatise on Muslim comparative law (Mughni, iv, 121), expresses surprise that the nature of a juridical operation may change according to the point of view from which it is considered.

The schools agree in allowing the above rules to be transferred from the contract of sale to other contracts, not only to contracts which are “brothers” of sale: change, barter, amicable settlements, etc. but also to all contracts, where these are not by their nature phyar lâîm, that is revocable unilaterally, in which case islâla is obviously unnecessary. It is impossible when the contract to which it puts an end, is of its very nature, not susceptible to cancellation, such as marriage or repudiation by agreement.

An islâla based on mutual agreement requires for its completion the same conditions of validity as any other agreement, that is an offer and a matching acceptance, both to be made at the same contractual meeting (madjîs).

**Bibliography:** All the works of fikhr in the chapter on sale. See especially Kâsânî, Baddî,
v. 306-8; Zayla', Tabyin, iv, 70-2; Zayla', Tabyin, iv, 70-2 (Httenafi); Suyuti, al-Ashbdh wa 'l-nagd^ir, ed. Mustafa ... his death.
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more distinctly in the Asdr-i ibdli (Secrets of the Self) 1915, which he wrote in Persian in order to reach a wider readership. His stress upon the development of the ego instead of mystical annihilation 
as well as Nietzschean trends shocked his 
audience. A second mul*anaw in Persian, com- 
plementing the first one, Rum*is ibdli i (Mysteries of Selflessness) 1918, determined the duties of the individual in the ideal Muslim community. Icbil 
then turned to lyric poetry in Persian, and published in 
1923 the Pay*im i ma*brih, an answer to Goethe's 
West-Ostlicher Divan. The following year, his Urdu 
poems were published as B*b-i ddr (The Sound of 
the caravan-bell), and in 1927 a second collection of 
Persian lyrics, Zab*t-i d*gam (Persian Psalms) with 
an appendix modelled upon Shabistari's 
Ghul*an-i r*v, 
was published. In 1928, Icbil delivered at several 
Indian universities his Six lectures on the recon- 
struction of religious thought in Islam, an attempt at 
reconciling Muslim theology with European philo-

sophy and science in a very personal way. At that time, 
the poet had started cooperating with the Muslim 
League; he presented his famous statement on the 
necessity of forming a separate Muslim state in 
Northwest India at their annual session in Allahabad 
1930. In the following years, he took part in two 
Round Table Conferences in London, visited France 
(where he met Henri Bergson and Louis Massignon, 
Spain, Italy (meeting Mussolini), and attended a 
Muslim conference in Jerusalem. In the autumn 
of 1933 he was invited to Afghanistan to discuss the 
problems of their Muslim congregations, but also 
which resulted in the Persian poems Musdrf (The 
Traveller); at the same time the Persian collection 
Pas ti b*yd krd (What is to be done?—the title 
alluding to Tolstoy's famous book!) was written. 
However Icbil's magnum opus in Persian is the 
D*iwdm, 1932, dedicated to his son D*blivid, a 
poetical account of a spiritual journey in the company of 
Djilal al-Din Rumi through the spheres, where 
he discusses philosophical and political problems 
with Muslim and non-Muslim leaders. In 1935, the 
most important collection of Icbil's Urdu poetry 
came out, Bbl-i D*blivid (Gabriel's Wing), which 
contains the famous hymn on the Mosque of 
Cordova. One year later followed the Urdu dwmp Darb-i Kaliim 
(The Stroke of Moses) with its bitter critique of the 
political and social situation. After a long illness, 
also, however, did not prevent him from 
conceiving a new evaluation of Islamic law, 
Icbil (upon whom the British Crown had conferred 
a knighthood as early as 1922) died on 21 April 1938. 
A collection of Persian quatrains and a few Urdu 
poems, A*r*ma*b^n-i H*j^dz (Gift of the H*j^dz), 
was published shortly after his death.
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contains the famous hymn on the Mosque of 
Cordova. One year later followed the Urdu dwmp Darb-i Kaliim 
(The Stroke of Moses) with its bitter critique of the 
political and social situation. After a long illness, 
also, however, did not prevent him from 
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Icbil (upon whom the British Crown had conferred 
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The very titles of Icbil's poems indicate his main intention: he felt like the caravan-bell which leads
those who are going astray in the wilderness towards the right goal, embodied in the Kacba, or guides who are written in the shari'a, and all his maq'awis are written in the metre of Rumi's Majdnaw-yi ma'navi. His imagery likewise is traditional, and he applies the inherited patterns of similes and metaphors to modern subjects (Farhad as the representative of exploited workers, Khursaw as the imperialist and capitalist). Many of his concepts can be traced back to classical Indo-Muslim poetry; but he needed these forms to gain an audience for his ideas. For poetry was, for him, not a means in itself but had to be, as he frequently asserted, "the heritage of prophecy", and its criterion is not its aesthetic beauty but its "life-yielding capacity". That is why he liked certain metres which could be easily memorized, and did not do away with the formal limits of Persian poetry with which his public was familiar. His poetry primarily concentrates upon one goal: to teach the Muslims how to regain strength by developing their personalities, be it as individuals or as nations. He has been accused of transplanting the Nietzschean superman into an Islamic environment; Ikbâl's ideal man, however, can only be understood in his relation to God.

God is, for Ikbâl, the greatest Ego, as witnessed by His personal name Allâh. He is "perfect personality which is compatible only with the conception of an Infinite Being" (F. von Hügel), which comprises everything and yet is distinct from everything. Each created being, too, has a small ego which it is called upon to develop. "Throughout the whole universe runs the gradually rising note of egohood"; and every ego is constantly striving towards a fuller realization of itself. Thus reality is eternal becoming; even death does not mean a break in this development, but opens new doors of self-realization. Immortality, then, is not ours by right, but is only an aspiration: only those who have perfected their ego during their lifetime as much as possible can partake in it. This perfection does not lead, as in the Nietzschean superman, to a detachment from God but can rather be attained by constant love and prayer. Love, 'ishq, is the man's means and the man's goal. "One who has defeated him, thus making up for his refusal to prostrate before Allâh (Sura II, 32, etc.). This is at least one of the differences between the thought of Ikbâl's Satanology. —As to time, Ikbâl was influenced in his view of the two levels of time, created and uncreated time, partly by Śāfīism, partly by Bergson; he often compared serial created time to a surûr, a magician's girdle which should be torn in order to reach the Divine nunc aeternum, if the faithful can speak, according to the example of the Prophet: "I have a time with God to which even Gabriel has no access". Ikbâl studied European philosophy intensely; he was impressed first by Hegel, but soon came to prefer the vitalists. His interpretation of Nietzsche, whom he compares to an Eastern maq'awî, is very thought-provoking; he felt that the German philosopher stopped at the lâ ilâh of the confession of faith without reaching the affirmation ilâh ilâhâ—a symbol which he also uses for Bolshevist Russia, which scattered the "ideals" of imperialism and capitalism but failed to affirm positively the power of the one God. What Ikbâl liked most in Nietzsche are the anti-Christian and anti-Platonic trends; his hostile words against Plato in the Asrar-i Ikbâl resound, though somewhat more mildly, through his whole work. Platonic mysticism was, for him, one of the main reasons of the decline of Islam. Ikbâl was a sincere admirer of Goethe, whose Faust seemed to him "nothing short of Divine workmanship", and who inspired his Payâm-i Maqût, parts of his Satanology, the two Preludes in the Dīwāndâne, etc. He compared him once with Rûmî, who was his oriental spiritual leader throughout his life. He discovered, probably under the influence of Šâhâb's sawânh-i Ma Rudân Rûm, the dynamic character of many of Rûmî's verses upon which he frequently relies. Very strong is likewise the influence of al-Hallâdî, whose thoughts he learned to understand thanks to Massignon's books, and whom he made, in the Dīwāndâne, a kind of forerunner of himself, blowing the trumpet of resurrection for the spiritually dead Muslims.

Ikbâl's main source of inspiration was the Kur'ân, whose beauty he praised again and again, and which unfolds every day new worlds, new possibilities before the faithful. His interpretation of single verses, however, is sometimes very unusual and personal, because he tries to affirm their relation with the findings of modern science. The Kur'ân and the gharî'a were thought of as capable of infinite development but at the same time as the unchangeable expression of the Divine will; hence a certain traditionism, for
example in his attitude towards women, which seems to contradict his outspoken belief in the dynamic nature of Islam. This latter belief is expressed in his numerous attacks on the theologians who cling only to the externals of religion and sink into the dust under the burden of commentaries, but never look at the original meaning of the Holy Writ. Though Ikbâl often advocates igîthâd, he sometimes prefers takfîd, traditional behaviour, as a kind of safeguard amid changing social life, until the Muslim community has attained a new consciousness and is freed from the idols of the modern "-isms" which threaten to destroy Muslims to new life. His work has been criticized, in the twenties, in European religious philosophy, he did not become a systematic philosopher; one would rather call him a "prophetical philosopher", or a "philosopher-poet", since poetry, which he wrote in masterly fashion in two languages, was not a means in itself, but a vehicle to propagate his mission, to restore the divine Decree. Such a poet, whose "spiritual father" he is called, more than that witness of unity.

The Kur'ân often uses the participle mukhâs, "he who devotes himself to God", who gives Him the worship that is His due (II, 139; IV, 146; XXXIX, 2-3; XL, 14, 65; XCVIII, 5, etc.). The worship due to God consists principally in proclaiming Him to be One and Unique, the absolute Lord, with Whom no other creature can be associated. This is why the Divine unity should be reflected in the unity of believers (notwithstanding geographical borders) who are bound by one Divine law, guided by one prophet, in whom prophethood has reached its culmination and end, and praying towards one centre, the Ka'ba. Islam is a spiritual force, opposed to blood kinship and earthrootedness; it is the witness of unity.

IKBĀL — IKHLĀS

Bibliography: Translations of Ikbâl's work mentioned in the article into European languages:


The IVth form adds to the double idea of the root—purity and salvation—that of "dedicating, devoting, consecrating oneself to God for the sake of God and God alone". Ikhâl is pre-eminently an interior virtue of the faithful Muslim, which implies both the unadulterated purity (and thus sincerity) of religious actions, pure (exclusive) worship given to God and pure (absolute) devotion to God and the Community of Believers. The perfection of one's adherence, and witness, to faith is gauged by igîthâd and ihsân (uprightness in good).

IKFĀ' [see KFIYA].

IKHLĀŞ. The IVth form adds to the double idea of the root—purity and salvation—that of "dedicating, devoting, consecrating oneself to God for the sake of God and God alone". Ikhâl is pre-eminently an interior virtue of the faithful Muslim, which implies both the unadulterated purity (and thus sincerity) of religious actions, pure (exclusive) worship given to God and pure (absolute) devotion to God and the Community of Believers. The perfection of one's adherence, and witness, to faith is gauged by igîthâd and ihsân (uprightness in good).

The Kur'ân often uses the participle mukhâs, "who devotes himself to God", who gives Him the worship that is His due (II, 139; IV, 146; XXXIX, 2-3; XL, 14, 65; XCVIII, 5, etc.). The worship due to God consists principally in proclaiming Him to be One and Unique, the absolute Lord, with Whom no other creature can be associated. This is why the divine Decree. The opposites of this interior attitude of the faithful Believer are hypocrisy (mi'âk) and the grave sin of shirk, "associating others with God". Hypocrisy is, in any case, a shirk of the heart, and any trace of shirk, however faint, is an obstacle to purity of action. Ikhâl cannot, then, be translated simply as "sincerity", as is often done. Ikhâl presupposes sincerity (ridâ), a unison of the heart and the lips", but, in a way, goes beyond this in a unity and purity of interior gaze which is directed at God and God alone.

The importance given to igîthâd in any attempt to interiorize religious values is characteristic of Muslim aspirations. We shall give three examples, which follow three quite different lines of thought.

1.—The moderate Ismânî-ism of the Ikhâlûn al-Šâfî makes igîthâd one of the conditions of faith (gâhârû al-imân), and one of the virtues of the Believer, together with complete reliance (tawakkul), endurance of trials (sabr), and one of the virtues of the Be-thinker (shârîf al-imân), "Who does not beget and is not begotten", is most usually called šurât al-ikhâl. The opposites of this interior attitude of the faithful Believer are hypocrisy (mi'âk) and the grave sin of shirk, "associating others with God". Hypocrisy is, in any case, a shirk of the heart, and any trace of shirk, however faint, is an obstacle to purity of action. Ikhâl cannot, then, be translated simply as "sincerity", as is often done. Ikhâl presupposes sincerity (ridâ), a unison of the heart and the lips", but, in a way, goes beyond this in a unity and purity of interior gaze which is directed at God and God alone.

The importance given to igîthâd in any attempt to interiorize religious values is characteristic of Muslim aspirations. We shall give three examples, which follow three quite different lines of thought.

1.—The moderate Ismânî-ism of the Ikhâlûn al-Šâfî makes igîthâd one of the conditions of faith (gâhârû al-imân), and one of the virtues of the Believer, together with complete reliance (tawakkul), endurance of trials (sabr) and acceptance (ridâ) of the divine Decree. Ikhâl is absolute purity and unity of intention, both in work accomplished (šârîf) before God and in requests (du'a) addressed to God (Rasûlî 'Ikhân al-Ša'fî, ed. Cairo 1347/1928, iv. 131-2).

2.—Analyses of igîthâd belong, above all, to Şî'î meditations and investigations. Ikhâl is the secret of the heart, and the grave sin of shirk, however faint, is an obstacle to purity of action. Ikhâl cannot, then, be translated simply as "sincerity", as is often done. Ikhâl presupposes sincerity (ridâ), a unison of the heart and the lips", but, in a way, goes beyond this in a unity and purity of interior gaze which is directed at God and God alone.

The importance given to igîthâd in any attempt to interiorize religious values is characteristic of Muslim aspirations. We shall give three examples, which follow three quite different lines of thought.

1.—The moderate Ismânî-ism of the Ikhâlûn al-Šâfî makes igîthâd one of the conditions of faith (gâhârû al-imân), and one of the virtues of the Believer, together with complete reliance (tawakkul), endurance of trials (sabr) and acceptance (ridâ) of the divine Decree. Ikhâl is absolute purity and unity of intention, both in work accomplished (šârîf) before God and in requests (du'a) addressed to God (Rasûlî 'Ikhân al-Ša'fî, ed. Cairo 1347/1928, iv. 131-2).

2.—Analyses of igîthâd belong, above all, to Şî'î meditations and investigations. Ikhâl is the secret of the heart, and the grave sin of shirk, however faint, is an obstacle to purity of action. Ikhâl cannot, then, be translated simply as "sincerity", as is often done. Ikhâl presupposes sincerity (ridâ), a unison of the heart and the lips", but, in a way, goes beyond this in a unity and purity of interior gaze which is directed at God and God alone.

The importance given to igîthâd in any attempt to interiorize religious values is characteristic of Muslim aspirations. We shall give three examples, which follow three quite different lines of thought.

1.—The moderate Ismânî-ism of the Ikhâlûn al-Šâfî makes igîthâd one of the conditions of faith (gâhârû al-imân), and one of the virtues of the Believer, together with complete reliance (tawakkul), endurance of trials (sabr) and acceptance (ridâ) of the divine Decree. Ikhâl is absolute purity and unity of intention, both in work accomplished (šârîf) before God and in requests (du'a) addressed to God (Rasûlî 'Ikhân al-Ša'fî, ed. Cairo 1347/1928, iv. 131-2).

2.—Analyses of igîthâd belong, above all, to Şî'î meditations and investigations. Ikhâl is the secret of the heart, and the grave sin of shirk, however faint, is an obstacle to purity of action. Ikhâl cannot, then, be translated simply as "sincerity", as is often done. Ikhâl presupposes sincerity (ridâ), a unison of the heart and the lips", but, in a way, goes beyond this in a unity and purity of interior gaze which is directed at God and God alone.
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L. Massignon, Passion*, 595-6). It is the secret imparted by Muhammad to JJudhayfa, who questioned
him about the "inner knowledge" film bdjiri). The
Prophet received the reply from God through the
angel Gabriel: "It is a secret (sirr) of My secret
(sirri)', I set it in the heart of My servant and none
of My creatures can comprehend it". Al-Mufrasibi
sees in ikhlds "the very principle of the spiritual
continuity of the true Sunna" (ibid., 596), and alyalladi wrote a Kitdb al-Sidfy wa-'l-ikhlds, in which
he both separated and united "sincerity" (sidfr) and
the perfect worship of predestined hearts" (ibid.}.
The great Sufi manuals frequently refer to it and
avail themselves of it to reorganize the "sayings of
the Ancients". Three examples: (a) al-Kalabadhi
makes ikhlds a "stage" (makdma) of the soul and devotes to it a short chapter of his Kitdb al-Tacarruf
(ed. A. J. Arberry, Cairo 1353/1933, 70; Eng. trans,
by the same, Cambridge 1935, 90-1). He reproduces
a phrase of Djunayd, who defines ikhlds as "that
through which God is desired, in whatever act it
may be", and he stresses the stipulation formulated
by Ruwaym, that no consideration should be given
to the act performed, but only to God. (b) Similar
themes, with references to the "Ancients", in the
Kut al-kulub of Abu Talib al-Makki (ed. Cairo 1351;
1932, iv, 33-5), in which the stress is laid upon uprightness of intention (niyya) "for the Face of God"
(li-wadih Allah), (c) Al-Kushayri, in his Risdlafi Him
al-tasawwuf (Cairo n.d., 95-6), quoting many Sufi
traditions, distinguishes between the ikhlds of the
mass of mankind (al-^awdmm) in which the soul, in
the spiritual state that it attains, should not seek
its own happiness, and that of the privileged (alkhawdss), in which the worship given to God should
be so pure that no consideration can be paid even to
the ikhlds.
Almost every author might be mentioned. AlAnsari, the great Hanbali mystic, in his Mandzil alsd^irin (ed. with Fr. trans. S. Laugier de Beaurecueil,
Cairo 1962, 31/72), numbers ikhlds among the ten
"types of behaviour" (mu'dmaldt) demanded of the
Sufi. He defines it as the effort to "purify action
of all admixture", that is to say, as Mahmud alFirkawi comments (ed. Beaurecueil, Cairo 1953, 34),
to purify it of infatuation, hypocrisy, the appetite
of the soul and other similar things. Al-Ansari
distinguishes three degrees: (a) detaching oneself
from correctly accomplished acts and not seeking
satisfaction in them; (b) endeavouring to act well,
but being ashamed of one's action and seeing it
only in the light of divine Generosity; (c) "purifying
action by freeing oneself from action".
The text, however, that had the most profound
influence was undoubtedly al-Ghazali's development
in his Ihyd* (Cairo ed., 1352/1933, iv, 321-8): four
chapters devoted to the virtue and merit of ikhlds,
its nature (hafcika), what the Shaykhs have said about
it and what obstructs it. This constitutes a small
treatise on spiritual psychology, which readily adopts
and develops, as often in the Ihyd*, Abu Talib alMakki's account. Having underlined the unity of intention that makes up ikhlds, al-Ghazali, too, stresses
the complete disinterestedness that it implies.
3.—The influence of Abu Talib al-Makki and alGhazali on Ibn Taymiyya needs no demonstration
(cf. H. Laoust, Essai sur les doctrines sociales et
politiques de Takl-d-Din Ahmad b. Taymiya, Cairo
1939, 84 and 90, n. i); similarly with the influence
of certain Shici views that he opposed in other connexions. If the direct heritage of al-Ansari is added
to this, it is hardly surprising to find in the interiorist

Hanbalism of Ibn Taymiyya frequent references
to the virtue of ikhlds, such as we have defined it.
He proclaims its value against a completely exterior
juridicism: first of all in the very act of obedience
to the religious Law (ibid., 472 and n. 2 with ref.).
He emphasizes the idea of devotion, pure and
absolute devotion to God, the Prophet, the Community. When he wishes to increase "effort (djihdd)
on the path of God" in order to extend on earth "the
rights of God and man", he makes djihdd the highest
form of ikhlds towards God (ibid., 360, n. 3). Pure
worship and absolute devotion are thus seen as the
most profound attitude demanded of the Believer.
Ibn Taymiyya's disciples readily adopted the
theme of ikhlds, above all his direct disciple Ibn
Kayyim al-Djawziyya, who saw in absolute devotion
to God (ikhlds li-'lldh) one of the fundamental virtues.
Muhammad b. cAbd al-Wahhab later echoed this
(ibid., 531). Following these, several contemporary
reformist trends (the salafiyya) emphasized it.
Ikhlds was for the Sufis an indispensable stage of the
soul in its quest for union with God. Through Ibn
Taymiyya's influence, and owing to his acceptance
of Sufi ideas, it became for the Muslim who wished to
interiorize his faith an attitude existentially required
by the very values of Islam.
Bibliography: in the article. (L. GARDET)
IKHMlM [see AFOIMIM].
IKHSHID, the title given to local Iranian rulers of Soghdia and Farghana in the pre-Islamic and
early Islamic period. Although Justi (Iranisches
Namenbuch, i4ia), Unvala (The translation of an
extract from Mafdtih al^UMm of al-Khwdrazmi, in
/. of the K.R. Cama Inst., xi (1928), 18-19) and
Spuler (Iran, 30-1, 356) derive it from O. Pers.
khshaeta- 'shining, brilliant', an etymology from
O. Pers. khshdyathiya- 'king, ruler* (M. Pers. and
N. Pers. shah) is more probable (Christensen, and
Bos worth and Clauson, see below). This O. Pers. term
khshdyathiya- penetrated beyond Transoxania as far
as Mongolia, where we find the Orkhon Turkish title
of shadh, a rank given to senior members of the
princely family below the Kaghan.
At the time of the Arab conquest of Transoxania,
the rulers of Soghdia were called Ikhshids, and
Mukaddasi, 279, says that the Ikhshid, king of
Samarkand, had his castle and residence at Maymurgh in the Samarkand oasis. The Ikhshids continued in Soghdia well into the early cAbbasid period,
having transferred their seat to Ishtikhan after the
Arab conquest of Samarkand; the submission of the
then Ikhshid to the Caliph al-Mahdi is recorded by
Yackubi (cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 95, 202). The local
ruler of Farghana also had this title (Ibn Khurradadhbih, 40), and according to Ibn al-Athir, v, 344,
it was he who called in against the Arabs the Chinese
army of Kao-hsien-chih, defeated by Ziyad b. Salit
at Talas in 133/751. The title evidently carried great
prestige in Central Asia, for it was adopted in the
4th/ioth century by the Turkish commander
Muhammad b. Tughdj [q.v.], claiming descent from
the ancient princes of Farghana.
Bibliography: in addition to the references
given above, see C. E. Bosworth and Sir Gerard
Clauson, Al-Xwdrazml on the peoples of Central
Asia, in JRAS (1965), 6-7. O. I. Smirnova gives a
list of the Ikhshids of Soghdia in the period 31168/650-783 in her Sogdiskie monetl kak novl
istocnik dlya istorii Sredney Azii, in SO, vi (1949),
356-67.
(C. E. BOSWORTH)
IKHSHIDIDS [see KAFUR and MUHAMMAD B.
TUGHDJ].


IKHTILADJ — IKHTILAF

IKHTILADJ. spontaneous pulsations, tremblings or convulsions which occur in all parts of the body, in particular in the limbs, the eyelids and the eyebrows, and which provide omens the interpretation of which as a divinatory sign is known as the "šim al-ikhtilddi" or "palmoscopy".

Palmoscopy forms part of physiognomy and, like it, formed part of medical diagnosis by the physicians of classical antiquity, among them Galen, who established a distinction between "palpitation" and "trembling, shudder, convulsion".

As a divinatory practice, Islamic palmoscopy seems to have been the first Islamic treatise, the written elements of which reached the Arabs through Persia. Ibn al-Nadim, who was conversant with an Arabic translation of the short works attributed to Melampos (op. cit., 391 f.), mentions, under the same heading (Fihrist, 314), two titles whose Iranian origin is beyond doubt: the first is Kitāb al-Ikhtilāf al-šarīf wa-la'dī fi-l-fird wa-'l-zadjr wa-'l-firdsa alayh al-haydīt, "The book of pulsations, with three interpretations, for Persians", which has not survived, but the contents of which might be similar to a paragraph of the Ps.-Diähiz, Bāb al-šarīf wa-l-ṣa'dir wa-l-firdaṣa al-šarīf madhab al-Furs (ed. K. Inostranzeff, in Matériaux de sources arabes, pour l'histoire de la culture dans la Perse sassanide, extr. from the Zapiski of the Oriental Section of the Archaeological Society, xviii, St. Petersburg 1907, 21-2); the second is Kitāb al-Ikhtilāf al-ṣa'dir wa-la'dī wa-l-ṣa'dir wa-l-ṣa'dir in-naṣṣ ar-rājū wa-l-iṣ'ābih wa-dīn wa-dīn wa-ma'ṣūfāt al-ša'dīq wa-l-ṣa'dir al-nisā' bi-ma'ṣūfāt mā yu'dīlu Ǧalayh al-haydīyt, "The book of pulsations, omens and of what man sees from his clothing and his body; description of naezi and of the treatment of women; the knowledge of the signs provided by snakes". The content of this collection of omens recalls that of an Assyro-Babylonian series entitled Shumma Ǧulina ma'sīl šahīk (cf. transliteration and tr. apud Fr. Nötzcher, in Orientalia, O. S. xxxi (1928), xxxix-xliv (1937), for the detailed references, cf. divination arabe, 399, notes 5 to 9).

The earliest manuscript examples of the treatises of ikhtilāf bear the name of Diyahar al-Sādik, the reputed teacher of esoteric sciences in early Islam. This attribution is due to the fact that he had gathered round him a circle of Iranian and Byzantine magi who were engaged in translating into Arabic specimens of the literatures of their native countries (cf. T. Fahd, La divination arabe. Etudes religieuses, sociologiques et folkloriques sur le milieu natif de l'Islam, Leiden 1966, 397-402; for survivals in Islam of palmoscopic practices, see E. Doutré, Magie et religion dans l'Afrique du Nord, Algiers 1909, 366. (T. Fahd))

IKHTILAF (a.), difference, also inconsistency; as a technical term, the differences of opinion amongst the authorities of religious law, both between the several schools and within each of them; opp. idjamʿ (q.v.), ittiḥād. The ancient schools of law, on the one hand, accepted geographical differences of doctrines as natural; on the other hand, they voiced strong objections to disagreement within each school, an opinion which was mitigated by their acceptance as legitimate of different opinions if based on idjamʿ (q.v.). The rising tide of disagreements on questions of principle arose only from the time of Shafiʿi (q.v.) and his systematic innovation. But the several schools arrived at a compromise, and the consensus (idjamʿ), which acted as the integrating principle of Islam, succeeded in making innocuous those differences of opinion which it could not eliminate. The four schools, then, are equally covered by idjamʿ, their alternative interpretations of Kurʾān and sunna are equally legitimate, they are all equally orthodox. This view has found expression in a saying which occurs first in the Fikh al-akhbar of Abū Hanifa (q.v.) and was later attributed to the Prophet, to the effect that "differences of opinion in the community of Muslims is a concession (raḥma) on the part of Allāh". The work of Shafʿārān (see below) expresses the attitude underlying this tradition with monotonous regularity.

The recording of these differences of opinion has produced a considerable literature since the begin-
nings of the study of fikh. The earlier works reflect the discussions between the several schools, the later ones are simply handbooks. To the earliest existing works belong the Kitāb ikhtilāf Abū Bakr (q.v.), which is in turn derived from the ūla, the Ashāris and Maturidis, and, as many of them have been lost, is only a valuable source for the comparative study of early ṣūfīs, Ibn Kutayba (q.v.); d. 276/889) in the early days of the 3rd century; the Ḥanbalis, certain Hanbalis, such as Alī, the Ashāris and Maturidis, and, as many of them have been lost, is only a valuable source for the comparative study of early ṣūfīs, Ibn Kutayba (q.v.), the Ḥanafis and the Ḥanbalis, certain Hanbalis, such as Alī, the Ashāris and Maturidis, and, as many of them have been lost, is only a valuable source for the comparative study of early ṣūfīs, Ibn Kutayba (q.v.)...
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Cairo 1382/1962, i, 340-65, with reference to Ibn Hazm). In treatises on the imdām, it is customary to contrast the akl al-ikhtiyār with the akl al-nāṣs, the supporters of free election with the supporters of textual determination.

It is, however, in the schools of ʿīm al-kalām that the question of the existence and the nature of free will in man is faced. It is one of the most discussed problems in the "Treatise on Actions".

The Muṭṭāzilīs of Baṣra, such as Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā Burqūdhūḥ, a disciple of al-Naḍīdīr, contrasted ikhtiyār, that which is performed voluntarily, with ḥudūr, that which is performed in obligatory acts and submission. In the school of Baḥdādhād, the first term is more frequently used as a correlative (mukhabal) of ṣiddār [q.e.] "constraint". According to the Muḥāḥaddīṣ al-Islāmīyīn of al-Ashʿārī (ed. Cairo 1309/1950, i, 110), Ḫāfa b. Ḥarb set out as follows the thesis of the Ṣāḥībī Ḥaṣūm b. al-Ḥaḍām: human action depends on a double perspective: it is free human action, but rather ʿāliyya, to the extent that it is "acquired" by the subject who performs it, which is constrained (ṣiddār) inasmuch as it cannot occur without the appearance of the cause that provokes it (cf. W. Montgomery Watt, Free will and predestination in early Islam, London 1948, 110). This distinction established within the same action is denied by the various Muṭṭāzilī branches. Briefly, it may be said that in their eyes man is the "inventor" (mukhtār) or "creator" (ḥulūl) of his actions inasmuch as he is mukhtār (in the sense of "one who chooses") and endowed with ikhtiyār.

But Ḫaṣūm b. al-Ḥaḍām had, on this very point, as it were, anticipated the Ḫāfa b. Ḥarb reaction. It should first of all be noted that the very word ikhtiyār is relatively little employed, or rather, it is used primarily to characterize divine action which operates bi-ʿl-ḥudra wa-ʿl-ikhtiyār (e.g., al-ʿAshʿārī, Istiḥṣāān al-khawād fi ʿīm al-kalām, ed. with Eng. trans. R. McCarthy, The theology of al-ʿAshʿārī, Beirut 1953, 93/127; al-Bakīllānī, Kitāb al-Tamḥīd, ed. McCarthy, Beirut 1957, 36). God alone is truly a "free Agent", al-fāʾil al-mukhtār.

Quite quickly, however, ikhtiyār takes on the common sense of an act that can be performed or not performed by the subject. Al-Bakīllānī stresses the fact that when a Ṣūfī likes to choose, he likes to choose (ṣūfī ʿāliyya al-ṭārikh al-ikhtiyārī) of the hand and the "movement" (tank al-ikhtiyār) which is the trembling of the hemispheric (Tamḥīd, 308, see also 286). This is a psychological statement that has to be placed within the vaster problem of the "creation" and "acquisition" of actions. In fact, generally speaking in the ʿAshʿārī and Ḥanafī-Māṭurīḍī schools, it is not al-ikhtiyār that is the title of discussions on free human action, but rather the "capacity" to act (mukhabal) of the subject. The opposite correlative is not longer ʿīm al-ikhtiyār-ṣiddār, but as formerly with Dirar, the leader of the Muṭṭāzilīs of Baṣra, ʿīm al-ikhtiyār-ṣiddār, the "contingent" ("commenced") power (of action)". The opposite correlative is no longer ʿīm al-ikhtiyār-ṣiddār, but as formerly with Dirar, the leader of the Muṭṭāzilīs of Baṣra, ʿīm al-ikhtiyār-ṣiddār. With the ʿAshʿārīs, the "acquisition of action", ʿīm al-ikhtiyār-ṣiddār, is understood as an "attribute" carried out directly by God, and with the Māṭurīḍīs as a simple "qualification" (ṣīya) of the subject. The term dealt with is that of ʿīm al-ikhtiyār, the "capacity" to act created by God in the human subject. Ikhtiyār does not belong to the list of technical words established by al-Djurādīnī in his Taʾrīfāt.

The existential determinism of the falsafīya does not hesitate, either, to speak of ʿīm al-ikhtiyār and of ʿīm al-ikhtiyār, but without in any way committing itself to the ontological reality of human free will.

Ikhtiyār must then most often be translated as "power of choice" (cf. A.-M. Goichon, Lexique de la langue philosophique d' Ibn Sīnā, Paris 1938, s.v.), and ikhtiyār as "deliberate". Ibn Sīnā says that the concupiscient and irascible faculties, simple opinion and the judgment of the intellect are all capable of ikhtiyār (Shīṭātāt, Iḥtiyyātāt, Cairo 1960, ii, 387-8). "Choice" presupposes an elective action, and it thus depends on a knowledge, which can, however, be instinctive as well as intellectual, animal as well as human and superhuman as well as human. Every animate being and every intelligent being, from animals to the celestial beings, is endowed with ikhtiyār. Al-Kindī speaks of the ikhtiyār of the celestial spheres, and of their ikhtiyār obedience to God (Rasāʾil al-Kindī, ed. Abū Rida, Cairo 1360/1950, i, 246-7). The adjective ikhtiyārī is the opposite of "natural" (tabīʾ) and is applied to the freedom of spontaneity of the estimalive faculty in animals in the same way as it is to the intellectual faculty in man (Māṭurīḍī, al-Falsāfah, ed. Cairo 1357/1938, 215), but it is not will that defines it. That which effects greater or less perfection of choice is not the degree of a freedom in which are joined intelligence and rational will, but the degree and quality of knowledge. The choice that depends on intelligence is the only one that can tend towards the "pure and true" good; it is no less caught up in the universal causal sequence.

It was probably the double line of influence, on the one hand of the tradition of kalām (especially al-Bākīllānī) and on the other of Ibn Sīnā, that inspired the analysis of the act of choice sketched by al-Ḥaṣāṣī at the beginning of the Taḥāfūt al-falsāfīya (with regard to the man put before two identical cups or two similar dates), and particularly in the Iḥyāʾ, Cairo 1352/1933, iv, 219-20 [see Ṣiddār]. Two points of view should be mentioned: (1) in human īm al-ihdā, voluntary decision is subordinated to the judgment of the intellect, that is to say, it is "constrained" by it; (2) in consequence, an absolute free choice is exercised in God alone, for God does not act "for a motive" or "to attain an end" (gharād, ḥuṣn), the existential determinism of the falsafīya that sees the freedom the "motive of preference" (mudājdūdīth), chosen by the intellect, into a decisive argument against "man as creator of his actions". Human choice, which is always motivated, is not a truly free choice; it is "an intermediary" between natural constraint and the pure divine freedom, both Ṣiddārī and ikhtiyārī, as Ḫaṣūm b. al-Ḥaḍām says. Al-Ḥaṣāṣī's analysis remains one of the peaks of the ʿAshʿārī thought. Similar themes are found, with more or less precision, in all subsequent treatises and manuals. In modern times, the ʿīm al-tawḥīd of Muhammad ʿAbduh (Cairo 1533, 60) limits itself to the double affirmation of two contrasting truths: the divine omnipotence, "which is proved" and the "evidence" of man "who is free (mukhtār) in his actions". It should finally be noted that nowadays, when Muṭṭāzilī theses are undeniably coming back into favour, the current philosophical vocabulary uses hurrīya more commonly than ʿīm al-ikhtiyār for the problem of the ontological foundation of human freedom.

Bibliography: in the article. (L. GardeT)

IKHTIVAR — IKHTIVARAT or hemerologies and mone-
logies (Gr. xartuyṣa, Lat. electiones) means an
astrological procedure whose aim is to ascertain the auspicious (sa*d) or inauspicious (nahs) character of the future. It deals with years, months, days and hours. This task, which was the duty of the official astrologer of the court as early as the Umayyad period, became increasingly important under the ‘Abbásids as a result of the adoption of Iranian customs and Sásanid calendars which established precisely how the prince's time should be spent during all the days of the week (cf. for example the Ps. ‘Dhaháb, Báb al-wrāja wa ‘l-sa’diyya wa ‘l-fajrā wa ‘l-hardā maddah al-Faww, ed. K. Inostranzeff, in Mahtāra, de sources abissées sur le Sasanide, extr. from the Zapiski of the Oriental Section of the Archeol. Soc., xviii, St. Petersburg 1907, 59; F. Gabrieli, Eitichetta di corte e costumi sasanidi nel Ktib Aqal al-Mulak al-di al-Gahis, in RSO, xi (1928), 292-305).

Divinatory hemerology was known to the early Arabs, as to all the peoples of antiquity (see La divination arab, 483, notes 4-5); the best known example is that found in the legend of the Ghariyān of al-Mundhir b. Mā' al-Samā', who once a year stood for two days beside these two sacred stones which were sprinkled with blood: one of these days was auspicious (ya'am na'min); on this day he was generous to those who came to see him; the other was inauspicious (ya'am bu'si); on this day his unfortunate visitors were sacrificed to his idols (on this legend and the Ghariyān, see T. Fahd, Le panthéon de l'Arabie centrale à la veille de l'hégire, Paris 1968, 91-4). For the Islamic period, particularly under the ‘Abbásids, there exist a large number of accounts which attest how frequently recourse was made to hemerology (cf. C. A. Nallino, Raccolta, v, 38 ff.; T. Fahd, La divination arabe, 484 f.).

The theoretical basis of hemerology underwent its greatest development during the ‘Abbásid period. There exist many short works of ikhtiyārāt, bearing the names of such famous astronomers as al-Kindī (Brockelmann, S I, 392), Sahl b. Biṣṣir, whose treatise survives in a Latin version (ibid., 396), al-Kasrānī (ibid., 392), Abū Mā'shar al-Falāki (ibid., 1, 222), Abū Sa'ād al-Sigzār (ibid., S I, 389), Muḥammad b. Ya’qūb b. Nawkhašt (ibid., 869), Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (ibid., 1, 507, S I, 924) and several others. For later implication, brief calendars, worked out according to various procedures, indicate the good or the bad actions which are to be advised or discouraged for a certain day of the week and a certain month of the lunar year (see examples in La divination arabe, 487).

In Iranian and Turkish milieus, more special attention is paid to the first day of the Islamic year, the Nawrūz (q.v.); the actions performed on this day presage what the whole year will be like (cf. H. Masse, Croisances et coutumes persanes, ii, 145 ff.; La divination arabe, 486, 489, note 1).


IKHTIYĀRĀT, in the sense of "anthologies" (see MUKHTARĀT).

IKHWĀN (see TARIQA).

AL-IKHWĀN ("the Brothers"), Arab tribesmen joining a religious and military movement which had its heyday in Arabia from 1330 to 1348/1292-30 under the rule of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān Āl Suʿūd, popularly known as Ibn Suʿūd (see Suʿūd, Āl). The movement, inspired by a resurgence of the Wahhābiyya (q.v.), bore a strong resemblance to the original work of the Ikhwan in the Arabian Peninsula in the 13th/14th century. In both cases the strength of tribal ties, the amazingly rapid spread of religious fervour in an attempt to form a cohesive community rising above tribal divisiveness, the zealous desire to propagate Islam by the dijāh, and the eagerness of the mujāhids to die as martyrs were strikingly similar. So likewise was the settlement of nomadic tribesmen in military cantonments, one of the distinctive features of the Ikhwan movement. Thanks in good measure to the prowess of the Ikhwan, most of the Arabian Peninsula was brought under the sway of a single Iṣṭān, Ibn Suʿūd. When the triumphant devotees of tawḥīd started to break out of the Peninsula to the north, however, the parallel with fājd al-İslam faded. The Ikhwan came up against British military aircraft and armoured cars based in the mandates of Transjordan and ‘Irāq and British warships stationed in the eastern Gulf for the protection of Britain's allies. The fanatical bravery of the Ikhwan beat in vain against the machines of the 20th century. And in challenging this century and its profound changes, the Ikhwan at last revolted against their sovereign, Ibn Suʿūd, who with superior force stopped and confined them. The Ikhwan movement may thus be regarded as the last gasp of pristine Islamic militancy, reproducing in many ways the beliefs and tactics of 1,300 years ago.

The progress and decline of the Ikhwan movement form an important chapter in the history of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. During the close association between Ibn Suʿūd and the Ikhwan the state expanded to the west and north, occupying the regions of ‘Aṣīr, Djabal Shammar, and al-Ḥijāz. Ibn Suʿūd as the new Protector of the Holy Cities acquired a position of prominence and dignity in the Islamic world. When the Ikhwan revolted, the response of the King and his government to the issues they raised determined the future course of the kingdom, which from then on emerged rapidly from its xenophobic isolation. The excesses of the Ikhwan harmed the reputation of Arabia in the Islamic world, yet their direct actionless storming up of Islam among the tribes of early Islam made a deep impression on many Muslims.

In the 12th and 13th/18th and 19th centuries Āl Suʿūd in their wars relied primarily on the sturdy town-dwellers of ‘Aqīd, who stood firmer in battle than the mercenarism Bedouin auxiliaries. In 1319/1902 Ibn Suʿūd recovered al- Riyād, the capital of his forefathers, from ‘Abd Rashīd b. Ḥayīl in Djabal Shammar, and began the reconstruction of the dominion of his house. Although a townsman by birth and largely by upbringing, he had lived among the Bedouins and knew them well. As he became embroiled in the tribal feuds which for ages had rent Arabia, he searched for a way of turning the talents of the Bedouins to better use. The answer he hit upon was to mobilize them in settlements, where they could more easily be taught the doctrines of Islam, be made responsible citizens, and be moulded into a formidable martial force. This revolutionary approach called for the Bedouins to depart from their old way of life, which came to be referred to as al- Dījāhilīyya, and to embrace a new way, illumined by God's grace, so that the name hūdra (variant hūdara) was given to the settlements and the name Ikhwan to the settlers. The Bedouin moving into a hūdara gave up his
house of hair for a mud hut. Often he sold his camels and ghānam, for he was now more of a farmer than a herder. He might even become a trader after a fashion by selling the products of his tillage.

The government supported the establishment of the ḥidiras through the selection of sites; the grant of land; the building of mosques, schools, and dwellings; the provision of seeds and tools and the giving of instruction in planting; the supply of arms and ammunition; and, above all, the sending of religious teachers (muwslims, islām); to indoctrinate the Ikhwan in the ideology of Islam as it was in the time of the Prophet and al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ. This was Islam as taught by Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb (q.v.), but the Ikhwan often went to extremes. They were vehement in denouncing bid’as of all sorts. Electricity, which brought light without oil or wax, was iniquitous. The Ikhwan broke mirrors because they reflected images. In their personal appearance men must follow what was believed to be the Prophet’s example. Moustaches must be trimmed almost out of sight and beards grown long. The traditional headcloth and headdresses of the Bedouin must be replaced by a white turban.

Missionary work in the ḥidiras was carried on under the direction of Sayykh ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥaḍir, a descendant of Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, who composed Ḥanbalī tracts for distribution among the Ikhwan. In Dhu-al-Ḥaḍir 1323/September 1914 he joined other ʿulamāʾ in addressing a circular to “ḥāfat al-Ikhwan min ahl al-hidirāṭ” in which moderation was urged upon them. No difference, the scholars said, could be found in the Sharīʿa between the wearing of headdresses and the wearing of a turban. At the same time Ibn Suʿūd wrote another circular to the Ikhwan in which he pointed out that there were no basic contradictions in the four madhhabs of Sunni Islam, even though he and his government adhered to Hanbaliism. He remarked that the Ikhwan had in their colonies the books of the different madhhabs, as well as the writings of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Kayyim al-Djawziyya (q.v.), the spiritual predecessors of Wahhābism. As the Ikhwan movement developed, however, such pleas for moderation and tolerance were often ignored by its followers. Nevertheless, the religious teaching in the Ikhwan had developed to the point where they began replacing the townsfolk of Nadjīd as the elite of Ibn Suʿūd’s army, marching with his bodyguard under his banner. In that year Ibn Suʿūd advanced with the Ikhwan to the walls of Ḥayl, and Ibn Rashid’s capital, but failed to take the city for want of artillery. In 1337/1919 the Ikhwan on their own won the first great victory in a contest destined to end with the downfall of the Ḥāghimīd regime of King al-Husayn ibn al-Jawdān in al-Hijaz. The Ikhwan took advantage of the enmity between Ibn Suʿūd and al-Husayn to send troops to the borderland between Nadjīd and al-Hijaz and the allegiance of the tribes living there. The key oases were al-Khurma and Taraba (q.v.), and the most important tribe was ʿUtayba. Ibn Suʿūd already had a strong segment of ʿUtayba with him under Ibn Humayd in al-Ghathāṣi. The Anīl of al-Khurma was the Sharīʿī Khālid b. Mansūr Ibn Luʿayy b. Dawlā of Ḥādī ʿAbd Allāh (see HāGHIMĪDS). Ibn Luʿayy, after falling out with his kinsman ʿAbd Allāh, son of King al-Husayn, during the siege of the Ottoman forces in Medina, returned to al-Khurma, where he enrolled as a member of Ibn Suʿūd’s Ikhwan and energetically spread their doctrines among the tribes. From 1336/1917 onwards, al-Husayn sent three expeditions against Ibn Luʿayy, but the latter reached the fort of Umm al-Qura and was annihilated. After the surrender of Medina, al-Husayn mounted an even larger expedition and gave the command to his son ʿAbd Allāh. The people of al-Khurma called on Ibn Suʿūd for help, and he commissioned Ibn Humayd to lead forward a contingent of the Ikhwan. Together Ibn Luʿayy and Ibn Humayd made a surprise attack on ʿAbd Allāh’s fortified camp at Taraba and thoroughly routed the Ḥāghimīd forces, both regulars and irregulars. The road to Mecca lay
open, but for diplomatic reasons Ibn Su'ud held the Ikhwan back.

In 1338/1920 soldiers of the Ikhwan, with the backing of Mubarak Al-Sabah, the ruler of Kuwait, over the borderland dispute with Asir. In 1338/1920 Ibn Su'ud felt that Salim was pressing his claims too far south, and Salim protested at the building of a kādīrā by the Ikhwan of Mutayr at Karya al-ʻUlyā (pronounced garyat al-ʻulayn). Salim dispatched troops into the disputed area, and at Hamd near Karya, they were overwhelmed by Faysal al-Dawish and the Ikhwan. Fearing invasion, the people of Kuwait in two months built a long wall with four gates to protect their town. In Muharram 1338/November 1920 al-Dawish moved, not against Kuwait town itself, but against the neighbouring oasis of al-Dajahra, which Salim defended with desperation and success. Losses on both sides were heavy. Britain, pledged to protect Kuwait, sent two warships to the port and two military planes to protect their town. After a siege of nearly two months in which al-Dawish and the Ikhwan played a prominent role, Hāyil capitulated in Safar 1339/December 1920. The Ikhwan leaders criticized the generous terms which Ibn Su'ud accorded to Al-Raghi.

The occupation of Al-Raghi's lands eliminated the buffer between Ibn Su'ud's state and the new states of Transjordan and Irāq. A number of followers of Al-Raghi, particularly from the tribe of Šhammar, took refuge in Irāq and made it a base for raids against the subjects of Ibn Su'ud. The Ikhwan, restrained from hurling themselves against the Hashimids in al-Hijāz, found substitute targets in their new neighbours, where al-Husayn's sons 'Abd Allah and Faysal had assumed the thrones of Transjordan and Kuwait. The Ikhwan did not move in time for the pilgrimage of 1342/1924, as their campaign against al-Hijāz began in Muḥarram 1339/August 1924. The main thrust westwards was accompanied by diversionsary expeditions against the Hashimids on two other fronts. A flying column of Ikhwan raided villages of Banū Ṣaḥḥir just south of Amman, and Amman itself on 3 May 1342/April 1924 with severe losses by British planes and armoured cars, while other Ikhwan made a series of irruptions into Irāq, where again the British opposed them with modern equipment.

A conflict arose between Ibn Su'ud and Sālim b. Muhammad Al-Sabah, the ruler of Kuwait, over the borderland dispute with Asir. In 1338/1920 Ibn Su'ud felt that Salim was pressing his claims too far south, and Salim protested at the building of a kādīrā by the Ikhwan of Mutayr at Karya al-ʻUlyā (pronounced garyat al-ʻulayn). Salim dispatched troops into the disputed area, and at Hamd near Karya, they were overwhelmed by Faysal al-Dawish and the Ikhwan. Fearing invasion, the people of Kuwait in two months built a long wall with four gates to protect their town. In Muharram 1338/November 1920 al-Dawish moved, not against Kuwait town itself, but against the neighbouring oasis of al-Dajahra, which Salim defended with desperation and success. Losses on both sides were heavy. Britain, pledged to protect Kuwait, sent two warships to the port and two military planes to protect their town. After a siege of nearly two months in which al-Dawish and the Ikhwan played a prominent role, Hāyil capitulated in Safar 1339/December 1920. The Ikhwan leaders criticized the generous terms which Ibn Su'ud accorded to Al-Raghi.

The occupation of Al-Raghi's lands eliminated the buffer between Ibn Su'ud's state and the new states of Transjordan and Irāq. A number of followers of Al-Raghi, particularly from the tribe of Šhammar, took refuge in Irāq and made it a base for raids against the subjects of Ibn Su'ud. The Ikhwan, restrained from hurling themselves against the Hashimids in al-Hijāz, found substitute targets in their new neighbours, where al-Husayn's sons 'Abd Allah and Faysal had assumed the thrones of Transjordan and Kuwait. The Ikhwan did not move in time for the pilgrimage of 1342/1924, as their campaign against al-Hijāz began in Muḥarram 1339/August 1924. The main thrust westwards was accompanied by diversionsary expeditions against the Hashimids on two other fronts. A flying column of Ikhwan raided villages of Banū Ṣaḥḥir just south of Amman, and Amman itself on 3 May 1342/April 1924 with severe losses by British planes and armoured cars, while other Ikhwan made a series of irruptions into Irāq, where again the British opposed them with modern equipment.

In the west the Ikhwan advanced under the command of Ibn Lu'ayy and Ibn Humayd. Early in Safar 1343/September 1924 their vanguard, with no responsible officer in charge, surged into the town

The British government, which held the mandates for Transjordan and Irāq and had a treaty with Ibn Su'ud, to whom it paid a modest subsidy, sought ways of preventing the raids and encouraging trade. The British felt that to determine the allegiance of tribes and to define boundary lines were essential steps. Representatives of Irāq and Najd were brought together to sign a treaty at al-Muhammad on 7 Ramādān 1340/5 May 1922, which Ibn Su'ud refused to ratify on the grounds that his representative had exceeded his instructions. Ibn Su'ud, however, in a meeting with British and Irāqī officials at al-'Ukayr accepted on 12 Rabi' II 1341/5 December 1922 a protocol to the treaty drawing a boundary between Najd and Irāq. At the same time a convention drawing a boundary between Najd and Kuwait was concluded with the British Political Agent from Kuwait. These instruments also established a neutral zone between Najd and Irāq and another between Najd and Kuwait, in each of which both governments concerned would have equal rights. The idea of the neutral zone was to provide a common territory without permanent inhabitants to which nomads with their livestock from both sides could resort for watering and grazing. For countless centuries the Bedouins of Arabia had moved back and forth without artificial boundaries to stop them. It would take time for them to adjust to the new arrangements, especially since the lines sketched on maps were not marked on the ground. Furthermore, the definition of the new boundaries was imprecise in a number of points, leaving room for argument over the location of the lines. For the better part of a decade raiding across boundaries was to remain a common practice.

Aiming to ease the tension between Ibn Su'ud and his three Hashimid neighbours, the British invited the four to send representatives to a conference at Kuwait. King al-Husayn of al-Hijāz refused to do so, but delegates from the other three met intermittently from Dīmāţ 1 to Ramādān 1342/December 1923-April 1924 without solving any of their problems, including control of the tribes on all sides. The situation between al-Husayn and Ibn Su'ud grew worse when al-Husayn was proclaimed Caliph in Rajab 1342/March 1924, an act regarded by the Ikhwan as further proof of Hashimid heresy. Islamic circles in Egypt and India voiced vigorous criticism of al-Husayn's administration of the affairs of the Holy Land and the Pilgrimage. In Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1342/June 1924 a congress of Ibn Su'ud's notables met in al-Riyād. The leaders of the Ikhwan accused al-Husayn of barring them from the pilgrimage, and the 'islamā' affirmed that the Muslims of Najd had the right to fulfil this fundamental duty "by consent or by force". The congress closed with the cry: "Tawakkala ʿala ilāh—ila 'l-Hijāz!"

The Ikhwan did not move in time for the pilgrimage of 1342/1924, as their campaign against al-Hijāz began in Muḥarram 1343/August 1924. The main thrust westwards was accompanied by diversionsary expeditions against the Hashimids on two other fronts. A flying column of Ikhwan raided villages of Banū Ṣaḥḥir just south of Amman, and Amman itself on 3 May 1342/April 1924 with severe losses by British planes and armoured cars, while other Ikhwan made a series of irruptions into Irāq, where again the British opposed them with modern equipment.

In the west the Ikhwan advanced under the command of Ibn Lu'ayy and Ibn Humayd. Early in Safar 1343/September 1924 their vanguard, with no responsible officer in charge, surged into the town
of al-Tā'if and put to flight the defending forces under al-Husayn's son cAli. A brawl with the citizens under al-Husayn's son cAli. It was enough to strike terror into the hearts of al-Husayn's subjects. Many, including the Amir cAli, abandoned Mecca, leaving it defenceless. In Rabī' I 1343/October 1924 the Ikhwan under Ibn Lu'ayy and Ibn Humayd thronged into the Holy City, wearing the robes of the Muslim jizya. Ibn Humayd rode into the town on a white charger, with his son on a white mule. The occupation took place nearly two months before the arrival of Ibn Su'ud from al-Riyād. When the Ikhwan chose Ibn Lu'ayy as Amir of Mecca, it became one of the ironies of history that the last Sharif of the nearly thousand-year-old Ḥaḍīmī dynasty to govern the city should be an adherent of the Ikhwan of Najd.

Carrying out the tenets of Wahhabism, the Ikhwan destroyed the image of the shrines in Mecca, thus provoking an unfavourable response in the Islamic world. Once again the Ikhwan showed resentment at Ibn Su'ud's leniency when he treated the people of al-Ḥijāz gently, and an ominous speech by Faysal al-Dawīsh in Mecca on 'Id al-Fitr indicated an inclination towards open revolt.

The leading citizens of al-Ḥijāz had prevailed upon al-Husayn to abdicate and had recognized his son cAli as the constitutional monarch. The Ikhwan joined in the sieges of 'Ali's main footholds, Diudda and Medina, but it was Ibn Su'ud who accepted the surrender of Diudda in Diūmādā II 1344/December 1925 and his son Muḥammad, rather than Faysal al-Dawīsh, who a little earlier accepted the surrender of Medina (Diūmādā I/December).

While the siege of Diudda was going on, Ibn Su'ud concluded with Britain in Rabī' II 1344/November 1925 the agreements of Bahra' and Haddā (places on the way from Diudda to Mecca), with Britain acting on behalf of 'Irāk and Transjordan. Both agreements were designed to enforce more effective control over raiding, and the Haddā agreement drew a boundary line between Najd and Transjordan (with the exception of the district of Ma'ān and al-'Aqaba, which Ibn Su'ud claimed as part of al-Ḥijāz).

In the wake of the triumphant entry of al-Ḥijāz, Ibn Su'ud sent most of the Ikhwan back to Najd or off on expeditions to rivet his control over districts in the south near the borders of the Yaman and in the north towards al-'Aqaba. In Mecca the Ikhwan influenced events again during the pilgrimage of 1344/1925, when they stoned the Egyptian caravan on the grounds that the Mahmal and its military band were hīḍās. The Egyptians fired on the pilgrims from Najd and killed a number of them. This incident was partly responsible for Egyptian coolness towards the new regime in al-Ḥijāz during the next 10 years.

The restlessness of the Ikhwan under the rule of Ibn Su'ud came to the surface in a congress of their chiefs at al-Arta'īwīya in 1345/1926. Ibn Su'ud, now King of al-Ḥijāz, was condemned for a number of his acts, such as sending his son Su'ud on a visit to Egypt, the land of shirk, and his use of automobiles, telephones, and the telegraph. Ibn Su'ud thereupon summoned his notables to a congress in al-Ḥijāz in Rājiḥā 1345/January 1927. Some but not all of the Ikhwan chiefs came. The 'ulama' issued a fatwa in Shābān/February, which in general deferred to the authority of Ibn Su'ud as ʿālim but at the same time made concessions to the Ikhwan. The entry of the Mahmal into Mecca was, if possible, to be prohibited. Strong measures were to be taken to bring the Shift of al-Ḥasā' and al-Ḳatif into the fold of true Islam. On the use of the telegraph however, the 'ulama' declined to give an opinion, holding it to be a modern invention about which nothing could be found in the works of the religious authorities. Two months later another congress in al-Ḥijāz brought together 3,000 of the Ikhwan leaders, only Ibn Humayd being absent, and Ibn Su'ud received further support. Ibn Su'ud strengthened his position by signing the treaty of Djudda with Britain on 18 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1345/20 May 1927, even though dealings with Christian powers were anathema to men such as Ibn Humayd and al-Dawīsh, who continued recalcitrant.

In Diūmādā I 1346/November 1927 an incident in 'Irāk north of the neutral zone between it and Najd set in train the revolt of the Ikhwan against their sovereign. Protocol No. 1 of al-Ūkāy had forbidden the building of military bases in the vicinity of the boundary. When 'Irāk began to construct a police post at the wells of Buṣayya, Ibn Su'ud's government called this a violation of the protocol. Faysal al-Dawīsh's Ikhwan of Muṭayr took the matter into their own hands, descending on the post at night and virtually wiping out the 'Irāk forces. Other incidents followed in quick succession, with Muṭayr repeatedly defying Ibn Su'ud's orders. The British struck back by bombing Najd territory. In Ramaḍān 1346/March 1928 Ibn Humayd began to outdo al-Dawīsh in aggressiveness, calling for an all-out assault by the Ikhwan on the infidels of 'Irāk. In Shawwāl/April Ibn Su'ud, who was preparing to negotiate again with Britain, prevailed on the Ikhwan to suspend operations for a time, but the negotiations, which took place in Diudda in Dhu 'l-Ka'da/May, failed to settle the problems of 'Irāk military posts and Ikhwan raids, nor was the deadlock resolved in a second round of negotiations in Diudda in Saḍar 1347/August 1928.

To cope with the internal crisis Ibn Su'ud held a congress in al-Ḥijāz in Diūmādā I 1347/October 1928, which Ibn Humayd, al-Dawīsh, and ʿAbdūn b. Fahhād Ibn Highâyyn of al-Ūgāmīn refused to attend, though al-Dawīsh did send his son ʿAbd al-'Azīz and his ulama' Usayyizin. Ibn Su'ud brought together 3,000 of the Ikhwan. He went so far as to offer to his son ʿAbd al-'Azīz the town of Deera. When the Ikhwan called on the rebels to surrender and undergo trial Ibn Su'ud deferred to the authority of Ibn Su'ud, leaving it defenceless. In Rabi' II 1347/1929, when they stoned the Egyptian caravan on the way from Djudda to Mecca), with Britain acting on behalf of 'Irāk and Transjordan. Both agreements drew a boundary line between Najd and Transjordan. The British struck back by bombing Najd territory. In Ramaḍān 1346/March 1928 Ibn Humayd began to outdo al-Dawīsh in aggressiveness, calling for an all-out assault by the Ikhwan on the infidels of 'Irāk. In Shawwāl/April Ibn Su'ud, who was preparing to negotiate again with Britain, prevailed on the Ikhwan to suspend operations for a time, but the negotiations, which took place in Diudda in Dhu 'l-Ka'da/May, failed to settle the problems of 'Irāk military posts and Ikhwan raids, nor was the deadlock resolved in a second round of negotiations in Diudda in Saḍar 1347/August 1928.

The situation stayed relatively quiet until Ramaḍān 1347/February 1929, when Ibn Humayd in a raid northwards massacred a number of Najd merchants escorting camels to sell in Egypt. This bloody deed solidified opinion in the towns of Najd behind Ibn Su'ud, and tribes which had suffered at the hands of the Ikhwan supported the townsman. Ibn Su'ud called on the rebels to surrender and undergo trial in the Sharī'a courts, but they refused. Finally Ibn Su'ud overtook the rebels on the plain of al-Sabala (often written Sibīla in English) not far from al-Arta'īwīya, the fountainhead of the Ikhwan movement. Here in Shawwāl 1347/March 1929 Ibn Su'ud broke the back of the revolt. Ibn Humayd fled, only to be captured and imprisoned in al-Ḥijāz, while his ʿālim al-Ghatībah was razed by Ibn Su'ud's
brother 'Abd Allâh. Faysal al-Dawish, gravely wounded, was carried to ... in Syria, and gained him in Egypt an ever-increasing prestige. During the second world war, in 1941, he was im-
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Abd Allah b. Djalwi, and rebels won successes, cutting the road from the coast Among the stoutest opponents of the rebels was the

Didan's place was taken by his cousin Nayif Aba in revenge the Ikhwan of al-

IJithlayn was killed by order of Fahd, son of Ibn Su'ûd's. In Rabi 1348/August 1929 al-Dawish's son 'Uza'yyiz led a raid into the country of Shammer and 'Anaza, but he died from thirst in the desert after being defeated in a battle with Ibn Su'ûd's governor of Hâylî, 'Abd al-'Azîz b. Mustâ'd Âl Djâlî. Hundreds of the Ikhwan of Mu'âyrr fell in this battle. Fahd's horse was killed by one of Fahd's son of Ibn Su'ûd's. Thus peace was restored by 1348/1930 to the

world, and at the end of Sha'ba'n/January 1930 Faysal al-Dawish, Nayîf Ibn Hîljham, and other chiefs surrendered to the British in Kuwait territory. The British negotiated terms for all his Ikhwan and grazing for his many thousands of camels, and the rebel cause was doomed when an important section of 'Utayba under 'Umair Ibn Rubayî'ân chose Ibn Su'ûd's side. Relentlessly Ibn Su'ûd's forces closed in on the rebels, and in Sha'ba'n 1348/January 1930 Faysal al-Dawish, Nayîf Ibn Hîljham, and other chiefs surrendered to the British in Kuwait territory. The British negotiated terms of surrender with Ibn Su'ûd, and at the end of Sha'ba'n/January the captive chiefs were handed over. Their lives were spared, but they went to gaol in al-Riyâd.

Thus peace was restored by 1348/1930 to the realm of Ibn Su'ûd, and the age of tribal raiding came to an end. The suppression of the revolt did not mean the total eclipse of the Ikhwan movement; it meant rather that it would be consigned to a sub-

ordinate role in the state. Some of the hîdîrâs were abandoned, but others continued to flourish. Ikhwan chiefs who had remained loyal to Ibn Su'ûd received regular stipends, and the Ikhwan in the hîdîrâs got an annual grant (sha'ba) of rice. Among the loyal chiefs was the Shari Khâlid Ibn Lu'âyî, who com-

manded expeditions against the Yanamis in Nadîrân in 1350/1932 and the Idrisîs in Thâmât 'Asîr in 1350-51/1932-33. After 'Uqayl was killed in 1351/1933, during the second of which he fell ill and died. Other loyal chiefs held places of honour in the King's court. The religious zeal of the Ikhwan re-

mained alive among large sections of the population of the kingdom, and it is still displayed by the mawâwu's and the members of Hay'ât al-a'mûr bi 'l-mâ'rûf wa 'l-nâhiy 'an al-munkar. As the military establishment of the kingdom developed, the Ikhwan detachments became the National Guard, popularly known as al-Mugâhidûn. Now they move about in motor vehicles, which their predecessors once looked upon as works of sihr.


(AL-REMTZ)

AL-IKHWÂN AL-MUSLİMÎN, "the Muslim Brethren", Muslim movement, both religious and political, founded in Egypt by Hasan al-Banna'[q.v.].

History. Many facets of the history of the Muslim Brethren are still unknown, which is to be expected since the movement engaged in many secret activities, on several occasions threatening the es-

tablished régimes and being persecuted by them, many notorious militant members of it being now (1969) either in exile or living under police supervision in their own countries. The history of the movement may be divided into various periods:

(1) A formative period (1928-36) dominated by religious and social activities. After the foundation of the movement in 1928 the "Association of the Muslim Brethren", in 1928 at Ismâ'îliyya [q.v.] in Egypt, sections were formed in the various localities of the Suez Canal zone, then gradually throughout Egypt, particularly after 1933, the year in which al-Banna', who had remained a teacher, was moved to Cairo, where he transferred the headquarters of the brotherhood. Missionaries (idâ'în, pl. du'â'în) specially commissioned by the founder and "Supreme Guide" (al-murîghid al-sâ'mî) preached in the mosques and other public places; the Brethren founded schools of various grades, organized courses of religious instruction, taught the illiterate, set up hospitals and dispensaries, undertook various enterprises to raise the standard of living in the villages, built mosques and even launched industrial and commercial enterprises.

(a) A period of political activity and of expansion, then of troubles (1936-51). After the signing of the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936, Hasan al-Banna' undertook the support of the cause of the Palestine Arabs, which enabled him to spread the movement throughout the Middle East and especially in Syria, and gained him in Egypt an ever-increasing prestige. During the second world war, in 1941, he was im-

(2) A period of political activity and of expansion, then of troubles (1936-51). After the signing of the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936, Hasan al-Banna' undertook the support of the cause of the Palestine Arabs, which enabled him to spread the movement throughout the Middle East and especially in Syria, and gained him in Egypt an ever-increasing prestige. During the second world war, in 1941, he was im-

(2) A period of political activity and of expansion, then of troubles (1936-51). After the signing of the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936, Hasan al-Banna' undertook the support of the cause of the Palestine Arabs, which enabled him to spread the movement throughout the Middle East and especially in Syria, and gained him in Egypt an ever-increasing prestige. During the second world war, in 1941, he was im-
prisoned for a time because of his violent anti-British propaganda. It seems that at this period the "Free Officers", who were to seize power on 23 July 1952, had a friendly relationship with the Brethren, but the two movements always remained independent of each other. It is probable that al-Banna had already organized, in addition to sporting and paramilitary groups, a secret army, and his plans certainly did not exclude the seizing of power by force. While awaiting a suitable opportunity, the Muslim Brethren continued their educational and social activities and became an increasing influence in Egyptian political life, but in the country itself and not in the parliament. After 1943 they had to reckon with competition from the communists, allied to the left wing of the Wafd, who like them were attempting to arouse the political awareness of the students and the populace. The Egyptian Left accused the Brethren of devoting in fact more energy to opposing than to opposing the British, and of resorting to violent methods and even actual terrorism to do so. The Muslim Brethren provided volunteers who fought with the Arab armies in the Palestine War in 1948. After the Arab defeat, they appeared as an organized armed force which was capable of challenging the Egyptian government; the government of al-Nukrashi ordered the dissolution of their organization, the confiscation of all its possessions and the arrest of a large number of Brethren. Al-Nukrashi was assassinated on 28 December 1948 by a Brother; shortly afterwards, on 12 February 1949, al-Banna was himself assassinated; no investigation of this murder was ever completed. The Brotherhood continued to function in secret. A new supreme guide was elected, Hasan Isma'il al-Hudaybi, a magistrate, but his authority was often challenged. In 1951, as a result of the law concerning organizations (23 April), the Brethren were able to resume their activities openly; in theory they were forbidden to do anything in secret or to make any military preparations, but they very soon managed to evade this prohibition. They took part in the harrying actions against the British bases in the Suez Canal zone. The part they played in the burning of Cairo on 26 January 1952 is still not clear.

(3) The Muslim Brethren under the Revolutionary régime (1952-1953). The beginning of the movement of the "Free Officers" which seized power on 23 July 1952 had a programme which resembled in many respects that of the Brethren, particularly on social matters; in addition, many officers who took part in the movement were in fact members of, or sympathizers with, the society of the Muslim Brethren. This may perhaps explain why the new régime at the beginning sought the support and even the collaboration of the Brethren; when all the political parties were dissolved (16 January 1953), the régime agreed to consider the Muslim Brethren as a non-political association. But it appears that al-Hudaybi demanded the right of control and veto over all the government's decisions, wishing to set himself up as the "moral tutor" of the revolution, a position which was unacceptable to the new régime. On 26 October 1952, al-Banna was summoned to the joint house of representatives and the Senate, and was granted again the right to exist as a non-political organization. The Anglo-Egyptian treaty signed on 29 October 1954 was the cause of a fresh disagreement: the Brethren regarded it as too favourable to Great Britain and rejected even the principle of negotiation with the British, maintaining that an armed struggle against them was the only method possible. On 26 October 1954, Colonel Djamaal al-Nasir and 'Abd al-Nasir were condemned to death and executed; the Supreme Guide, al-Hudaybi, was condemned to death, but his sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. One would have expected that after this the Brotherhood would be crushed; indeed many of the members who did not approve of terrorist methods, had given their support to the new régime. In fact the Brotherhood continued to exist clandestinely. During the summer of 1965, a conspiracy hatched by the Muslim Brethren, the aim of which was to overthrow the régime of Colonel 'Abd al-Nasir, was discovered; several hundred arrests were made; the enquiries and the trials lasted for a year; in August 1966 there took place three executions, including that of Sayyid Kiit, a well-known writer among the Brethren, not to mention many sentences of hard labour and prison. It appears however that the Brotherhood continues to exist clandestinely and constitutes a certain threat to the Egyptian government (1969).

The Muslim Brethren outside Egypt. Similar movements appeared at the same time in other Arab countries, inspired by the example of the Egyptian Brotherhood, but it is difficult to tell whether they were organically attached to it, and if so in what degree, or whether they were independent. In Syria, in 1937, there was founded an association of Muslim Brethren which was to be less extensive and less active than the Egyptian association, but some of its members occupied official political offices in Syria, and in particular the Muslim Brethren of Syria exercised a not inconsiderable moral and intellectual influence, under the leadership of ghayb Mustafa al-Siba'i (d. 1965). Less important, and in some cases more temporary, associations existed also in Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon and 'Irak. It should be added that the Muslim Brethren in Egypt commanded, and, it seemed, still command, wide sympathy in many Arab countries and also in non-Arab Muslim countries.

Doctrines. The essential message of the Muslim Brethren may be summarized thus: they consider Islam to be an "order" (nizam) without equal, because it is revealed by God, which has a vocation to organize all aspects of human life: "Islam is its dogma and onegi, its morality, its religion and state, spirituality and action, al- 'Amin and sword" (H. al-Banna); furthermore, this order is valid for all men of all time and all countries. The originality of the Muslim Brethren lies not in their doctrine, many elements of which may be found in the preaching of Djamaal al-Din al-Asfahani ('q.), but in the fact that their founder, by simplifying it and making it more strict, made it the ideological basis of a powerful popular movement. The professions...
of faith of the Brethren, and especially those of H. al-Banna3, who was educated in the Hanball madhab, are strongly inspired by the idea of a return to the faith of the "devout ancestors" (ta'dabbur) of the Community, although they are for the most part formulated on a plane and in terms very different from those of tradition and invoked on occasion the authority of non-Muslim scholars and philosophers in the cause of the struggle against atheism; the believer can know God only through the description which He has given of Himself in the Qur'an and through the words of His Prophet; but the faith of the Muslim is an active faith which, already in its first steps, throws itself into his mind and his heart by the total commitment of his life to the service of Islam. In the same spirit, the Brethren were obliged to perform pious exercises based on the recital of the Qur'an with meditation (tadabbur) and to make an assiduous study of hadiths and of the model provided by the history of the beginnings of the Muslim Community. Whatever the differences between them, all the professions of faith of the Brethren show the greatest mistrust of the traditional formulations of halâm, which they consider to be too much impregnated with the Greek spirit, which is foreign to primitive Islam, and whose speculations they accuse of having provoked in the past, and of encouraging at the present time, divisions and a sectarian spirit, which form an obstacle to the necessary unity of all Muslims which is indispensable in their struggle against the foreign imperialsists.

The Brethren's dedication to the service of Islam has as its main objective the struggle against western invasion in all its forms. Abroad first, it is necessary to fight until all the Muslim countries are freed from any foreign domination. Next, within Egypt, the Muslim Brethren planned to re-Islamize Egyptian life in the very many fields which had been impregnated by western influence, now considered to be waning; these extended from social habits, such as dress, greetings, the use of foreign languages, hours of work and of rest, the calendar, recreation, etc., to the educational, legal and political institutions, not to mention the field of ideas and sentiments. Matters relating to the family and to the position of women were not neglected; in addition there existed a "devout ancestors" (islâl) "Mother of the Community". One of the main points of this programme was the abolition of the Egyptian legal codes, based on European codes, and the creation of a legislation based on the sharî'ah; they considered the question of the evolution of fîsh to be no longer relevant, since a society which is renewed and really living, has as its main objective the struggle against atheism; the believer can know God only through the description which He has given of Himself in the Qur'an and through the words of His Prophet; but the faith of the Muslim is an active faith which, already in its first steps, throws itself into his mind and his heart by the total commitment of his life to the service of Islam. In the same spirit, the Brethren were obliged to perform pious exercises based on the recital of the Qur'an with meditation (tadabbur) and to make an assiduous study of hadiths and of the model provided by the history of the beginnings of the Muslim Community. Whatever the differences between them, all the professions of faith of the Brethren show the greatest mistrust of the traditional formulations of halâm, which they consider to be too much impregnated with the Greek spirit, which is foreign to primitive Islam, and whose speculations they accuse of having provoked in the past, and of encouraging at the present time, divisions and a sectarian spirit, which form an obstacle to the necessary unity of all Muslims which is indispensable in their struggle against the foreign imperialsists.

The Brethren's dedication to the service of Islam has as its main objective the struggle against western invasion in all its forms. Abroad first, it is necessary to fight until all the Muslim countries are freed from any foreign domination. Next, within Egypt, the Muslim Brethren planned to re-Islamize Egyptian life in the very many fields which had been impregnated by western influence, now considered to be waning; these extended from social habits, such as dress, greetings, the use of foreign languages, hours of work and of rest, the calendar, recreation, etc., to the educational, legal and political institutions, not to mention the field of ideas and sentiments. Matters relating to the family and to the position of women were not neglected; in addition there existed a "devout ancestors" (islâl) "Mother of the Community". One of the main points of this programme was the abolition of the Egyptian legal codes, based on European codes, and the creation of a legislation based on the sharî'ah; they considered the question of the evolution of fîsh to be no longer relevant, since a society which is renewed and really living, has as its main objective the struggle against atheism; the believer can know God only through the description which He has given of Himself in the Qur'an and through the words of His Prophet; but the faith of the Muslim is an active faith which, already in its first steps, throws itself into his mind and his heart by the total commitment of his life to the service of Islam. In the same spirit, the Brethren were obliged to perform pious exercises based on the recital of the Qur'an with meditation (tadabbur) and to make an assiduous study of hadiths and of the model provided by the history of the beginnings of the Muslim Community. Whatever the differences between them, all the professions of faith of the Brethren show the greatest mistrust of the traditional formulations of halâm, which they consider to be too much impregnated with the Greek spirit, which is foreign to primitive Islam, and whose speculations they accuse of having provoked in the past, and of encouraging at the present time, divisions and a sectarian spirit, which form an obstacle to the necessary unity of all Muslims which is indispensable in their struggle against the foreign imperialsists.

The ideas of the Muslim Brethren were, and still are, widely spread, even after the association disappeared officially, and they have today a great influence on Muslim literature in apologetics and in popular religion, particularly that written in Arabic. **Bibliography:** To the works and reviews mentioned by J. M. B. Jones in the article al-Banna3 should be added the following: Christina Ph. Harris, Nationalism and Revolution in Egypt, the role of the Muslim Brotherhood, London 1964; Anwar Abdel Malek, Egypte société militaire, Paris 1962 (see index); F. Bertier, L'ïdologie politique des Frères Musulmans, in Orient, no. 8 (4ème trim. 1958), 43-57; H. Laoust, Les schismes dans l'Islam, Paris 1965, 375-9.—There exists so far no complete list of the writings of Hasan al-Banna3 (which, apart from his autobiography, Mudâjkhirât al-da'wâ wa'l-da'âya, Cairo, n.d., consists of short brochures [his rasâ'il]), newspaper articles and lectures), nor of the periodicals produced by the Brotherhood, nor of the very numerous works of his propagandists; it would be possible however to compile an adequate list of documents using I. M. Husaini, The Moslem Brethren [see al-Banna3] and C. P. Harris, op. cit., supplemented by D. Harris, The Children of al-'arabiyâ, Beirut 1956, 209-12; a recent re-issue: Madîma'at rasâ'il al-imâm al-qâhidî Hasân al-Banna3, Dâr al-Andalus, Beirut 1956 (500 pp.); various writings of al-Banna3 are re-issued sporadically in different Arab countries. **Translations:** some works of al-Banna3 have been translated into French in Orient: Nahu al-nâr, Vers la lumière, tr. J. Marel, no. 4, 37-62; of an art., La...
nouvelle renaissance du monde arabe et son orientation, by A. Miquel, ... be in actual communication with chosen intimates (the authors of the Epistles) and to have disseminated the Epistles conceal their identity; these in the spiritual City, by the purity of their souls (all also call, more simply, ikhwa und the authors of the famous flows from this, loyalty to one another, in fact to other important problems in this respect: that of it seems indisputable that (New information), Stern was suspect to orthodox Muslims, the Epistles cir- tazili; authorship . . . . ., 142), today, 157 ff.). Al-Tawfeidi's teacher, Abu Al-Hurr, was connected not only as the authors of the Epistles, but also, he also names the dā`i `Abd Allâh b. Maymûn al-Kaddâdh and three other dā`a`i as collaborators in their composition. The Musta`i ril tradition of the Yemen has attributed them generally, since at least the 7th/11th century, to the ismā`īlî Abî Ahmad. In 1876, however, Dieterici (Philosophie . . . , 142), without recognizing the ismā`īlî character of the Epistles, mentions the Al-Tawâhidî (on which Hâdhâdhi Khâlîfà relied, iii, 46, gives 29 references to their supposed authors. Stern recently revived the question in the two articles mentioned above. It is clear that the four persons mentioned by the Al-Tawâhidî (Abû Sulaymân Muhammad b. Ma`shâr al-Bustî, called al-Maqdisî, the kâ`dî Abu `l-`Hasan `Abî `Ali b. Hâ- rîn al-Zanjânî, Abî Ahmad al-Nahradjuri and al-`Âwî, all friends of a Chancellery secretary, Zayd b. Rifa`a) are the authors (or among the authors) of the Epistles; for al-Tawfeidi was connected not only with Zayd b. Rifa`a, but also with the kâ`dî al-Zanjânî, and the latter told him a story which is found word for word in the text of the Ikhwân. He knew, then, what he was talking about. He calls the kâ`dî al-Zanjânî “the author of the doctrine” (Kitâb al-mu`awwana, ed. Ahmad Amin, Cairo 1942, 41 ff., 157 ff.). Al-Tawfeidi's teacher, Abû Sulaymân al-Mañîfî, for his part, gives al-Makdisi as the author of the work. Stern, however, discovered two most instructive passages in an unpublished Tâbîthi dâlî`i nuwra`uwa Suyâyûsînî Mu`ammad, the work of the Mu`tazzî chief kâ`dî of Rayy, `Abd al-Djabbar al-Hamadânî (325-415/936-1025) (now published as Tâbîthi dâlî`i al-nuwra`uwa, ed. `Abd al-Karîm `Uthmân, Beirut n.d.—preface dated 1966; see p. 610 ff.). One gives almost the same persons as the authors of the Epistles, and the other generalizes the ismā`îlî conviction. He believes that they were adopted by the Al-Tawâhidî only a century or two after their publication. According to him, the authors mentioned by Al-Taw- feidi and the kâ`dî `Abd Allâh al-Djabbar, although connected with Ismā`îlism, represented a particular trend in it, which believed that Muhammad b. Ismā`îl lived concealed and would come again as the expected mahdi; he was supposed to be in actual communication with chosen intimates (the authors of the Epistles) and to have disseminated the Epistles Shî`is claim them, although they contain some clear criticisms of their doctrine of the hidden ismā`îlî. The Ismā`îlîs rightly consider them to be one of their fundamental works (see Ivanov, in ET', suppl., s.v. ISMA`ILIA). Casanova, well before the Ismā`îlîs had allowed the publication of works of Fātimid literature, was the first orientalist (1898) to assert that they were of Ismâ`îlî origin; this was confirmed by this literature when it came to be partially known. The authorship of the Epistles has sometimes been ascribed to `Ali, and to Dja`far al-Sâdîk. Towards the end of the 5th/11th century, a Syrian Nizârid attributed them to the hidden ismā`m Muhammad b. Ismā`îl, and `Ali, but not; he also names the dā`i `Abd Allâh b. Maymûn al-Kaddâdh and three other dā`a`i as collaborators in their composition. The Musta`i ril tradition of the Yemen has attributed them generally, since at least the 7th/11th century, to the ismā`îlî Abî Ahmad.
through them. Stern thinks that the secret organization described by the Epistles was illusory, utopian and idealized, merely that of a group of authors who wished it to be. He believes that these authors had no official function in the organization of the Isma'ili da'wa and had no influence on contemporary Isma'iliism.

If this were the case, the kādī ʿAbd al-Diabār would not have considered them dangerous Isma'ili. What is more, the Ikhwan reject the idea of an expected imām. On the other hand, the secret organization described by them is too precise and corresponds too well to what the Isma'ili organization may at first have been to be a product of their imagination. It does not seem to be idealized, but quite in conformity with the spiritual condition of a revolutionary movement in full expansion, which sets the purity of its convictions above everything—this is what gives such a movement its efficacy; the mystique of the spiritual City which unites them and contrasts them with the terrestrial city is typical: on one side, the good, on the other, the evil. Why should so much information that could apply to Isma'iliism be found concerning a non-existent sect, and nothing concerning Isma'iliism itself, which was so active at that time? Moreover, the Epistles lead one to believe that the propaganda was addressed particularly to those whose culture made them most apt to receive it: philosophers and mystics, or those who could be of most use to the movement, Chancellery secretaries or governors. Now, this was probably historically the case with the Isma'ili propaganda. In spite of the slight doubt caused by the small difference between the information given by al-Tawhidi and that given by the kādī ʿAbd al-Diabār, it may well be thought that the persons mentioned by them, or some of them, certainly collaborated in the composition of the Epistles, and that they were initiates of the highest rank who played an important part, even if others, of equal importance, were more disposed to action. Perhaps they were among the four abdāl, or even the “forty” (cf. Révélation et vision véri- dicque, 33-6). But perhaps they were not the sole authors, and assertions of Isma'ili origins contain only a part of the truth.

If the authors sometimes mention their work in connection (iv, 362), the 50th Epistle (on different modes of government), on the other hand, considered particularly important because of its central chapter on the hidden meaning of festivals and sacrifices, and the 48th (on proselytizing) are put directly into the mouth of an imām. It is thus conceivable that the imām should have inspired the whole or part of the contents of certain Epistles, that he should have taken part in their composition or that he should have given something similar to his “imprimatur”; in any case, the imām of this world and those of the other world inspire all the members of the spiritual City. It is, however, also probable that the authors mentioned by al-Tawhidi and the kādī ʿAbd al-Diabār gave the Epistles only their more or less definitive form. They seem to have been begun much earlier, perhaps actually by the dāʾī ʿAbd Allāh b. Maymūn al-Kaddāb and his contemporaries, and then continued by their successors, under the aegis of several successive imāms, including Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, his son ʿAbd Allāh and his grandson Abmad. This would be no way surprising, if we suppose that the Epistles constitute an attempt to arrange and fix the official doctrine of Isma'iliism. This point of view appears confirmed by the attempts at dating that have been, or can be, made.

Dating.—Dietertki (Die Philosophie der Araber, Leipzig 1876, i, 124 ff.), in view of the facts that their supposed authors are mentioned by Ḥadżārī the Khaḍīfa (in his Muḥtārih, i, 232), and that verses of al-Mutanabbi (303-5/915-65) are too frequently quoted in them to have been incorporated subsequently, and in view, similarly, of the fact that al-Madżriti who introduced them into Spain died in 395/1005, fixes the date of the composition of the Epistles approximately between 350 and 375/961 and 986.

Other information that can be drawn from the Epistles seems to support these conclusions. They several times name Abū Ma'shār al-Falaki (d. 272/ 886 aged more than one hundred) and quote a passage of one of his works. They mention Bābak and the Khurramiyya, who began to attract attention in 92d/858, and the Sāmānids (ii, 280).

Although the Muṭṭalils are not named, many criticisms are evidently directed at them. Finally, one passage (iii, 161) mentions the Ashʿarītes, who, too are often criticized. Al-ʿAṣḥārī, born in 300/913, became orthodox in 300/913 and died in 323/935; there could have been no question of Ashʿarītes' existing until several years after his conversion, if not after his death; for the passage leads us to believe that ʿAṣḥārīsm had already begun to be talked about, but was not yet equated with orthodoxy. All this is confirmed by the fact that (as we have seen) al-Tawhidi personally knew al-Zandjānī, one of the supposed authors, and that he mentions these authors in a conversation with the vizier Ibn Saḍān in 370/981; this presupposes that at that date the Epistles had already been completed for some time. This is not incompatible, either, with the fact that the kādī ʿAbd al-Diabār al-Hamadānī speaks of the activity of al-Zandjānī, for he was 45 years old in 370. The Epistles, then, may have been finished between 350/961 and 370/980, that is to say before the conquest of Egypt by the Fāṭimid (358/969), or shortly after. Several passages, however, (notably iv, 146, 190, 252-3, 269) presage an important event, the manifestation of the cause by the Ikhwan, and the approach of government by good men. Two of these passages lead us to believe that this event is foretold by all the methods of divination and astrology (iv, 139) and in particular by the Judgement furnishing by the Ikhwan concerning the imminent conjunction that was to lead to the event is interpreted by Casanova (Une date astronomique), who bases himself on a passage of Ibn Khaldūn (ed. Quatremère, 186) and on the tables drawn up by an astronomer for De Goeje (Les Carmathes du Bahrain et les Fati- mides, Leiden 1886); according to him, the Ikhwan had in mind a conjunction that they expected on 18 Djamād I 449/19 November 1047, and the expected event occurred eleven years and 42 days later, on 13 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 450/1 January 1059: the khutba was then given in Baghdād, for a short period, in the name of the Fāṭimid al-Mustansir. The conjunction itself occurred in the caliphat of al-Zāhir, and Casanova sees an allusion to the latter in the term zāhir used in the text of the Ikhwan. Information furnished by the Djumās (247) suggests that this question should be reopened; it is possible that the tables used by Casanova did not correspond with those that the Ikhwan had at their disposal. Even if the dates that he suggests, however, are the right ones, his interpretation, for reasons that it would take too long to discuss in detail here, is certainly erroneous. It suffices to say that the Ikhwan allude here not to the final victory, but to a preliminary success.
Two dates, then, seem acceptable for the foretold event: 358/969 (the conquest of Egypt) or Rabic 1 297/December 900. It must be noted that Ibn Ubayd Allah al-Mahdi by the dā'ī Abū ʿAbd Allāh in Ifrikiya. Several of the passages cited give us to understand that not only many adepts and propagandists but the imām himself are in concealment, and that the return to manifestation is near at hand; this prompts the choice of 297/909. One of these passages (iv, 187) even states that “government of good men will begin through the agency of virtuous good men who will join together in a land”; to this end, is not Ifrikiya? If this is so, it must be concluded that the composition of the Epistles took a good many years, and this time can be approximately fixed as between 287/900 (perhaps even well before) and 354/965. The only fact that appears strange, in this case, is that no allusion is made to the victory of 297/909. On the other hand, it may be considered normal that the passages that predict it should have been kept intact, as a proof (to be commented on orally) of the truth of their doctrine.

It also follows from this that the Epistles, unlike most subsequent Ismāʿili writings, circulated in the orthodox world at a moment when an expanding Ismāʿilism anticipated a total victory, by degrees, but relatively rapidly.

Does the composition of the Epistles support this point of view?

The composition of the Epistles.—Only a close analysis would perhaps produce a reasonable certainty in this regard. Certain facts, however, demand attention at first sight.

The Epistles, as we have them, are 52 in number. In the text itself, however, it is ten times asserted that there are 51 Epistles. The 52nd itself (on magic) mentions the “fifty preceding Epistles” and designates itself the 51st. The extra Epistle, clearly added subsequently, is the 51st in our editions (“The Hierarchy [of the parts] of the whole world”), the normal position of which, besides, as its title indicates, would be in the second section (physical sciences). In fact, five pages of the nine that make up the Epistle are identical with pages of the 21st (the vegetable kingdom), and the remaining four pages add nothing new to the problem of the whole (which itself mentions, at the end, a total of 51 Epistles, without adding it is the last) perhaps represents the first state of an Epistle left to be rewritten, then rediscovered and subsequently included in the penultimate position, since the Epistle on magic had to be the last.

Moreover, the work has traces of a certain vagueness, both in the order of chapters, and in the number of Epistles in each section. Thus the 8th Epistle in the 1st section (mathematical sciences), which deals with manual arts, was earlier placed at the beginning of the 3rd section (psychical and intellectual sciences) (i, 276 and 285); the 9th (1st section) seems, according to its introduction, to have been placed, at one time, after the 25th (2nd section); this might justify its contents. It seems also (iii, 29) that the second section consisted at first of 8 Epistles, instead of the 17 that it contains in its definitive version; that the 10th in this section was then the second; that the sixth (quiddity of Nature) was added later. Similarly, it seems that the first section, which contains 14 Epistles, consisted only of 5; that the 4th Epistle (geography) was added later; that the 5th (music) at first formed part of the 6th (numerical and geometrical relationships) and was subsequently detached; that there was at first one single Epistle on logic, afterwards split into five short Epistles. In short, it appears that, at the time of the composition of the Epistle, there were only five Epistles from the 1st section and seven from the and were already written; that certain of these were afterwards amplified and then split up; that these two sections were afterwards enlarged by the addition of new Epistles. The same was probably true of the other two sections. A trace of this, at least, is to be found: a piece of information in the last Epistle (iv, 285), applicable, according to the writer, to the 50th, in fact applies to the 49th; this suggests either that the 50th had not yet been written, or that the order of Epistles has been altered. It is probable that the first writers had not accurately foreseen their number, and that towards the end the authors made arrangements to round off this number to 51, so that it might be satisfactory from an arithmetical point of view.

All this confirms the view that a very long time must have elapsed between the beginning of the composition and its being put into a definitive form. As far as the form is concerned, its unity is remarkable. This need not surprise us, if we imagine that the different authors worked more or less together, and, moved by the same spirit, influenced one another. Moreover, their style is singularly affected by that of certain translations of Greek works. Certain differences, however, can be detected, which are probably not to be attributed solely to a difference of subject-matter. While most of the Epistles are characterized by clarity of thought and rigorous exposition, except when the discussion concerns points of doctrine that the Ikhwan wish to treat only in an esoteric manner, the 31st (causes of differences of languages), in spite of the interest of the content, is distinguished by a pedantic, obscure and over-subtle style, which is hardly to be found elsewhere except in the 41st (definitions and diagrams).

Another peculiarity of the 31st Epistle is that the author speaks in the first person singular; this occurs in no other Epistle, except by accident and for a reason that can be explained.

The same remarkable unity is to be found in the fundamentals. Most of the contradictions are merely superficial, and arise from the fact that the same general doctrine is expressed by different authors, each of whom deals with his own special point of view.

Content of the Epistles.—When, following an astral conjunction, a community assumes power and enjoys hegemony, it takes over, according to the Ikhwan, all the sciences of the communities that have dominated previously. This is particularly the case at the beginning of a new millennium, when one religious law comes to supplant that which preceded it. The Ikhwan, then, believe it legitimate to adopt all “the sciences and wisdoms” produced by the efforts (supported by divine inspiration) of the good philosophers (certain philosophers were also prophets, prophets being the best of the philosophers) and those that have been revealed by God in the course of the previous millennia. They claim, then, to present a compendium of all the sciences known in their time, taken, in the first place, from these ancient books, next from the “caliphs of the prophets” and their companions (iii, 38a). This is what has led Orientalists to regard the Epistles as an Encyclopaedia. These sciences express the profound “realities” (ḥādīṯ) of the universe, which support revelation
and religious laws, and, consequently, explain them in a rational way; for this reason they form part of the Ismā'īlī dogmas: they constitute the "hidden meaning" of the holy scriptures; and the Law, which are their "visible" aspect. It is, clearly, a doctrine of emanation inspired by Neoplatonism—but one in which the ṣaddām plays in this world the essential part in the re-ascent of fallen souls—combined with Plotin's theory of the celestial spheres, and astrological laws are, consequently, of prime importance in it as the instrument for the realization of the divine will (for a more precise idea of the doctrines see the few remarks which will suffocate here.

The theory of great cycles of 7000 years—a cycle of manifestation alternating with a cycle of concealment (cf. Corbin, *Hist. phil. Isl.*, 129)—is not discussed. Two fairly clear allusions to it, however, are founded (ii, 228, iv, 229; cf. *Imānāt*, 73-5); three allusions to our present cycle (ii, 344, iii, 319, 512); one allusion as well to the fall of the celestial Adam and the "Revelation and the Law" which are considered the "first terrestrial Adam" (iv, 512). The respective roles of the legislator and of the successive ṣaddāms are not clearly defined; there, however, an allusion to the great prophets who ushered in the millennia of our cycle (Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muḥammad and the haʾūm who is none other than Muḥammad restored to life) in the account of the myth of the cave (iii, 315-8). Once the five Legislators (Noah, Abraham, Jesus, Moses, Muḥammad, iv, 18-9) are named, and elsewhere the "five prophets endowed with energy . . . whose legislation is different" (ii, 470-1, iii, 486). It should also be noted that the role of the initiator of the prophet is clearly seen (iii, 509 [al-Khīdr and Moses], iv, 90-8); the instruction of the initiator, however, is a human instruction, not divine like that of the ṣaddām; it is the ṣaddām and his principal lieutenants that bear the name of khudā, and not the initiator. Moreover, the legislators are superior to the other ṣaddāms, and Muḥammad is superior to all the other legislators. It is Muḥammad (the City of Knowledge) who initiates ʾAlī ("the Gate of the City").

Again, Salmān does not receive any particular precedence; he is mentioned once only, among the Companions of the Prophet, as being the seventh of these. In the Ikhwaʾn, then, we find not the order some ṣaddāms, even if it should be noted, finally, that everything relating to the ṣaddāms is dealt with most discreetly, and thus in a completely esoteric manner (manifestation and concealment, true revelation, etc.); the ṣaddāms succeeding al-Husayn are never mentioned by name.

The semi-esoteric character of the Epistles can be understood if one considers the object of their authors had in view.

The object of the Epistles.—In fact, they aim secondarily at securing man's happiness in this world (the perfection of the body favours the perfection of the soul), but have the essential object of securing the happiness of his soul in the next world, and first of all of allowing it to re-ascent there after death. The soul must, then, gradually disengage itself from the defilements of matter which weigh it down, that is to say which obscure it and prevent its having a true and universal vision of the realities of creation, and, consequently, its approaching its Creator. When it has, at last, regained the original purity of its essence, thus taking on "an angelic form", it loses interest in the body and its appetites; it is ready to rise through the celestial spheres when it is at last released from the body, and later to merge itself in the universal Soul, and then, with the latter, in the Intellect. The Epistles must, then, gradually inculcate this purifying knowledge. Since, however, the legitimate ṣaddām has the office of guiding the ascent of souls, it is to him that these must cling; drawing near to God involves drawing near to the ṣaddām in this world; "true" knowledge helps him to be recognized, and he is rightly the repository of this "true" knowledge.

The Epistles, then, incite not only to knowledge, but also to action; they include, in fact, a deep commitment to their practical implementation; they have as their object, apart from the satisfaction of the spirit, that they draw many towards this and rally men round the ṣaddām. Idealism of convictions is accompanied by realism in application.

All this greatly conditions the form of the Epistles. The form of the Epistles.—This rigid conception of the purification and opening out of the soul, which is concurrent with its evangelistic character, involves a well defined pedagogical conception, which lead the soul progressively "to the goal of the sciences and wisdoms" and to its first purity.

This is why the 51 Epistles (actually 52) that make up the latter part of the realities are supposed to follow a gradual progression; they should, in theory, go from the concrete to the abstract, and fall into four sections. According to the classification given in the 7th Epistle, the four sections should be as follows: mathematics (the root of all the other sciences), logic, physics, metaphysics. In fact, they appear somewhat differently in our Epistles, but this is probably in order that the work may have an harmonious equilibrium, with the four sections all of the same size. These are in fact the following: (1) mathematical section, which comprises essentially, in order of progression: arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, music, to which is added logic (which, according to the classification given in the 7th Epistle, should form a separate section); (2) physical section ("bodily and natural sciences"); (3) section on the psychical and intellectual sciences (which, according to the classification given in the 7th Epistle, should belong under metaphysics); it deals in particular with the universal Intellect and Soul, with resurrection, and with many other things as well; (4) section on the metaphysical (the word used is ‛īlāhiyya "divine") and legal sciences. In fact, they deal particularly with the behaviour of initiates and propagandists, but also,
cryptically, with the method of finding the *imam*—this, no doubt, is what justifies the name “metaphysical” for these Epistles; as for the name “legal” (al-*ṣafār*), it is probably due to the fact that they deal with moral beliefs. Which, unhappily for prophecy, itself, unworthy to figure among the *ḥabash* (ii, 251): they form the “hidden” meaning of “visible” law. They conclude with the Epistle on astrological magic, the worth of which, in practical terms, lies in its helping in the recognition of the legitimate *imam*.

This supposed progression remains theoretical, for many of the Epistles are arranged in one section when, they are already entirely different (i.e., ii, 45); this, however, is not always possible, for only certain rare privileged ones can have all the Epistles at their disposal (iv, 205, 250). They are, naturally, a remedy for those who are worthy of them, and they should not be deprived of them; for others, however, they constitute a danger, if they are unable to understand them or are unworthy and are likely to put them to evil use. It is foreseen that the Epistles may fall into the hands of such people, and this is why certain points are discussed esoterically and by means of allusions (i, 45, iv, 462). It seems that the Epistles were studied at “sessions” (*madī*); it is, however, foreseen that adepts who are already advanced may study them themselves, if they cannot attend “sessions”, and may afterwards question qualified men about points that seem obscure to them; in addition, they will assist adepts less advanced than themselves by their reading. In general, the method consists of reading the Epistles to the less advanced, then commenting on them in the form of discussion, in order to teach them the ideas, the morality and the object of the Epistles (iv, 185, 186, 188, 250-1, 331, 339).

**The nature of the Epistles.**—An attempt has been made, in *Sabdans et Ikhwan al-ṣafā*, to show that the origins of the doctrine should probably be sought in direct contacts between the first Ismaʿili and the Sabaeans of Harrān. The latter, following the Hellenistic tendency to syncretism, mingled, in a new synthesis, their religion, Babylonian in origin, with Mithraism and Greek religion and philosophy, a synthesis catalyzed by Hermetic influence. The Ikhwān, in their turn, considering that the sciences of the past, “philosophical” or “revealed”, belonged, under the aegis of their *imān*, to Islam, achieved a new syncretism by establishing in Islam the elements of this Harrānian synthesis and by giving, without perhaps being aware of the fact, a far more important place to Neoplatonism.

In the Epistles, then, many diverse elements are to be found. There are probably some traces of early Babylonian astrology, supplemented by Indian and Iranian astrological elements, the whole based on the tenets of Greek astrology. There are stories of Indian and Persian origin and quotations and stories taken from the Hebrew Bible, as well as from Rabbinic texts; there are also borrowings from the New Testament (Christian influence is, in any case, very strong). The influence of Greek writings, however, as might be expected, is the dominant one. Influences of Hermes Trismegistus are particularly evident (not only from the writings called “Hermetic”, magical, astrological or alchemical—certain of which are perhaps Harrānian—but also from the Hermetic philosophical writings, the influence of which pervades the whole work), as are those of the Pythagoreans (on arithmetic, music, arithmology, but also on the general spirit of the work), of Aristotle (especially in logic and “physics”), of Plato, and of the Neoplatonists (especially in metaphysics). No Neoplatonist author, however, is named by the Ikhwān, except Porphyry, of whose work only the *Isagoge* appears to have been known to them. Of all the Neoplatonists, probably Plotinus—although they differ from him on certain points—without their realizing it, and without their knowing him, exer-
cised the strongest influence on them; they, however, believed that they were following Aristotle; in fact, they quote a passage of the supposed "Theology of Aristotle", which is, actually, known to be a résumé of several of the Enneads of Plotinus (ed. H. Fr. Dieterici, Beirut 1955). Even the dialectical form seems to have influenced that of the Ikhwan, as it perhaps influenced, in a totally different direction, that of the Mutahallimin.

They appear, however, to have known other Neo-Platonist works which they do not quote. This influence is supplemented, in astronomy and astrology, by that of Ptolemy (but the Ikhwan knew what Pythagoras and Plato had spiritualized, the celestial spheres). Finally, Euclid and Nicomachus were used in geometry.

The Ikhwan also had recourse, when necessary, to many other authors of whom they quote only a few, such as Galen (physics, alchemy and astrological magic) and Vettius Valens (in astrology). What seems most remarkable, however, is the synthesis that they achieved, in an original manner, for their metaphysics, adapting them to the dogmas of Islam, and modifying, where necessary, the information of their predecessors.

The Epistles of the Ikhwan occupy a place in the first rank of Arabic literature, for if pure Aristotelianism progressively ousted emanatism in the philosophers, their influence endures, not only in Shi'ism, but also in the mystic movements.
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in general, such as al-Biruni. But it is found also, as a view of the world in general, in the introduction to the Kitāb al-Mukaddasi reject the tradition, as will be seen, but yet mention it, even if only briefly: this is the case at least with al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Hawkal, whereas al-Muqaddasi, going much further, reserves a special chapter for the seven climates. More specialized, but also descriptive, the geography of the world, such as al-Balkhi (al-Istakhri, al-Mukaddasi); the view of the world in general, in the introduction to the Sifat Diwārat al-ʿArab: he knows the traditional division (pp. 24-6), but elsewhere (p. 10 f.) increases the number of the geographical unities thus defined and multiplies them by raising to 26 the total number of parallels which mark their limits.

On the whole, the central climates, those where there are large concentrations of Islamic peoples, are obviously better known than the others: it is noticeable that the precision of the latitudes decreases in proportion as the north is approached. From this point of view it may be considered that Islam (as was natural) was interested, among all the regions, chiefly in those with which it was essentially concerned. But although the precision with which maps are made is merely a consequence of the historical phenomenon of the expansion of Islam in these climates, it may also have been facilitated by the merchants, particularly for the knowledge of the eastern extremities of these same climates, which were vital for the important commerce of the time. Finally, it should not be forgotten either that the location of the towns as precisely as possible is a result of the necessity to fix in each of them the direction for the prayer: it is not by accident that al-Muqaddasi gives their chapter on these questions the title Dhikr akallm al-ʿilm wa-marks al-kibla.

This knowledge derives, with much else, from the type of geography which consists of the description of the terrestrial sphere, which is called sīrat al-ard. A general knowledge of this "configuration of the earth", together with its climates and the degree of uncertainty or precision of its respective parts, very soon became an obligatory part of the knowledge of the educated man. One of the most prominent themes is that of the central climate, the fourth, which represents "moderation in all things". Here the old Babylonian tradition combines with preoccupation with the political and cultural pre-eminence of ʿIrāq to produce the statement that in Mesopotamia are combined the most beneficial effects of a place's position on the map, of the astral influences and of the general configuration of the contours, the whole ensuring to its inhabitants the most solid qualities of character, perfect balance and the liveliest intelligence. Concerning this, the picture given by the ʿIkhwan al-Safā' (I, 170-9) is most revealing: in it ʿIrāq holds both a middle position so far as regards the natural features represented by the rivers and the mountains, and a high position regarding the cultural benefits represented by the towns.

The passage in adab writings concerning the general theme of the seven climates, and the special theme of the fourth is a widely attested phenomenon. Their importance is illustrated by the fact that, as we have said, they are not even completely absent from works of the school of al-Balkhi who, as we shall see later, have no use for them in the method which they follow. The integration of these themes in the general culture of the time led also to the appearance of new climate maps in the Kitāb al-Buldan of Ibn al-Fakhr (pp. 24-6) or in a more specialized book like that of the Spanish geographer al-Rāzī: the statement (p. 51) that Spain is situated in the fourth climate, that of Bagdad, is the result of a local enthusiasm which, attributing to Spain its own advantages, celebrities and marvels, allows it to stand comparison with ʿIrāq.

Against this collection of texts, stemming from the Greek tradition, the work of Ibn al-Fakhr must be set other works from the beginning of the age of geography, which obviously rejected this tradition. The administrator-geographers, even when they make allowances for it like Kurdāma (p. 230), tend to present their facts to conform with the exigencies of administration or politics: al-Yaḥṣūbī, who describes the world starting from Bagdad as centre, is uninterested in any division which is not by provinces, in other words which does not correspond to those concrete realities which are the history and geography of well-defined areas which may be administered as such. Ibn Khurdāṣihbī, the earliest of the Muslim geographers in the strict sense, is still more interesting: although he makes ʿilm, according to a rather confused terminology, the equivalent or a subdivision of a kūra, it is certainly to a real entity, forming an administrative whole, to which he refers by these two words: it is a "country" grouped round a capital town, and combining with others to form a larger entity. Thus Šamāt, Šīyazār, Maʿarrat an-Nuʿmān and the Lebanon are each considered as an ʿilm, whereas Antiṣārūs, Bulūnās or al-Lāḏīkiyya are given the name of kūra, these divisions together forming, with many others, a wider area known as abālīm Ḥimṣ (pp. 75-6).

There exists another meaning of the word ʿilm, this time pertaining to Iran. The word khorār refers, in Persian tradition, to the seven great kingdoms of the world, of which six (India, China, the Turks, Rum, Africa and Arabia) are distributed around the central kingdom, that of Iran. An obvious borrowing of this idea, but using the word ʿilm, appears in al-Masʿūdī (ed. Pellat, i, § 189).

Finally, the school of al-Balkhi was to give the word a new meaning, fully adapted to the realities of practical geography. Although it borrowed the word itself from the Greek tradition, it took from the Iranian tradition the idea of a figurative representation of ʿilm in the form of a bird or a familiar object, and the idea of a distribution of human groups around one centre, with the difference that this time the pivot of the world shifted from Media to Arabia. But a more important fact is that the school of al-Balkhi, in the spirit this time of administrative geography, is careful to define areas, land or maritime, regarded as wholes which in geography are clearly isolated. Thus al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Hawkal, describing (in order to repudiate it) the old division of the seven climates, produce twenty new abālīm, exclusively Muslim: Arabia, the sea of Fārs, the Maghrib, Egypt, Šīm, the sea of Rum, Ḫuzār...
IKLIM — IKRAR

The geographical division of the iklim: he considered, first of all, that geography is concerned with men, thus with the cultivable earth, and he refused to use the term iklim for seas and deserts. He therefore reduced the number of the abalim: he no longer listed sixteen earthly abalim as his predecessors had done, but fourteen: six Arab (Arabia, 'Irak, Khazars, the desert of Persia, Sidjistan, Khurasan). It will be seen that, first the group Armenia-al-Ran-Adharbaydjan is listed under the single name of al-Rihab (the "[high] plains") and that, secondly, Sidjistan, Khurasan and Transoxiana are grouped in the iklim of the Mashrik, which means (ed. de Goede, 7) the Sāmānīd sphere of influence. The whole operation is to designate the iklim of the Mashrik, as a geographical and historical entity which was to have been at a certain time in the past, sufficiently independent of others to be the seat of a de jure or a de facto autonomous authority.

The final meaning of the word, that of "region", "country" in general, is attested by Abu l-Fidā', who, in his tables, places side by side the scientific definition of iklim (al-iklīm al-hakīki) and its current definition (al-iklīm al-urfī).
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IKRAR, in fīhā, means an acknowledgement, whether judicial or extra-judicial. The Muslim jurists define ikrār as irādār, "confession" (Ibn Kudāma, Mughnī, v, 137). The institution, as it has been built up by the jurists of Islam, is however much more flexible, more comprehensive and more independent of the exact anterior reality which it is considered to reveal, than the corresponding institution of the western systems, in the sense that it is used not only to rectify a mistake to contain an error, but also often in practice to produce a new juridical situation. As J. Schacht has pointed out, ikrār, at least in matters concerning patrimony, "creates an abstract debt"; the efficient cause, sabab, of the obligation admitted is never demanded of the declarant, except in Šafiʿi and Ḥanbali law in matters concerning a slave "authorized to trade". The slave is required to state the origin of the obligation which he considers himself to owe in order for it to be admitted: whether it comes within the provisions of the authorization which he has received.

All these reasons make it seem preferable to substitute, as far as possible, when translating ikrār, "recognition of rights" for the much narrower term "acknowledgement".

Whether it is judicial or extra-judicial, ikrār is subject to the same juridical rules; this is why the jubahā', in their writings, have not divided the study of it into two separate chapters, and although they return to the question in the chapter dealing with judgment (bādā'), this is solely in order to point out the place of judicial acknowledgement among all the methods of proof admitted in law. A judicial acknowledgement is one which intervenes during an action. It consists of the recognition by the person against whom the petitioner alleges a fact, or a right, of the soundness of the request. At this juncture, the procedure goes no further. The judge cannot neglect this recognition and demand a further proof. But if the defendant denies the claim of the plaintiff, it is then a matter of an inkrār [q.v.] or denial, which may lead to the procedure of an oath, which then has to be sworn by the defendant.

On the other hand, a distinction which must be made concerning ikrār is that based on the object of the recognition. If this object is a right to a patrimony, it is then a matter of an ikrār bi-l-jubāhā'; but if it is a non-patrimonial right (marriage, paternity, reputation, etc.), it is described as ikrār bi-l-nasā', bi-l-inkāhā', etc. This is not merely a question of terminology, since the two categories of recognition do not function quite according to the same rules.

1. Conditions of validity. These concern the declarant (al-maḥārīr), the beneficiary (al-mukāhār) and the object of the recognition (al-muḥārār bihā).

The author of the recognition must have reached the age of puberty and be of sound mind. A minor, an idiot or a person of low intelligence (maʿṭāh) may recognize neither a patrimonial nor a non-patrimonial right. A spendthrift (ṣafīh) may recognize only a non-patrimonial right.

With slaves, it is important to distinguish between one who has been authorized by his master to trade, and one who has not. For the latter, as a general rule, there can be no question of the recognition of debts, since he has no patrimony proper, and the acknowledgement of a previous debt would be manifestly untrue. Has he then the right to admit to an offence which is dealt with by a corporal punishment? According to almost all the writers of all the schools, his admission, under the circumstances, is valid, and he should recognize the continuance of the slave's liability for this offence in spite of the loss (e.g., the slave's life, or the mutilation of one of his limbs) which this could involve for the master; the Hanbalīs' adopt more or less the same point of view but do however consider the admission of a murder to be un-accepalbe.
The situation of a slave "authorized to trade" is quite different. According to the non-Hanafi doctors, his recognition of a debt is valid if this debt is in connexion with the trade in which he has been authorized to engage; it is a charge on his own profits, and not on any goods which may have been entrusted to him by his master. Hence the non-Hanafi insistence on the necessity that the cause (sabab) of the debt should be defined. According to the Hanafis, the debt recognized by the "authorized" slave is to be a charge on the whole of the goods in his possession. All the Hanafi doctors agree that an ikhr obtained by force is null whether the object of the recognition be patrimonial or non-patrimonial. Indeed this leads, in Hanafi law, to a rather paradoxical situation, concerning in particular repudiation or enfranchisement. This school regards these two actions as still valid even if they have been obtained directly through violence, but the ikhr, if its object is an earlier repudiation or an enfranchisement, and if it has been obtained by force, is nevertheless deemed to be invalid (al-Zayla'i, Tabyin, v. 2). For a person in a state of intoxication, the general principles of the law demand that any recognitions of rights towards a third party which he may be persuaded to utter while in such an unconscious or semi-conscious state are to be regarded as not having occurred, and the majority of the schools accept this solution. The Hanafis, on the other hand, rather inappropriately introduce a new consideration: that, in the strict juridical field, distinction between drunkenness which is excusable and drunkenness which is voluntary or culpable. In the first case (if for example the declarant has become intoxicated inadvertently through taking too large a dose of a medicine containing alcohol), the drunkenness, in this case considered excusable, makes inoperable all the admissions of the person who is in this state. But if the admissions are pronounced while in a state of culpable or voluntary intoxication, all his admissions are considered in Hanafi law to be valid.

The recognition of rights, whatever its object, is a unilateral act which is an obligation on its author for as long as the beneficiary (who is of course never forced to accept it) has not in some way expressed his refusal (radd), also referred to as denial (istithnd*). If this happens, it becomes invalid, the declarant being made the beneficiary implying its dishonest character. This is what the writers mean by saying that ikhr is irrevocable. There cannot therefore be any inhr after an ikhr, but the reverse is possible: al-ikhr ha'ad al-inhr sakht (al-Sara'kh, Mabsu', xvii. 157).

The rule of irrevocability admits at least two exceptions: (a) the first concerns the "rights of God" (habb Allah). A person who confesses to an offence punishable, i.e., revocable, such as the use of alcoholic liquor, etc., has always the right to retract, even after judgement has been passed, and right up to the moment when the punishment is inflicted. This does not apply to an offence punishable by retaliation, since retaliation is a "right of man", and the admission in this field is always irrevocable. (b) It is also permissible for the author of a recognition of "infect relationship" (see below) to retract his statement; indeed this recognition is in fact equal to a testament in which the right of acceptance, since an ikhr may always be refused. It is agreed that the acquiescence of corporate bodies does not have to be formal; those below the age of puberty who have reached the age of discretion may acquiesce in person. When the beneficiary of an ikhr has not reached the age of reason, he may not consent to it in person; the question is important particularly with regard to the recognition of paternity. If the person recognized by another as his son has not reached the age of reason (or if he is mentally defective), he may not acquiesce in this recognition, which will therefore be valid only in respect of the unilateral wish of the author of the recognition, and this definitively, that is without its being possible for the recognition to be questioned when the child reaches the age of reason, or when an insane person who has lucid intervals recovers his reason (al-Kasani, op. cit., vii, 232).

Concerning the object of the ikhr, al-mukarr bihi, it may be stated without hesitation that all rights of whatever sort, "the rights of man" (habb al-'ibad) or "rights of God" (habb Allah), patrimonial or non-patrimonial rights, may form the object of a recognition subject to the conditions mentioned above. There does not exist in fiqh a single exception to this rule, on condition, of course, that the right which is the object of the recognition appears feasible and is permitted by Muslim law.

But the problems raised by ikhr are not exactly the same, according to whether its object is a patrimonial or a non-patrimonial right.

II. The recognition of patrimonial rights (al-ikhr bi-l-hukuk).

The authors deal mainly with the recognition of a monetary debt and list the formulas suitable for expressing such a recognition, the simplest being: "I owe you a thousand dirhams".

The formula naturally varies according to whether the right recognized is a right to property, a deposit, a share in a limited partnership, etc. The Muslim jurist is faced with two great problems in connexion with this type of ikhr. The first is that of the indivisibility of the acknowledgement, the second that of the valuation of the mixed debt made during the final illness (marad al-mawt) of the declarant.

A. The problem of the indivisibility of the acknowledgement is common to all the legislative systems. It is stated thus: upon the hypothesis that the author of the acknowledgement, after having recognized a principal fact or a right, produces a new fact which modifies the juridical effects of his first affirmation, it is necessary to know who has the right acknowledge that the right which is the object of the recognition appears feasible and is permitted by Muslim law.

The Muslim jurists, adhering to their method of proceeding by concrete cases, put the question slightly differently. Is the isstithna? I.e., the exception, the restriction, which is introduced into an acknowledgement by the jurist, is "except", qualified, or is it considered non-existent, the acknowledgement remaining valid because it is irrevocable?

All the schools allow istithna? when the object of the restriction is of the same genre (djinna) as that of the main obligation; this is easy to understand, since the acknowledgement then forms an indivisible
whole. Apart from this case, on which all the jurists agree, the Hanafis authorize *istihdam* (thus rendering the acknowledgement indiscriminable) when the objects of the declaration are things which may be weighed, measured or counted". If this is not so, if, to take a classic example, the author of the recognition of a sum of money excludes from the object of his acknowledgement a slave or a garment, the restriction is null, considered not to have been formulated, the first part of the acknowledgement remaining perfectly valid. The Shafiis and Malikis go much further in the direction of the principle of the indivisibility of the object of the declaration. According to their doctrine, any *istihdam* is valid and is binding on the beneficiary of the recognition, who must either accept it as a whole or reject it entirely. The Hanbalis reject any *istihdam* except one whose object is of the same genre as the main obligation. Ibn Kudama (Muzni, v, 142) explains their position thus:

"To admit every sort of *istihdam* is to allow the author of the recognition to attach to the debt which he recognizes a claim against the best security which has no connexion with the object of the recognition. This would absorb him (if the thing were permitted) from proving, by witnesses or other means, the sound foundation of his claim"

The preceding rules do not apply in matters concerning the term *(aqd)*, which the author of the recognition includes in his acknowledgement. If the beneficiary contests the term, he is, say the Hanafis and the Malikis, to be believed, but must take the oath; the Shafiis and the Hanbalis on the other hand give precedence to the statement of the declarant; and it is incumbent upon the latter to state on oath that the debt was indeed due.

It is important not to confuse *istihdam* with what the jurists refer to as *istidrak*, which is a rectification. It is supposed that the author of the acknowledgement corrects himself in order to recognize a higher sum than the one he has just mentioned. It is easy however to avoid confusion, since *istidrak* is introduced into the phrase by the expression *lah bal*, which means: "not this, but rather". Thus the author of the acknowledgement may say "I owe so and so a thousand *dirhams*, nay rather two thousand".

According to the Hanafis, because of the rules of *kifah* (q.v.), the second declaration should be added by the author of the recognition, which finally owes 3000 *dirhams*, since all recognitions of debt are irrevocable as soon as uttered; but in *istihdah*, in equity, it is admitted that he owes only the total given in the *istidrak*, i.e. 2000 *dirhams* (al-Kasani, op. cit., vii, 212).

B. *Ikrar al-marad*. The recognition of debts made by a sick person in *articolo mortis*, or by anyone in danger of death (a person drowning or under sentence of death) is especially suspect, in a legislative system which, like *fikah*, sets very narrow limits to any acts of liberality inspired by approaching death. It could be too easy for a sick person to arrange things to the advantage of an heir by means of an *ikrar* or to dispose of more than a third of his fortune to a stranger, both of these being acts of generosity which he is not permitted to perform, directly, by testament.

Nevertheless, it is only the Hanafi and Hanbal school which lay down definite rules for the *ikrar* in favour of an heir. According to these two schools, *ikrar* uttered during the "death sickness" of the declarant in favour of an heir may be annulled, just as a testament in his favour would be (unless it had the unanimous agreement of the co-heirs).

The Malikis turn in each individual case to discovering the intention of the declarant. If this intention, because of the circumstances, is suspect (*mutiama*), then the *ikrar* is not valid, as such, but if it is considered that the declarant really did owe the object of the *ikrar* to his heir, they then consider the recognition to be perfectly in order. The Shafiis consider that, of the two diametrically opposite opinions professed by the Imam al-Shafi, the *raddjif* (preferable) opinion is that which regards as valid (*sahih*) any *ikrar* made during a final illness, even one in favour of an heir (al-Rami, Nihayat al-muhaddi, iv, 51).

If the beneficiary of the *ikrar* is not an heir of the dying person, all four schools allow him the *entire* benefit of the sum that is recognized as being due to him, even if this absorbs all the inheritance.

The beneficiary will then be in competition, and for a share proportional to his claim, with those to whom the declarant had been in debt before his illness. Only Hanafi law gives to those who were creditors before the illness priority over those who are beneficiaries of the *ikrar* made during a final illness, by virtue of the saying *dusyan al-shahih mukaddama* al-dusyan al-marad "debts [contracted] in a state of health are to be preferred to those made during the last illness".

III. Recognition of extra-patrimonial rights. It is always slightly surprising to see how readily *fikah* admits the recognition of a non-patrimonial right by one person in favour of another, even when this right cannot have come into existence directly except under relatively stringent conditions, from which its simple acknowledgement is exempt. Marriage, paternity, direct or indirect relationship, repudiation, enfranchisement, etc., may be the object of an *ikrar* which will take the name of the right thus recognized. We shall deal here only with the recognition of marriage, or, in other words, of the status of spouse (*ikrar bi-'l-nikdh*) and with the recognition of relationship (*ikrar bi-'l-nasab*). These are in fact the family rights which in the past most often formed the object of an *ikrar*.

A man may recognize a woman as being his wife, and *vice versa*, on the sole condition that there exists between them none of the impediments to marriage laid down by Muslim law. This possibility allows proof by witnesses or by documents to be replaced by other methods when such proof is impossible of too difficult, but it will also allow in certain circumstances the circumvention of the detailed regulations which govern the contracting of marriage in Muslim law. Naturally the recognition is valid only if it is approved by the beneficiary. Here there becomes apparent a difference between the recognition made by a man and that made by a woman. When it is the man who takes the initiative in the recognition, the woman may acquiesce, even after the death of the person who claimed to be her husband, whereas if it is the woman who is the first to "admit" her marriage with a certain man, the man may approve it only while the woman is still living.

The above dispositions are those of the Hanafi school; all the other Sunni schools and the Shi'ite schools hold more or less the same principles, except for the Malikis, who admit the *ikrar* bi-'l-nikdh only between persons who come from a distant country and who because of this may have some difficulty otherwise in providing proof in any other way of a marriage between them which took place in that country.

The *ikrar bi-'l-nasab*, the recognition of relationship, covers in reality two different institutions,
according to whether the relationship recognized is direct or indirect.

The relationship is direct when it does not imply, in order to be possible, the existence of a third person between the author of the recognition and the beneficiary. This can arise only in the case of the recognition of a child, a father or a mother. In all other cases (recognition of a brother, an uncle, a grandson) the relationship is indirect, since the author of the recognition could obtain the result he seeks only by attributing to a third person (his father, his grandfather, his son respectively in the examples given) the paternity of the person whom he recognizes.

This is why, while the recognition of direct relationship "establishes" (hābbāla) sonship or paternity, as the fukāhā say, the recognition of indirect relationship has only very narrow effects, limited to the author of the recognition only, and resulting occasionally in a right to inheritance of the beneficiary.

a) Recognition of direct relationship. In all the schools, three conditions are necessary for its validity: the child who is recognized (or who recognizes) must not be the son of someone else; there must be a sufficient difference in age between the author and the beneficiary to make the recognition likely; finally the person recognized must agree to it, unless it is a question of a very young child or of an insane person. To these three conditions the Mālikis add a fourth: they require that the circumstances of the birth were such as to make such a relationship plausible, in other words they consider that a child born in Morocco may not be "recognized" by a father who is definitely known never to have left Syria; but the other schools do not demand this condition nor (agreeing in this with the Mālikis) do they demand that proof be shown of the marriage of which the child is the issue.

The recognition of direct relationship puts the beneficiary in exactly the same juridical situation as if the relationship resulted from the rule al-walad li-‘fīrādī, "the child belongs to the marriage-bed", or from the proof by bayyina, by witnesses; this applying in all the branches of law, whether concerning succession, impediments to marriage, inheritance, his grandmaster witness, or else in penal law.

b) The recognition of indirect relationship. This, unlike the above, does not form a situation valid erga omnes. The author of the recognition binds only himself, but it is excessive to write, as does al-Zayla‘i (Tabyīn, v, 28), that "the recognition of a brother or of an uncle is the equivalent of a bequest!". In Hanafi law, a person who has recognized someone as being his brother (the most usual example) obviously cannot attribute to the beneficiary the status of being the son of his own father without the latter’s approval. Without such approval (the father being already deceased or having refused his consent), the beneficiary has no rights except as regards the author of the recognition; for this reason he will share with the latter the possessions which he inherits from his father; he may eventually claim from him maintenance, and will receive the whole of his inheritance, if the author of the recognition dies without leaving any heirs. This recognition, unlike the preceding one, may always be revoked, as may a testament.

The contemporary legal codes, since the Syrian Code of Personal Status of 1953 (art. 134 & 135), devote a fair number of clauses to the recognition of direct relationship. This modern legislation appears to be very reasonable. The institution still retains today a large part of its practical interest, since it enables the gaps in the records of the registry office to be made good, the latter in any case not being held in very high regard in certain Muslim countries; furthermore, it makes possible the recognition of a natural child (it is enough to fail to mention the irregular conditions of its birth) and also the adoption (referred to as recognition) of a foundingling.

It is surprising on the other hand to find, in these contemporary texts, clauses concerning the recognition of indirect relationship. This is hardly ever used today and it is doubtful whether it was really useful to include even brief rules about it in the laws and the codes the aim of which was adaptation to the conditions of modern life. Thus the Egyptian law of 6 August 1943 on inheritance devotes to it article 42; the Syrian, Tunisian and Moroccan codes of Personal Status refer to it, giving it moreover the same outline which the institution had in Hanafi law. It is only Trak which, in correcting the legislative whims of Kāsim, has not, in its Code of Personal Status, revoked the right to inheritance of a beneficiary of a recognition of indirect relationship (art. 88, modified by the law of 18 March 1963).


(Y. LINANT DE BELLEFONDS)
Azza [q.v.], and the prayer for the dead was spoken on both of them together. It is related that on account of his Kharidji opinions he was searched for by some governors, but the vagueness of this information shows it to be spurious. According to the oldest sources, he transmitted traditions from Ibn 'Abbās, Ḥāsha, and a very few others; later, the numbers of his authorities and of the transmitters from him increased almost indefinitely. Already in Ibn Sa'd, admiration of his knowledge is mixed with critical comments on his traditions; Bukhārī still endorses him, but the other Traditionists accepted him notwithstanding the objections which were being raised to him (four of the authors of the classical collections of traditions, Bukhārī, Muslim, Abā Dāwūd, and Naṣāʾī, included his traditions in their works), and only some later critics declared him unreliable or to have been untruthful in relating from his master, no doubt on account of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji works), and only some later critics declared him unreliable or to have been untruthful in relating from his master, no doubt on account of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions; but the final appreciation of his Kharidji, and therefore heretical, opinions. The Fihrist (p. 38, l. 2) mentions a book of his, derived from Ibn 'Abbās, on the revelation of the Kurān; it is no doubt as little authentic as the other collections of interpreting notes on the Kurān attributed to Ibn 'Abbās (Goldziher, 77).

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, v, 212-6; Khaliqa b. Khayyāt, K. al-Tabābāi, Bagdad 1359/1357, 280; Bukhārī, al-Tafsir al-Kubrā, iv/1, no. 218; Ibn Abī Hātim al-Kāzī, K. al-Dīnār wa l-ladūl, liša, no. 32; Tabari, Annals, iii, 243-5, and index; Mubarrak, K. al-Kāmil, 561, l. 12; Ibn 'Abd Rabbīh, al-Ibad al-farād, Êndexes by M. Shafi, 1, 603; Ağa, viii, 42 f.; xv, 126; xix, 60; Yākūt, Irshād, vi, 52-6; Naawai, Taḫḥīb al-asma', ed. Wüstenfeld, 431 f.; Ibn Khallīkān, Wafāydt, s.v.; Dhahābi, Taḫkhirat al-Buhḍas, Hyderabad 1333, l. 89 f. (no. 87); Ibn Ḥāḍir al-Aškālānī, Taḫḥīb al-Taḫḥīb, vii, no. 475; Caetani, Chronographia Islamica, 1328 (year 105); Goldziher, Die Richtungen der islamischen Koranauslegung, 75 f.; Brockelmann, S I, 691. (J. Schacht)

IKRĪTIS, Arabic name of Crete, with the variants Akritēs (Yākūt), Iršādīsi (Ibn Rusta), Irktēs (Ibn al-Hawkal) (Akrita [Yākūt, ii, 865] refers to a locality in Asia Minor and has only a fortuitous resemblance with the name of the island of Crete).

Geography. The Arabic geographers describe it as one of the largest islands in the Mediterranean (Bahr al-Rūm [q.v.]), whose situation they sometimes confuse with that of Cyprus. They give widely varying figures for its area; a circumference of 300 miles (Ibn Rusta) or taking 15 days on foot (Ibn Khurraḍa al-Dhath; al-Himyari), 100 farsakh (al-Mukaddas; see Sh. Miquel in his Indices by M. Shafi, 1, 98 f. (no. 87)) that it came under Muslim domination. Its conquerors were not Arabs from the East, but came from Andalusia.

After the revolt, in 202/818, of the inhabitants of Cordova against the Umayyad amir al-Hakam 1, which was ruthlessly suppressed, the whole population of the Suburb of Cordova (al-Rabad) was exiled. A party of them (al-Rabadīyiūn) reached Morocco; others, more than 10,000 in number (15,000 according to Ibn al-Abbâr; see al-Bakrī, tr. de Slane, 285, note) joined probably by sailors from the coast of Andalusia, became pirates in the central and eastern Mediterranean. These pirates landed on occasion in Alexandria and became, owing to the political troubles there, masters of the city, forming with the help of a part of the population a small republic
which lasted for about twelve years, from 200 to 212/816-27. According to al-Ya'qūbī there were about 3,000 of them, arriving in 4,000 ships—an unlikely number—under the command of Ḥaṣṣ b. Ṣuḥayy b. ʿIsā (and not Ṣuḥayy b. ʿUmar as is given in one single tradition in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Baḥrī) al-Baḥrī, a native of Faḥṣ al-Baḥrī [q.v.], who was called al-Ghalz (the fat, the corpulent; Ṣaḥīḥ), also later al-ʾIrṭīṣīḥī. It was not until 212/827 that a new governor of Egypt sent by al-ʾArābī, Ibn Ṭāhir, put an end to their domination. He laid siege to Alexandria in Saḥār/May and forced it to capitulate, after a few days, in Rābi‘ I/June. According to Michael the Syrian (in Brooks, Storia, 2, 404, n. 2), the Spaniards mentioned in Ibn Ṭūlūn’s At-dhambāt (the emigration) and in selling the slaves and the booty which they had been expected, either because of the absence of Greek troops or because of the indifference of a population dissatisfied with Byzantine rule.

Byzantine tradition (Theophanes continuatus, 74-5) claims that, after this, Abū Ḥaṣṣ had his ships burned in order to deprive his companions, who wished to see their wives and children again, of any hope of getting away from the island, praising to them the wealth of this country where milk and honey flowed abundantly and telling them that they would find wives there. This tradition is not confirmed in the Arabic sources and seems unlikely, since the Andalusians certainly had their families with them. It is very probably a legend. Nevertheless Amari supposes that Abū Ḥaṣṣ might have burned some ships which were in a bad condition, and this may have given rise to the tradition.

Once settled in the island, whose Christian population they reduced to subjection, the Andalusians organized themselves into an independent emirate, recognizing more or less the authority of the ʿAbbāsid caliph and led by Abū Ḥaṣṣ ʿUmar and, after him, his descendants. They engaged mainly in piracy and in selling the slaves and the booty which they acquired from this. They may have contributed to the conquest of Sicily if, as Amari supposes (Storia, i, 304, n. 2), the Spaniards mentioned in Ibn Ṭūlūn’s (Baṣīr, i, 95) as having helped Ṣaḥād b. al-ʾUmar to come from Crete.

In 828, they ravaged the island of Aegina; in the same year the Byzantines attempted to reconquer Crete. Soon after 828 an expedition under the Greek Photios, which was joined by reinforcements under Damianos, failed completely: Damianos was captured and Photios fled with great difficulty. Another expedition led by Photios landed on the island, but after an initial success the troops were surprised in the night and massacred. Crateros, who succeeded in escaping, was captured on the island of Cos and hanged.

At the end of the reign of Michael II (820-9) or at the beginning of that of Theophilius, his son (October 829-842), the islands of the Aegean were re-captured from the Cretans, and this liberation is generally attributed to a certain Ooryphas, who had been put in command of a large fleet. In 829-30, Theophilius entered into relations with the Umayyad ruler of Cordova, ʿAbd al-Rahmān II, and attempted to gain his support against the Andalusians of Crete, on the pretext that they were rebels against the Umayyad authority who had given their allegiance to the ʿAbbāsid caliphate. The Umayyad merely gave the emperor complete freedom to expel the Andalusians from Crete (see E. Lévi-Provençal, Un échange d’ambassades entre Cordoue et Byzance au IXe s., in Byzantion, xii (1937), 1-24, following an anonymous Arab chronicle).

During the reign of Theophilius there occurred several encounters between Byzantines and Cretans. In Shabān 214/October 829, the Arabs destroyed a Byzantine fleet off the island of Thasos and laid waste Mount Athos, which remained for some time deserted. The Byzantines ravaged the coasts of the theme of Thrace (the west of Asia Minor) and massacred the monks of Mount Latros; but after this they were annihilated by the strategos of the theme, Constantine Contomites. The date of this event is not known, though Brooks puts it as late as 841.

During the reign of Michael III (842-67), Byzantium, after destroying in 843 a powerful Arab fleet which was sailing towards Constantinople (but which came from Syria and not from Crete), decided to attack Crete. The expedition, which took place in the same year, 843, was led by the logothete Theoctistes. It resulted in a temporary occupation of Crete (see Ahrweiler, 112 and 441), but Theoctistes returned to Constantinople because of rumours spread by the Arabs of political intrigues in the capital and, according to the continuator of Theophanes, the troops left in Crete were massacred by the Arabs.

The Byzantines continued to plan an expedition against Crete, which constituted a continual danger to the Greek coast and islands. As Crete obtained its arms from Egypt, a Byzantine fleet attacked Damietta in 853 and seized there a large supply of arms destined for Crete, while other squadrons were in action around Crete itself. The increase in the Byzantine maritime power at this time did not prevent the Cretans, in the last years of the reign of Michael III, from landing in Athens on two occasions in 862. In 866, Byzantium decided to undertake a new expedition against Crete, but the assassination of Bardas, the maternal uncle of the emperor, with the latter’s connivance, interrupted these operations (Vasiliev, i, 258; cf. Ahrweiler, 112).

During the first period of the Macedonian dynasty, the Arabs of Crete remained active. In 872, their raids reached as far as the Dalmatian coast of the Adriatic, and in the following year they laid waste the islands of the Aegean with a fleet under the command of a renegade called Photios, probably accompanied by other renegades. Some ships even reached the island of Proconnesos in the Hellespont. But the Byzantine admiral ʿOoryphas (a different person from the ʿOoryphas mentioned above), inflicted a severe defeat on the Cretan fleet, of which several ships were burned. Nevertheless, Photios re-appeared on the coast of the Peloponnese. The same Nicetas ʿOoryphas gave battle to him and, according to the Byzantine sources, took his revenge on the prisoners, inflicting horrible tortures on the renegades in particular. As a result of these Byzantine
victories, it appears that for about a decade the Cretans were forced to pay tribute to Byzantium. The amir of Crete, according to the Byzantine sources, was, in Salphis or Saet, a corruption of Ish'qiyb. At the beginning of the 10th century, the raids by the Arabs of Crete who were in communication with those living on the coast of Syria continually caused great havoc, in particular in the Peloponnese, where they massacred the inhabitants or carried them off to sell them as slaves. They were in control of Patmos, one of the Sporades, and Naxos paid tribute to them (see John Cameniates, Εἰς εἰκόνα Θεσσαλονίκης, ch. 68, 360-3, ch. 70, 573; Vasiliev, ii/1, 148-150, Russian ed., 134; cf. Ahrweiler, 104). The Muslim Syrian squadron of Leo of Tripoli, which captured Thessalonika in 291/904, anchored on the island of Patmos, one of the Sporades, and Naxos paid tribute to them (see John Cameniates, Εἰς εἰκόνα Θεσσαλονίκης, ch. 68, 360-3, ch. 70, 573; Vasiliev, ii/1, 148-150, Russian ed., 134; cf. Ahrweiler, 104).

The Muslim Syrian squadron of Leo of Tripoli, which captured Thessalonika in 291/904, anchored on its return journey at Crete, where some of the prisoners were sold (John Cameniates, ch. 73; Vasiliev, ii/1, 177, Russian ed. 150), which demonstrates the agreement which existed between Crete and Syria.

At the time of the expedition of the admiral Himerios in 297/909-10, a Byzantine emissary, who was the author of the Life of Saint Theoctistus of Lesbos, was sent to Crete to find out the intentions of the amir and to try to ascertain whether he would be giving his support to the Arabs of Syria (see Vasiliev, ii/1, 209, Russian ed. 177-8). It is not clear whether the same Himerios led an expedition against Crete in 911. This has been questioned (Ahrweiler, 113, n. 4). In any case, in the spring of 912, whether after the expedition against Crete or that against Syria, Himerios's fleet was pursued by that of the Arabs of Syria, probably helped by the Cretans, and destroyed to the north of Chios (Vasiliev, ii/1, 214; Russian ed., 182-3).

During the reign of Constantine Porphyrogogenitus, between 930 and 940, the Cretans attacked the Peloponnese and central Greece and also Athos (where fortifications had to be built) and the coasts of Asia Minor (see Vasiliev, ii/1, 320 ff., Russian ed., 270 ff.). It is possible that they penetrated Attica and as far as Athens (see the works quoted by G. C. Miles in Hesperia, 1956 and the note in Vasiliev, 320). The emperor therefore decided to prepare an expedition against Crete in 914 in order to put an end to the activity of the pirates: the preparations for it are described in detail in the De ceremoniis, ii, 45. But again the expedition was a failure; after the army had had to turn back, they were taken by surprise and defeated; and, large a number of ships were lost (see Vasiliev, ii/1, 333 ff.). It was during the reign of Romanus II, the son of Constantine Porphyrogogenitus, that Crete was reconquered by Nicephorus Phocas with a large fleet and army. The expedition left Constantinople in June or July 960. After landing, the army marched on the powerful fortress of Chandax and laid siege to it, while detachments spread across the island. The siege lasted throughout the winter of 960-1 and the fortress was captured by assault on 6 March 961.

The Cretans had not been able to obtain help. The amir of Aleppo had no fleet and does not appear to have been approached. An embassy had been sent from Crete to the Ikhshid amir of Egypt, but he, realizing his weakness, advised them to seek help from the Fatimid caliph of North Africa, al-Mu'tazz. The latter not only sent word to the emperor declaring that the truce concluded with Byzantium in 345/956-7 was at an end and demanding that he raise the siege of Crete; he further promised to send a fleet to aid Crete, and proposed to the amir of Egypt that they should act together, the African and Egyptian fleets to meet at Cyrenaica on the first day of Rabī' II 350/20 May 961. Documents relating to this are to be found in al-Majdūlīs wa' l-musayyārāt of the khitāb of Abu Hanifa al-Nūmān, the friend of the caliph al-Mu'tazz, published in the work by Hassan Ibrahim Hasan and Tāhā Abūmānṣar, al-Mu'tazz il-Dīn Allāh, Cairo 1948, 303-4, 321-2, analysed by Fahrat Dachraoui, La Crette dans le conflit entre Byzance et al-Mu'tazz, in Cahiers de Tunisie, no. 26-7 (1959) and tr. by M. Canard, Les sources arabes de l'histoire byzantine, in Revue des Études Byzantines, xix (1961), 283-8.

Although G. Al'Atir and other historians state that the Fatimid caliph, as he had promised the Cretans' ambassador, sent troops, who gained a victory over the Byzantines and took them prisoner, this is very doubtful: at the date indicated Chandax had already been taken by Nicephorus Phocas and this help would have arrived too late. According to the Byzantine sources, the amir of Crete having sent an appeal for help to the Arabs of Spain and Africa, a number of ships and a large force under the command of al-Mu'tazz, possibly supported by the Cretans, who had already been taken by Nicephorus Phocas and this help would have arrived too late. According to the Byzantine sources, the amir of Crete having sent an appeal for help to the Arabs of Spain and Africa, a number of ships and a large force under the command of al-Mu'tazz, probably helped by the Cretans, and destroyed to the north of Chios (Vasiliev, ii/1, 214; Russian ed., 182-3).

A treaty was concluded on this basis. Then the emperor proposed to the amir to send to Crete a herd of brood-mares, whose progeny was to be shared between them, the males for the emperor and the females for the amir. This was a ruse, which allowed the Byzantines to introduce into the island 500 horses with their grooms. Thereupon there arrived secretly the troops of Nicephorus Phocas, who landed at the place where the horses were, bringing with them saddles and bridles. They had only to mount the horses to be ready for battle and to take the defenders of the island by surprise. But, according to Yāḥūt, the army of Nicephorus Phocas consisted of 70,000 men, 5,000 of them being horsemen, and according to Ibn Khaldūn, he arrived with 700 ships.

The work of C. Schlumberger, Un empereur byzantin au Xe siècle, Nicephore Phocas, gives a detailed and vivid account of the siege of the town of Chandax. After the failure of a detachment sent into the interior, which was taken by surprise and massacred, Nicephorus began a complete blockade of the town by means of an entrenched, which stretched from one end of the island to the other. Bombarded and cut off from the rest of the island, the town fell, though not without putting up a vigorous defence, after a siege which lasted throughout the winter of 960-1. The town was pillaged and the inhabitants who had not been killed were taken captive, among them being the last amir, Kouroupas, his son Anemas and their family. The walls were demolished, and a fortress was built on a neighbouring height and provided with a garrison. The mosques were destroyed and all copies of the Qurʿān were burned (cf. Kūdāb al-'Uyūn, s. v. Mu'tazz). The Muslims who remained in the island were gradually converted to Christianity.

The capture of Crete resulted in unrest in Cairo, of which the victims were the Christians there (Yahyā b. Sa'id).

According to al-Nuwayri, the conversion of the Muslims was achieved by cunning and by force.
Some important inhabitants, invited to pay their respects to the emperor at Christmas, received lavish gifts and returned to the island very pleased. Following this a great many people travelled to Constantinople but then were arrested and forced to become Christian. In this way the island became entirely Christian.
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Following this a great many people travelled to Constantinople but then were arrested and forced to become Christian. In this way the island became entirely Christian.

After this a great many people travelled to Constantinople but then were arrested and forced to become Christian. In this way the island became entirely Christian.

Abu Hašf ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, d. 361/972.

Also in the Byzantine and the ʿAlamiyya are mentioned Cretan scholars, probably of Andalusian origin, with the nisba al-ʿIrājīth. One of them taught in Damasc, another in Egypt. Al-ʿIrājīth mentions an ʿUmar b. ʿĪsā b. Muḥammad b. ʿYūsūf, a descendant of Abu Hašf, who wrote, while a prisoner in Constantinople, a book on the meanings and the miracles of the Kurʾān. Al-Ṭabar (iii, 1880) speaks of a Byzantine ʿAlamiyya whom he refers as Naṣr al-ʿIrājīth, and who was killed in battle in 259/872-3. The commander of the Cretan fleet, Nisīr (Nisīris), see Vasiliev, i/l, 209 n., does not seem to have belonged to the family of Abu Hašf.

Crete remained Byzantine until the capture of Constantinople by the Franks in 1204. It then fell to Count Boniface of Monferrat, who sold it to the Venetians (see Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, Oxford 1932, 356; cf. K. M. Setton (ed.), A history of the Crusades, ii, 190-1, and Heyd, i, 276 ff.). It was in dispute between Genoa and Venice, the latter reconquering it in 1207. A key-point of the Venetian possessions (Heyd, i, 470), it remained Venetian until it was conquered by the Ottomans in 1669.

OTTOMAN PERIOD

From the time of the occupation of Crete by the Venetians until it was conquered by the Ottomans, there were very few attacks against it by the Turks: an expedition by the bey of Aydin, Umur, circa 741/1341; an Ottoman attack in 873/1469; another, more serious, led by Khayr al-Din Barbarossa in 943/1538; and finally an assault on the fortress of Suda in 974/1567 while a fleet from Algiers was ravaging the region of Retimo.

All the same the existence of this Venetian bastion in the eastern Mediterranean constituted a permanent menace for Ottoman navigation. There had been peace with Venice since 1573, but some incidents in the Adriatic had led to a brief period of hostilities in 1596 during the reign of Murad IV, and attention had then been drawn to the danger which Crete represented to the Turkish sea-routes, in particular to North Africa. It was during the reign of İbrahim I that the decision was taken to seize the island; a large fleet was assembled at Istanbul during the winter of 1644-5, and when it set sail in Safar 1055/April 1645, under the command of the Kapudan-i deryâ Yusuf Paşa, rumours were spread that its objective was Malta. In June, Turkish troops disembarked near Kana: the town was taken, after a siege of 54 days, on 26 Dümâda II 1055/19 August 1645; this occupation was followed by those of Kissamo in Muharram 1056/March 1646, Aprikorno in July, Milopotamo in September and Retimo in November of the same year. But the Ottoman offensive slowed down, in spite of reinforcements sent from Istanbul and also from Tripoli, Tunis and Algiers; the siege of Candia was several times resumed and then abandoned, while on their side the Venetians set up a blockade of the Dardanelles in 1648-9 and during 1650; an Ottoman naval victory in May 1654 near the entrance to the Dardanelles was answered by a Venetian victory in June 1656 in the same waters, with an occupation of the islands of Tenedos, Lemnos and Samothrace, which were re-captured by the Turks in the following year.

In 1676/1666, the grand vizier Köprülüzâde Fâdil Ahmad Paşa decided to bring matters to a conclusion: in fact, more than two years were needed from the resumption of the siege of Candia in May 1667; the Venetians, having obtained very little support from western Europe, finally accepted the Ottoman peace proposals; on 9 Rabi' II 1060/5 September 1669, peace was concluded: the Venetians abanoned all claims on Crete except Suda and Spinalonga, which were occupied by the Ottomans in 1715. This long war in Crete, although it ended in a Turkish victory and their control of all the eastern Mediterranean, was in the end not a very glorious one; it underlined the growing weakness of the Ottoman empire and confirmed the decline of Venice.

Once under Ottoman domination, Crete became a province (veyâdet) with Candia as its capital and divided into three sandjaks: Candia, Canea and Retimo. The Turkish authorities retained most of the local laws and interfered very little with the possessions and property of the Cretans; however some Anatolian Turks were transferred to the island, which finally came to contain an important Turkish minority; the internal affairs of the Greek community were left in its own hands and the use of the Greek language was continued. The population was made subject to the personal taxes usual in the Ottoman empire; land was subject to a tax of 1/5 of the production from it, and gardens and orchards of 140 aspers per džarîb; these taxes were reduced in 1675 to 1/7 and 80 aspers respectively.

In 1821, the Greek revolt reached Crete: the governor of Egypt, Muhammad 'Ali, summoned by the sultan, restored order and placed the island under his own authority; he instituted mixed assemblies of Muslims and Christians in Candia, in Canea and Retimo, which were to deal with local affairs; later, another assembly was instituted at Sphakia (Issakiya). In 1830 a new revolt broke out, and the Ottoman government proposed to Muhammad 'Ali that he should keep the island; but Muhammad 'Ali refused, and the Treaty of London in 1840 forbade him to make any claims on Crete.

Later, and especially after 1866, intermittent troubles broke out in the island: the Cretans demanded union with Greece, an idea which had the support of the Great Powers, especially France and Russia, whose aim was to make the question of Crete an international one, one of the elements of the "Eastern Question". In January 1869, the intervention of the Great Powers led to an alteration of the administrative system, by which the local responsibilities were more equally shared between Christians and Muslims; the governor (whose headquarters had been in Canea since 1850) was to be assisted by a council composed of 5 Muslims and 5 Christians; the official posts were divided among the two communities. A new revolt broke out however in 1878 and, finally, a-
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vention signed on 23 October 1878 stipulated that the governor of the island should be a Christian, appointed with the agreement of the Great Powers, and that an assembly of 50 members (40 Christians and 10 Muslims) should take all the decisions concerning the internal affairs of Crete, but that these decisions should be submitted for the approval of the sultan. This convention was not fully implemented. In 1896, the Cretans revolted again and this time received the support of the king of Greece; war broke out between Greece and Turkey; finally the latter, in December 1897, accepted the principle of autonomy for the future government of Crete. On 27 November 1908, Turkish troops left Crete and, on 29 November, Prince George of Greece was appointed as commissary extraordinary: Ottoman suzerainty was theoretically retained, but in fact Crete was already lost to the Ottomans. In 1900, Prince George tried (unsuccessfully) to proclaim the union of Crete with Greece. This union was proclaimed by his successor, Zaïmis, on 6 October 1908, but was not recognized by the Young Turk government. The years 1909 and 1910 passed in an atmosphere of extreme tension. On 9 May 1910, the Cretan assembly swore allegiance on the transfers of populations between Greece and Turkey. Before these treaties, a certain number of the Cretans revolted again and this time received the support of the king of Greece; war broke out on 6 October 1908, but was not recognized by the Ottomans. In 1900, Prince George tried (unsuccessfully) to proclaim the union of Crete with Greece. This union was proclaimed by his successor, Zaïmis, on 6 October 1908, but was not recognized by the Young Turk government. The years 1909 and 1910 passed in an atmosphere of extreme tension. On 9 May 1910, the Cretan assembly swore allegiance.

This convention was not fully implemented. In 1896, the Cretans revolted again and this time received the support of the king of Greece; war broke out between Greece and Turkey; finally the latter, in December 1897, accepted the principle of autonomy for the future government of Crete. On 27 November 1908, Turkish troops left Crete and, on 29 November, Prince George of Greece was appointed as commissary extraordinary: Ottoman suzerainty was theoretically retained, but in fact Crete was already lost to the Ottomans. In 1900, Prince George tried (unsuccessfully) to proclaim the union of Crete with Greece. This union was proclaimed by his successor, Zaïmis, on 6 October 1908, but was not recognized by the Young Turk government. The years 1909 and 1910 passed in an atmosphere of extreme tension. On 9 May 1910, the Cretan assembly swore allegiance.
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form 100, 1,000, or even 40,000 dirhams of base metal into gold. Al-Akfani (Kitab Irshad al-biyad, ed. A. S. Longwell, Collected by hs, 76 ff.) gives an interesting systematization of the elixirs into the esoteric (djawwānī) and the exoteric (barānī). Eventually the elixir served the mystics as a symbol of the divine truth which changed an unbeliever into a believer (Kleinere Schriften des Ibn al-'Arabi, ed. H. S. Nyberg, Leiden 1919, 219, 3 ff.).

With the translation of the Arabic alchemistic writings into Latin, the theories of the elixir spread to the West, and Albert the Great, d. 1280, specialized in cuadu em elixyr, aklymicus quo metalla convertuntur (Liber de animalibus, ed. H. Stadler, Munster 1921, ii, 1562). The notion of the elixir then returned from the field of alchemy to that of medicine: the elixir developed into the panacea, into the life prolonging agent, and eventually became more and more integrated into the pharmacopoeia (see P. Diepgen, Das Elsir, die kostlichste der Arzneien, Ingelheim 1951).


ÎKTĀ, term for a form of administrative grant, often (wrongly) translated by the European word "fief" (German Lehman). The nature of the Îktā' varied according to time and place, and a translation borrowed from other systems of institutions and conceptions has served only too often to mislead Western historians, and following them, even those of the East.

In the article DAVÂ it was seen how the Muslim state, in its early centuries, had distributed to its notables portions of its territory called khatîf (pl. of khatîf). These portions were made over, in fact, in semi-ownership, subject to the tithe, as were all properties of Muslim origin (as distinct from properties of indigenous origin, which were subject to the more onerous khāradj). It was shown too in the early stages, the income thus made over to the treasury, and paying to the state, out of the normal payment of the inhabitants, only a fixed contracted sum. This institution operated sometimes to the advantage of notables of various sorts, but above all, in the case of tribal groups—of Kurds, Bedouins, etc. and later Turcomans.

The Saltjûks and their vizier Nizâm al-Mulk have often been credited with the conception and organization of a new system of Îktā', nearer to the European fief and constituting a specific contribution of the new Turkish rulers. This view, based on late and misinterpreted texts of 'Îmâd al-Dîn al-Ish flora and al-Maârî, although contradicted by the evidence of contemporary, chief among whom is Nizâm al-Mulk himself. Certainly the Saltjûks made a wider use of khatîf in their empire than had been made previously, and probably introduced it in provinces (particularly eastern Iran) where it had scarcely ever been used; but it remained in conception a continuation of that of the Buûlds—an equivalent of pay granted for a short time—and what has been taken for an original creation of the Saltjûk government is merely a later result of their decline. In the course of the internal struggles which marked the last years of the dynasty, the Îktā' was granted must have increased continually in size and number, while the period of tenure became longer, tending even to hereditary succession. Such Îktā's now differed only in extent from provincial governorates, which themselves were changing at the same time from being revocable delegations of authority to becoming in effect hereditary principalities. The similarity was so great that the term Îktā' was extended finally without distinction to both. Then, we are told, the muklìm's began to take some interest in developing their Îktā'. Some successors of the Saltjûks, particularly the Zangids, explicitly proclaimed the right of in-
heritance to i'jadi's in order to secure the loyalty of their troops in the struggle against the Crusaders. This development has been ascribed to the influence of the Latin Orient, where something like the western idea of the hereditary fief had been introduced. While no definite denial of any such influence can be made, it does seem that the same result might have been reached through a natural autonomous development, even without the presence of the Latin Orient. Then again, the permanence of the i'jadi and the relative strength of the mubaka allowed the latter, by means of "protections" [see "himaya"], more or less forced purchases, or simple usuries, to acquire very large parts of the territory granted him, and, in the case of an incumbent who was at the same time governor of the province in which his i'jadi and these mukhs were situated, to exercise all public and private power at the same time. Under such conditions, it can be seen that the i'jadi evolved through a confusion of various notions and practices to a status approaching that of a "lordship". The inhabitants, indeed, were reduced to servitude by reason of the predisposition against them leaving the land when the taxes had not been paid, and of their extreme difficulty, which the mubaka could increase at will, in paying him off completely and on time. Besides, the intervention of the Turco-

mansk apparently necessitated the multiplication of lands of the mukalla'a type, which were gradually confused with the i'jadi's.

It has often been said that the Saljūk introduced in Asia Minor, newly won by the Turks for the Islamic World, the Turco-Muslim system of i'jadi with which their cousins had experimented in the traditional Muslim lands. But ethnic or dynastic kinship was not enough to obliterate the originality of the conditions of the conquest or the difference of the pre-existing indigenous usages. It is certain that when the State of "Rūm" was organized, it was with a particularly extensive state domain; but it is wrong to say that there necessarily resulted a considerable distribution of i'jadi. On the contrary, a careful study of the documentation available gives the impression that i'jadi in Rūm before the Mongol invasion was less defined, less widely distributed and less elaborated than in the neighbouring Muslim countries. The disintegration of the regime, which followed the Mongol conquest, certainly increased the importance of properties on this type. At the same time the State lands, but it also increased the importance of lands held in full ownership at the expense of the old i'jadi. The subsequent Ottoman régime was to give great importance to a related institution, that of the imdār [q.v.], but in the present state of our knowledge we do not know how the transition from the old i'jadi to the new imdār was made. The name imdār, etymologically Persian, but used here with a meaning corresponding to the Greek institution of the pronoia, suggests different antecedents.

In Iran itself, the periodic repetition of conquests and invasions uprooted the developing military aristocracies while they were still in process of formation; the Mongol conquest did still more, in that it partially overturned the institutional system of the conquered country. Nevertheless, once the new régime was established, the Il-khans, facing an economic situation broadly comparable with that of their predecessors and confronted in addition by agricultural decay, were forced in about the year 700/1300 to develop, little by little, analogous institutions. Originally their army had supported itself, in addition to treasures inherited from the states destroyed, on public estates, war booty, the pasture lands which they took for themselves in the conquered lands, and on forced levies. This could not continue when the frontiers and institutions became fixed. In the time of Ghiyath al-Din Khwājāi, it became impossible that non-institutionalized payments from the Treasury and pastureland should suffice. Even the direct assignment of wages from the local treasuries proved insufficient. The Il-khān and his vizier, the famous Rashīd al-Din, then decided to grant the actual districts to the soldiers who would have to manage them and fulfill their military obligations. Thus they approached the system of the Saljūk régime. However, whereas the Saljūk tended to differentiate. In Mongolia, the institution is called suyurgal when it is hereditary, tawuli when it is temporary or tenable for life only. But the vassal principalities and the indigenous populations had retained the term i'jadi, which is also found in use in the administrative texts. Perhaps originally the Mongol words were used more exactly in the case of large grants for the benefit of the Mongol notables, and the i'jadi as smaller grants made over indiscriminately to the military, sometimes to civilians of all kinds. But with the disorganization of the Il-khanid régime, the terms became less and less distinct, the more so since the grants were made for the most part from the important state lands inherited at the time of conquest and added to by the disappearance of numerous indigenous owners. It was further increased because the new military aristocracy, accentuating the work of its predecessors, stripped of all meaning the "rights" of ownership of the existing small proprietors. There came to be no distinction made between what had been i'jadi and what had been mukalla'a, and the two words, thanks to the common root, were often used indiscriminately.

Egypt also posed special problems, and there has been all too often a tendency to regard what was done there as corresponding with the situation elsewhere. This was not so even when, for example, Syria was incorporated into the same state. In Egypt, the traditional, far-reaching control of the state over all aspects of rural life cancelled out, in practice, the significance of the distinction between 'ushr lands and bākārān lands, and, in consequence, the significance of the distinction to be made between the older-style kāfīr and the new i'jadi, as even the contemporaries (Ibn Hawkal, al-Mukaddasi, Ibn Muyassar, etc.) clearly noted. In practice there, what was to be called i'jadi consisted of agricultural lands leased in return for a contractual payment, called here apparently kābālā [q.v.], but corresponding quite closely to the system more generally called mukalla'a (see above) in the Muslim world as a whole. Redistributions took place from time to time, to take account of the fluctuations of yields and expenses. These redistributions implied a certain stability of areas leased and leaseholders, and the vizier al-Afdal, at the beginning of the 6th/12th century, made a specially important one. The arrival of the Turco-Kurdish army of Salah al-Din, accustomed to the institutions inherited from the Saljūk régime, brought about a change in the Egyptian i'jadi system, but not so great a change as has been thought: the i'jadi's of the previous army were transferred to the new one, but henceforth free of all dues. They did not, however, completely escape the control of the administration, and, although certain i'jadi's might be granted on a long-term or even hereditary basis, cases of withdrawal and redistribuc
bution seem to have been just as frequent, not to speak of such systematic revisions as the famous rawk... the East; that it is doubtful a priori whether one may apply to one society concepts drawn from another, and that such

In the Muslim West, the development of the ḥāra was probably in a sense starker than in the East, but ḥāras and institutions were perhaps less clearly differentiated. In Umayyad Spain, apparently, the classic stage of ḥāra has not been passed and in the pre-Almorah Maghrib it was probably the same, save for a certain indistinctness concerning the status of certain lands and the terms designating them. In Ifrikiya the trend towards the fiscal ḥāra certainly appears more clearly, though with these reservations, under the Almohads and particularly the later Hafsids. We must await new studies before we can consider the situation in Marinid Morocco or the Kingdom of Granada, for example.

The remarks often made about oriental "feudalism", on the basis of the institution of ḥāra, justify our concluding with some more general remarks. The verbal and conceptual confusion in which the development of the ḥāra culminates, gives the impression of a sort of hierarchy of rights comparable to that known in European feudal society: at the top the Sultan, below him the great muḥāfaẓa, the provincial governor, then the small military muḥāfaẓa, and finally, with or without the intermediary of local proprietors (who are such only in name), the peasants. In addition, the fact that the senior officers and their men, even those who reached the highest ranks, often had the legal status of slaves or otherwise were clients of various types as having taken some kind of oath of personal obedience, produced alongside the hierarchy of rights over things, a hierarchy of personal obedience, which at its highest level was expressed by the introduction of the name of the Sultan on coins and in the public Friday prayer. But it must be repeated that the full development of this system was relatively rare, and, for example, in Turkey as in Egypt, the connexion between the collection of the ṣakīl and the muḥāfaẓa was direct. Besides, no state ever alienated (far from it) all of its land (in Egypt about a half). With the solid intellectual and administrative traditions of the East, the distinction between public and private rights was never obscured as it was in the West. Whilst in Europe the rebuilding of the social system was attempted on the basis of personal relations, in the East, the notion that all personal power was a delegation of public power remained clear. Even though personal subordination was known in the East, the feudal contract of fealty was never even imagined. Economically, a muḥāfaẓa differed from the Western lord in that he lived in the town and did not have to organize his rural lands with the reser... manner which could have been necessary had he lived there. He conquered the soil, and that is all. The fact that he was often a foreigner might, of course, be very important from various points of view, but this did not modify the structure of the ḥāra, nor, since he was permanently established in the country, the use made of this income. In this sense it is for example incorrect to speak, as has been done, of a "colonial" character of the Mamlūk state.

Even in places and times where the tendency to... number of factors limited the formation of a fully-developed military aristocracy. First of all, a system of law and custom which had been firmly established for generations and was linked in some degree to the Islamic religion itself could hardly be modified at the pleasure of the muḥāfaẓa. The Muslim law of succession, ignoring primogeniture, shared out the inheritance and consequently rapidly weakened the power of great families. Furthermore, the ḥāra, even when the right of inheritance to it was to some extent recognized, was still conditional on service. Otherwise it was replaced by a pension, and in fact quickly annulled. In any case, the resources drawn by rulers from the relative growth of the mercantile economy and from the retention of substantial domains almost always enabled them to buy new slaves with which to bring their former slaves back into line. Finally, no matter how external this factor was, it did happen in the East that the periodic recurrence of foreign invasions and conquests drove out or destroyed the aristocracies in the process of formation in favour of the newcomers, who in addition sometimes had different traditions.

From a very general point of view, the comparison of the development of different societies can still be justified. Nevertheless, it is much less instructive to make this comparison, as our "European-centred" education encourages us to do, between the Muslim countries and the very different society of Europe, than to make the comparison with the neighbouring Byzantine society, where the pronoia presents some obvious points of resemblance to the ḥāra. The development of the pronoia took place a little later. The ḥāra, therefore, owed nothing to the pronoia, and it is impossible to say whether the pronoia owed anything to the ḥāra. Both, however, bear witness to certain requirements of political and economic-social régimes which are, at least in part, comparable. As for the term "feudalism" as applied to the East, it is doubtless too late to attack an established custom, which (even for Europe) is sometimes dangerous. It is necessary only to underline the facts that there are as many differences as there are similarities between European feudalism and the feudalism of the East; that it is doubtful a priori whether one may apply to one society concepts drawn from another, and that such
a transfer cannot be justified by an equivalence between *ibda* and fief—an equivalence which arises only through the confusion of ideas of ill-informed translators.

**Bibliography:** It is obviously impossible to list here all the sources which might be relevant to the history of the *ibda*. Alongside the documents, papyri, inscriptions, etc., they would include almost the whole of the historiographical literature (particularly that of the 4th/10th century, Miskawiyah, Sabi etc.), the geographical literature, etc. References here then are restricted to the administrative treatises, such as Ibn Kirdā of Kudamā and al-Akhdām al-Sulāfinyāy of Māwarzāl for the 'Abbāsī-Būyid period, the Minhdāf fi 'ilm al-khurād of Mārzūmī (see Cl. Cahen, in JESHO, 1963), the Kāwinīn al-dawdawīn of Ibn Māmātī and the Description du Fayyum of Nābulūsi for Fāṭimid and Ayyūbīd Egypt, the Khtāf of Mārzāl and the chancery treatises of Nawayrī (in the Nīkhdī, viii), 'Umarī, Kalkašandī, etc. for the Mamlūk state, and finally the Daudīr al-khurād of Nābūsī and al-Salāfī, of his time. Zadī (i, Baku 1964) for the Mongol régimes of Iran.

**Modern Works:** It is still useful to consult the studies of a few 19th-century pioneers, though we should no longer be guided by them:—Sylvestre de Sacy, Nature et révolution du Droit de propriété en Égypte, 1828, the studies of Worms and Belin, in JA, 1842, 1852, 1870, Tischendorf, Das Lehnen vor moslem. Staaten, 1872, the latter including also the Ottoman Empire, Max Van Berchem, La propriété territoriale et l’impôt foncier sous les premiers Califes, 1886. A new phase of study begins with C. H. Becker, Steuerpacht und Lehnenweisen, in Isl., 1914 (reprinted in his Islamstudien, i, 1924), the first to have made use of the Egyptian papyri, but his conclusions should not be extended to other countries, or always regarded as final even for Egypt. A good résumé of the state of the questions by about 1925 is given in the article *ibda* by Salaboinah in EJ, dealing extensively with the stipulations of the jurists. Further useful information may be found in Pollak, Classification of laws in the Islamic Law, in Amer. J. of Sem. Languages, 1940, and Fr. Lokkegaard, Islamic taxation in the Classical period, Copenhagen 1950. The conclusions of Turkish scholars are presented by M. F. Kopriilī, Le féodalisme turc musulman au Moyen Âge, Communication au Congrès Intern. d’histoire, Zurich 1941, and Osman Turan, Le régime terrien sous les Seljoukides de Rum, in REJ, 1947.

Cl. Cahen has tried to give a more evolutionary historical interpretation of the whole question up to the 13th century in his article *L'évolution de l'qida*, in Annales ESC, 1953, and has discussed the special case of Salğūq Turkey in Pre-Ottoman Turkey, London 1968. A. K. S. Lambton, whose important work, Landlord and Peasant in Persia was published in 1953, took up the question again in a more synthesized form in her Reflexions on the *qida*, in Arabic and Islamic Studies in honour of H. A. R. Gibb, 1965; for Iran and 'Irāk in the 10th century, see also the important article by C. E. Bosworth, Military organisation under the Buyūids, in Oriens, xviii-xix (1967); for the Mongol period, I. P. Petrushevsky, *Zemledelie i agrarnye otnešeniya v Irane XIII-XIV vv.*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1960 (Persian translation by Karim Kishābvārz, Kishāhvārz va masnābāšt-i ard-i Iran 1967).


**IKTIBĀS** means to take a *habas*, a live coal or a light, from another's fire (Kurān XXI, IO; XXVII, 7; LVII, 13); hence to seek knowledge (*ilm*) and, as a technical term in rhetoric, to quote specific words from the Kurān or from Traditions but without indicating these as quoted. Some scholars limit the term to the use of Kurānīc phrases, while others extend it to the use of terminology from *fikr* and other sciences, but all agree that *iktibās* is found both in poetry and in prose. If the source is indicated and the quotation put into verse the figure is called *ʿāhid, binding*. A related figure is *talmīb*, allusion, which consists of alluding to famous passages in the Kurān or Traditions, or in profane literature. The practice of using Kurānīc expressions is often mentioned in works on literary theory, but rules for it and the specific term *iktibās*, instead of the more general *ṭadīm* (q.v.), may not have existed earlier than the 6th/12th century. Suyūtī mentions the existence of a legal controversy over *iktibās*, the Mālikis condemning it outright or allowing it only in prose and the Ṣafīites on the whole allowing it (cf. however Zarkashi, al-Burhān fi ʿulām al-Kurān, Cairo 1376/1957, i, 483-4 on the use of Kurānīc passages as proverbs). Saʿfī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī and, following him, Ibn Ḥijīdā distinguish three categories: praiseworthy, permissible, and objectionable (mardūd) *iktibās*. The last category falls into two sub-categories: (a) the use of Kurānīc passages in which Allāh refers to Himself and (b) the use of the Kurān in frivolous verse (the *ghazal* is not considered as such). Kazwīnī and those following him allow the borrowed phrases to be slightly changed or to be given a different application.

It should be noted that Rādūyānī in his Tarjumān al-Balīghā (ed. A. Ateī, 118-21, 125-7; cf. also 121-5) quotes verses with paraphrases in Persian, and that some writers suggest (though not in their chapters on *iktibās*) that the Kurān itself borrows from, or alludes to, not only the Old and New Testaments, but also pre-Islamic poetry and prose (see Usāma, al-Badī fi nād al-ghīr, Cairo 1380/1960, 284; Ibn al-ʿAlījīr, al-Dhimmī al-habīr, Baghdād 1375/1956, 245-6; Ibn Abī 'l-Isba, Badī al-Kurān, Cairo 1377/1957, 52-3; idem, Taftazam al-Ṭahbīr, Cairo 1383/1963, 180).
[1092] IKTIBAS — IL
Cairo 1358/1939, 166-9, 170-2; idem, al-Itkdn, Calcutta 1857, 262-6; Shuruh al-talkhis, Cairo 1937, iv, 509-14, 525-9; Mehreren, Die Rhetorik der Araber, Copenhagen/Vienna 1853, 138-40, 141-2, 204-2.
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[1092] IKTÎDÎB [see tâbînis; tâhîallas].

IKTİSÂB [see kâfiya].

IKWÂ [see kâfiya].

IL, Arabic orthography of the Turkish word il, more correctly šî, which has undergone a wide semantic development (see Radloff, Versuch ..., i, 805-5, 1421). (1) As defined by V. Thomsen as signifying, in its numerous occurrences in the Orkhon inscriptions: “un peuple ou une réunion de peuples considérés comme formant un tout indépendant et organisé et ayant à sa tête un kagan” (Inscriptions de l’Orkhon déchiffrées, Helsingfors 1896, 135), and thus approximately “empire”. In this sense it often appears in conjunction with the word budun (i.e. budûnum), “confederate” (cf. English: “lawful customs” (occurrences collected and discussed by R. Giraud, L’Empire des Turcs Célestes, Paris 1960, 67-72). It is presumably in this sense that it appears as an element in such Turkish regnal titles as il-êrîsh, il-etmîsh, il-tutmîsh (A. Caferoglu, “un peuple ou une réunion de peuples considérés comme formant un tout indépendant et organisé et ayant à sa tête un kagan” (see TADJNIS; TAKHALLUS).

(2) At an early period the word acquired the notion of “district over which authority is exercised”, so that Mahmûd Kâshghari gives the definition (ed. Kılıslî Rifai, i, 49; cf. tr. B. Atalay, i, 48): il-wildya: yuvâl minku ‘beş âlı ay wîldyat al-âmîr. Hence, in the sense “district, territory”, it appears as the first element in the Turkish personal names Il-âldî, Il-begi, Il-ghazî, etc.; and in Ottoman times very frequently as the second element of place-names, most notably in Rûm-âli (“Romelia”), a calque of “Romania”, “Byzantine territory [in Europe]” (see P. Witteke, Le Sultan de Rûm, in Ann. de l’Inst. de Phil. et d’Hist. Or. et Slaves, vi (1938), 361-90, esp. 377 f.), and also commonly for smaller territories, e.g., il-ii (q.v.). In such cases the first element is usually a personal name, so that the toponyms signify sometimes “territory conquered by so-and-so” (thus Kodja-îli (q.v.) is the region conquered by the ghâzi hero Aýçi Kodja (F. Giese, ed., Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken, i, Text), Breslau 1922, p. 13, lines 24-5); and the current names Aydın, Menteşe, etc. for the 8th/i4th century Anatolian emirates stand for Aydın-ili, Menteshe-ili, etc., the “language reform” movement, the word il was coined to replace kâza (so ibâb for valî, and iðçebây for kaymakâm).

(3) The word acquired also the sense of “people”, at first (apparently) in a hendiadys with the (?synonym kîrûn = “folk”). The hendiadys is a common expression in old Ottoman, in the form el gûn, also el u gûn (see TTS, i, ii, iv, s.v. il gûn), and survives in some fixed locations (see the discussion by F. Rundgren, in Orientalia Suecana, xvi (1967), 190-2), in modern Turkish el alone signifies rather “other people”, i.e., “strangers” (Türkçe Sözlük, s.v. el (II), with examples; cf. eldem, in which the first element is not the Arabic definite article but T. el + A. âlim). In Persia the word was used of “tribesfolk” (synonym: ulus (q.v.), having a quasi-Arabic plural ilâlî (q.v.).

(4) At an early period the word meant also “peace” (G. Doerfer considers this to be the original meaning), cf. Mahmûd Kâshghari, i, 50 = tr. B. Atalay, i, 49 (al-sulh bayn al-malikayn); from this derives perhaps elîs (q.v.), “ambassador” (i.e., “negotiator of peace”); cf. O. Turan, in Turan, vii-viii (1942), 197; and cf. Abû Hayyân, K. al-Idrîk, ed. A. Caferoglu, Istanbul 1934, 20: al-rastûl âldâdî yasîlîl al-sulh), and the Ottoman term ilîs, which may be both adjectival, “who has accepted peace”, i.e., (?) belonging to the Dâr al-sulh (q.v.) (cf. E. Zachariadou, in Diámeta, i (Athens 1966), at 212, where ilîs kâfîler, in a document of 870/1465, refers to the inhabitants of Patmos), and also quasi-nominal, “territory acknowledging [Ottoman] suzerainty” (cf. Mehmed 3’ârî’s introduction, page dâlî, to the so-called “Kânânâmé of Süleyman I”, “îdârê to TOEM, Istanbul 1329; the converse is yaghîlî, see text p. 24).

(5) By the 7th/i13th century the word had become current in Persian, with the meaning “submissive, obedient” (Rashld al-Din uses the expressions il kârdan, “to bring into obedience”, and il gûdan, “to submit”); from this usage arose the title Il-khân for the Mongol rulers of Persia as being subordinate to the Great Khân (see Hâdîdî); and from the adjective was formed the Persian abstract noun iî, “submission”. In Ottoman Turkish usage too el may be adjectival, both as a “Persian” loanword (e.g., Tursun, p. 157, i, 3: il u mûnhâd) and as a “Turkish” word meaning “state, province” (as opposed to towns). For the expression il-dîzn, apparently implying amân (q.v.), see V. L. Ménage, in S. M. Stern (ed.), Documents from Islamic chancelleries, Oxford 1965, 96-8.

Bibliography: besides the references in the article, see G. Doerfer, Türkische und Mongolische Elemente in persischen Bezeichnungen, ii, Vienna 1936, nos. 653 (il), 656, 657, 661, with full references to the literature, and H. H. Zarinezade, Fars dilinde Azerbaycan sözleri, Baku 1962, 169 ff. (ED.)
ILAL — ILAH

ILAL, Kur'anic term (CVI, 1-2) which probably refers to economic relations entered into by the Kurayshis well before the advent of Islam, which presents problems of reading and interpretation which are not easily solved.

In the first place, this Sūra CVI, which is very short and certainly very early (no. 3 in the classification by R. Blachère), begins abruptly, after the *basman*, with the words *li-ildf* Kurayshī *ila* firmih rihat... *’l-ghidā* wa *’l-sayif*, which may be translated as: "because of the *ildf* of the Kurayshīs, [their] *ildf* of the journey of winter and of summer (let them worship the Lord of this Temple who has protected them against hunger and sheltered them from a fear)". But in the corpus of Ubayy, this Sūra was not separated from the preceding one, which deals with the fate inflicted by God on the *Ashāb al-Fīl* and appeared as a logical continuation of it: "Has thou not seen how thy Lord has treated the man of the Elephant... because of the *ildf* of the Kurayshīs..." (see Rs. 1031). Nevertheless, the preposition *li-* may also have the force of a final conjunction "in order that the *ildf* [may be possible]...". Finally the "readers" of the Kurān hesitate between *ildf*, *ildf*, and *ild*, which indicates that these verses did not seem very clear to the redactors of the Kurān, just as they later/proceeded to confuse exegists and translators (R. Blachère suggests three possible translations, but always translated *ildf* as "entente"; M. Hamidullah: "pact"; A. J. Arberry: "composing").

It is not certain that the word *ildf* has the same meaning in each of the two verses; in fact it really seems to have the force of a noun in the first and of a verb in the second, so that *ildf* Kurayshī can be regarded as a set expression and *ila* firmih rihat... as an equivalent to *tadhir*: "their organization of a caravan...".

Nevertheless, *ildf* had acquired a very precise connotation, and the lexicographers give this term the meaning of *ahd, dīhām, amān*, that is: "pact guaranteeing safety, safe-conduct, undertaking to protect"; the customary expression is *al-aḥadh il-ildf*, "to conclude an *ildf*".

 Tradition relates that the Kurayshīs had concluded with foreign peoples acts which guaranteed them freedom of trade, and it is Ḥāshim b. ’Abd Manāf (q.v.) who is credited with having obtained from the emperor of Byzantium authorization to send a caravan regularly into Syria and the assurance that it would come to no harm. His brothers, ’Abd Shams, al-Muttaṣīlī and Nawfal, had concluded similar pacts with the Negus, the Himyar rulers of the Yemen, and the king of Persia respectively; these four pacts which guaranteed them protection against hunger and sheltered them from a fear. It is not certain that the word *ildf*, as a triliteral, is no deity" (cf. Zamakhshari, Kashâkhāf, e.g., 227, and in XXVIII, 70, Ḥawa *’l-ildf* is la Ḥawa *’l-ildf*, "he is the deity other than whom there is no deity" [cf. Kashâkhāf, 1064], in which the juxtaposition of al-ildf/illf/īlāh is noteworthy.

*īlāh* is certainly identical with *īlāh* and represents an expanded form of an element -i*†* (i, et) common to the Semitic languages (see Enc. Biblica, i, col. 3323 ff.; Brown-Driger-Briggs, Hebr. Lex., 42 f.; Genesis-Buhl, Hebr. und aram. Wörterbuch, u.v.; Fleischer, Kleinere Schriften, i, 15 ff.; T. Fahd, Le Panthéon de VArabie centrale, Paris 1968, 41, and bibliography there given). The Arab philologists discussed at great length the etymology of the words *īlāh, al-ildh*, and *al-lidhl* (see al-Rāzī, al-Bulāqī; Genesius-Buhl, s.v.; Genesius-Buhl, 42 f., and bibliography there given). The Arab philologists discussed at great length the etymology of the words *īlāh, al-ildh*, and *al-lidhl* (see al-Rāzī, al-Bulāqī). The Basrans established no direct connexion between *īlāh* and *al-lidhl*, regarding the latter either as formed spontaneously (murtagil) or as *lāh* (from the root *lyh*) preceded by the article. Some held that *īlāh* was a loan from Syriac or Hebrew, but most regarded *īlāh* as a derivative (munkhs, munkhs), a contraction of al-ildhīl, and endeavored to attach *ildf* to a triliteral root; to explain it (see also al-Bayāḏwī, ed. Fleischer, i, 4), some ten derivations were suggested, from the following "roots":

1. *il* "to adore", but as al-Zamakhshārī pointed out (Kashākhāf, 8), the verb *alāh* is derived from the noun; *alāh*, "to be perplexed, confounded", for the mind is confounded in the experience of knowing Allāh (alāhī has the same meaning); *alāhī alāh*, "to turn to for protection, or to seek peace, or in long ing" (alāhī has a similar meaning); (2) *lyh*, which hence *lāh* "to be lofty" and *īlāh* ("the statues") of the *Baṣrians*; (3) *alāh* hence *lāh*, "to create"; (4) *rul* and *yul*, roots conveying the idea of "priority"; (5) Abū ‘l-Baṣṣār al-Kaffawi, Kulliyāyat al-ulām, Bālāk 1953, 69, regards the word Allāh as formed from
Ilah, the "noun of majority" and pronoun of the 3rd person, and the lam of possession.

On the other hand, lexicographers have pointed out that the terminations -il in some South Arabic proper names indicates the deity; on this question, see G. Ryckmans, *Les noms propres sud-sémitiques*, Louvain 1934-5, *passim*; for -i in the South Arabic inscriptions, see A. Jamme, *Le Panthéon sud-arabe présislamique d'après les sources épigraphiques*, in *Le Muson*, lx (1947), 57-147.

**Bibliography:** In the article.

(D. E. Macdonald*)

**ILAHABAD** [see ALLAHABAD].

**ILAH,** term used in Turkey of a genre of popular poetry of religious inspiration, consisting of poems sung—without instrumental accompaniment—in chorus or solo during certain ceremonies; the *ilahi* is thus distinguished from all other types of popular religious poetry by its melody and its use in ritual. Many texts not originally intended as *ilahis* may have become so later through the addition of an appropriate melody and been introduced in ceremonies which require the chanting of *ilahis.*

*Ilahis* were sung mainly at sessions of *dhikr* in the convents (*tekke*) of the mystic orders; as much by their rhythm as by their words, they encouraged the participants to reach a state of exaltation. But in more or less secular milieus and circumstances, *ilahis* are used as poetic and musical elements in various popular ceremonies. They are sung on the following occasions: as interludes during the relation of the story of the birth of the Prophet Muhammad, the *Mevlid* (*Mawlid* [q.v.]); on commemorative occasions; as a choral chant by pupils escorting a new pupil to his first lesson in a Kur'an school; by the procession accompanying the bridgegroom, on the last evening of the wedding celebrations, from the mosque to the nuptial chamber; during the ceremonies which take place on the departure of pilgrims to Mecca (and on their return).

Versions which have descended into children's folklore are also used to accompany the begging which takes place at the time of certain feasts: in the region of Çankiri these childish parodies of *ilahis* are known as *meneçim* (< *minâdçâj*); at Mudurnu (in the province of Bolu) these children's *ilahis* have lost all their serious meaning and have acquired humorous and farcical elements. Not only in these much debased forms, but also in the versions which still preserve their original function, *ilahis* have always been subject to a process of "folklorization," the cause of this being oral transmission and the extensive additions to the texts to which even the written versions are subject. Many *ilahis* which were initially the works of known poets have with time become anonymous; progressive deterioration has taken place, and the texts of various different authors amalgamated with one another, with the result that new "folklore" versions have been created.

The earliest surviving *ilahis* are by Yunus Emre (q.v.) (d. circa 1320). During the following centuries, the repertory of *ilahis* was enlarged by the works of many popular poets of religious and mystic inspiration; the most famous are: a poet (or more than one poet?) with the name of Yunus (9th/10th or 10th/11th century) whose *ilahis* are often confused with those of the early Yunus; Hâdîdî Bayram (d. 833/1429-30), Eshefoglu Rûmî (d. 874/1469-70), İbrahim Gülsenli (d. 940/1533-34), Üfâde (d. 988/1580-1), Seyfullâh Nişâmî (d. 1010/1602-2), Mubîyl (d. 1020/1611), Hüdâyî (d. 1034/1624-5), Hîmet (d. 1095/1683-4), Nîyâzî Mûsî (d. 1105/1694). These poets were all dervishes or *ilahis* belonging to mystic orders. The *ilahis* became part of the ritual of the orders of Sunnite tendency. In the ritual of the Mevlevîs as well as in that of the orders and sects of Şî'î-Âalawî tendency, the chants performing the same functions as the *ilahis* are more differentiated and are referred to by special terms.

Manuscript collections of *ilahis* have survived with an indication of only the mode and the rhythm of the melodies. Similarly, at the beginning of this century there existed lithographed copies of these collections, for the use of school-children. It is impossible to date the composition of the music of the earliest *ilahis*. It is known that, like popular poetry on secular subjects, the religious popular poetry was composed at the same time as the melody which was to accompany it; a certain number of melodies which have survived may be of the same age as their texts, and perhaps also by the same author. The names of some composers (of the melody only) of *ilahis* from the beginning of the 18th century are known; Çâlkânzâde (d. 1130/1718), Tosunzâde (d. 1127/1715), Hâmidzâde, Abidî àlîzâde (d. 1262/1846). The musical notation of the *ilahis* began to be printed in the first quarter of this century; a fair number of melodies have been transcribed by Seyyid Abdulâkîdî and Ra'îf Yekîte (d. 1935).

A modern Turkish composer, Adnan Saygun, has written an oratorio inspired by *ilahis* (*Yûnus Emre, oratorio en trois parties*, op. 26; Fr. tr. of texts of the poems published in Paris, 1947); of 13 poems sung in this work, several of which are very popular *ilahis*, 5 are by Yunus Emre (and thus of the 7th/13th century) and 8 are texts attributed to him.

ILAHI BAKHSH “MA‘ROF” — ILAT 1095

ILAHI BAKHSH “MACRUF”, Urdu poet, born c. 1156/1743, was the youngest son of Mirza ‘Arif Djan, the younger brother of Shahr al-Dawla Kāsim Djan (grandson of the emperor Dhu ‘l-Fakhr al-Dawla Nadîjā Khan (a street in old Delhi, Galī Kāsim Djan, is still named after Shahr al-Dawla; in it once resided many famous men, such as the Urdu-Persian poet Ghâlib [q.v.], Shâykh Fâkhr al-Din, the spiritual guide of the last Mughal emperor Bahâdur Shâh “Zafar” [q.v.], and the physician Ra’s al-Ātibba’ Muhammed Sharîf Khan, great-grandfather of Shifa’ al-Mulk Ḥakim A’dâjl Khan, d. 1227). He claimed descent from Ahmed Wâfiz and Muhammad Sharîf Khan, is al-Atibba’ (governor of a part of which place he frequently visited). As a reward for his military services, rendered first to Shah Muhammed Shâh and then resident in Lucknow. Although his grandfather, Khâlid al-Din Cishtî [q.v.], was 38 years of age, so that Ma‘rûf was disenchanted of the latter’s having close friendly relations with Ma‘rûf). (A. S. Bazmee Ansari)


ILÂHIYYAT (see ‘MAR‘ÎD)

I LAT. The word ‘ilâh (“god”) (pi. ‘alâhû), first used in Persian in Ilkhânid times, denotes nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes. ‘Ashkâl, kabbîl and tawdîf
are also used in this sense, and for tribes generally, whether strictly speaking nomadic or not. The combination *ilāt* and *asāḥ* is a phrase frequently encountered in medieval and modern times, and suggests that the two terms are broadly synonymous. In medieval times *ilāt* also occurs in conjunction with *ušā*, i.e., tribal followers, and *uymah*.

From early times the population of many parts of Persia has derived its living from pastoral agriculture, and was accustomed to take its flocks in summer to nearby pastures. Such groups, although they lived in summer in tents, were not properly speaking nomadic, though they were sometimes in a state of semi-nomadism. Instead, the keeping of flocks and a tribal structure of society were among the characteristics of nomadic groups, but neither was confined to them. What distinguished them from, and placed them over against, the settled population was the absence of settled villages and their seasonal migration whether for short or long distances. There were however also semi-nomadic groups, whose leaders lived part of the year in settled villages or towns, and who led a few of their number either in their summer or winter quarters, or both. In some parts of the country, the adoption of pastoral nomadism a larger population was able to adapt itself to climatic conditions than would otherwise have been the case. But it is not clear how early such practices became important on the Persian plateau as distinct from Transoxania and Central Asia. From Sal̲djūk times onwards, and more particularly after the Mongol invasion, the balance between the settled and the semi-settled elements of the population was a delicate one. Apart from a constant seepage of population from the nomad areas into the settled, drought and local over-population within Persia and beyond its frontiers in Central Asia led to major and minor movements into the settled areas by nomads. Whenever the nomad population and its flocks rose above the level which could be maintained by the available pasture, either because of natural increase or lack of rainfall, there would be a movement, violent or otherwise, into the settled areas.

We know little of the nomadic tribes of pre-Islamic Persia, but pastoral life was almost certainly important. The capitals of the Achaemenids, Parthians, Arsacids, and Sassanians were seasonal, and it is probable that the majority of the population were accompanied by flocks and that round their capitals there were large tented encampments. They had presumably in their armies some nomadic tribal contingents, but it is unlikely that they depended to the same extent as the Sal̲djūks and later Turkish dynasties on nomadic or semi-nomadic tribal support. From about A.D. 300 the Sassanians attempted to defend themselves from predatory incursions by the nomads from the Arabian steppe by an alliance with the semi-nomadic Lakhmid rulers of al-Hira (see *Ilāt*, iii: Pre-Islamic Arabia).

Although we have more information on nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes in Persia in Islamic times, it is nevertheless often difficult to trace their history and movements in detail. Their numbers were constantly changing: some prospered while others dwindled or became settled. Many of the tribes have eponymous ancestors, but their inter-relationship is complicated by alliances and intermarriages among their leaders, sometimes in settlement of blood feuds. Strong tribes attracted to themselves others, which they absorbed or with which they formed a federation, the various tribes of which might later break up and become regrouped in new federations. There was also deliberate fragmentation and settlement of tribes by different rulers in outlying parts of the empire, while the grant of land to their leaders in return for military or other services led to their dispersal throughout the country.

Leaving aside ethnological, anthropological, and sociological criteria, it will be convenient to divide the nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes in Islamic times into three broad groups: Arab; Turkomān and Turkish; and those which are neither Arab nor Turkush and were already settled in Persia at the time of the conquest. Of these three the last two are the most important in terms of numbers and continuing influence. The last includes the Kurds (*gūrūh*), Lurs (*gīrūh*), Bahaʿ (*gūrūh*). Dīlī, who were, however, cultivators and shepherds rather than nomads (cf. Ibn Hawkal, ii, 376), and others. The Kurds were the most numerous. They were tribal, partly living in villages and partly semi-nomadic. The Lurs appear to have been mainly settled until Timurid times. Neither were confined to Persia. The Kurds spread north-westwards into Syria, and in modern times are found in Persia, Turkey, Iraq, and Syria. Shībāb al-Dīn *Umari* mentions Lurs in Egypt and Syria in the 8th/14th century.

The early Islamic geographers in their descriptions of Persia give, on the whole, a picture of a settled and prosperous agricultural community, practising pastoral and arable farming, with well-developed handicrafts. They mention much pasture land. Ibn Hawkal, for example, states that the most widespread occupation in the Dībāl was the raising of sheep (*al-aqūḥām*, ii, 372-3). Little mention, however, is to be found in their pages of specifically nomadic groups, apart from those in Central Asia, either because these were outside their experience, or because, as seems more probable, they were less important and numerous than was to be the case later. It seems, indeed, fairly clear that the decline in settlement which occurred in Persia was brought about, not by the Arabs or the Sal̲djūks, but by the Mongols. The early geographers and historians refer to nomadic and semi-nomadic groups by the generic term *al-akrād*, by which they mean not necessarily people of Kurdish race but non-Arab and non-Turkish tent dwellers and herdsmen. Thus, Tabāri, under the years 23 and 29, calls the tribes of the Zagros the *Balaʿ*, who were accompanied by flocks and herds of camels and sheep (ii, 446); and Hasan b. Muhammad al-Kummi speaks of the *ahrād* of *Tabaristān*, "who are a group (**gurāḥ**) of Daylamites" (Zaʿīrī-Ḥ Ḳummt, (ed. Sayyid *Djalal* al-Dīn Tehrānī, Tehran 1934, p. 261)).

The main concentration of nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes in Persia in the early centuries seems to have been in the area between Kūhīzāstān and Išfahān and Fārs. Ištāḥkhrī (followed by Ibn Hawkal and others) mentions five tribal districts in Fārs, which he calls *rumām* (sing. *ramm*). Yākūt defines these as districts and quarters inhabited by Kurds (*makhāl al-akrād wa maqdmāškum*), see Barbier de Meynard, *Geographie de la Perse*, p. 263). The largest of these was the *Dijūla* (Kūhīgīlūa), also called the *ramm al-rumādīn*, which extended from Kūhīzāstān to Išfahān, and was bounded by Ištāḥkhrī, Shāpur, Ardājad, and Baydā. All the towns and villages in it came under the tax administration of Išfahān. The other districts were the *ramm al-Ḥāmid b. Layvī* (also called the *ramm al-Lawāldīān*), which was situated in the *kūra* of Ardāshīr Khūra,
the ramm of Ḫusayn b. Ṣāliḥ (also called the ramm al-diwdn), which was in the kura of Shapur, the ramm of Bahrāyīn (also called the ramm al-Bāsinjān), which was bordered by Sīf of the Banū al-Ṣaffār, the ramm al-Bāsinjān, Kirmān, and Ardashīr Khūra. According to Istāqkhārī, the inhabitants of these districts wandered in search of pastures in winter and summer “in the fashion of the Arabs” except for a few who remained in the summer season and made themselves independent. They numbered 500,000 tents, each of which could provide from one to ten men, counting herdsmen, hired men, and followers. Istāqkhārī adds a rider, however, to the effect that an accurate assessment of their numbers could only be obtained from the sadaqa registers. It was said that they comprised more than a hundred tribes, but Istāqkhārī himself knew of only thirty. They were numerous, brave, and strong in men, beasts, and horses. The government found it difficult if it wanted to reduce them or to assert itself against them. They owned sheep and mares but few camels. Their cattle were excellent but only those from Bāsinjān had good horses. Their method of herding was like that of the Arab and Turkish tribes. It was claimed that they were originally Arabs. Within each of these rūmām there were towns and villages. The khorṣīd was farmed by the leader of each ramm, who was responsible for the safety of caravans, guarded the roads and carried on the affairs of the temporal government (pp. 97-9, 113). Idrīsī, writing in the 6th/12th century, has a broadly similar, but rather brief, account. He mentions only four rūmām, omitting that of al-Kāriyān. He adds that the Kurdish tribes which frequented the country, the Khūva (?) and the Yazīd, numbered 500 families and that each tribe could put about 1,000 horse in the field. Quoting Ibn Durayd, he states that they were descended from the Banū Mzarr, Banū ʿUmar, and Banū ʿAmir (i, 406-7).

The leaders of the tribes, and perhaps the tribesmen also, apparently owned landed estates. Istāqkhārī states that the estates (al-ṭayyār) held by the tribal people (ahl al-rūmām) paid tax by mukāsama, according to charters (šukūd) which they held from “All b. Khālid” and the khāṣṭār (disorders) of the caliphs, paying one-tenth, one-third, one-quarter, and so on (p. 158). Ibn Hawkal gives a slightly different account. He says that the tribal districts (rūmām) were assessed by contract (mukāsama), estimation (ʿibrā), or by a share of the crop (mukāsama). In the last case, the tax was levied in one of two ways: if the estate was in the hands of tribesmen (kaum min ahl al-rūmām) or others who had a charter from “All, ʿUmar, or a governor appointed by the caliph, they paid one-tenth to one-third. If the villages had been taken possession of by the treasury because of disorders committed by the owners, or for some other reason, the cultivators paid one-fifth according to agreements concluded with them (ii, 302-3).

Ibn Balkhī, the author of the Fārs-nāma, alleges that the nomads (ḥurān) of Fārs, who had formed the flower of the Sasanian army, had all been killed during the Islamic invasion. The nomads who inhabited Fārs in his day were descended from a group whom the Buyid ʿĀḍud al-Dawla (d. 372/982) had brought to Fārs from ʿIsfahān. Ibn Balkhī knows these nodamic groups by the name of Shābānkārā. They presumably replaced or absorbed the earlier rūmām. In Ibn Balkhī’s time (he dedicated the Fārs-nāma to Muḥammad b. Malīkghāb, d. 311/1127) Fārs suffered much from disorders and raids at the hands of the tribes, until the Ābāgbālī Cawli, to whom Muḥammad b. Malīkghāb assigned Fārs, brought order to the province after several engagements with the rebels. According to Ibn Balkhī’s account, the Shābānkārā, who comprised five tribes or groups, had originally been herdsmen and wood-cutters in Fārs. On the disintegration of the Buyid rule, their power had increased, until finally Fāḍlūya, the leader of the Rāmān, the most powerful of the five tribes, was reduced and made himself independent, and was reduced from the Buyids an allowance. Subsequently Kāwūrūd was sent by Alp Arslān to reduce Fārs to order. Fāḍlūya was unable to resist and went back to Alp Arslān’s court. He was sent back to Fārs with a contract to farm the revenue of the province. He rebelled again and was besieged by a Saljuq army under Nizām al-Mulk and captured. He escaped and renewed his rebellion, to be eventually hunted down and caught (Fārs-nāma, ed. S. Le Strange and R. A. Nicholson, G.M.S., 1962, pp. 164, 166; Ḥāmid b. Zarkūb, Shīrāz-nāma, ed. Bahman Karimī, Tehran, 1931-2, pp. 38-9).

Of the five groups, Ibn Balkhī states that the Īsmāʿīlī, who had settled in Dāshī-i Urd after the Islamic conquest, were the noblest. Tāsh Farrāsh, Masʿūd b. Muḥammad’s general, expelled them from the region of ʿIsfahān; they first wandered southwards, and then, under pressure from the Buyids, westwards, and settled near Dārbāghīr. Internecine strife weakened them, enabling Fāḍlūya to interfere in their affairs (Fārs-nāma, 164-5; Shīrāz-nāma, 37-8). The Karzūbī were also shepherds. At the end of the Buyid period they obtained possession of Kāzirūn and the neighbourhood until Cawli dispossessed them. The Masʿūdī were an obscure group whom Fāḍlūya raised up. Rukan al-Dīn Khurāṣṭegīn, the Shāfī governor of Fārs, gave them ṭalās. They subsequently obtained possession of Fīrūzābād and most of Shapur Khūra. Finally they were subdued by Cawli (Fārs-nāma, 167). The fifth group, the Shākkānī, were mountain dwellers, living in the mountains of the garmsīr. They were alleged to be an evil people, committing highway robbery. Cawli reduced them also (Fārs-nāma, 167). In later times little is heard of the Shabankara. Either they became extinct, or they failed to recover from the losses inflicted on them by Cawli and ceased to have an independent existence. It may well be that they were absorbed by the Lurs, who increased in importance during the 6th/12th century.

The eponymous founder of the Lur-i Buzurg [q.v.], was Abū`l-Ḥasan Fāḍlūya, a Kurd living in Djalāl Sumak in Syria. Some of his descendants migrated through Mayāfārīqīyān and Ābāgbālīyān to north of Ushtrān Kūh, where they arrived about 500/1006. Their chief, Abū Tahir b. `All b. Muḥammad, distinguished himself in the service of the Salghūrī Sunkūr (543-56) in an expedition against the Shābānkārā, and was given as a reward the Kūhgilūyā and sent to conquer Luristān. He later quarrelled with Sunkūr and made himself independent. At the beginning of the 7th century, the Buyid tribes from Syria joined his son, Ḥāzārāsp. These included two Arab tribes, the ʿUkaylī (ʿĀlīlī and Ḥāshimī, and twenty-eight others, among whom were the Bahgāyarīs, Djaṃwānī, Gotwand, Lārāw, and Māmāsītī [?Mamansīn, see Bidlīsī, Sharaf-nāma, Cairo n.d., pp. 44 ff., and LUR]. In consequence of these movements, the Shīls were displaced and moved to Fārs (Ta`ṣīl-e Gūzīdā, pp. 537-9; see LUR-I BUZURG).
Mention is also made by the early geographers of tribal groups in Kirman, which appear to have been semi-nomadic. The Khufs (Kuc) and Balus (semi-nomadic or nomadic tent-dwellers) and that they were harried by the semi-nomadic or nomadic tent-dwellers (p. 471). Ibn Hawkal states that they lived on the frontiers of Manijdan and Hurmuz and that they were a branch (sinf) of the Kurds (i.e. semi-nomadic or nomadic tent-dwellers) and that they themselves claimed to be of Arab origin and to number some 10,000 men. The temporal government gave them allowances to keep them quiet. In spite of this they committed highway robbery and were a perpetual menace to communication between Kirman and the desert of Sistan and the frontiers of Fars. Their power was destroyed by the Buyid malik and they were dispersed (ii, 309-10). According to I斯塔khr they were Shifi (p. 167). The Hudad al-salam states that the inhabitants of the Kufidj mountains were divided into seven tribes, each under its own chief, and that the government tax-collectors did not go into these mountains, the chiefs paying an annual sum by mukafa'a (p. 124). Istaqhari and Ibn Hawkal make similar statements, but add that the Kufs had flocks and black tents like bedouins, and were pacific and did not molest travellers (I斯塔khr, 164; Ibn Hawkal li, 310); and that they were Shifs (167, ii, 312). Ibn Hawkal also mentions camel owning nomads or herdsmen in the neighbourhood of Khwah (ii, 313). In Saladin times Kauwir succeeded in establishing some measure of control over the Kufs and Balu6, confining the former to the mountain districts between Bam and Djuruf (see Afdal al-Din, Ibd al-ala, ed. *Ali Mohammad 'Amiri Nami, Tehran 1932-3, p. 66). With the influx into Kirmán of more Ghuzz after the death of Sandjar, the Balu6 appear to some extent to have been displaced and pushed further to the east.

As for the Arab tribes in Khuzistan and along the Persian Gulf littoral, the majority came with the 5th/nth century to the Balkans via the Black Sea, while a fourth and larger group, partly settled, remained in the region of the Sîr Darya (Faruk Sunem, Oflalar (Türkmendeler), Ankara 1967). Legend represents the Ghuzz as being divided into twenty-four tribes. Twenty-two, with their touches, were known to Mahmûd Kâshkâhârî, but only the Khul (to whom the Saljuqs belonged), Iva, Dûger, Yaghma, Salghur, and Aivyhr (Afsahr) appear before the Mongol period. Raqût al-Din mentions twenty-four tribes, but his list is not identical with that of Mahmûd Kâshkâhârî (C. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, London 1969). The Saljuqs, although they became the leaders of a nomadic tribal migration, were nevertheless familiar with urban life and Islamic civilization. From the beginning they had settled capitals and do not appear to have lived in tented encampments apart from the local population as did the Mongol Ilkâhns—at least not to the same extent. Most of the independent or semi-independent Ghuzz bands who came to Persia were undisciplined and their activities unco-ordinated. The difference between their leaders and the Saljuqs was that the latter, on the whole, exercised control over their followers. Tughril Beg [q.v.] and Alp Arslân [q.v.] showed themselves to be competent commanders and rulers. Adopting the pattern of government existing in the lands of the Eastern Caliphate, they brought to it new interpretations from their tribal background (see further A. K. S. Lambton, 'The internal structure of the Saljuq empire' in The Cambridge History of Iran, v, Cambridge 1968, 203-82). On the whole, the Saljuq invasion brought remarkably little dislocation, and not more than that caused by the movement of government troops in the late Ghaznavid period. The numbers involved were not large—perhaps no more than tens of thousands. The coming
of the Saldjûks with their flocks may, in fact, have been beneficial to the country, so far as these provided meat and milk products to provision the towns, wool and skins for industry, and fertilized the stubble fields they grazed. Their herds of camels may also have been useful in providing additional transport for merchandise.

There is little evidence to show that the Ghuzz tribes came into conflict with other tribal and nomadic groups, except the Kurds and the bedouins in Western Âghanbâyjân and Upper Mesopotamia. There, indeed, the Ghuzz who were opposed. Settlement probably took place at first only on the lower slopes of the Kurdish mountains. At a later period there were conflicts between the Saldjûks on the one hand and the Şhabânkâra and the Kufs on the other, as stated above, but these arose from the attempt of the Saldjûks, who by this time had become the rulers of an empire, to assert the authority of the central government. They were not conflicts between rival nomadic groups over the possession of pastures. In general, the Ghuzz tribes do not appear to have established themselves—at least to any large extent—in areas such as Fârs, Luristân, the Kufs mountains, Tabaristan, or Kurdistân where there was already a tribal and semi-nomadic population. This raises the problem, which cannot be answered in our present state of knowledge, of whether their intrusion elsewhere brought about a contraction of the area under arable farming or whether they mainly utilized land which was not being fully exploited by the existing population for either arable or pastoral farming.

Once the Saldjûks had become the masters of an empire, they were forced to find a more stable basis of power than that provided by the Ghuzz tribes. Increasingly they depended for their military forces and for provincial governors on Turkish slaves and freedmen who had become separated from their nomadic tribal background. Considerable bodies of Ghuzz (or "Turkomans" as the Muslim Ghuzz who had entered the dâr al-tâlam are usually called in the Arabic and Persian sources) were, however, still to be found in the country, although the general tendency was for them to move in a westerly direction towards Syria and Asia Minor. Apart from these, the lands of the Ghuzz were reduced to the areas of Western Mesopotamia, Gurgân, Marv, and Âghanbâyjân, with some minor settlements in Khûzestân, Fârs, and elsewhere. The fact that many of their leaders were officers of the sultan enabled them, when the central government weakened, to transform themselves rapidly into local rulers. One of the most notable cases is that of the Artûkîs (q.v.).

Under Sandjâr, the Turkomans in Gurgân, Dihis-tân, and Marv were administered by a shîhna (q.v.) appointed by the sultan, who allotted to their leaders pasture and water according to the number of their tents, and through whom they referred to the government. They paid pasture dues and a due for the office of shîhna ("Atabat al-kababa, ed. Muhammad Kazwînî and ʿAbbâs ʿIkbâl, Tehran 1950, 8-12, 84-5). The grant of special allowances (nâhpâra) to the Turkomans is frequently mentioned. Nîzâm al-Mulk seems to have assumed that they would receive such, and recommended that numbers of them should be kept at court, some for military service and some as hostages for the good behaviour of their fellows. By the end of the reign of Sandjâr the grant of allowances to the Turkomans in Khûrâsân was probably primarily to assure their good behaviour rather than to reward them for military or other services—though it is clear that the Saldjûks, like other dynasties, employed the nomadic tribes, Turkomans and others, in their armies as auxiliaries.

By the middle of the 6th/12th century the Khîtâb conquest of Transoxiana was causing unrest among the Ghuzz who had remained in Central Asia, and it became increasingly difficult for the Saldjûk government to control those who were living on its borders. Their relations with Sandjâr illustrate both the difficulty experienced by a settled government in subjecting the nomads to control, and also the lack of understanding which characterized the relations between the settled population and the nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes. Disputes over the annual tribute in sheep due from the Ghuzz to the sultan's treasury and malpractices over its collection eventually led to a collision between Sandjâr's forces and the Ghuzz. An engagement took place in 548/1153. Sandjâr was captured and Khûrâsân pillaged (see further A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and peasant in Persia, 58-9). In due course Sandjâr escaped captivity but was unable to restore control. After his death in 552/1156 more Ghuzz came into Khûrâsân. Some, under Malîk Dinâr, took possession of Kîrmân. These Ghuzz did not succeed in establishing an empire, as had the Saldjûks, and in contra-distinction to them brought about much devastation and dislocation (see further Muhammad îbrâhîm, Turîrî-k-i Saldjûqûydan-i Kîrmân, ed. M. T. Houtsma, Leiden 1886, 106 ff.). There was also a resurgence of nomadism in Fârs on the break-up of the Saldjûk empire when the Salghurids, basing their power on semi-nomadic tribes living in the region of Gûnamân, began to extend their rule (Abhâm b. Zârkûb, ʿIrâz-nâma, 48-9). The later Salghurids, however, conformed to the usual pattern of "settled" rulers.

The Mongol invasion was accompanied by a new influx of Turkish tribes on a large scale. Carried out by tribes organized for war, it was of a different order from the Saldjûk invasion. Political rule remained in the hands of the tribal leaders, who formed a kind of military aristocracy. They were hostile to settled life and exploited the peasants and the townspeople. The invasion was accompanied by widespread destruction and massacres. Much land fell out of cultivation because of the flight or death of its occupants in the Khîtâb or Ghuzz tribes. Settlement probably took place at first only on the lower slopes of the Kurdish mountains. This was caused by the tribal following of the Mongols and their need for pastures for their flocks and herds (cf. Rashîd al-Dîn, Turîrî-k-i muðarâk-i Ghâzâni, ed. Jâhîn, GMS, n.s. xiv, London 1940, 349 ff.). The tribal leaders were allocated, or took possession of, pastures. Many of them also received land grants, which they sometimes converted into private property, and were given control over the population living on the land. Various new taxes were introduced including bûhêtâr (q.v.), which was probably originally a pasture tax paid by nomads (though it was later to designate a tax on the settled population also). During the reign of Ghâzân Khân (694/1295-703/1304) there was a modification in the policy of the Ilkhâns designed to bring about a revival of agriculture and a reduction in the power of the nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes. This was only partially successful (see further L. P. Petrushevsky, "The socio-economic condition of Iran under the Il-Khans" in The Cambridge History of Iran, v, 483-537, and A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and peasant in Persia, 72-104).

The centre of the Ilkhân kingdom was Âghanbâyjân, and it was there and in Arrân, and to a lesser extent in Asia Minor, that the tribes which
had come with the Ilkhanids were mainly concentrated. Many of them had close affinities with some of the Turkic tribes already in Persia. Among the tribes which came with or joined Hulagu were the Afšār (some groups of whom had apparently migrated with the Saldjūqs, see Arqārān). They settled mainly in Ādharbāyjān, and gradually increased in numbers and power.

Hamd Allah Mustawfi mentions districts to the south of Sultāniyya containing some hundred villages with good pastures, which were settled by Afshars, by G. Le Strange, G.M.S., (1919, 64-5), and Mongol winter quarters in the Mughān steppe (p. 83). Sawūd Bulāgh, near Ray, was according to him mostly inhabited by nomads (ṣārāb-nīghān, p. 63). Among these were probably the Ka‘rā Evlī. They were not numerous and eventually joined the Afšār, though some of them were absorbed into other Turkomān tribes (Kā‘līm Mākām, Muwshāhāl, ed. Dājdāngir Kā‘līm Mākām, Tehran 1950-60, 763). There were also according to Hamd Allah many nomadic Kurdish tribes (khayl-i akrād-i ṣārāb-i nishīrī) in the Nihāvand-Malāyīr district, though by nishīrī he may simply have meant tribes which were neither Turkish nor Arab. They paid an annual tribute of 7,000 sheep (gāsfand, p. 74). There appears also to have been an extension of nomadism in Luristan at this time. Mu‘īn al-Dīn Nātanž states that the Atabeg Șams al-Dīn Alp Arghūn, who was made governor of Luristan by Hulagū, found the province in a state of ruin and its peasants dispersed. He remitted taxation for a year, and by good administration restored agricultural prosperity. “One reason for the prosperity of the province was that the Atabeg adopted, after the fashion of the Mongols, the practice of moving from summer to winter quarters. He spent the winter in Idādji and Șādr and the summer in the Zardak mountain, in which the Zindarūd rises, so that the cattle of the soldiers had no need of barley and the peasants (rā‘iyād) were not subjected to tyranny by all kinds of people” (Mustaḥkab al-tawārīkh-i Mu‘īnī, ed. J. Aubin, Tehran 1957, 43-4). Among other Ǧuzz tribes which apparently came to Persia with the Mongols, passed through the country and came back later with the Ǧazwids, were the Begdūlī. The Ǧuzz tribes which passed through Persia but did not come to Persia with Dūrμagān. Some of them went on to Syria, where they became known as the Ṣāmīlū. They returned to Persia with the Ǧazwids, and were powerful under them and the Afšārīds. In Kādžār their centres were in Mazdakān near Tehran, and Marqāgh (Kā‘līm Mākām, op. cit., 368). Some small groups of Begdūlī were to be found near Tehran in the 19th century. According to tradition the Kādžārs also entered Persia with the Mongols, passed on to Syria and came back to Persia with Timūr.

By the end of the Mongol period, federations of tribes under new names were beginning to appear, of which the most important was the Adji Khān of Mughūlātān, who was known as the Afšār (see C. Cahen, op. cit., 314 ff.; see also J. Aubin, Un souverain Qara-Qoyunlu concernant le Buluk de Bawdandt, ed. S. M. Stern, Oxford 1955, for the distribution of Turkomān and Arab tribes in that region at the end of the 8th/14th century). From about 747/1346 there was a resurgence of nomadism in Khūrāsān also (cf. Mu‘īn al-Dīn Nātanž, op. cit., 197 ff.).

Meanwhile in Eastern Turkistan the break-up of the Mongol empire the nomads under the Çagātāy Khān of Mughūlātān began to press into Western Turkistan. This provoked a counterattack and eventually Timūr, having united the nomads of Western Turkistan, emerged as the defender of the Islamic borderlands against the nomads of Central Asia, thus giving to the settled population a measure of security in which to pursue their commercial activities and to continue their religious life (see further Mu‘īn al-Dīn Nātanž, op. cit. and H. Hookham, Tamerlane the conqueror, London 1962). After crushing the nomads of the Çagātāy appanage and the Kipchak hordes, Timūr then carried out a series of expeditions into the Islamic borderlands, as a consequence of which many of their inhabitants had to take refuge in his new dominions. Timūr’s military organization was similar to that of the Mongols. The basis of his power was a military tribal aristocracy, who with their followers and flocks migrated from pasture to pasture. Clavijo describing Timūr’s horde writes, “When Timur calls his people to war all assemble and march with him, surrounded by their flocks and herds, thus carrying along their possessions in company with their wives and children. These last follow the host, and in the lands which they invade their flocks, namely and particularly the sheep, camels and horses, serve to ration the horde” (Clavijo’s embassy to Tamerlane 1403-1406, tr. from the Spanish by G. Le Strange, London 1928, 191). He also mentions the numbering of the flocks of the nomads for taxation purposes (p. 187). Certain of the Çagaṭāyats, however, were exempted in return for military service (pp. 195-6). There appear to have been also nomadic Kurds (?) in Khūrāsān near Nayshāpūr. Clavijo, describing them, states “they own no other habitations but their tents, for they never take up their abode in any city or village, but live in the open country-side, both summer and winter, pasturing their flocks. These consist of droves of rams, ewes and cows, and the people of this particular tribe possess some twenty thousand camels. They wander over the length and breadth of this province living under the jurisdiction of Timur, and they give him yearly as his due in tribute three thousand camels, also some fifteen thousand sheep” (p. 182).

The death of Timūr was followed by a period of internecine strife. In the west the Turkomāns of the Karā Koyunlu and the neighboring Bayārūm Khāˈdja of the Baharūl tribe (d. 782/1380), had originally entered the service of Sultan Uways, the Dīlāʿir, invaded Ādharbāyjān in 812/1408 from Armenia, where they had been driven by Timūr. By 814/1410 they had taken Baghādār from the Dīlāʿūrs. They were subsequently superseded by the Āk Koyunlu, whose main centre was at Dīyar Bakr and whose leaders belonged to the Bayānūr clan [q.v.]. In the east also there were further tribal movements. In 870/1465-6, 15,000 tents of nomads from Irīk set out for Khūrāsān “because they had been reduced to straits by the tyranny and oppression of the Turkomans", and were given ʿursī in that province by the Timurid, Abū Saʿīd (Abd al-Razāk, Majlaʿ al-ṣaʿdāyin, ed. Muhammad Shafi, Lahore 1949, ii, 1296). About the same time, the Hazāras (who according to tradition came to Persia with the Mongols) apparently began to emerge as a distinct people. There have been increasing in the neighbourhood of Harat, and difficulties between them and the government over their refusal to pay taxes are mentioned (ibid., 1296 ff.).

The period of the Turkomān dynasties of the Karā Koyunlu and the Āk Koyunlu, who emerged successively as the most powerful group in Western and North-western Persia and finally in Central
and Southern Persia also, represents a reassertion of the rule of the Turkoman nomads and was accompanied by a movement of the Turkomans eastwards into Persia. Unlike the Saldju^s, whom they resembled rather than the Mongols and Timurids, they never succeeded in imposing their rule over the whole of Persia and succeeded only to a limited extent in uniting the various Turkoman tribes, who by this time had been familiar with Islam for generations, and some of whom had been won over to the more extreme forms of Shi^-ism. Their leaders, the most celebrated of whom was Uzun 'Asan (d. 882/1477-8), were in many cases men of ability; their administration was well organized and their courts, in spite of their nomadic background and habits, were centres of Persian culture and Turkoman poetry. (See further V. Minorsky, Persia in A.D. 1476-1490, London 1937, and also Travels to Tana and Persia by Barbaro and Contarini, Hakluyt ed., 1735). The death of Uzun Hasan was followed by a renewal of tribal forays with the main A^ Koyunlu centres in Adzbarbyjân and Shiraz, until finally the Safavids, having united the Turkoman tribes and given to them a cohesion which the Karâ Koyunlu and A^ Koyunlu had failed to do, established themselves as the rulers of Persia.

The great majority of Isma^-i's supporters belonged to tribes from Asia Minor, Syria, and Armenia, their very movement having detached them from the A^ Koyunlu and the A^ Koyunlu. The core of his force, the Kizilbâsh, was formed by the Ustadjlu, Shamlu, Tekkelu, Rumlû, Baharlu, Dhul-Kadr, Turkman, Khinislu, Kadjâr, and Afshâr tribes (see further V. Minorsky, Tadhkirat al-mulûk, G.M.S., 1943, 189 ff.). From the two last-named came dynasties which were exempted from the payment of divan dues ('A^lam al-khujafd*), which they held by direct grant or conquest. Many of them were also appointed to governorships. There was no clear dividing line between the tribal leaders, the military governors and the provincial governor. In the early period the chief military office, that of amir al-amîrs, was regarded by the Kizilbâsh as their prerogative. Under Tahmâsp the provincial governments were still mainly in the hands of the tribal leaders. They were moved from province to province, no tribe having a special claim to the government of a specific area; but under Shah 'Abbâs there were several cases of hereditary succession, and by 1034/1624 it had become common (see further Kâdî Ahmad Kûmml, Khulzat al-savâ'irâk, ed. H. Muller, Wiesbaden 1964). Tahmâsp was unable to control the tribal leaders and the jealousies between Turk and non-Turk and inter-tribal feuds, especially between the Ustadjlu and the Rûmul, threatened the existence of the state. The problem was broadly the same as that which had faced the Saldju^-s: how to integrate the tribes, upon which rested the ruling dynasty's control over power, into the life of the empire. The circumstances of the time, however, were different: in particular, there was no longer the possibility of settlement to the west, on or beyond the frontiers of the empire.

Tahmâsp's death was followed by struggles between the tribal leaders. Shah 'Abbâs (993/1587-1629) eventually reorganized the frontiers of Khurasan was for the Safavids, as it had been for the Saldju^-s, and reduced the importance of the tribal forces by instituting a special cavalry corps recruited from the descendants of Georgian and Armenian captives, converts to Islam, paid direct from the treasury. As a result the tribal and military leaders and also the tribes and the standing army to some extent became differentiated, although the tribes were still required to furnish contingents when called upon to do so. For example, in 1013/1604 Shah 'Abbâs ordered them to fight over and deliberately reduced to a state of desolation adversely affected the tribes formerly occupying it. Shah 'Abbâs further weakened the power of the tribal leaders by allotting provincial governments to amîrs resident on the frontiers and the contingents fixed for each province, many of which were provided by the tribes (pp. 100 ff.). With the increase in the size of the 'standing army' and its payment from khâssa (crown) lands, there was less land available for the tribal leaders, which fact further reduced their power and influence (See Tadhkirat al-mulûk for an analysis of the tribal affiliation of the leading amîrs in the Safavid empire, pp. 14 ff.). Moreover, the fact that the Turkish frontier region was repeatedly fought over and subsequently reduced to a state of desolation adversely affected the tribes formerly occupying it. Shah 'Abbâs further weakened the power of the tribal leaders by allotting provincial governments to amîrs from the court, whether slave or free, rather than to the tribal leaders. A number of tribes were moved by Shah 'Abbâs, some in order to contribute to the defence of the empire. Thus, the Kadjâr tribe was divided into three branches: the first stationed at Qandja to check the incursions of the Lusâq, the second at Marv to contribute to the
defence of Khurāsān against the Üzbeks, and the third at Astārabād on the borders of the Turkmān country. In the course of an earlier period the tribe had been divided into two sections, the Yūkārī-bāsh and the Aḥkārī-bāsh. Families of both went to Astārabād, Shāh 'Abbās also moved some tribes from frontier districts because of doubts as to their loyalty. For example, the Kazuklari tribe was moved from Karāli Dāgh to Dārāb-bīrdrīd in Fārs about 1024/1615 (ʿĀlām Arā, p. 623). Somewhat earlier (about 1000/1591-2) a group of Afghār came to Kaseh, and their head Khālija Pir Būdāq was given the governorship of the district by Shāh 'Abbās. The family continued to hold this government for some 250 years (Fāsā, Fārs-nāma-i Nāṣeri, Tehran, lith., 1894-6, ii, 250-2). Shāh 'Abbās also constituted a number of his supporters into a new tribe known as the Shāhsivān, which was later to become important in Ādharbāyjān.

According to the Dastār al-mušāk (written for Shāh Sultān Ḥusayn), the five main provincial governments were Georgia, ʿArabistān, Luristān, Kurdistān and the Bahktiyārī. The last four each had a large non-Turkish tribal and semi-nomad population. Whereas the influence of the Turkmān tribes had to some extent been reduced by Shāh 'Abbās, the importance of the non-Turkish tribes began to increase. Some of the lesser governments also, such as Karābāgh, and the Khāgilūya, were predominantly tribal areas, and others, such as Hamadān, had a considerable tribal population. The wāli of ʿArabistān was the most important of the five governors because of the numbers of the tribes (ii waʿa ʿagbar) under his jurisdiction. Luristān was the next in importance. (Muḥammad Tākā Dāniżhpāshū, Dastār al-mušāk, in Review of the Faculty of Letters, University of Tehran, July 1968, pp. 473-508, and November 1968, pp. 62-93). Chardin writing of this province states: "The people that inhabit it never mind the building of cities, nor have any settled abodes, but live in tents, for the most part feeding their flocks and their herds, of which they have an infinite number. They are governed by a kaan who is set over them by the king of Persia but chosen from among themselves; and for the most part all of the same race, the father and sons or brothers, or both, to the court as hostages. Shāh in Fars was his capital. That this was a tribal area probably had no special significance. Tabriz, Mughān, and certain other places in Ādharbāyjān, still one of the main areas of settlement by Turkish tribes, were entrusted to the sipahsārāt, the most important military officer after the kūrči-bāsh (see Dastār al-mušāk, loc. cit.). The Tahkhirat al-mušāk also gives lists of the enrolments of the amīrs resident on the frontier and the contingents fixed for each province, some of which were provided by tribes (pp. 100 ff.)." After this point, Shāh 'Abbās gave the control of the central government weakened and was only temporarily arrested under Shāh 'Abbās II. With this the tribes, notably the Ghulāzī and Abdāllā Afghān in the east, began to reassert themselves. The Balūt also raised up from Bāb and Kirmān; while the Kūrds revolted, captured Hamadān and raised up to Isfahān in 1719 (see L. Lockhart, The fall of the Safavi Dynasty, Cambridge 1956, 110 ff.). There were also uprisings by Lur and Bahktiyāris in the Isfahān district in the middle of the century (A chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia, London 1929, i, 660).

In a manuscript which professes to be taken from the state papers of Shāh Sultān Ḥusayn are details given of the location and numbers of the tribes. Although these figures appear to be grossly exaggerated, they probably indicate the general distribution of the tribes at the beginning of the 18th century. It may also be that the tribal population at that time was again on the increase. The writer divides the tribes into those of Persian and non-Persian origin. The former consisted of (i) the Lurs, comprising four great tribes, the Fāyli (centred on Khurramābād, with winter quarters near Hawaiā), Laks and Zands (who for a brief period under Katīm Khān Zand provided the ruling dynasty, centred on Kāzāzā, Bahktiyāris, and Mamassānis. The Bahktiyāris ranged from the Kūhgilūya to Isfahān and from Shūstār to Bībāhān. They paid revenue to the beglarbegi of Isfahān. The sun due, though more than that paid to the Bahktiyāris or the Fāyli. Their revenue was included in that of Fārs and was paid to the beglarbegi of that province. The Lurs were all Shīʿīs. (ii) There were the Garrūs, Kālkūr and Mūkī inhabiting the country between Hamadān and the borders of Marāgha. About one fourth of them were Shīʿīs. (iii) There were the Kurdish nomadic tribes in Khurāsān, of which the four main tribes were the Zafarānā (centred in Aghlamad), the Saʿdānā (centred on Khabbāshān, the Kavānūn in Rādkān, and the Dāvānūn near Dādājmār). They paid no revenue to the government. There were (iv) the Dīlāʾīr also in Khurāsān, ranging up to Marv-i Shāh Dīshān, (v) the Karāʾīr, centred on Turbat-i Dījām, and (vi) the Dīlāʾīr. The non-Persian nomadic tribes consisted of Arabs and Turks. The latter, according to the author of the manuscript, included the Afšār, the Kādājīr, the Shākākī (who were in fact Kurds) ranging from Ādharbāyjān to Gīlān, the Zangana (also Kurds) in the neighbourhood of Kirmānshāh, the Karagūzā in the neighbourhood of Hamadān, Burmaqīr and Nīvāvand, and the Shāhsivān, some of whom were in Fārs and others in Ādharbāyjān and Gīlān. The Afšār, according to Chardin, had introduced some new tribes to themselves and lost others. They included the Shāmīlī, Kiklūī, and Shirvānī. They held Yūs in Khurāsān and Urmiyīya in Ādharbāyjān. The Bayāt and Dūnbulī who held Nayşāpūr, Khwāy, and Salīmān, on the other hand, were no longer counted with the Afšārs. The Arab tribes consisted of the Čaḏb (Kaʿb), the Mūlāʾī of Hawaiā, who with various other Arab tribes ranged from that district up to Baghdad. In
There was also an Arab population in some other centres, including the Banū Shaybān in Tabās (see Ms. Dr. Caro Owen Miniasian Collection, Isfahan, OR Ms. Provisional No. 1134 (s & b)). A copy of this ms. appears to have been seen by Sir John Malcolm (see History of Persia, London 1819, ii, 372). In the 19th century there were groups of Mishmašt Arabs following a nomadic existence between Kāshān, Lār, and Lārzān (Mirzā Ḥabīb al-Rāmhūn b. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm b. KāṣĀnī, Mardā’ al-Kāṣānī, British Museum, MS Or. 3603, f. 61b).

The Safavids were succeeded by three dynasties whose founders were tribal leaders, Nādir Shāh, who belonged to the Kirklī tribe of the Afšār, Karim Kān Zand and Āqā Muḥammad Kān Kāqār. Nādir Shāh, who favoured the Sunni tribes, namely the Afghāns and Turkmāns, resettled a number of tribal groups elsewhere. In 1142-3/1730-1 50-60,000 families of tribespeople were transferred from Adhārbāyjān, Persian ʿĪrāk, and Fārs to Khorāsān. Two years later 60,000 Ābdāl were moved from Hārāt to Maḥbād, Naʿṣāḥpur and Dāmghān, and 5,000 families of the Haft Lang of the Bakhṭīyārī were sent to Khorāsān. A second group of Bakhṭīyārī, consisting of Haft Lang and Ḋāḥār Lang, amounting to 20,000 families were sent to Ḍānj in Khorāsān after a Bakhṭīyārī rebellion was crushed in 1140/1726 (L. Lockhart, Nādir Shāh, London 1938, 51-2, 54, 65, 110; see also M. Otter, Voyage en Turquie et en Perse, 1748, ii, 187). The widespread dispersion of the Afšār tribe in Persia in the 19th century presumably dates from that time of the reign of Nādir Shāh (cf. Macdonald Kinneir, A geographical memoir of Persia, London 1813, 46).

The murder of Nādir Shāh was followed by disorders. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Kān Kāqār, having established himself in Astarābād, where a branch of the Kādqār tribe, as stated above, was settled by Shāh ʿAbbās, extended his power over Māzdārān. A Bakhṭīyārī chief, ʿAll Mardān Kān, took possession of Isfahān and was joined by Karim Kān Zand. The two subsequently fell out. ʿAll Mardān Kān was murdered, and Karim Kān, after an initial defeat by Azād Kān, the Afghan ruler of Adhārbāyjān, regrouped his forces, defeated Azād Kān near Khišt and took Shirāz. A struggle then ensued between Muḥammad Ḥusayn Kān Kāqār and Karim Kān, in which the latter proved victorious. Karim Kān's court, like that of many other tribal rulers, was the resort of men of learning and culture (q. Malcolm, op. cit., ii, 86). His rule was on the whole peaceful. In Adhārbāyjān there appeared to have been an attempt to settle the tribes. A farnās dated 1271/1764 instructs the beqālabegī of Tabriz to treat the Shākkāy and other tribes in the province well, to cause them to engage in agriculture and government service (see Landlord and peasant, 133).

The death of Karim Kān was followed by anarchy and internecine strife among the Zands, in which there appeared to have been decimated finally Āqā Muḥammad Kān Kāqār, who had escaped from Shirāz where he had been held in captivity by Karim Kān, united the Kādqār tribe and made himself master of most of Persia, reducing the various tribal leaders who had established themselves in different parts of the country. Although Āqā Muḥammad Kān transferred the seat of his government to Tehran, Māzdārān and Gurgān remained the centre of the Kādqār tribe, with whom the ruling dynasty maintained its lines. Abbott writing in 1844 put the Kādqārs in Astarābād at only 20,000 families. They were exempt from taxation (London, P.R.O., F.O. 60:1:80. Account of Abbott's journey along the shores of the Caspian, incl. in Abbott to Aberdeen, No. 8, Encamp. near Tehran, 29 June 1844). Sir Justin Sheil, writing rather later, puts the Kādqārs in Māzdārān at 2,000 houses (Lady Sheil, Glimpses of life and manners in Persia, London 1856, 396). The ruling dynasty never entirely lost its nomadic background. William Osuely records that Fath ʿAll Shāh, like most other members of the Kādqār family, preferred 'an erratick to a settled life; a village to a city, and a tent to a palace' (Travels, London 1819, iii, 151). Lady Sheil also remarks on the nomadic habits 'so prevalent throughout the nation' (op. cit., 214). Even Naṣīr al-Dīn Shāh was, according to his French physician, Dr. Feuvrier, still a nomad at heart (Voyage en Armenie et en Perse, Paris 1906, 189). Many of the provincial governors came from the ruling family, which, however, became increasingly separated from the main body of the tribe.

Tribe contingents, as in the case of earlier dynasties, together with a standing army and the forces of the provincial governors, also containing tribal levies, composed the military forces of the Kādqārs (see Landlord and peasant, 137ff.). Morier states that Fath ʿAlī's standing army consisted of 12,000 men, drawn indiscriminately from the tribes or the population of the cities but principally from the Kādqār tribe of Māzdārān. The soldiers had their families and homes in Tehran and the neighbouring villages and were ready at call (A journey through Persia, Armenia, and Asia Minor to Constantinople, in the years 1808 and 1809, London 1812, 243-3). A register of the tribal levies was kept. Each tribe formed its own division in the army. These would attend at the Nawrūz at the royal camp. If their services were not required that year they would be dismissed. Whether retained at the royal camp or dismissed they received a stated pay. Jaubert describes the mixed population to be found at the royal camp (Voyage en Arménie et en Perse, fait dans les années 1805 et 1806, Paris 1821, 258-9).

ʿAbbās Mirzā was able to raise from three of the tribes in Adhārbāyjān 50,000 horse and foot, and the governor of Khorāsān from the tribes in that province 20,000. The Arabs and Frylis were exempt from the provision of military contingents (Morier, op. cit., 240-1).

Morier speaks highly of the military potential of the tribesmen. 'As raw materials for soldiers,' he wrote, 'nothing could be better than the Eelauts. Accustomed from their infancy to a camp life, habituated to all sorts of hardships and to the vicissitudes of weather, they are soldiers by nature. They have undertaken incredible marches without scarcely any food and without a murmur' (A second journey through Persia, Armenia, and Asia Minor to Constantinople, 1810-16, London 1816, 215). Sheil also speaks highly of the Persian soldiers, though he did not agree that the ḳādāns were necessarily the best (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 382). With the modernization of the army and the increasing dependence on artillery as the century proceeded, the importance of the tribal forces decreased, though it was not till after the first world war that they finally disappeared as a part of the military forces of the state.
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In general the Kadjars were forced to administer the tribal areas through their own chiefs. The writ of the government and the administration in the frontier districts was conducted by a special minister of tribal affairs and administered customary law (see also Landlord and peasant, 158 ff.). The ỉk̪b̪āni and ỉḻešqi were appointed over the larger tribes. The nomination of these was confined to the leading tribal families. The shah might alter the succession by placing an uncle in the place of a nephew or younger brother in the condition of an elder, but normally he had no choice but to appoint as the leader of the tribe a man belonging to the family of the chief. The ỉk̪b̪āni and ỉḻešqi collected the government taxes and were generally responsible for their faithful observance and the tributary law. (cf. Layard, i, 499 ff.).

The ỉk̪b̪āni of the Kadjär tribe (who was not the reigning shah) presided over the tribal council of elders and enjoyed considerable influence (cf. Malcolm, op. cit., ii, 327).

The ỉḻešqi, ʿAḍūd al-Mulk, became regent in 1909 after the deposition of Muhammad ʿAlī Shāh.

Aḵa Muḥammad Khišān, like many preceding rulers, resettled various tribes. The ʿAbār al-Malik, one of their leaders, were transplanted from Fārs to Kalārḵāṭ and Kudjūr, as also were the Hāqqīdavāns. In 1844 the former numbered some 3,000 families and the latter 4,500. Both were settled, but the former had summer and winter quarters. They contributed, 1,500 horse to the government when so required (Account of Abbott’s journey, op. cit.). He also transferred the ʿAmala from Luris-tān to Kūčīk to Fārs. After his death many of them returned to their original encampments (C. A. de Bode, Travels in Luristan and Arabistan, London 1845, 118-19). Later rulers also transported various tribes (see Landlord and peasant, 158 ff.).

Realizing that the existence of large bodies of tribes, separated from the settled population, under leaders whose commands, whether to commit aggression against their neighbours, highway robbery, or resistance to the law, was unfavourable to internal tranquillity, Fāth ʿAlī Shāh devoted much of his energy to overthrowing the tribes. Many of the chiefs were put to death, others brought to court. Some tribes were broken up and others transplanted. The result was that by the middle of the century few of the tribal chiefs, except the ỉk̪b̪āni of the Kāsh-kāḵ in Fārs and the Zaḵarānān in Khorāsān were able to exercise a preponderating influence on the affairs of the tribe (op. cit., 158 f.). Macdonald Kinneir writing of the tribal chiefs states that they were “both from birth and influence, the men of the first of the men in the empire; they are always mutually jealous and hostile; and the king by fomenting their quarrels, and thus nicely balancing the power of the one against the other, insures his own safety and the peace of his dominions. It is the custom to detain at court, either the chief himself or some part of his family, as hostages for the fidelity of the tribe” (op. cit., 45).

The traditional policy of the government in the tribal regions from this time onwards consisted of dividē et impera—in setting one tribe against another, fomenting family feuds and jealousies, and bribing the chiefs with gifts or promises of support in their struggles, one with another for the headship of the tribal affairs and administering customary law (op. cit., 158 f.). Sometimes they were often extremely poor (cf. Lady Sheil, op. cit., 107-8).

Jaubert states that the nomads were attached to their nomadic life because of the independence which it gave them and which was for them the supreme happiness (op. cit., 252). Malcolm, writing of the Kurds, states that they preferred the freedom they enjoyed in their rugged mountains and felt a pride of taking hostages from the tribes was continued (cf. Malcolm, op. cit., ii, 338). This policy, although it enabled the government, in spite of its weakness, to maintain its power, shook the confidence of the tribes in the trustworthiness of the government, and contributed to the anarchy which frequently prevailed in the tribal districts. The government would invite tribal chiefs to parleys under flags of truce and after sending them as safe-conducts ʿUrāņs on which they had sworn to keep faith with them, would arrest them as soon as they had got them in their power or had them “accidentally killed” as the latter word may be interpreted in this view. The tribal leaders often had their own agents at court to keep them informed of matters which might be of interest to them and especially to give them forewarning of steps which might be contemplated against them. Another way in which the government attempted to control the tribal leaders was through marriage alliances.

During the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, and more particularly under ʿAbāb Mīrāzā and ʿAlī Shāh, the power of the tribes was further reduced and the authority of the central government asserted. In 1896 there was a proposal for the establishment of a special ministry or high council to have charge of tribal affairs, but little came of this.

Taxes were assessed on flocks and sometimes a poll tax or family tax was also paid. Many of the tribal leaders owned land in the districts occupied by the tribe or outside it, and so far as they or their followers held land they were subject to land taxes. The system of land tenure in the tribal areas was often complicated. Pīghaksh and special levies were also paid by the tribal leaders to the ruler or local governor at the new year. These were collected by the tribal leaders from their followers and often constituted a heavy imposition (see Landlord and peasant, 142-3, 158). Jaubert alleges that Fāth ʿAlī Shāh insisted that at least one fifth of the taxes due from the tribal leaders should be paid in cash (op. cit., 270). Some of the tribal leaders, especially in the frontier districts, held land free in return for the provision of military contingents. This was the case in Buḡnjurd, Dārā Gāz, and Ašraf in the second half of the 19th century (see Landlord and peasant, 165-4). There were also cases of tribes being exempted from taxation for some particular reason. The Karā Pāpāḵ, who were settled in Suldūz by ʿAbāb Mīrāzā after the Treaty of Turkmānchāy, were not required to provide soldiers or pay taxes (E. Aubin, La Perse d’aujourdh’hui, Paris 1908, 78-9). Disputes between the government and the tribal leaders over arrears of taxation were frequent. If the government felt strong enough, it would collect these by a military expedition, if not bills (bardtūds) would be drawn on the defaulters and sold at a large discount. The bardtūds were often to be found quartered on the recalcitrant taxpayers and might remain months or years until the sum, or a part of it, was paid (cf. Layard, op. cit., i, 499 ff.).

The numbers and condition of the tribes fluctuated. On the whole their life was one of hardship and uncertainty. Some among the Kurdish and Turkomān tribes were wealthy, but the smaller tribes were often extremely poor (cf. Lady Sheil, op. cit., 107-8).
in the privations and hardships to which they were exposed, when they regarded them as associated with their independence (op. cit., ii, 332). There is no doubt some truth in these statements, and on the whole the nomads, until recent times, have resisted settlement, fearing a loss of independence.

Baron de Bode, who travelled in south Persia in 1841, describing the character of the migrating tribes, states that he found this marked by much frankness, mixed with a great deal of cunning. He accounted for this apparent weakness partly by habit, partly by necessity, the chiefs led and partly by the necessity they were under of being constantly on their guard, in order to defeat the machinations of their adversaries or from their own inclination to encroach upon their neighbours' property (op. cit., i, 253). In general, the tribes were distinguished from the settled population by the greater freedom enjoyed by their women. Occasionally during the minority of a chief the tribe might be governed by his mother (cf. de Bode, op. cit., ii, 134 ff.).

Large areas of the Kâdîr kingdom were tribal districts. In some the tribes migrated long distances, as the Bakhtiyâri and the Khâshkâhî; in others the migrations were more limited, and in some the movement was no more than into tents on the village outskirts. There was no clear demarcation between tribal and non-tribal land, any more than between village outskirts. There was no clear demarcation among the tribesmen living in villages all or part of the year. They often contumacious and lawless and sometimes did extreme damage to crops and gardens (cf. Landlord and peasant, 157-8).

Macdonald Kinneir thought that the numbers of the Ilâs, wandering tribes, probably exceeded the town population (op. cit., 44). Sheil, who had a long experience of Persia in the reigns of Fatâb 'Ali Shâh and Muhammad Shâh, put the semi-nomadic and settled tribes together at possibly half the total population (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 393). In 1891 Mrs. Bishop recorded that the Ilâs "are supposed to constitute a fifth of the rural population" (op. cit., 84). The decrease in the figures given by Mrs. Bishop is perhaps partly to be explained by the fact that tribesmen who were living in villages were presumably excluded from the figures given to Mrs. Bishop. Sir A. Houtum-Schindler put the tribal population at 2,200,000 out of a total population of 9,000,000 in 1900. These figures were broken down as follows: 850,000 Turks, 800,000 Kurds and Laks, 300,000 Arabs, 230,000 Lurs, and 20,000 Balûc and gypsies. (Report on Persian Army by Lt. Col. H. P. Picot, Jaun 1900; see also Curzon, op. cit., ii, 493, who quotes figures drawn up by Houtum-Schindler in 1884, which differ slightly from the above). He notes that by this time very few of the Ústdîlû and Dhûl-Kadr remained. They resided in Adbârâyán. The Tekkélî had ceased to exist (Eastern Persian Ira, London 1898, 48-50).

One of the most important tribal areas in the north country was that inhabited by the Bakhtiyâri with whom the government had repeated conflicts, and who in the 20th century played a major role in the restoration of constitutional government in 1909 (see A.K.S. Lambton, Persian political societies, in St. Antony's Papers, No. 26, Middle East Affairs, No. 3, London 1963). They were divided into two main groups, the Haft Lang and the Cahâr Lang, the former having summer pastures in Châhr Mâjâlî and the latter in Firâydan; both had winter pastures in Khûzistân. Morier put their numbers in 1809 at 100,000 families (Journey, 242). Malcolm states that they continued to be ruled by their own customs and admitted hardly any interference by the officers of the government in their internal jurisdiction. They furnished troops and paid a small tribute. They were encouraged to settle in the plains with a view to rendering them more tangible to the laws of the country and, by giving them an interest in the general peace of the country, it was hoped to prevent the predatory attacks they had in common habit of making, on their neighbours (op. cit., ii, 332). De Bode states that many of the Haft Lang had been settled (op. cit., ii, 86). Fatâb 'Ali Shâh kept hostages from the Bakhtiyâri at Tehran, where a separate quarter was allotted to them (de Bode, op. cit., ii, 75). Later rulers continued the practice of taking hostages. This did not, however, prevent rebellion by the tribe or secure the safety of the roads. Morier, when passing through Isfâhân in 1811, mentions that the town was in a continual state of alarm lest Asad Khân of the Haft Lang should seize the city (Second journey, 156).

Rawlinson put the Bakhtiyâri (the Cahâr Lang and Haft Lang together with the Dînârûns) at 28,000 families about the year 1836. Their assessment was fixed at 100 kâtîrs, which term he states was used to denote a sum of money, which was increased or diminished according to the prosperity or otherwise of the tribes and the power of the government to exercise authority over them. Under the Atabegs a kâtîr had apparently been the equivalent of 1,000 tâmâns, but when Rawlinson was writing it was 100 tâmâns; but the government was unable to realize this amount. Muhammad Ta'ki Khân of the Dînârûn tribe of the Cahâr Lang was îlàkhân at that time. Rawlinson states that he could put 10-12,000 well-armed men in the field. He speaks highly of Muhammad Ta'ki Khân's justice and states that he had attempted to break the tribes of their nomadic habits and to some extent succeeded. He had bought land in Firâydan and founded villages and also settled tribesmen in the Râm Hurmuz plain, which he farmed from the government for 3,000 tâmâns a year. The Bakhtiyâri supplied Khûzistân with tobacco and exported a small quantity of grain and in 1841 the governor of the Dînârûns supplied Khûzistân with 9,000 heads of cattle, mostly bullocks and sheep. The Bakhtiyâri tribe of the Bakhtiyâri had its acknowledged hereditary chief or Khân who ruled his subjects with despotic sway (Notes on a march from Zohab, at the foot of the Zagros, along the mountain roads to Khûzistan (Russiana) and from thence through the province of Luristan to Kûrmânschah, in the year 1836, in J RGS, 1889, ix, 26-110). Layard also speaks highly of Muhammad Ta'ki Khân and of his wish to open the Bakhtiyâri to commerce. In 1841 the governor of Isfâhân, Mu'tamid al-Dawla, marched from Isfâhân to Mâlamîr to demand payment of arrears of taxation from Muhammad Ta'ki Khân, who was declared a rebel. Wishing to avoid conflict, he temporized, but was unable to reach a settlement. He then took refuge with the Ca'b at Fâlâyînya, but was persuaded to come to Mu'tamid al-Dawla, the latter seized him and took him a prisoner to Isfâhân, where he died in captivity in 1853 (see Layard, op. cit., i, 375 ff.).

De Bode states that the Cahâr Lang were taxed at 15,000 tâmâns but that the tax was not regularly collected since they could only be compelled to pay it by force (op. cit., ii, 82). Some 195 villages settled by Haft Lang paid 7,070 tâmâns in cash and 530 kharârs of grain, while those of the tribe who still
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migrated and were more numerous only paid 3,000 tumdns. Some of the Haft Lang chiefs farmed whole districts ... Fars was administered by Husayn cAli Mirza. Wali Khan, the Bakish chief, was the main ringleader. He and his son Bakir

Some of the Haft Lang chiefs farmed whole
tumdns.

poverty which she saw among the Bakhtiyari with

she estimated the number of the Bakhtiyari at 29,100 families,

put the numbers of the Bakhtiyari at 20,000 (op. cit.,

Curzon wrote, this was no longer the case (op. cit., ii, 299). Curzon states that in addition
to the office of ilkhdnl and ilbegi, both of which were salaried by and in the gift of the shah, a third
class of chiefs, known as the kdtirs or "tribal kings," was also closely bound up with tribal politics, since
the tribal chiefs held landed property in Caahir Maahl (op. cit., ii, 295).

Luristâni Kâkîk was divided into Pîshkîh and Pught-i Kûh. The principal tribes of the former were the Silâstîl and Dilfûn, numbering according
to de Bode about 30,000 families, the 'Amâla (2,000 families or more), and the Bâlâ Gîrîwa (4,000 families) (op. cit., ii, 286 ff.). The Pught-i Kûh tribes, the Faylls, were less numerous. Rawlinson gives a
detailed list of the tribes of Pîshkîh and Pught-i Kûh, putting the former at 38,000 and the latter at
12,000 (op. cit.). The Lurs supplied mutton and milk products and charcoal to the bazaars of Burûjdîrd, Nîhawand, Hamadân, and Kirmângâh. They also made carpets and a coarse tenting made of goats'
hair, which was used for saddle-bags by muleteers (de Bode, op. cit., ii, 295).

Luristânî Kâkîk differed from that of the Bakhtiyari (the Lur-i Buzurg). Each sub-division had its
own leader or tîshmâlî, and they met as equals on occasion to discuss their common interests. The government of the tribe as a whole was in the
hands of an Ubegl, and his deputy, the ilkhdnl. The over-all security was left to the hands of a few officers of the day, Sultan Muhammad Khan,

The summer quarters of the tribe were near Isfahan in the winter quarters near the
coast. Several groups dwelt among the Bakhtiyari near the Djânûkî mountains and Mt. Dinî. They were rich in flocks and herds and did great harm
in their movements (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 398-9).

In addition to the Kashkâî and the Turkish tribes of the Khamsa, there were a number of other Turkish tribes in Fars, such as the Khalâlî in Kun-kâî, whose leader Mirzâ Kashmî Khân married the daughter of Dînî Khân, the ilkhdnl of the Kashkâî in the early part of the 19th century (Fasâ'î, op. cit., ii, 244). There were also small groups of Khalâlî in Kirmân and Agâh-râîyân (Houtum Schindler, Eastern Persian Arab, 50).

The Mamassani, living on the borders of Fars and Khûzistân, consisted of four main divisions, the Rustami, Bakîsh, Dîlî, and Dushmanzâyî.

The first two were the strongest and jealousy existed between them. The chief of the Dushmanzâyî, Muhammad Rûdâ Khân, was executed in 1840 on the orders of Fâryûnî Mirzâ, governor of Fars, and the tribe was accordingly weakened. The total number of the Mamassani about that time was said to exceed 4,000 families. The tax levied on them by the governor of Fars amounted to 7,000 tumdns (c. £2,800). They committed much robbery during the latter years of Fath 'Ali Shâh, when Fars was administered by Huseyn 'Ali Mirzâ. Wall Khân, the Bakîsh chief, was the main ringleader. He and his son Bâkîr
Khan were eventually captured and imprisoned in Tabriz and the power of the Mamassani was somewhat reduced (de Bode, op. cit., i, 270 ff.). De Bode puts the total number of the Khan at 10,000 tents and houses. The Teyyibi numbered some 3,000 families and the Bahma'i inhabiting the mountains north-west of Bihbahân, "the wildest and most unruly tribe among the mountaineers of Fars", were, de Bode thought, somewhat underrated at 2,000 families. At the time he was writing they had gone over to the Bakhštyârî leader, Muhammad Taki Khan. They were much split by blood feuds. There were also a number of small tribes of Arab and Turkish, occupying the plain of Bihbahân, some settled in villages and others living in tents (de Bode, op. cit., i, 275 ff.). The figures given for the tribes by Sheil were on the whole smaller than those given by de Bode. The power of the Mamassani had by the middle of the century been considerably reduced. Sheil puts their numbers at 8,000 tents and houses (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 399; see also Curzon, op. cit., ii, 318). According to Sheil's estimates of the tribes of Bihbahân and the Kühgîlâyâ the largest was the Bahma'i (2,500 tents) followed by the Buwayr Ahmadi (2,000 tents), Bâvî (1,200 tents), Cîrâmî (1,000 tents), Tâyyîbî (1,000 tents), and numerous smaller tribes. Many of them were poor, though the Tâyyîbî were said to be rich (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 399). Farhâd Mirzâ reduced the Kühgîlâyâ in 1852 (Curzon, op. cit., ii, 318). (See also Mahmûd Bâkwar, Kühgîlâyâ wa li-l-an, Tehran (?) 1945, and Manûchehr Zarrabî, Tâwâfî-kühgîlâyâ in Farhang-i Irân Zamin, ix, fas. 1-4, 278-352. See also F.O. 371:1728 for a genealogical tree of the kânûn of the Buwayr Ahmadi tribe and their numbers in 1913.)

The Ça'b in 'Arabstân increased in importance in the 19th century until the death of Shaykh Tâhemîr, after which they declined. Between 1870 and 1875 they occupied the territory that was previously occupied by the Buwayr. They were also obliged to provide, when called upon by the government (see Firuz Mirzâ Farman Farma, Tawaâfî Kühgîlâyî in Farhang-i Irân Zamin, ed. Mansûra Nâzîm Mâfî, Tehran 1963). Morier, writing in 1898, states that the Balûc, although once subject to Persia, had resumed their independence (Journey, 49-50). During the reign of Nâzîr al-Dîn Shâh some progress was made in bringing the Balûc under the control of the central government (see Frâz Mirzâ Fârmân Fârmân, Safar-nâmâ-i Kûrmân wa Balûcstân, ed. Mansûra Nâzîm Mâfî, Tehran 1963). Ferrier, who travelled in Persia in 1845, states that there were some 8,000 Balûc tents with very large flocks in Tûrsâq (op. cit., i, 277). Sheil puts their number rather lower at 2,000 tents, which were ruled by their chief Ahmad Khan (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 400). There were also Balûc at Kâ'în (Ferrier, op. cit., 411) and some 2,000 tents and houses at Turbat-i Haydari (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 400). The most important group in Turbat-i Haydari were the Kârâ'î, numbering 5,000 tents and houses. There were also various miscellaneous groups amounting to some 3,000 tents and houses (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 400). In the reign of Fath 'Ali Shâh, the Kârâ'î leader, Isbâk Khan, achieved a position of great influence. He was eventually seized with his son and killed by Muhammad Wall Mirzâ, governor of Kûrûsân (Watson, A History of Persia, London 1866, 175 ff.). Colonel Yate, who travelled in Kûrûsân in 1893, put the Karatâ at 3,000 families. They provided one regiment of infantry (Kûrûsân and Sîstân, London 1990, 53). In Tûrsâq there were 4,000 Arab tents and houses, 7,000 in Tûn and Tabas, and 12,000 in Kâ'în (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 400).

In Eastern Kûrûsân, the Hazâras, Taymûris, Mayîman, Pîrâshkûhîs, Dîzmûshkîs, and Zangîs, all Turkish tribes, were in the early Kâdîr period barely under government control, and on the death of Fath 'Ali Shâh and Muhammad Shâh they committed disturbances. Ferrier mentions that when he visited Kûrûsân 2,000 families of Hazâras had recently emigrated from Harrât to Shâh-i Naw near Mâhûm Dâbâd. The had some considerable numbers of horses in which they paid their tribute to the government. They were also obliged to provide, when called upon to do so, a contingent of 1,000 cavalry (op. cit., 137). By 1853, the number of Hazâras in Persia had apparently fallen. Yate estimates them at only 1,200 families (op. cit., 137). Sheil puts the Taymûris living in Khwâf at 4,000 tents and houses; a second group of 2,000 lived near Masghâd. There were a
number of miscellaneous Turkish and Persian tribes, amounting to some 11,000 tents and houses, round Mashhad. In Naishapur there were 10,000 Bayat and Kuragháh, who were settled. There were also Bayat in Burújird, Khurramábád, and Fars, apart from those who had joined the Kájár tribe, forming the sub-division known as the Shámhâyátli (Houtum-Schindler, *Eastern Persian Irak*, 48-50). The Kurdish tribes in Khurásán consisted of 14,000 houses and tents of Za'faránli at Kúchán, 2,000 Kánvaráli at Rádkán, and 3,000 Shádilíli at Budjnurd, and various other groups at Júdání and elsewhere (Lady Sheil, *op. cit.*, 400). The Za'faránli had originally been settled in Akhal by Sháh 'Abdás to repel the Özbeks, but they were driven out in the reign of Sháh Súltán Husayn, and retired to Kúchán, Shirwán, and Budjnurd (Yate, *op. cit.*, 180 ff.; see also Curzon, *op. cit.*, i, 97 ff., and 191-2).

The Central Asian frontier of Persia and control of the tribes living in the Turkomán steppe proved a difficult problem for the Kájárs, as it had for earlier dynasties. They were unable to prevent widespread raiding by the Özbeks and Turkománs, who plundered and, in the early part of the century, carried off many Persian subjects into slavery. The two most important Turkomán tribes on the Persian side of the frontier were the Gulkán and the Yamút, both Sunní. The former were not nomadic. The latter, who were found on both sides of the ill-defined frontier, were divided into two sections, Özbeks, who were cultivators, and lewrongás, who were nomads. The relations between the Yamút and the Aták villagers were hostile and raiding by the former was frequent. There was, however, often provocation by the latter and much oppression of them by government officials. The Gulkán, who occupied the area to the south-east of the Caspian Sea, lived in constant dread of the Yamút and were also on bad terms with the Kurds of Budjnurd and the Hándjáilí tribe of Kabúddjáma. Raids and counter raids were of common occurrence (cf. Yate, *op. cit.*, 245-7, for an account of a raid). Each section of the Gulkán and Yamút consisted of several awbás, each of which had its leader (áj sabáh), who held a hereditary *yurt*. There was no leader of the whole tribe. When necessary, the elders of the awbas and the *sikáyés* within (assasíyá) the Gulkán, and elsewhere, would assemble to decide on some course of action. When the *cambúrás* migrated and the *cumúrás* were left without their protection, the governor of Astarábád would levy a small poll-tax and *fískhás* from them. The Persian government, unable to coerce the Turkománs, as far as possible conciliated them (Account of Abbót's Journey, *op. cit.*). In the reign of Násir al-Dín Sháh, the Gulkán were compelled to furnish forty or fifty families as hostages, but this did not prevent their carrying on foraging excursions into Persia (Lady Sheil, *op. cit.*, 207 ff.). Yate in 1893 states that some of the Gulkán were wealthy. The Persian government numbered the Gulkán settled in the Gurgán district at 900-1,000 families, but others put them at 1,700-2,000. They lived in constant dread of the Yamút (*op. cit.*, 217 ff.). The Yamút were variously estimated at 7,000 to 15,000 tents. Yate thought the lower estimate the most nearly correct. Of them, 4,000 were said to be *cumúrás* and 2,400 *cambúrás* (*op. cit.*, 279-80). (See also Curzon, *op. cit.*, i, 189 ff.; and various reports from Karelin, the chief of the expedition sent to the Eastern shores of the Caspian in 1836, to the Russian Minister of Finance, translations of which are in F.O. 65:226, incl. in Durham to Palmerston, St. Petersburgh, 15 December 1836; F.O. 65:223, incl. in Durham to Palmerston, 1st March 1838; and confidential, St. Petersburgh, 13 February 1837, and F.O. 65:234. Incl. in Durham to Palmerston, no. 63, St. Petersburgh, 8 April 1837).

In the Tehran region there were a miscellaneous collection of tribes, of whom the Sháhsívan were the most numerous—9,000 tents—in the middle of the nineteenth century. They were dispersed according to the season between Kumm, Tehran, Kazán, and Zandján. The remainder consisted of various small groups, most of whom were extremely poor (Lady Sheil, *op. cit.*, 397). There were also Khládíadj near Kumm and Sáva (de Bode, *op. cit.*, ii, 318). Houtum-Schindler mentions some 1,000 Pážíklí families in Varámní and Khwár towards the end of the century. Some spoke Kurdish and some Turkish. He also mentions various other minor tribes in Eastern Persian Irák (*op. cit.*, 50 ff.).

The Khámsí district of Zandján was inhabited by a number of Turkish tribes. They lived in summer in tents, but did not move far. In winter they lived in houses, because of the severe cold. The two largest tribes were the Gárráns, numbering 4,500 houses, and the Sháhsívaní al-Afshár, numbering 2,500 tents (Lady Sheil, *op. cit.*, 397). By the beginning of the 20th century they had apparently all become settled,
except for a few Shahisivans and one Talish tribe, originally from Gilan (E. Aubin, La Perse d’aujourd’hui, Paris 1908, 147). Of the Shahisivan tribe in the Hamadan-Malayir-Tuyserkan-Farahan region was the Turkish tribe, the Karaguzlu. Macdonald Kinneir states that they could put 7,000 men in the field (op. cit., 127). The district between Kangavar and Hamadan was in the hands of the Afsær, centred on Assadabad (op. cit., 129). Sheil numbered the Karaguzlu at 4,000 houses. By his time they were all settled. There were also various Laki tribes, reckoned at 1,500 tents and houses, in the Hamadan-Malayir-Tuyserkan-Farahan area (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 398).

The Kurds, apart from the settlements in Khurāsān and elsewhere mentioned above, were to be found in Kirmānshāh, Ardalan, and western Ādharbāyjān. They lived on the frontiers of the Persian and Ottoman empires and in some cases migrated across these. This greatly aggravated the difficulty of controlling them. Sheil gives a list of the Kurdish tribes of Kirmānshāh, but states that the figures must be treated with reserve. According to this list the most numerous were the Kalkhūr, put at 11,500 tents and houses, the Zangana (including the Sandjābī) at 10,000 houses and tents, and the Gūrān at 3,300 tents and houses (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 401). Curzon, towards the end of the century, puts the Kurds of Kirmānshāh at some 24,500 tents and families, of which the Kalkhūr and Gūrān accounted for 5,000 each, and the Sandjābī 1,500 (op. cit., i, 557). Curzon’s figures presumably include many Kurds who were settled in towns. The Kurds of Ardalan were mainly sedentary, and until towards the end of the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh were in fact independent of the interference of the central government because of the inaccessible nature of the country. Among them were the Hakākī, living west of Urmiyya near Salmās and on both sides of the Ottoman-Persian frontier (see Malcolm, op. cit., ii, 334-5). Gaspard Drouville, who was in Persia in 1872-73, states that the most important protection of Ābbās Mirzā and that they came annually with immense flocks to use the pastures in Persia. In time of war their flocks provided Ābbās Mirzā with horse and foot soldiers. As soon as they entered Persia, they were supplied and provided for by the shah. Drouville also states that the Kurds of Ādharbāyjān who provided Ābbās Mirzā with military contingents were exempt from taxation (Voyage en Perse, Paris 1825, ii, 7). The Shābaks under Saḍīq Khān, to whom Miyanā and the surrounding districts belonged, were said to be able to number 10,000 horse. On the death of Ākā Muhammad Khān, Saḍīq Khān made an abortive attempt to establish his independence. He rebelled again later and lost his life. The tribe was subsequently dispersed (Macdonald Kinneir, op. cit., 152). According to Sheil, the Shābaks and Mukri both consisted of 15,000 tents and houses. The latter lived round Sawdj Bulāgh (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 396). The figures given by Curzon are lower (op. cit., i, 555). The Bāban in Sulduz according to Sheil numbered 1500 houses (Lady Sheil, op. cit., p. 401). (See also Shāykh Muhammad Mardūḵ, Ta’rīḵ-i Mardūḵ, n.d., 2 vols., and Muhammad Mukri, Ta’rīḵ-i Kurd, Il-i Sandjābī, vol. i, pt. 1, Tehran 1934).

Of the Turkish tribes in Ādharbāyjān the Shāhsivan were the most numerous. Abbott, writing in 1844, states that they were usually estimated at 11-12,000 families, about 6-7,000 inhabiting Miḵūn and about 5,000 Ardabil. Both wintered in Miḵūn. In the Ardabil district they inhabited several villages, of which the population was partly made up of peasants and partly tribal. In these the government’s demand on the tribe was 1,000 tūmāns p.a. The tented families, on the other hand, paid 5,500 tūmāns, of which the Miḵūn division paid 4,000 tūmāns. These sums were paid by the heads of the tribe, who collected them from their followers (‘Account of Abbott’s Journey’, op. cit.). According to Sheil, the Shāhsivan numbered 10,000 tents (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 396). Houtum-Schindler states that the Inānū were the most important branch of the Shāhsivans. The Shāmūlī by this time existed partly as a branch of the Shāhsivan and partly as a separate tribe called the Bahārūfū, numbering some 2,500 families, half residing in Fārs, where they formed part of the Khamsa, and half in Ādharbāyjān (Eastern Persian Irāk, 48-50). By the 20th century many of the Shāhsivan had become settled. Aubin puts them at 19,700 families, divided into sixty groups or uḏjābs, each under a kadkhūd (op. cit., 106-7). The Mukāddam in the middle of the century numbered 5,000 houses and the Māḥmūdī 2,500; both were in Marāgha. The Bahārūfū and the Afsār, both in Urūmiyya, were reckoned at 2,000 and 7,000 houses respectively, the Dunbulī at 2,000 houses, the Karā Papakh at 1,500 houses. There were a few minor tribes also (Lady Sheil, op. cit., 396). In the early 20th century they numbered 5,000 families (Aubin, op. cit., 78-9). Houtum-Schindler puts the Afghāns in Ādharbāyjān at the end of the 19th century at 12,000 families (Eastern Persian Irāk, 48-50).

The tribes of Karādja Dāgh, Karā Dāgh and Tālīsh proved, like most of the frontier tribes, difficult to control, migrating from one side to the other. In the early Kāḏār period they played a restless part in the Perso-Russian wars, their allegiance vacillating. Sheil puts the numbers of the Cīlibiyānū in Arasbārān at 1,500 tents and houses, the Karāčurū at 2,500, the Hāḏḏijī ʿAllū at 800, the Begdālī at 200 and various minor groups at 129. These figures are probably too low (op. cit., ii, 129 ff.). (See further Bāyburdī, Ta’rīḵ-i Arasbārān, Tehran 1962, 121 ff. and Aubin, op. cit., 255). The Karāčurū were among the first of the tribes in Arasbārān to become settled (Bāyburdī, op. cit., 110 ff.).

By the beginning of the 20th century the position of the tribes had changed considerably. Many of the tribal leaders were familiar with urban life, either through government service or because of their detention in the capital by the government as hostages. A few had travelled abroad. Settlement both of the leaders and the tribesmen was growing, and, apart from the outlying areas, the tribes were becoming assimilated to the rest of the population (cf. Aubin, op. cit., 177-8).

With the Constitutional revolution a new period began in Persia, which affected the position of the tribes as well as that of other sections of the population. Tribal forces were found on both sides in the struggle for the constitution. Under the electoral law of 9 September 1906, dividing electors and elected into six categories, the tribes, apart from the Kāḏārs, were not reckoned as a special category, but were counted among the inhabitants of each province and as such had the right to vote subject to the conditions laid down (Art. 1, note 2). Under the electoral law of 7 July 1909, however, provision
was made for the Shahsivan, Kashka'i, Khamsa (of Pars), Turkomans, and Bakhtiyari each to send one representative to the assembly (Art. 63). In the later electoral laws no special provision was made for tribal representation. In the early years of constitutional government and during the anarchy prevailing after the suspension of the constitution in 1911 the government was unable to control the tribal areas. Because of this, with the discovery of oil in southwest Persia, special agreements were made between the Anglo-Persian Oil Company and the Shah, and the Shaykh of Mumawmara and the Bakhtiyari respectively on the other. The latter supplied labour to the engineers and provided guards for the protection of the oil-fields. During the first World War there was much unrest, rebellion and disorder in the tribal areas (see further Sir Percy Sykes, A History of Persia, ii). After the war Ridâ Khân, later Ridâ Shâh Pahlawi, reimposed the authority of the central government throughout the country. The Kurds of Aghdarbâyjân were subjugated and disarmed. In 1925 the Bakhtiyâris and Kashkâ'is were partially disarmed and the Turkomans to some extent reduced. Subsequently, attempts were made to settle the tribes (see Hassan Arfa, Under five Shâhs, London 1964, and Landlord and Peasant, 181, 283 ff.). During and after the second World War there were also disturbances in the tribal areas, especially a separatist movement in the Kurdish districts of Aghdarbâyjân and a serious tribal revolt in the south in 1946.

Bibliography: In the article. Further material on the tribes and their movements will be found in chronicles, dynastic and local histories. See also H. Field, Contributions to the anthropology of Iran. Anthropological Series Field Museum of Natural History, xxix/x-ii, 15 December 1939: X. de Planhol, "Geography of Settlement", in Cambridge History of Iran, i, 409-67, and E. Sunderland, "Pastoralism and the social Anthropology of Iran", ibid., 611-83.

(_VECTOR_)

ILBIRA, Sp. Elvira, town and the associ¬ated province, near or identical with Granada. The Ilbira question is one on which much discussion and may be summarized as follows: The Roman town of Iliberri occupied part of the present site of Granada. The Arab governors of the region at first resided there, Arabicizing the name into Ilbira, but about 130/747 founded, 12 km north-west of modern Granada, a new capital which was called Kaštâla, Kaštilla, or Kaštiyâ. This however soon became known by the name of its predecessor, Elvira. The original Elvira continued to be populated, largely by Jews and Christians, but in time came to be known as Granata/Charnâta. In 401/1010, during the Berber insurrection, new Elvira was sacked by the Şanğâdja troops of Zâwi b. Ziri and the inhabitants emigrated to Granada. In 403/1012 Zâwi declared his independence and made Granada his capital. Henceforward Elvira declined though there was still a fortress there as late as 891/1486. The ruins are still visible and the name survives in the Sierra de Elvira and the Puerta de Elvira at Granada.

The name Ilbira as that of the region of which the capital was Granada continued in use long after the decline of Elvira town. See further GHARNATA.

Bibliography: Pasim in most historians and geographers, but see in particular Yâkût, i, 348, iv, 97; Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., i, 343; Dozy, Recherches, i, 328-33.

(A. K. S. LAMBOT)
the early decades of the 7th/13th. Down to the death in battle in 590/1194 of Toghril b. Arslan, last of the Great Saljuqs of Iraq and Persia, the Ildenizids ruled as theoretical subordinates of the Sultans, acknowledging this dependence on their coins almost down to the end of the Saljuqs. Thereafter, they were in effect an independent dynasty, until the westward expansion of the Mongols and the Kharaizmshahs weakened and then brought the line to its close. All the Ildenizid Atabegs issued coins of their own.

Genealogical Table of the Ildenizids

1. Shams al-Din Ildeniz
2. Nusrat al-Din Djahan-Pahlawan Muhammad
3. Muzaaffar al-Din Kizil Arslan
4. Kutlug Inan6
5. Nusrat al-Din Abu Bakr
6. Muzaaffar al-Din Ozbeg
7. Amir-i Pahlawan Muhammad
Khadsh

1. Political history. The career of Shams al-Din Ildeniz himself is discussed above, s.v. Ildeniz. His name, most frequently spelled in the sources ‘yydzh, has been traditionally rendered “Ildiz” or “Ildeniz”, but V. Minorsky (Studies in Caucasian History, 92, n. 2) regarded a derivation from Turkish ‘iliz + deniz as “modernizing and impossible” and suggested, on the basis of the transcription of the name in Georgian and Armenian sources, the form Eldigiz. The links which he had forged with the Saljuk royal family—his marriage with Sultan Toghril b. Muhammad and Malik-Shah’s widow Mumtana Khattun and his support for the succession of Arslan b. Toghril—gave his offspring a commanding position in northwestern Persia, which they were for a considerable time able to maintain against rival powers.

Ildeniz’s eldest son the Atabeg Nusrat al-Din Djahan-Pahlawan Muhammad (571-82/1175-87) was Sultan Arslan’s half-brother and succeeded not only to his father’s lands of Arranz and those parts of Adharbaydjan not held by the Aghmaulis [q.v.] of Maragha, but also to Djibal, including Hamadhjan, Isfahanz and Ray; his brother Kizil Arslan was established in Tabriz as subordinate ruler. Pahlawan Muhammad continued his father’s policy of holding the Sultan in tutelage, and ‘Imad al-Din plausibly asserts that Pahlawan Muhammad poisoned Arslan in 571/1176 when he attempted to break free from the Atabeg’s control; the latter now set up Arslan’s young son Toghril as Sultan and thereby maintained his grip on real power in the state. A feature of Pahlawan Muhammad’s Atabegate, particularly stressed by Rawandi and Ibn Isfandiyar, is that he raised to positions of great power in the territories a body of his personal slave commanders, the Pahlawanimatediya, as Ibn al-Athir calls them. They were seemingly meant as a basis of support for Pahlawan Muhammad’s children after he was dead, but they seem in practice to have been more a divisive than a cohesive factor, contributing much to the confusion of western Persia during the last years of Sultan Toghril’s reign and the ensuing period (see Luther, Rawandi’s Report on the adminis-

trative changes of Muhammad Jahang Pahlawan).

When Pahlawan Muhammad died in 582/1187, he was followed in the Atabegate by his childless brother Muzaaffar al-Din Kizil Arslan (582-7/1187-91), in accordance with the Turkish practice of the seniorate. However, Pahlawan Muhammad also divided out his personal territories amongst his four sons, who were to be subordinate rulers under Kizil Arslan’s general supervision. This arrangement proved to be an unhappy one. The ghulams whom Pahlawan Muhammad had appointed
the old Ildenizid heartland of Adharbaydjan during Kyuugh Inan's Atabegate, and he now continued to rule there unchallenged. His authority in Dibajl, on the other hand, was only nominal, real power being in the hands of the ghulams (guards) of the Pahlavan-Ishfahani, whilst the Caliph al-Nasir controlled such towns as Isfahan, Kazvin and Hamadhan. Much of Abu Bakr's energy had to be concentrated on his family's old rivals, the Ahmadilis of Maragha. Ala

3. Culture. The Turkish Ildenizids shared to the full in the Perso-Islamic civilization of their period. At this time, the courts of northern Persia, including those of Sharwan, Arran and Adharbaydjan, were particularly attractive to poets and literary men. Ildenizid patronage was aimed for his piety and patronage of scholars; he built and endowed with asek the great madrasa in Hamadhan where he was ultimately buried. Even the notorious drunkard Abu Bakr was known for his attention to the "ulama" and his zeal for building mosques and madrasas. Dawlatshah stresses the great number of poets in the Ildenizid court circle, and mentions specifically Abu'din al-Din Abshaklat, Mudjur al-Din Baylakani, Zahir al-Din Faryabhi, Niqami, Kiwami, Mutarrizi and Yusuf Fu
doili; to these, 'Afwi adds "Ismad ad-Din Ghazawi and Shahrub Ishfahan, the eulogists of Pahlawan Muhammad. Of these poets, the roles of Mudjur al-Din, the pupil of Khakshiri, at Khakshir's court; and of Zahir al-Din at the courts of Khzir Arsln and Abu Bakr, are especially noteworthy. Nizami, one of his rare journeys outside his native Gandja to converse with Khzir Arsln, and no fewer than four of the Khamsa are connected with the Ildenizids: the Makbuz arm-r, was dedicated to Ildeniz; Khosruw u Shrin to Sultan Togrul b. Arslan, Pahlawan Muhammad and Khzir Arsln (from the last of whom the poet received the grant of four villages as a reward); and the first version of the Iskandar-nama and the Half payhar were dedicated to Abu Bakr (on the problems connected with the dedication of the two parts of the Islanand-nama, see Minorsky, Caucasius II, 872-3).

3. Conclusion. The historical significance of the dynasty is twofold. Firstly, the decay of the Saldjuks enabled the Ildenizids to convert the governorship of northwestern Persia, which was theoretically a reward for exercising the position of Atabeg over a Saldjuk prince, into hereditary rule. Whilst such strong personalities as Ildeniz and Pahlawan Muhammad directed the family's fortunes, they enjoyed de facto independence, at the same time deriving such prestige as remained from the position of Atabegs to the Saldjuks family. But their weaker successors found themselves only one element amongst many struggling for hegemony in northern and western Persia—rival Turkish amirs, the 'Abbasid Caliphs, the Kh'aran-Shahs, and on the western fringes, the Ayyubids, with whom Pahlawan Muhammad had diplomatic brushes over the heritage of the Shahr Armanids of Khilat (see for Ayyubid policy on the borders of Armenia and Adharbaydjan, V. Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian history, 150 ff., and F. Symposium, 1A, art. Pahlawan)—and outside Adharbaydjan their authority was frequently disputed.

Secondly, the consolidation of Ildenizid power coincided with a resurgence of military expansionism by the Georgian Christians, whose territories marched with Muslim Sharwan and Arran. The defence of the Caucasian frontiers had been one of Ildeniz's special concerns, and the efforts of the Atabeg and other local rulers like the Sharwan-Shahs and the Shahr Armanids had slowed down the dynamic of the Bagratid King Giorgi III (1256-84). However, the Georgians became again active during the reign of Queen Tamara (1284-1322). In her time, they interfered frequently in the affairs of the Ildenizids and Sharwan-Shahs, aiding rival Ildenizid princes in the period after Pahlawan Muhammad's death, until Abu Bakr in 607/1210 endeavoured to safeguard his position by marrying a Georgian princess. The Ildenizids were only barely able to contain the Georgians, and not until the appearance of the Mongols in the Caucasus were Georgian energies quelled.

Bibliography: Primary historical sources: Ravidani, 'Rakhi-al-sudur; Zahir al-Din Nishapuri, Saldjuks-nama; Abu Hamid, Dhaul-i Saldjuks-nama; Muhammad al-Yazdi, al-'Uruda fi l'ikhtiyar al-saldjukiyah; "Ismad al-Din, in Bundari, Zubat al-nusra; Shadr al-Din al-Husayni, Ashqar al-dawla al-saldqkiyya; Ibn Isfandiyar, 'Tarikh-i Tabaristanis; Sibt b. al-Djawzi, Miirdi al-zamun; Ibn al-Akhf, al-Kamal; Nasawi, Sirat Sultan Djalal al-Din; Hamd Allah Mustawfi, 'Tarikh-i guzida. For the Georgian and Armenian sources, see Bonnet, Histoire de la Geographe, and idem, Collection d'histoire armeniens; the Armenian historians Kiralos of Gandzak and Vardon are especially relevant.
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For the cultural and literary history of the dynasty, see the references in Dawlatshah, Tadhkirat al-shu'ard*, Awfi, Togarfa armagan, T. Talqin, 125-6.

What has been said above about the internal structure of the Karakhanid confederation shows how these dominions were never ruled as a unitary state, but the eastern Khanate was not Islamized till some time after 742 A.D., part of the tripartite confederation of the Orkhon Turks or T'u-chueh, and then after 742 A.D., part of the confederation gradually becomes discernible. As amongst certain other Altaic peoples, there was a system of double kingship. The Great Khan ruled directly over the western part of the confederation, with his court at the encampment of Khak'ghar or Kara Ordu in the Çu valley of Semireythe. The Associate Khan was under the supreme authority of the Great Khan, and also ruled directly over the western lands, with his encampment at Talas or Käshghar. Beneath these two Khans was a complicated hierarchy of subordinates to Khans and regional governors of the Karakhanid family. These rulers all bore Turkish regnal names and titles, including a totemistic one (oqulam), and after their conversion to Islam they adopted Arabic names and titles. The Turkish titles changed as members of the family moved up in the hierarchy. The disentangling of the genealogy and chronology of the dynasty, on the bases both of literary sources and of coins, is accordingly very difficult.

Military activity along the Sämändid-Karakhanid borders, and commercial intercourse, led to the conversion of the Karakhanid in the course of the 4th/10th century. Much of this proselytizing work was doubtless done by dervishes and other Muslim enthusiasts; the name of one of these, Abu 'l-Hasan Muhammad Kalimât of Nishâpur, is accordingly very difficult.

Military activity along the Sämändid-Karakhanid borders, and commercial intercourse, led to the conversion of the Karakhanid in the course of the 4th/10th century. Much of this proselytizing work was doubtless done by dervishes and other Muslim enthusiasts; the name of one of these, Abu 'l-Hasan Muhammad Kalimât of Nishâpur, is accordingly very difficult.
but instead as a loose, tribal grouping. In the early 5th/nth century, two distinct lines emerged within the Karakhanid dominions inevitably led to disputes and rivalries. The Ghaznavid historian Bayhaqi already speaks of warfare amongst "the Khans and the Ilg" in the middle years of Mahommed of Ghazna's reign, and the Sultan encouraged these divisions in the hope of weakening the solidarity of the Karakhanids. In particular, he allied in 416/1025 with Yusuf Kadir Khan b. Harun Bughra Khan of Khotan and Kashghar and after 417/1026, of the capital Oezkend and Kashghar. The Ilig Nasr, the grandson Harun or Hasan Bughra Khan (the "Hasanids"), and the Ali Tigin plays a central part in the history of Transoxania at this time; his power had a secure base in the rich cities of Bukhara and Samarkand, and in alliance with the Saljuq bands of Arslan Is'rail, Toghril and Cahgir, he was the Ghaznavids' implacable foe until his death in 423/1034. All Tigin's sons, representing the Ilig Nasr line, were not long able to retain their father's principality in Transoxania once he was dead. The whole region was gradually conquered by two brothers of the 'Ali line, Muhammad 'Ayn al-Dawla and Bori Tigin, sons of the Ilig Nasr. Muhammad proclaimed himself Great Khan, and Bori Tigin became his Associate Khan (433/1041-2). From this date onwards, there were two distinct Karakhanid Khanates (cf. O. Pritsak, "Karachanidische Streitfragen. 4. Zwei Karachanidische Kugane"). The eastern one comprised the original Karakhanid territories of Semirecry, eastern Farghena and Kashgharia, with Balasaghun or Khar Ordu as its capital and with Khashgar as an important religious and cultural centre. The western one comprised Transoxania and western Farghena as far as Khudjanda, with first Oezkend and then Samarkand as its capital. The intermediate zone of the middle Syr Darya was frequently a subject of contention between the two branches. The eastern branch of the Karakhanids, the Hasanids, soon conquered the whole of Farghena. Their resources in manpower were augmented by the conversion to Islam of large numbers of pagans from the outer steppes; thus in 435/1043-4, 10,000 tents of Turks who nomadized "between Bulghar and Balasaghun" became Muslims. The Great Khan Muhammad b. Yusuf Kadir Khan was probably the grandfather of the pioneer Turkish lexicographer Mahommed Khashhari [g.v.]; Mahommed's father was Amir of the district of Barskh in Semirecry (cf. O. Pritsak, "Mahmu'd Kâşgarî kimdir?, in TM, x (1951-3), 243-6). During these years, Khashkar grew as a centre for cultural and religious life, and it was there that Yusuf Khâqân Hâdîlî [g.v.] wrote his Kudâddû biliq, dedicating it to the Khan Hasan b. Sulaymân (456/1064-5; 1102-3). In particular, Khashkar speedily became the chief starting-point for the spread of Muslim faith and culture over the Tarim basin and towards the frontiers of Mongolia and China.

Hasan Khan's son and successor Ahmad held in check the Western Liao or Kara Khitây [g.v.], a people who were probably of Mongol origin and who were at this time being forced to migrate westwards after the downfall of their two centuries' domination in northern China. But after Ahmad's death, the eastern Karakhanids were no longer able to stem the Kara Khitây advance. Balasaghun fell under Kara Khitây control and became their capital. Little is known of the eastern Karakhanid Khans of the later 6th/12th century; they were willy-nilly vassals of the Khitây Sultan, and their rulers had their capital in Kashgar. When the Nayan Mongol adventurer Kutulg overthrew the Gur-Khan and established his ephemeral empire in Semireczy, he released the Karakhanid Muhammad II from his previous detention at the Kara Khitây court, and restored him to Khashkar. Unfortunately, an internal revolt brought about the death of this last eastern Karakhanid before he could re-assume the throne (607/1210-11). Khashkar passed into Kutulg's hands and the eastern branch of the dynasty was finished.

The history of the western Khânate is better known that that of its eastern counterpart, for the Islamic historical sources deal more fully with Transoxanian events, these being frequently intertwined with happenings in Khourassan. Ibrahim Tamghach Khan, the former Bori Tigin (ca. 444-50/1052-68), secured a leading place in the "Mirrors for Princes" and adab literature as the exemplar of a just and pious ruler, although the historical sources show that Ibrahim was at the same time involved in many clashes with the over-powerful and ambitious class of "ulama" in Transoxania. A serious external threat to these Karakhanids arose from the rise of the Great Saljuq empire, which in the second half of the 5th/11th century was at its apogee under Alp Arslan and Malik Shâh [g.v.]. Ibrahim had already found it impossible to retain in face of Saljuq pressure the upper Oxus provinces of Khudjand and Chaghânîán, which he had previously conquered from the Ghaznavids. His son Shams al-Mulk Nasr (460-72/1066-80), famous for the splendour of his court and his patronage of scholars, had to endure a Saljuq invasion in 465/1072-3; in the following year, he had to sue for peace at Samarkand with Malik Shâh, and to acknowledge Saljuq suzerainty over Transoxania. Tension between the throne and the "ulama" was now a permanent feature of the western Khânate. In 483/1095 the religious classes called in Malik Shâh against Ahmad Khan b. Khûdîr, and the Sultan penetrated as far as Oezkend; soon afterwards, the "ulama" secured Ahmad's deposition and execution on a charge of sympathy for the Isma'ilîs. The next Khans seem to have been nominated by the Saljuqs. Muhammad II b. Sulaymân (497-524/1002-9) was Sultan Sandjar's nephew and son-in-law, but his reign was much troubled by the activities of rival Karakhanid claimants.

Muhammad's son Mahommed II was also Sandjar's nephew and was Great Khan from 516/1123 to 516/1141. It was he who came up against the Kara Khitây. After reducing the eastern Karakhanids to submission, the Kara Khitây marched westwards. In the great battle of the Katân Steppe in 536/1141, Sandjar and his Karakhanid protégés were disastrously defeated. Mahommed fled to Khourassan, and the Gur Khan set up Transoxania. The Gur Khan then set up various Karakhanid princes as his...
puppets, although the real power in Bukhara now lay with the Sunni religious leaders or 

With the deaths of Mahmud and his sons, the "Ali branch of the Karakhanids came to an end, and the rule over the western Khânate passed to the Hasanids

In Farghana, Karakhanid princes lingered on for a few more years. It seems that a separate line had arisen here, centred on Özked, after the Kara Khítica invasion of 536/1141. One of these Khâns, Arslan, in 608/1211-12 threw off Kara Khítica control and recognized the rising power of Şingiz-Khân. The line apparently persisted as governors of Farghana under the first Mongol Khân, but virtually nothing is known of them.

3. Cultural. Like the Saldjuk Sultans, the Karakhanid Khâns gradually assimilated themselves to the Perso-Islamic cultural and governmental traditions. The Khân's red ceremonial parasol or lâr is mentioned in the Kutadgu biiliq. Such pious and just rulers as Ibrahim Tamghac Khan stipulated that the Friday mosque of Bukhara and laid out the palace of Shahsâbâd near that city. Muhammad II b. Sulaymân was also a great builder, and restored the citadel of Bukhara. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the Dar al-Islâm were undertaken by the Khâns, and we hear of Muhammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" in the Karakhanid provinces. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the Dar al-Islâm were undertaken by the Khâns, and we hear of Muhammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" in the Karakhanid provinces. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the Dar al-Islâm were undertaken by the Khâns, and we hear of Muhammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" in the Karakhanid provinces. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the Dar al-Islâm were undertaken by the Khâns, and we hear of Muhammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" in the Karakhanid provinces. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the Dar al-Islâm were undertaken by the Khâns, and we hear of Muhammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" in the Karakhanid provinces. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the Dar al-Islâm were undertaken by the Khâns, and we hear of Muhammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" in the Karakhanid provinces. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the Dar al-Islâm were undertaken by the Khâns, and we hear of Muhammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" in the Karakhanid provinces. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the Dar al-Islâm were undertaken by the Khâns, and we hear of Muhammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" in the Karakhanid provinces. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the Dar al-Islâm were undertaken by the Khâns, and we hear of Muhammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" in the Karakhanid provinces. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the Dar al-Islâm were undertaken by the Khâns, and we hear of Muhammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" in the Karakhanid provinces. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the Dar al-Islâm were undertaken by the Khâns, and we hear of Muhammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" in the Karakhanid provinces.
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also the anecdote concerning the titles of the Kara-
khanids and Mahmud of Ghazna's jealousy over them,
given in Nizam al-Mulk's Siydsad dilma, ch. xi, and
discussed by Bosworth in Oriens, xv (1969), 224-6.
The legends of Karakhanid coins also show that the
Uyghur script was used side-by-side with the Arabic.
The Kutadgu bilig of Yusuf Khass Haghjib [q.v.] was
completed at Kaghkar in 652/1159-60 and dedicated
to the then ruling Khán. Four years later, Mahmud
Kaghghari [q.v.] completed his Divan i-iughat al-Turk,
with the express aim of demonstrating that the Turk-
ish language was comparable to Arabic in its rich-
ness. The didactic nature of early Turkish poetry
was continued at the end of the Karakhanid period in
the 'Atabat al-hakdik of Ahmad b. Mahmud; the existence
of this work shows that the Kutadgu bilig was by no means an isolated phenomenon. Shaykh
Abmade Yasawi (d. 562/1166) left behind a collection of
vernacular Turkish verses, the Divan-i-iikmet, although
this is now regarded as of doubtful authenti-

4. General conclusions. The limitations of source
material make it difficult to assess the general
historical significance of the Karakhanids and difficult
to evaluate the changes which their rule brought to
Transoxania and the adjacent lands. As with the
Saldjûks, we have the establishment of a Muslim
Turkish power, not by Turkish slave commanders
(as in the case of the Ghaznavids) but by tribal
leaders and their hordes. Compared with the proceed-
ing regime of the Sâmanids, the Karakhanids brought
about a decentralization of administration and a
fragmentation of authority in Transoxania. One of
the continuators of the historian of Buhkárâ, Nar-
shakhi, says that taxes were everywhere lightened
when the Karakhanids supplanted the Sâmanids,
and it is further probable that indigenous landed
classes there, the dihkâns, enjoyed a resurgence of
local power. The Khán remained close to their
Khurul followers, who comprised such tribes as the
Çigil and Yaghma; certainly, in the time of
Shams al-Mulk Naçr the Khán were nomadic during
the summer months, residing in their capitals only
during the harsh steppe winters. Unfortunately, we
know little about changes in land utilization and
tenure, although it seems likely that the influx of
pastoral nomads did cause some changes. The mention
during Shams al-Mulk Naçr's reign of qurâns or tracts of
limiting ground established as crown
preserves (Continuator of Narshakhi, tr. R. Frye,
The history of Bukhara, Cambridge, Mass. 1954, 29,
125) may indicate a certain extension of pastoral-
ization.

The Karakhanid territories shared in the general
economic trend, whose causes remain obscure,
whereby silver coinage tended to be replaced by
gold. Nevertheless, the dirham remained the standard
coin circulating in Transoxania, and both dirhams mu'ayyad-iyya 'adîyya and the slightly baser qibret-
fiyya ones circulated in the later 5th/11th and the early 6th/12th century. These dirhams were,
however, considerably debased in relation to the
legal dinár, and the currency was obviously some-
what unstable at this time; the testimony of the
waftfiyya for Ibrâhim Tamâhâ Khân's madrasa,
mentioned above, suggests a figure of 47 dirhams
mu'ayyad-iyya 'adîyya to the dinár instead of the
legally desirable figure of 14¿ (cf. Cohen, in JA
(1967), 309-20, and Continuator of Nasrshakhi,
tr. Frye, 36).

Yet despite the Khán's identification with their
tribal contingents, their positions as Muslim sover-
eigns over such rich and fertile regions as Trans-
oxania and Farghânâ inevitably tended to raise them
to the general tribal level. As happened within
the Great Saldjûk Sultanate, social and political
tensions were generated. During the 6th/12th century,
the Khán were continually at odds with their
military supporters, the Karluq tribesmen, often
with dangerous consequences; it was Mahmûd II's
appeal to Sandjar in 536/1141 for help against the
Karluq that determined the latter to call in the
Kara Khâty as a counterweight. It is not clear
exactly how the Khán obtained in the Samânid period, and is an instance
of the essential continuity of the ruling
and society in Transoxania. Because of these tensions,
and because of the fragmentation of power within
the ruling dynasty itself, the Karakhanids were ill-
prepared to withstand such resolute opponents as
the Kara Khâtây and the Khánaraam-Shâhs.

Bibliography: A detailed bibliography is given by O. Pritsak at the end of his article Die Kara-
chaniden (see below), 63-8. The pre-Muslim history of the
Karluq can be pieced together from the diverse sources which bear on the history of Central
Asia; Chinese, Uyghur, Orkho-Turkish, Byzantine,
etc. For Muslim historians, the Karakhanids inhabited
the periphery of the Islamic world, and they tend to mention the Khán so only
as they impinge on the wider eastern Islamic world. There are, however, important notices in such
authors as 'Utbi, Gardizi, Bayhakhi, continuators of
Nasrshakhi, Nizâm al-Mulk, Dümâl Kârsh, Nasawi, Dhuwaynî and Ibn al-Âlîh. Light is
thrown on the culture of the Karakhanid period by the works of such authors as the
Yusuf Khâss Hâjjjib, Mahmûd Kâshghari, al-Kâbît al-Samar-
kanî, etc., and by the anecdotes given by Nizâmâ
'Ardâl and 'Awfi. Amongst secondary literature,
the following should be noted: E. Sachau, Zur
Geschichte und Chronologic von Khwardzm, in SBAK.
Wien, lxxiv (1853), 330-3; Sir H. Howorth, The
northern frontlagers of China. IX. The Muhammadan
Turks of Turkestân from the tenth to the thirteenth
century, in JRA, 467-502; F. Grenard,
La légende de Salot Boghra Khan et l'histoire, in
JA, Ser. 9, xv (1900), 5-79; Barthold, Turkestan;
iden, Zuwölf Vorlesungen ilber die Geschichte der
Türken Mittelasien, repr. Hildesheim 1962, Fr. tr.,
Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale, Paris 1945;
idem, A short history of Turkestan and History of the
Semirechey, in Four studies on the history of
Central Asia, i, Leiden 1956; R. Vansier, Zur
Münzbunde der Qaraqândîn, in MSOS As.,
xxxiii (1930), 83-104; O. Pritsak, Karachidische
Streitfragen 1-4. in Oriens, iii (1950), 209-28; idem,
Von den Karluh zu den Karakaniden, in ZDMG, ci
(1951), 270-300; idem, Die Karakaniden, in Isl.,
xxxi (1953-4), 17-68 (Turkish version in IA Art.
"Karahânîlar")-; A. Z. V. Togan, Zentral-asiatische
Türkische Literaturen. II. Die Islamische Zeit, in
Handbuch der Urgeschichte, Abt. Bd. ii, 1, 1966,
Berlin, 219-232; A. Câferoğlu, La littérature
turque de l'époque des Karakanides, in Funda-
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bridge 1968; Emel Esin, Türk san'at tarihinde Karan-
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(I. E. Bosworth)

ILERI, DJELAL NURI, in modern Turkish Celâl Nuri Ileri, Turkish modernist, writer, journalist and
critic, 1877-1938. He was born in Istanbul, from Crete, served as governor in various provinces and
gave a speech in 1908. His mother was the daughter of Abdülmecit Pasha (surnamed Dino, 1843-1908)
from Prizrin, a governor and vizier under 'Abd al-
Hâmid II and the author of a well-known commen-
tary on the Mathnawi. One of his brothers, Sübûl Nûri Ileri was a socialist writer and journalist and the
dehusabûn, or publicist, 1850-1936. He was educated at Galatasaray Lycée and Istanbul Univer-
sity, where he studied law, Djelal Nuri perfected his political to publish a few books in that
language, including a novel, Cauus i, about life in Istanbul under 'Abd al-Hâmid. He also learnt
English. His education owes much to his family
circle, which included his paternal uncle Sirri Pasha
and his wife, Leylî Şaz (1850-1936), the poetess and
composer, and author of valuable memoirs of 19th
century hareem life.

Djelal Nûri visited Europe several times and
published some of his impressions in two books: Küstük musâhabeleri and Şimdi hâtlıhâlari (see below).
He soon abandoned the legal profession to become a journalist and free-lance writer. He contributed to
many newspapers and periodicals (some of which he
founded), particularly İbâtâm, Âlî, Ileri, İlgîhâh, Edebiyyat-i 'Umûmîye Medîini, Türk Yurdu, Le Courrier d'Orient and Le
Jeune Turc. He wrote more than fifteen hundred
titles in the last-named French language news-
papers, many of great documentary value for the
period following the mutiny on 13 April 1909
(31 Mart waâbâsî) .

Djelal Nûri represented Gelibolu in the last
Ottoman Parliament, and was elected four times to
the Grand National Assembly. His wide legal know-
ledge and his familiarity with both Eastern and
Western culture made him one of the most sought-
after advisers of the new Nationalist Government in
Ankara. He was an honest, straightforward writer,
always consistent in his principles and in his advocacy
of liberalism and honest government. His strong
activity in the Istanbul daily Ileri, of authoritarian
rule and its abuses, and his contention that the
single-party system was incompatible with democ-

racy, resulted in violent polemics in the press.
Several extremist supporters of the Government,
particularly Aghaoglu Ahmed and Yûnûs Nâdi,
violely attacked him in Government organs. A
member of Parliament, Kûllûf 'Alî, whose name was
published in a list of deputies and officials accused
of having misused their influence, went to Djelal
Nûri's office and attacked him (for details of this
event and subsequent incident, see the newspa-
pers Ileri, Hâkimiyeyeti Milliyeye, Diyanetîyeyet
and Şon Telgrafî for June to August 1340 (fiscal)/
1924. Djelal Nûri's journalist brother Sübûl Nûri
published a strong article of protest the following
day in Ileri (31 July 1924). But Djelal Nûri himself
henceforward wrote only occasionally in the same
paper, and avoided polemics. He died in Istanbul
on 2 November 1938.

Djelal Nûri is the author of some thirty books
and thousands of articles, a few of which have been
published in book form. Without fully adering to any
of the three main groups of the post-1908 period,
that is, "Turkists", Islamists, and Westernizers, he made
his own compromise between the last two. He con-
ducted long polemics on social, political, religious,
juridical and linguistic issues with leading writers
of the period, and opposed equally the extremist
Nationalists, the radical Westernizers and the uncom-
promising Islamists (see Gökâlî, Dîewdet, Mehemed
'ârif, Panislâmîm, Tûran).

He himself was a moderate reformist. But he was
no systematic thinker, so that his ideas and sugges-
tions on various problems crop up in most of his
writings no matter the subject title. The following
are his most outstanding themes on controversial
issues of the period, and consequently polemists.

The legal system. The need for a radical
reform in this field is one of his main themes. The
legal system of a country must take into consider-
ation the historical development, the character, pecu-
liariies, conditions of life of the nation and the re-
quirements of the contemporary age. Midhat Pasha's
Constitution, Dîewdet Pasha's Medîîle and many
laws dealing with administration, jurisprudence, pro-

perty, the civil service etc., are, since they ignore
these conditions, inadequate. Laws are not unalter-
able; on the contrary they should at times be review-
ed and modified according to the changing circum-
cstances of the times.

The emancipation of women. Many social
evils in Ottoman society have as their primary cause
the humiliating position of women. Polygamy
should be prohibited and women should not be treated as
property. Laws concerning marriage, divorce and
childhood should be modernized. This too is in keeping
with the spirit of Islam; whose rules on women and
marriage have been misinterpreted for centuries.
Djelal Nûri's ideas on this subject were by many
found to be "too progressive".

The causes of Ottoman decline. The main
cause for the backwardness of the Ottomans are
that they had no part in the maritime discoveries,
the Renaissance, and the exploitation of printing.

Alphabet and language reform. The Arabic
alphabet not being suitable for Turkish, a reformed
alphabet based on the Roman script is necessary. As
far as the language itself is concerned, however,
Djelal Nûri's approach is conservative. He saw the
Persian-Arabic elements as being as natural and
necessary to Turkish as Latin and French words are
to English. Yet his campaign against the supporters
of "simplification" mellowed later in the republican
period.

Reform in Islam. Islam per se has never been
an obstacle to progress. But it has been constantly
misinterpreted and exploited by bigots and oppor-
tunists. A reform in Islam, particularly in Muslim
law, is necessary. The unity of the Muslim world
should be the ideal, and should replace the national-
istic ideologies of individual Muslim nations. Yet the
ideal of a theocratic state is an anachronism. To
ignore Western civilization leads nowhere. But there
are two civilizations: the technological and the real

civilization. The Turks, like the Japanese, should
adopt the first, but preserve their own Muslim-
Turkish civilization, improving it as necessary, by reforms. (This anticipates Gökalp's later differentiation between "civilization" and "culture").

His main works are: (1) 1327 senesinde Selânîkde münâbâa Îlîhâd ve Terâbbî Kongresine tabâdîn dâman musâhîlâtı, Istanbul 1327/1911; (2) Kenâîî münâm merkezîn, İstanbul 1328/1912; (3) Mây würdên-î-tarihî-i mânâmî yetim-i külhî, İstanbul 1329/1913; (4) Mânâmî-yi hâmîsânî-yi Mâmed dârî-ı-terâmî-yi, İstanbul 1330/1914; (5) Şimâlî fâlîlî-yi mânâmî-yi, İstanbul 1330/1914; (6) Hâtâyî-l-i mânâmî-yi, İstanbul 1331/1915; (7) Iltîhâyî-l-i İslâm; İstanbul 1331/1915; (8) Ka'darînî-wînîsî, İstanbul 1331/1915; (9) Ka'darînî-wînîsî ve hâmîsî-yi, İstanbul 1331/1915; (10) Ta'rikhî-î sîhîhî, İstanbul 1331-1/1915-6; 3 vols.; (11) Ta'rikhî-î sîhîhî-yi-ı mânâmî-yi, Istanbul 1331/1915; (12) Kâdêm-î emîsî, İstanbul 1332/1916; (13) Velî-âhî-âhî-yi-ı mânâmî-yi, İstanbul 1332/1916; (14) Mîllîmîlaları, Türklerke hâmîrât, dûxîlînî-yi râyî-yi, İstanbul 1332/1916; (15) IltîhâyÎ-î İslâm ve Almanyâ, 1333/1917; (16) Kâdêm-î ehtedîmî-nizîrî, İstanbul 1334/1918; (17) Hârîdên sîhîhî Türkleri-yi, İstanbül 1917; (18) İlahîhâk-î celâmî-yi, Istanbul 1926; (19) Türk inkılıbî, Istanbul 1926.


ILETMISH [see İLÎTİMİŞ].

İLGHÂZî [see MU'ÂMMA].

İLGHÂZİ (i.e., "champion of the people") is the name of two local Saljûq rulers of the Artûkî dynasty who attained power in northern Mesopotamia.

1. NÂDÎM AL-DÎN İLGHÂZÎ I. B. ARTUK. He was first of all a supporter of his brother-in-law Tutush in his eventful struggle for the throne of the Saljûq empire of Persia. After Tutush's defeat and death (488/1095) he withdrew to Jerusalem, which he had received as a fief from Tutush jointly with his brother Sulûmân. The two brothers had, however, after a 40 days' siege to surrender Jerusalem to the Egyptians (Shâ'bân 489/July-August 1096). At a later date (from 493/1099), İlgâzî joined the new pretender Sultan Muhammad, who appointed him governor of Baghdad in 494/1100-1. He held this important office for four years, ultimately in the service of Sultan Barkâyûrûcî and his son Sultan Malikshâh.

When Sultan Muhammad dismissed him from the governorship of Baghdad in 498/1105, he fell out with this ruler. Between 498 and 501/1105-8 İlgâzî captured the hitherto impregnable fortress of Mardin, one of the most important in the whole of the eastern frontier of the state in which also lord of Našîbûn. In 504, 505, 506-7 and 508/1111-5 he refused to partake in the war which the Muslim amirs of the west were conducting against the Crusaders in Mesopotamia and Syria upon Sultan Muhammad's orders. During the rest of these campaigns he, with two of his nephews, was the most effective of the commanders-in-chief of the Muslim armies after Sunkur al-Bursûkî and defeated him (May 1115). The Sultan sent a threatening message to İlgâzî, who fled to Damascus. Tughtakin, also on bad terms with the Sultan because of charges of complicity in the murder of Mawdûd, welcomed him, and the two decided on resistance to the Sultan and alliance with the Franks, with whom terms were agreed in a meeting at Lake Máthûn. İlgâzî left for Dýyar Bakr to assemble a force of Turcomans, but was captured at al-Rastan (between Hîms and İmmâtî) by Khîrîhâm, the governor of Hîms. Khîrîhâm appealed to the Sultan for troops to help defend Hîms against Tughtakin, whom meanwhile he held off by threatening to kill İlgâzî. The troops being delayed, he released İlgâzî in return for a hostage and a promise of İlgâzî's protection against Tughtakin. Released, İlgâzî went to Aleppo, collected his Turcomans, and returned to lay siege to Hîms. He was interrupted by the arrival of the Sultan's army commanded by Bursûk b. Bursûk. According to Walter the Chancellor, Tughtakin and İlgâzî occupied Aleppo with the intention of offering it to the Sultan, as a reward for the murder of Mawdûd. Their Frankish ally Roger, Prince of Antioch, hastened to dissuade them. After some inconclusive operations and a defeat by the Franks, Bursûk returned to the East, where he died while preparing a new expedition. İlgâzî established good relations with the Saljûq government after the death of Mawdûd and the accession of his son Mähmûd.

Lu'lu', the governor of Aleppo, was murdered towards the end of 510/1117. Owing to internal disputes the town and district of Aleppo were exposed to the inroads and depredations of the Franks. After İlgâzî had temporarily occupied Aleppo in 511/1117, but had withdrawn after encountering difficulties, he was appealed to in the following year by its inhabitants as their last hope and recognized as prince of Aleppo. In the second half of 512/1118 İlgâzî succeeded in definitively gaining possession of Aleppo and thus became a neighbour of the Franks, against whom he at once made energetic preparations. The numerically weaker Franks were outnumbered on 17 Rabi' I 513/28 June 1119 by his army of 20,000 men in the valley of Tell 'Afrîn, taken by surprise and for the most part cut to pieces or taken prisoner. Among those who fell was Roger of Antioch. It was one of the greatest battles which the Muslims had so far won against the Crusaders (the village of Balût, after which the battle is often called, appears in Ibn al-Čâdis as Roger's camp on the night of 20 June 1119, eight days before the decisive battle). Antioch now lay defenseless for the next 9 years (to 1128) under İlgâzî's feet; but he neglected to take the city.

The reputation of İlgâzî's military ability now spread far and wide and he received the chief command over the Muslims in the war which Sultan Mähmûd was waging in person against the Christian Georgians. İlgâzî suffered a very severe reverse (Ibn al-Čâdis, Ta'rikh Halâb, 515/1121; Ibn al-Čâdis, al-Čâmi, 514/1120), which resulted in the loss of Tifsîn to the Georgians. In 516/1122 he was granted by Haydâr Farrîkîn, the Sultan in addition to his other lands.

Soon afterwards, on 1 Rama'dân 516/3 November 1122 (Ibn al-Kalânîsî: 6 Rama'dân, al-Fârijît: 17}
Ilghazi died at the age probably of barely 60 at Mayyafarikin (Ibn al-Athir and Abu 'l-Su'd ed. S. Dahlan, ii, Damascus 1954, 206; at 'Aqilayn on the road from Mardin to Mayyafarikin, according to Ibn al-Alkanisi). Ilghazi possessed an influence unequalled at that time by Ibn al-Adim. The latter, however, he did not rule in Amid, the metropolis of this district. Ilghazi II left two sons, liusam al-Din Yuluk Arslan, and Malik the Syrian. At the end of Du'mada I 578/September-October 1182 or a little later.

For a general survey of the period and the bibliography, see artukids, adding to the sources there given for Ilghazi I: Walter the Chancellor, De bello Artischoeno, ed. Hagermeyer, 1896, important for his relations with the Franks, and especially the Georgians; see also the bibliography to crusades.

ILHAM (A.) means literally "to cause to swallow or gulp down" (Lisin, xvi, 29, especially last two lines). In the Kur'an it appears only in XCI, 8—

"then He (Allah) made her (a nafs) swallow down her sins and her godly fear" (Arberry: "and inspired it to lewdness and godfearfulness"; Blachere: "et lui a inspire son libertinage et sa piété"; Paret: "und ihm (je nachdem) die ihm eigene Sündhaftigkeit oder Gottesfurcht eingegeben hat"). The oldest exegetical tradition (Tabari, Ta'rif, xxx, 115 f.) gives two explanations: (i) Allah explained to the nafs; (ii) Allâh created these in the nafs. The Mu'tazilis chose the first (Zamakhshari, KashShid, ed. Lees, 1612) but orthodox Islam generally chose the second, the almost certainly correct view, because their hearts are prepared and purified for it. It differs from intellectual knowledge because their hearts are purified and prepared for it. It differs from intellectual knowledge (ilm 'alhil in that it cannot be gained by meditation and deduction; but is suddenly communicated while the recipient cannot tell how, whence or why. It is a pure gift from the generosity (fayd) of Allâh. It differs from 'awây only in that the angel messenger who brings 'awây may be seen by the Prophet and that 'awây brings a message to be communicated to mankind, while ilham is for the instruction of the recipient. From waswasâ or satanic whispering in the heart, it differs in respect of the cause—an angel as opposed to a devil; and in the things to which it incites—good as opposed to evil (al-Ghazâli, Fuyûd, ed. with comm. of Sayyid Murta'da, vii, 244 ff., 264 ff.; id., B. Macnamald, Religious attitude and life in Islam, 252 ff., 275 ff.). But while the fact of ilham was universally admitted,
even Şübs raised the question of the certainty of the knowledge given by it. So al-Hujwiri (Kash'f al-maḥdūb, trans. Nicholson, 271) only said that iḥām cannot give assured knowledge (maw'ārif) of Allāh; but al-Ghazālī would probably have said that al-Hujwiri was using iḥām in the sense of an idea which one found in his mind, and not of the flashing out of the divine light on the soul which, once experienced, can never be mistaken. Others taught that, while it was sufficient for the recipient, it could not be used to convince others or reckoned as a source of knowledge for men in general. This appears to have been al-Nasifī’s position; see his Kitāb al-‘Abādī with commentaries of al-Tafsīrānī and others, Cairo ed. 1321, 40 f. A very curious use is by Ibn Kathīr in the sense of “instinct” (Muḥad-dima, ed. Quatrémère, ii, 331, transl. de Slane, ii, 384; tr. Rosenthal, ii, 370) but this, though a natural development, does not seem to have been taken up by others. Yet Ibn Ḥazm speaks of iḥām as a jābī‘a and refers as an illustration to Kūrān, XVI, 70, on the instincts of the birds: Ḥajjār (871/1465).

Bibliography: Add to references above: Dict. of technical terms, 1308; al-Djurjānī, Ta‘rīfāt, Cairo 1321, 22 foot; Rāghib al-‘Isfahānī, Mufradāt, 471; L. Massing, Taqaddus, 125-8.

(D. B. Macdonald*)

II, a large river in Central Asia. It is formed by the two rivers Tekes and Kunges, which rise on the northern slopes of the Tien-Shan Mts.; the united stream of the II then flows for some 950 kms. across the northern part of the region known in mediaeval times as “the land of the seven rivers”, Yeti-su or Semireçye, into Lake Balkhash. The lower course of the II falls within the Soviet Kazakhs Republic, whilst the eastern part of the II river system belongs to the Chinese Sinkiang-Uyghur Autonomous Region.

The II is first mentioned in the history of the Chinese T’ang dynasty, when one of the main roads from China to Turkestan passed through its valley (Chavannes, Documents sur les Toukous (Turcs) occidentaux, 11 ff.). The oldest Muslim source to mention it is the Hudud al-Sīlām (372/982-3), which says that the Ili runs into the Işk-Kol (the existence of Lake Balkhash was not known to early Islamic geographers). Kāshghārī calls the Ili or Ili “the Djaybūn of the Turkish country”, and he places the Turkish tribe of the Tujgh in the Ili valley, together with the Yaghma and part of the Cīgīl (tr. Atalay, i, 30, 81, 92, 408). The Huddād mentions a town in this region, probably to be identified with Kāshghārī’s frontier town Iki-ogīz (“situated between the two rivers”, i.e., the Ili and Yafindj, cf. Huddād, 77, 208, 276-7, 300-1.

It is not known when Islam first came to the II valley, but in the 7th/13th century it was regarded as marking the farthest boundary of the Đār al-Islām, and the lands to the east were only converted in the post-Mongol period. Immediately before the Mongol period, northern Semireçye, including the town of Kayaligh (see below), was ruled by the Karlik Ars-ān Khan. He threw off Kara Khiıtay suzerainty and negotiated with Cīngiz; consequently, the region did not suffer from the Mongol devastations so badly as Transoxania and Kūrāsān. The upper parts of the II basin contained good pasture for the nomads, and Cīngiz had his ordu on the Ili after Cīngiz’s death. The reports of such travellers as Rubruck (651/1253) and the Chinese envoy to Hūlegū’s court Chang-tee (657/1259) show that the II region was still reasonably flourishing, but that there was a trend towards pastoralization. Rubruck mentions that after crossing the II, he came to the town of Equeius (sc. Ili-bally “town on the II”), whose population was Tādíjk, and the Armenian King Hāitōn (Het‘ūm) also visited it. The nearby town of Cailac (sc. Kālīylagh) is also described as having many merchants (cf. E. Bretschneider, Mediæval researches from eastern Asiatic sources, i, 169), and the trading centre of Almahāl [q.v.], to the north of the II, was at this time the capital of a small Muslim principality. By the 9th/15th century, however, urban life seems to have disappeared from the region.

From the later 17th century until the destruction of Kalmuck power in Turkestan in 1758, Semireçye and the II valley were occupied by the Buddhist Kal-mucks or Oyrat. During the time of the great Khān Ghāldan (d. 1108/1697), the II valley became regarded as the Khān’s personal domain. In the 19th century, it was part of the lands of the Kazaks, but during the reign of Tsar Nicholas I was annexed by Russia. The upper II valley, and especially the town of Kūldjā [q.v.], suffered considerably during the Muslim rebellion in Chinese Turkestan led by Ya’kūb Beg. Because of Russian fears that the outbreak might spread, the district of Kūldjā was in 1871 annexed by Russia, but given back to China in 1883.

During the present century, the main centres of population have been Kūldjā and the small town of II, situated at the junction of the river and the Turkestan-Siberia railway. Navigation is possible during the ice-free months on the Soviet part of the river down to a point near the delta; the waters of the II’s tributaries are extensively used for irrigation, and the upper reaches are an important source of hydro-electric power (see BSE, xvii, 350-1, with a map).

Bibliography: In the text. (C. E. Bosworth)

ILĠPūR [see Supplement].

ILĠĐA (r.), “hot spring”, and a bath served by a hot spring (whereas in principle, in Ottoman usage, a hammām [q.v.] is a bath whose water is artificially heated), a characteristically Western Turkish word, the diminutivel? of II “hot” (< ṭüg, cited by Māmah Kāshghārī, Ar. text, i, 31 = tr. B. Atalay, i, 31, in contrast to “Turkish” yilän, as an example of the Oghuz tendency to drop initial y). According to ‘Alī bin Ṭāhīn (transl. of al-Firūq bādi’s Muḥt, s.v. al-kimma, = ed. of 1268-72, iii, 435; cited in TTS, i, 349), a thermal and curative spring is called “Ildja in Turkish, kapludjā in Bursa, and bāna [cf. Serbo-Croat banja] in Rumeli”; Red house distinguishes kapludjā as “a hot spring roofed in [kaplu] as a bath; especially any one of the hot-baths of Brousā”. These distinctions are perhaps etymological rather than real: kapludjā [q.v.] is admittedly used primarily of the baths, served by thermal springs, in the Cekirge suburb of Bursa; and Ḫilīlī Čelbi says of Sofiā (iii, 399) “in these regions an Ildja is called bāna”; yet he himself uses the word Ildja for the baths of Sofiā and Buda (vi, 242 ff.), and so too Feridūn (i, 599) uses the terms bāna and Ildja without apparent distinction in a “Rumelian” context.

Ildja is a common toponym in Anatolia (over thirty attestations in Türkiye’de meşhur yerler hakkavı, Ankara 1946-50).

(Ed.)

IliYă [see al-kūdās].

ILKHĀN [see TA’RĪKH].

ILK瀚S, Mongol dynasty ruling in
Persia in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries. The first Mongol advance towards the Middle East (1218-21) had touched only the north of the Iranian area and only Khurāsān [q.v.] had, to a certain extent, been subjected to Mongol control. Therefore, when the territories were being divided up under the Great Khan Möngke (1251-9), who himself was fighting in China with his brother Kubilay, the task of extending control over Persia, Mesopotamia and, if possible, Syria and Egypt as well, was entrusted to their brother Hülegü [q.v.]. According to Barthold, about 125,000 men were levied for this purpose from the armies in different parts of the empire, and in about 1253-5 Hülegü advanced. He took the Assassin fortress of Alamāt [q.v.], but left the eastern and southern Iranian principalities (Herāt, Fārs, etc.) undisturbed for the time being in order to push forward his advance on Bagdad after negotiations with the Caliph had collapsed. Bagdad fell on 20 February 1258. Hülegü now held southern Mesopotamia and the north of the country fell to him in the following year; only Mayyāfārīkīn [q.v.] continued to hold out against him.

While Hülegü was absent from the army following the death of Möngke (1259), the advance was to be continued through Syria against the Mamlūks, which, in a certain sense, lasted beyond the year 1295 mentioned above. Syria and Palestine remained in the hands of the Mamlūks, with the western edge of the Euphrates valley forming the frontier. To the north of this area it embraced as dependent states Lesser Armenia and Saljiq Asia Minor, which threw off the suzerainty of the Golden Horde, along with the Caucasus region, which had hitherto been subject, albeit loosely, to this same suzerainty. Various attacks from the north in the following decades failed to loosen the bond between the Caucasus and the Ilkhans, even when the Georgians engaged in repeated insurrections. The course of the Oxus formed the frontier against Čaghatay's territories in Central Asia. In the east the principality of the Kart [q.v.] dynasty of Herāt remained more or less independent of the Mongol power; also in Makrān [q.v.] there existed for a time a frontier zone of uncertain ownership against the principalities in Balūcistān and the Pandībāb. Likewise the island state of Hurmūz [q.v.] with its possessions and the minor principalities in Luristān as well as in Gīlān and Māzandarān [q.v.] were able to remain largely independent; only in 1284, through the marriage of a Mongol prince, did Fārs [q.v.] come into the possession of the Ilkhāns.

The rulers of Persia bore this name to indicate that they were dependent on the Great Kāhn (in Peking). So it remained until the death of Kubilay in 1294, the final adoption of Islam by the Persian rulers (1295) severing the close relationship. From that time the name of the Great Kāhn disappeared from the Persian coinage and in place of the title "Ilkhan" there appeared the designation "Kāhn". It is customary, however, for historians to designate the rule of the Mongols in Persia until its end in 1356/1355 as the "Ilkhanid" period.

The territory of the Ilkhāns was, therefore, essentially a Persian state with the inclusion of Mesopotamia, and hence rather similar in extent to the Sassanian Empire.

For this reason, their policy towards Central Asia, the Golden Horde and Egypt had to be that of a government of Persia, and in internal affairs too the adoption of Persian culture and tradition was as swift as the corresponding process was in China. Indeed, these two Mongol states formed something of a community of interest against the nomadic states of Čaghatay and the Golden Horde) which, in a certain sense, lasted beyond the year 1295 mentioned above. The cultural assimilation to Persia and the linguistic acceptance of Turkish were certainly delayed so long as the religious differences persisted. Some of the Mongols who had invaded Persia had been Nestorian Christians, but the majority had been Shamanists; in the royal house and among the ruling class there soon became apparent (even under Hülegü) a tendency towards Buddhism, which perhaps is connected with the fairly close relations with China, and perhaps goes back to the missionary activity of Buddhist priests, bhikshus (details on whose origin remain doubtful, just as all our sources—all non-Buddhist
give scarcely more precise information about the spread of the Buddha’s teaching). In any case, it found a fertile ground among the rulers and strengthened them in their hostile attitude towards Sunni Islam, an attitude apparently dictated also for reasons of state during the decades of rivalry with Egypt (while conversely Islam formed the link for political and economic relations between Egypt and the Golden Horde, which led to an equally enduring coalition against the Ilkhan). The enmity against Sunni Islam resulted in a tolerance of the Shi’as, for example was achieved after the capture of Baghdad under the leadership of the mathematician and astronomer Naṣr al-Dīn Ṭūsī [q.v.]; this had very favourable effects for their social position and their admittance to the administration. Preference was shown also to the Christians, especially the Nestorians, to whom Hūlegū’s favourite wife Doḵzī Khātūn (d. 1265) belonged; she was also of assistance to the Jacobites and helped to win over the Christians in Syria for the Ilkhan cause.

At the same time the favourable policy towards the Christians made it possible to enter into diplomatic relations with the Christian West; these had already been initiated before Hūlegū, but became especially noteworthy under his son and successor Abāka (663/1265-680/1282), himself a Buddhist. This led to closer relations, particularly with the Papal See and the France of Louis IX (St. Louis) as well as with a few Crusader states, as being the stubborn opponents of the Mamluks. A proposed joint campaign against the Egyptian state (1269) miscarried as a result of the impossibility of agreeing on the time to undertake it. On the other hand, a simultaneous blow planned by the rival coalition in the Caucasus and on the Oxus (1268-69) was also unsuccessful.

Thus Abāka could carry through a strengthening of the state founded by his father within the frontiers described above, and thereby he became its true organizer. At the same time he promoted the Buddhist mission, and this openly by building many Buddhist temples. This was balanced by his tolerant attitude towards the Christians. The Nestorians thanked him for this in 1261 by the choice of a Christian Uygūr as Catholicos (Yḥābālāhā II, until 1317), who on account of his descent had access to the court and was able to achieve the capture of the Mamluks. A proposed joint campaign against the Egyptian state (1269) miscarried as a result of the impossibility of agreeing on the time to undertake it. On the other hand, a simultaneous blow planned by the rival coalition in the Caucasus and on the Oxus (1268-69) was also unsuccessful.

Abāka’s death of a fever (1282) introduced a period of confusion. His brother immediately embraced Islam and took the name Ahmad. This led to an easing of tension with Egypt which, however, did not endure after his fall at the hands of his nephew, Abaka’s son Arghun in 1284. The latter, zealously devoted to Buddhism but lacking any real ideas of the financial strength of his state, gave a free hand to the ważīr Ša’d al-Dawla, who remained true to his Jewish faith, gave control of many districts to his relatives, and by exorbitant demands for money repeatedly stirred up unrest among the population. This brought him to a violent end immediately after Arghun’s death in 1291. The new ruler Gaykhatu [q.v.], Arghun’s brother, confronted with a financial crisis, attempted the introduction in 1294 of paper money on the Chinese model (and called by the Chinese word Sad); he visited the country, since he now proceeded with severe demands against the Sunnis, who were still in the majority; the Christians also suffered more under him than they had under Ghazan (who had quickly suppressed the attempted campaign of terrorism against them in 1295-6). Thus, civil war was threatening the state when Oldjeytu died in 716/1316 and his young son Abu Sa’d (the first Mongol ruler with a purely Islamic name) reverted to Sunni Islam. His youth, however, permitted the various factions around him to indulge in many kinds of intrigues. The vizier Rashid al-Din, also important as an statesmanlike an of his own and fell victim to a plot three years later through a concatenation of unfortunate circumstances. From that time on the two factions of Cǔbān’s son, Ḥanūs Kūčūk, and his former son-in-law, Ḥasān Buzurg [q.v.], fought each other almost continually. Abū Sa’d no longer played a significant part in this; he died in 736/1335 on a campaign in the Caucasus.
With the death of Abū Sa‘id the Mongol dynasty practically came to an end, although until 756/1355 a motley succession of princes of the house — and even a princess in 1339-40 — were installed and deposed as Ḵāns. The real power lay in the hands of the two Ḥasan, of whom the younger was murdered in 1344 and the elder gradually repulsed to Bāghdād, where he founded the dynasty of the Ḍjāλāyirdīs [q.v.], whose sway remained limited to Mesopotamia. The outlying territories of Asia Minor, Georgia, Little Armenia and the Kurids had in the meantime broken away, with further emperors, the Indjīids (a.d. 1339) in Tabriz and the Sāfrānīds [q.v.] took control, in Māzandarān and further east the Sarbādārīds [q.v.], and central Persia had to endure the incessant battles of local rulers. In 1357-8, Aḥharbāḏyān was occupied for a short time by the Golden Horde. Only the campaigns of Timūr [q.v.] put an end to this internal collapse — and then only for a short time as the foundations of the empire he created also proved weak.

Under the Ḵāns of Persia, for the first time for centuries, was brought together as a territorial and political entity (even though this was thanks to the toleration of independent minor states): and thus this period must be regarded as of the highest significance for the country. There emerged an unusual development of the arts; and the promotion of various branches of science — while limited in aim (astronomy as a development from astrology, medicine, historiography) — finally raised the standard of the whole nation.

Our information on the period of the Ḵāns is very extensive; first we have the abundant Persian historiography, especially the works of Djiwānī, Raschīd al-Dīn and Wāṣṣāf [q.v.]; then the independent historiography by Syriac (Barhebraeus, Chronography), which views the course of events from a Christian standpoint and thus brings valuable supplementary information, especially on cultural history. Besides these sources, we have works in Arabic, firstly Ibn al-Fuwarīt [q.v.], whose work on events in Mesopotamia is very enlightening for administrative history, then the numerous works of early Mamlūk Egyptian history, which reflect the Mamlūk point of view and therefore shed light on external events and provide a contrast with Persian works. There are also works in Armenian, Arabic, Persian, Caucasian, and Western works which should not be overlooked. The large number of surviving coins form a reliable alternative for the almost complete lack of original documents.


For the coinage, besides the general works of Lane-POole and Markov, the catalogue of the Museum in Istanbul and other catalogues, see especially C. M. Frähn, *De Il-Chanorum sine Chulaguidarum nominis Commeniationes duae*, in *Mém. de l’Acad. Imp. des Sciences de Saint-Pétersbourg*, ser. 6, vol. ii (1833), 469-562.

Maps are to be found in the above mentioned works by Spuler, also in the Historical Atlas of the Verlag Georg Westermann-Braunschweig (1956), as well as in A. Hermann, *Historical and commercial atlas of China, Central Asia, and Mesopotamia*, London 1935 (Havard-Yenching Institute, Monograph Series). Full genealogies in Spuler and Howorth, as well as in E. von Zambaur, *Manuel de généalogie*, Hanover 1927, *Bad Pyrmont 1955, pp. 244-5* (B. Spuler)

**Architecture and Art**

Ilkhanid art represents the art of the Mongol period of Iran, that is from the time when Hulagu as-
ILKHĀNS
constitute the link between it and subsequent Timurid art.

Architecture. The religious and secular buildings within the present political boundaries of Iran have been described by D. N. Wilber (Architecture of Islamic Iran. The Il Khānīd period, Princeton 1955; Persian translation by 'Abd Allâh Fâyârî: Mi‘mârî-ye islâmî-ye Irân dar dawre-ye Ilkhânî, Tehrân, 1346/1967; for some corrections and additions see the review by Myron Bement Smith in JAOS, lxxvi (1956), 243-7). To this body of buildings should be added the Russian publications on the monuments of Adharbayjân and the Turkmen S. S. R. (sheikhend of Lują Dâr at Dâshlî, Kedârî and Azerbaidzana XII-XV vv. i ego mesto v arkhitekture perednego vostoka, Moskow 1966; G. A. Pugačen- kova, Iskusstvo Turkmenistana, Moscow, 1967). In general the plans, techniques and decorative schemes of the Salidjûk period continue, especially when after nearly five decades of inactivity a new architectural boom developed. This change of pace was due to the Islamization, Iranization and amalgamation of the dynasty under Ilkhan Khân (604-703/1295-1304). The main religious buildings were mosques, madrasas, mausolea, shrines and khânsâhs. The novel stylistic tendencies are a stress of the vertical by means of high, often ovoid domes, higher and narrower eyvâns (barrel-vaulted halls open toward the courtyard end), minarets flanking portals or eyvâns and colonnettes at corners; the subdivision and opening-up of non-bearing walls through windows, bays, niches and stairways; and stronger use of colour, not only in the form of painted plaster decoration, usually in relief, but more specifically, after about 710/1310, by the use of faience mosaic for total wall coverage (D. N. Wilber, The development of mosaic faience in Islamic architecture, in Ars Islamica, vi (1939), 40-7). The classic Iranian mosque developed in the Salidjûk period with four eyvâns cross-axially arranged around a courtyard and with a high dome chamber in front of the mihrâb occurs only in the Masджīd-i Dâjmî of Varâmîn (222-6/1622-6) and under Muzaффarid rule in Kirmânn (750/1349). However, the two earlier mosque types consisting of an open, domed kiosk based on the چââh-يâk fire-temple or of a large single eyvân still occur, namely in the Masджīd-i Bâbâ 'Abd Allâh in Nayîn of 700/ 1300, in the three mosques of about 725/1325 in the city of Varâmîn (in Karadaxî at Dâshlî, Pouradî and Ezrân, the Masджīd-i Dâjmî of Ardabîl rebuilt in the early 8th/14th century and respectively, in the monumental Masджīd-i Dâjmî of 'Allî Shâh in Tabriz of ca. 710-20/1310-20. While on his visit to Iran in 727/1327 Ibn Battûtâ speaks repeatedly of madrasas which according to him served not only as religious schools but also as یازیya (hostel, hermitage or convent). However, only four such buildings have been described, all of them of Ilkhânid proper style. Of these the most significant are the Masджīra Imâmi of 755/1354 and the Madrasa in the Masджīd-i Dâjmî built between 768 and 778/1366 and 1376, both in Isfâhân and following the four eyvâns-scheme with cells for the students between the eyvâns. The importance given to mausolea particularly to imâmzâdas (or burial places of descendants of the Shîite imâms) is apparent from their large number, as they comprise 39 monuments among the 119 listed by Wilber. They fall into two major categories, both with an inner dome over the burial chamber in the centre of which there is the sarcophagus, if the latter is not placed in a vaulted crypt underneath. They are either square chambered with more horizontally dominant features, of which the Gunbad-i یالیyâvan with very high florid stucco decoration of ca. 715/1315 (according to E. Herzfeld and Wilber, or ca. 1200-1250 according to D. N. Wilber (Art) and also that of Afrâm b. Abu '1-Hasan, known as Pir-i Bâkîr in Lîndîân of which the tomb chamber, deep eyvâns and entrance passageway were built between 695 and 712/1299 and 1312 and which is very important for its lavish display of carved stucco decorations and faience mosaics. The low tomb of Gâhâân built between ca. 1297 and 1305 in Gâhâânîyeh, a suburb of Tabriz, was destroyed by Shâh 'Abbâs I, but the undoubtedly even more remarkable mausoleum of Sultân Muhammad یلیyetsı Khudabanda in Sultâniyeh of 707-13/1305-13 is fairly well preserved, although various subsidiary buildings and a surrounding wall with towers have disappeared (a view of the town with this building as seen in 944/1537 in a MS of Nâşrâbâd al-Sulîhî al- Matraki is illustrated in colour in E. Akurgal, C. Mango and R. Ettinghausen, Treasures of Turkey, Geneva 1966, 201). A. Godard has characterized it as “certainly the finest example known of Mongol architecture, one of the most competent and typical products of Persian Islamic building and technically perhaps the most interesting" ("The Mausoleum of یلیyetsı at Sultâniyeh", in Survey of Persian Art, li, 1103-18; Wilber, op. cit., 139-41). While یلیyetsı followed the Shîite persuasion (after 709/1309), he meant to have the remains of the Caliph یلî and of his son, the Imâm Husayn, transferred to his mausoleum, but this project was not realized. The building is an enormous octagon, about 126 feet (39 m.) wide with the burial chamber containing the cenotaph of the Sultan in a rectangular addition opposite the outer wall, and built in three stages, each one broader than its predecessor. The facade, faced with faience mosaic and, on the inside, painting in the manner of book illuminations. Also in this period whole sanctuary complexes were constructed around tombs of venerated saints, such as that of Bâyazîd al-Bistâmi consisting of the shrine proper, a Masджīd-i Dâjmî and a tomb tower, built between 700 and 713/ 1300 and 1313 (A. U. Pope, in Survey of Persian Art, li, 1080-6; Wilber, op. cit., 127-9), that of Shaykh 'Abd al-Sâmâd al-Islâmî-ye Imâma, built between 704 and 725/1304 and 1325 which comprises besides the tomb a Masджīd-i Dâjmî, a minaret and a یلیyetsı (Pope, op. cit., 1086-9). A Godard, Najâns, in Al-ğârî -Îrán, i, 1926, 83-102; Wilber, op. cit., 133-4); and also that of Ahmad b. Abu یلی-Isân, known
as Shâykh Dâim, in Turbat-i Shâykh Dâim, where there is a fairly well-integrated congregate of various units erected ca. 1330 (Wilber, op. cit., 174). Finally a religious monument of great distinction is the mihrâb of delicately carved stucco of 710/1310 in a side prayer hall of the Masjîd-i Dâim of Isfâhân, which dates from the Shâhrite period of Ōldjâytī. That few secular buildings are preserved is partly due to the fact that Ōldjâytī rulers preferred to live in luxurious tents till the end of their rule and that such monuments were built of wood and other perishable material. In the Mongol mountain town of Sâturk, a site now called Taşkht-i Sulaymân, is a large ruined eyvân, decorated with niches topped by stalactites; it was part of a palace which according to Ḥamd Allâh Mustawfî was rebuilt by Abâs Bkân and has been dated ca. 1275 by Wilber (op. cit., 112). As the intensive German excavations between 1960 and 1964 elucidated, the intricate palace complex was composed of various units such as isolated eyvâns, cross-shaped hypostyles either with a central court or a central dome, rectangular halls, a twelve-sided building, etc., all erected along the four sides of a huge near-square layout with pillars forming an arcade around the courtyard with the oval lake in the centre. Wall tiles with geometric designs and partially glazed blue and green were discovered there, as well as two capitals decorated with Chinese dragons. In addition, a great deal of locally manufactured pottery, especially of the so-called Gârrûs type (which had previously been dated 5th/11th to 7th/13th century), and moulds for mihrâbs and animal sculptures appeared in the ruins. Furthermore, a square building with a carved doorway, apparently covered by a central dome was found to be Mongol (although it was formerly thought to be Parthian) and it was assumed that it might be a mausoleum. Finally, there was a large Mongol gateway. All these discoveries were unique and thus of the greatest importance for our understanding of secular Iranian architecture (R. Naumann, W. Kleiss, et al., Taşkht-i Suleyman and Zendan-i Suleyman, in Archäologischer Anzeiger, lxvi (1961), cols. 51-9; idem et al., ibid., 1962, cols. 660-70; idem et al., ibid., 1964, cols. 27-57; idem et al., ibid., 1965, cols. 697-723). In addition, three poorly preserved carved panels of the standard 3rd/9th century type were found near Marand (ca. 1330-5). Sin (730-1/1330-1) and Safâ (734/1333), of which in each case the best preserved part proved to be the single portal. In Sin it is followed by an unusual hexagonal vestibule, while in Safâ the cut stone entrance doorway and inscription above it betray Syrian influence. The most unusual secular building was probably the observatory built about 656/1258 at Marâqân on Hulârūd. Orders from plans prepared by Nasîr al-Dîn Tusi. The structure is known to have contained a dome and a library, to which Ghâzân Bkân added yet another dome, all of which were already in ruins in 1340 when Ḥamd Allâh Mustawfî wrote his Nuzhat al-khulâb.

A novel feature of the Mongol period was the massing of public buildings in newly constructed quarters, such as the Ghâznîyya of Ghâzân Bkân and the Takht-i Suleyman and Zendan-i Suleyman. In the 8th/14th century the depicted personages begin to wear Mongol costumes. Toward the end of the 7th/13th century rather coarse relief designs appear with Far Eastern motifs in the centre and large nasâk writing in white on a blue ground as the framing device. In the 8th/14th century there is a definite decline in the artistic quality. Throughout the 7th/13th century the pottery, too, followed Sâlûqûk tradition, but was slowly losing the Parthian's arcading and large inscription in white on a blue ground as the framing device. In the 8th/14th century there is a definite decline in the artistic quality. Throughout the 7th/13th century the pottery, too, followed Sâlûqûk tradition, but was slowly losing the Parthian's arcading and large inscription in white on a blue ground as the framing device. In the 8th/14th century there is a definite decline in the artistic quality. Throughout the 7th/13th century the pottery, too, followed Sâlûqûk tradition, but was slowly losing the Parthian's arcading and large inscription in white on a blue ground as the framing device. In the 8th/14th century there is a definite decline in the artistic quality. Throughout the 7th/13th century the pottery, too, followed Sâlûqûk tradition, but was slowly losing the Parthian's arcading and large inscription in white on a blue ground as the framing device. In the 8th/14th century there is a definite decline in the artistic quality. Throughout the 7th/13th century the pottery, too, followed Sâlûqûk tradition, but was slowly losing the Parthian's arcading and large inscription in white on a blue ground as the framing device. In the 8th/14th century there is a definite decline in the artistic quality.

Throughout the 7th/13th century the pottery, too, followed Sâlûqûk tradition, but was slowly losing the Parthian's arcading and large inscription in white on a blue ground as the framing device. In the 8th/14th century there is a definite decline in the artistic quality. Throughout the 7th/13th century the pottery, too, followed Sâlûqûk tradition, but was slowly losing the Parthian's arcading and large inscription in white on a blue ground as the framing device. In the 8th/14th century there is a definite decline in the artistic quality. Throughout the 7th/13th century the pottery, too, followed Sâlûqûk tradition, but was slowly losing the Parthian's arcading and large inscription in white on a blue ground as the framing device. In the 8th/14th century there is a definite decline in the artistic quality. Throughout the 7th/13th century the pottery, too, followed Sâlûqûk tradition, but was slowly losing the Parthian's arcading and large inscription in white on a blue ground as the framing device. In the 8th/14th century there is a definite decline in the artistic quality.
preference for a subdued chromatic range consisting of greys, browns and whites with dark blue and turquoise only discreetly used. The flower and animal motifs are often of Far Eastern origin and the figures wear Mongol costume. This type of pottery had a strong influence in other Muslim countries, even those politically at odds with the Mongols. Its style is therefore found not only in the pottery of the Golden Horde at Saray Berke, but also in Damascus and Cairo (A. Lane, Later Islamic pottery, Persia, Syria, Egypt, Turkey, London 1957, 6-20). The material evidence of the pieces themselves is corroborated and supplemented by a section in an Persian MS of 700/1300 in which Abu 'l-Kásim 'Abd Allah b. 'Ali b. Muhammad b. Abi 'Aabir, son and brother of two well-known Kāshān potters, provides information about the raw materials and technical processes involved in the contemporary Kāshān production of glazed ceramics (H. Ritter, J. Ruska, F. Sarre and R. Winderlich, Orientalische Steinbücher und persische Fayencetechnik, Istanbul 1935).

Metalwork. It is difficult to differentiate the Iranian objects from those made in neighbouring countries especially in the Dżazira. The designs on the brasses of the 7th/13th century and those of the 8th/14th century, inlaid with silver and sometimes with gold, and very rarely with copper, become progressively drier, more rigid and less imaginative in comparison to those of the Seldjuk period. However, they continue the earlier modes of decoration, particularly the deployment of the patterns in registers with skilfully arranged roundels and cartouches of various sizes set against formalized background designs, and often using human figures in court scenes. In this respect they show the strong imprint of Mesopotamian, especially Mawšil work, although it must be remembered that the pieces from that region were originally themselves influenced by the Iranian metal production. (For a study of a special group starting in 705/1305 with a bowl by a Sḫraḏ î artist see Eva Baez, Fisch-pond ornaments on Persian and Mamlûk metal vessels, in BSOAS, xxxi (1968), 14-27.) Chinese influence is occasionally found (R. H. Pinder-Wilson, A Persian bronze mortar of the Mongol period, in Proc. XIXth Int. Congress of Orientalists, 9th-16th August 1960, Moscow 1963, ii, 204-6). That the period is not without creative ability is demonstrated by a number of new shapes for caskets, especially a polygonal one with a domed cover. Dated pieces of the 8th/14th century indicate that in the second half of the Mongol period there is a growing predilection for the sole use of inscriptions, floral designs, arabesques and geometric patterns, although a bowl of 752/1351 still has human figures in the uninterrupted main register. L. Giuzalian has identified a production in Sḫraḏ made for the Inglī Sultan Oldjeytī (see Proc. XXVth Int. Congress of Orientalists, i, 174-8). Sḫraḏ work continued under the Muzaffārīd dynasty, as a signed piece in the Cairo Museum of 761/1360 indicates. A different type of metalwork, a huge bronze basin by an ʿIṣfahanī artist, carrying the name of the Sultan Qiyāḥāl dīn Muḥammad Abū Bakr of the Kart dynasty, was cast in 776/1375 for the Mādgjūl dī Ḍammī in Herāt (A. S. Melikian-Chirvani, Un basam iraniyen d’Iran 1275, in Gazette des Beaux-Arts, n.s. Ixxiii (1969), 5-18). A third, and again different post-Mongol group consists of a number of richly silver inlaid bowls with elaborate miniature-like court scenes in or between roundels which foreshadow the Timūrid painting style. (A general survey in D. Barrett, Islamic metalwork in the British Museum, London 1949, pp. XVII-XIX).

Textiles. There is no doubt that fabrics were woven in Iran during the Mongol period, but modern research has shown that it is not possible to distinguish them clearly from the products of other Muslim regions and possibly even from those made in China. These textiles called panni tatarici in Western sources represent an international luxury style. It is, however, obvious that the overall organization based on rounds with one or two heraldically rendered animals and an interstitial pattern which had been developed in the 8th/14th century was still recognizable in the Seldjuk period was no longer the main arrangement. Chinese ideas had thoroughly destroyed that convention of many centuries and had introduced new composition schemes and Far Eastern motifs. The arrangement which was closest to the old system was an overall pattern of pointed ovals formed by a system of stems which enclose animals in a circular setting. Otherwise there was often an open composition with animals in alternate rows placed in dense vegetation. The most common organisational schemes were bands of various width with Arabic inscriptions, flowers, geometric and other formal designs, and, to a lesser extent, with animals and birds. The key piece is the burial robe of Duke Rudolf IV of Austria (1365) in the Episcopal Museum in Vienna which has the name of Tčlān Sultan Abū Sa‘id woven in it; this in turn is close to the fabric found in the tomb of Cangrān I at Verona (1239) (G. Sangiorgi, Le stoffe e le vesti tombali di Cangrān I della Scala, in Bollettino d’Arte, n.s. i (1921), 441-57; see also Otto von Falke, Kunstgeschichte der Seidenweberei, Berlin 1913, ii, 50-63, now antiquated, but richly illustrative material; W. Mannowski, Kirchliche Gewänder und Stickereien aus dem Schatz der Marienkirche, Danzig 1929, vol. 3, vol. 2, nos. 30-35; Phyllis Ackerman, Textiles of the Islamic periods, in Survey of Persian Art, iii, 1942-61; A. Lane, Later Islamic pottery, 3-5).

The Art of the Book. The period’s earliest dated book binding of 676/1277 and 697 or 699/1299 or 1299 respectively, both from Marāqgha, use blind tooling to create a central mandorla-shaped medallion and triangular corner pieces within a simple frame. The punches are limited in number and all of a geometric nature (or, indeed, sometimes the exceptions on the flap of the second piece. In composition and in its filling devices this binding is still in the Seldjuk tradition and only in the following century does the style advance. Thus on a thirty-volume Kur’ān set made in Hamādān in 713/1313 for Sultan Oldjeytī gold tooling in the form of dots appears and is applied to a larger and more elaborate circular medallion filled with geometric patterns. Designs impressed into the lining (doublure) of the binding are first found in 704/1304 and the first signature stamp in 706/1306. By 735/1334 the central medallion and corner pieces have become bigger and have a more elaborate outline, while in 781/1379 the earlier mode of filling the decorative forms with geometric strapwork has been replaced by arabesques and even naturalistic floral branches. Over-all large scale geometric configurations as found in Mamlûk Egypt remain, however, unknown, and in the 8th/14th century the use of gold tooling remains still limited (R. Ettinghausen, The covers of the Morgan Manâfî manuscript and other early Persian bookbindings, in Studies in art and literature for Belle de Costa Greene, ed. D. Miner, Princeton 1954, 459-73; K. B. Gardner, Three early Islamic book-
More spectacular than the bindings are the illuminations, especially the "carpet pages" in Kur'an MSS and other MSS. Here again Oldjeýtî's was the great patron, as is shown by the large size, thirty-volume Kur'an set in the National Library, Cairo, created in Hamadân in 713/1313. Here colourful arabesques and knot designs were placed within ever changing geometric layouts. Other giant Kur'an MSS were written for the same sultan in Baghâd in 706/1306 and in 716/1316. However, the juxtaposition of Oldjeýtî's 710/1310 demonstrates that other MSS were also handsomely decorated, in this case with a carpet-like repeat pattern within a richly treated frame. Its design is, however, in a less monumental, more delicate style and the same general tendency is noticeable in later Kur'an MSS of 728/1327 and 738/1338. All these illuminations have a character of their own which distinguishes them from both the Seljûk and Timurid creations (R. Ettinghausen, Manuscript illumination, in Survey of Persian Art, iii, 1954-9).

In spite of conservative tendencies in certain early MSS and even in the late MSS painted in Shiráz between 731/1330 and 741/1341 under the Indjû Sultans, miniature painting of the Ilkhanid period achieved a complete break with traditions evolved by Arab or Seljûk Iranian ateliers, or as the Safavid calligrapher and painter Dûst Muhammad expressed it in 957/1544: "its first great master (Abd welded "withdrew the covering from the face of painting and invented the kind of painting which is current at the present time". The evolution developed rapidly from MS to MS and, as already the earliest MS, Dîwâni-i Ta'rikh-i Yûsûf of 691/1292 in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, indicates, is engendered by a strong Chinese influence. In this earliest MS as well as in a group of undated small-size Shâh-nâmeh MSS of the early 8th/14th century and in the Shiráz MSS between 1330 and 1341 it is only Chinese motifs and Far Eastern costumes which betray the new trend, but in many miniatures of the next MS, Ibn Bakhshî's Manâdîs-al-ayawân of 697-690/1297 or 1299 in the Morgan Library, there is in addition a new indication of spatial depth, an interest in the rendition of landscape and impressionistic tendencies to landscape which is reflected in the more advanced style of the "Demotte Shâh-nâmeh", but still reflects its manner. A more advanced style, possibly from another locality, if the paintings were not executed at a later date than the MS, is found in another Kallla wa-Din-ma, the text of which is dated 741/1343 (in Cairo), where the figures are more diminutive while the landscape is purely decorative and the space hardly rendered. This is a general tendency which is clearly noticeable in various dated MSS of the second half of the 8th/14th century (L. Binyon, J. V. S. Wilkinson, Basil Gray, Persian miniature painting, London 1933, 29-48, 184; D. Barrett, Persian painting in the fourteenth century, London n.d.; E. Kühnel, History of miniature painting and drawing, in Survey of Persian Art, iii, 1933-41; R. Ettinghausen, On some Mongol miniatures, in Kunst des Orients, iii (1959), 44-55; B. Gray, Persian painting, Geneva 1961, 19-55 (bibliography: p. 173); B. W. Robinson, Persian painting, London 1967, 35-42; 84-5; on the albums: R. Ettinghausen, Persian Ascension miniatures, in XII Convegno Volta (Accademia dei Lincei, Roma 1957, 360-83; M. S. Işıpiroğlu, Salar-Alben. Diwân-i Khânumânî ve Berliner Sammlungen, Wiesbaden 1964; idem, Malerei der Mongolen, Munich 1965).

Bibliography of publications treating of the whole subject: "Ikhan Art", in Encyclopedia of World Art, vii, New York 1965, columns 788-98 with extensive bibliography; and chapters in the general histories of Islamic art, e.g., those by Georges Marcâis, Ernst Kühnel and Katharina Otto-Dorn. For the decorative arts and painting see also Oleg Grabar, Persian art before and after the Mongol conquest, University of Michigan Museum of Art, Ann Arbor 1959; idem, "The visual arts, 1050-1350" in Cambridge History of Iran, v, New York 1968, 626-58.---R. Ettinghausen

"ILLA "cause", pl. .qqāl.

i.—GRAMMAR

The idea of the ILLA is important, and appears in the earliest treatises. In fact, Ibn Sallâm al-Dîmâmî, who sees ʿAbd Allâh b. Abî ʿIshâk (d. 117/735) as the founder of naḥân, says of him: "he enlarged the scope of ʿiṣâs and explained the ʿilla" (al-Kîfî, in...
Few grammarians, however, have dealt with the question of Hillat al-Hillat with its own sake: Ibn al-Darradji, in several chapters of the Kitab al-Ikdah fl Hllat (Cairo 1371/1952); Ibn al-Sarradji, in several classes of the Khasis (Cairo 1310); from him we know that Ibn al-Sarradji dealt with it at the beginning of his Usuli and al-Husayn al-Dinawari al-Dalis (Beguya, 236) in the chapter Thimar al-sinda (in MS., see Brockelmann S T, 174). Al-Zadidiadji (d 337/948-9), in this ch. 5 Hillat al-nafrw, says that they are artificial (mustanbata) and not necessitating (laysat mudjiba), and puts them into three categories: ta'misinya, kiyasyya, jadalaisyya naqarisyya. The first are concerned with the teaching (ta'lim) of the language of the Arabs, permit it to be learnt and are included among the norms that rule it. One says: kdm Zayd**, "Zayd rose", with Zayd in the ra/ (nominative), and if the question is in the ra/ (predicate) in Hillat al-Hillat, the answer is— why is Zayd in the ra/? The answer is— and this is the Hillat—because he is the fi`il, "the agent" of the verb, which affects him and puts him in the ra/ of the Hillat. One says: inna Zayd** kdm** "Zayd is standing". Why, in this case, should Zayd be in the nafrw (accusative) and kdm in the ra/? The answer is: because inna, which puts the noun following it in the nafrw and the khasas (predicate) in the ra/. This reply expresses the Hillat.

Hillat kiyasyya are concerned with explanations founded on kiyas, "analogies": in the case of inna Zayd** kdm**, why should inna put the noun in the nafrw? Because Hillat kiyasyya it resembles a transitive verb; it is thus thought of as comparable with it and behaves like it, because of this resemblance. From a formal point of view, Zayd** is comparable with the object of the verb in the nafrw, and kdm in the ra/ with the fi`il, which is in the ra/.

Hillat jadalaisyya naqarisyya make up all the other explanations that are worked out by reflexion (nasar) and frequently brought into discussion (jadal), in answer to the questions that arise subsequently. The previous Hillat kiyasyya stated: a resemblance to a transitive verb. To what verb? To a verb in the past? In the present? In the future? In a comparison with a transitive verb, why select a verb the complements of which are fi`il or hadj, "faces". This, in fact, is only a resemblance to wudjuh > hadj, "have a time assigned for something", or hadj as in Hillat mudiib, "the cause that permits action", such as the changing of alif to waw in darib ("hitting") > dawarih in the diminutive; this is comparable with the causes of the theologians; (b) the Hillat that can be avoided, but in this case one must accept something disagreeable and repugnant; such as, for example, in saying: "ma`ukin (following the asl), without changing the y to w: ma`abin, "he who knows with certainty"; or muzan, without changing the y to y: mizan "balance"; its causation is not absolute. Thus he says (i, 87 end): "We do not claim that they [the Hillat al-nafrw] reach the same level (ta`ligh badr) of the Hillat of the theologians" (cf. i, 145, l. 9-12). He is not talking of the Hillat as the changing of alif to waw, but simply to note that they exhibit a more marked resemblance to one another. Thus, going beyond the Hillat of the jurists on the one hand, and on the other, more resembling the Hillat of the theologians, while falling short of the latter, the Hillat of the grammarians hold a peculiar position. As R. Arnaldes says (Grammaire et theologie chez Ibn Haem de Cordove, Paris 1956, 146): "The problem is this: is a sabab which permits but does not necessitate (see below, Rem. a). Hillat al-mudhiba remains. Is this of the type dealt with by the theologian or of that dealt with by the jurist? He says (i, 48, 145) that it is closer to the first than to the second, and superior to the latter (i, 50, l. 15), for the grammarians refer to sense (al-his) and speak of heavyness or lightness in the sounds of the language, which are clearly perceptible to everyone, whereas legal causation has recourse to signs (il-awad') and carries on in order that judgments may be made (see also: i, 48, l. 6-12; 51, l. 12-5). He also distinguishes, with al-Hillat al-mudhiba (i, 88, 164): (a) the Hillat that necessitates, leaving no possibility of evasion, such as the Hillat al-nafrw, in the sentence: functions, provided with formal signs, and relationships between the different signs in the sentence: functions, provided with formal marks.

What, however, does Ibn Dinni mean by Hillat al-mudhiba? Without doubt the first category of al-Zadidiadji and Ibn Dinni (cf. i, 12-5). Having rejected the Hillat Hillat of the latter, he has to confine himself to this first category, Now, to take one example, he makes frequent use of istithbakhal estimation of heaviness and, consequently, of lightness. Moreover, he uses the arguments of the grammarians by means of istithbakhal to show the Hillat.
difference between the 'ilal of the grammarians and those of the jurists (above and i, 48, l. 4). This istithkdl is a 'ilha nasariyya; in fact, in the cases quoted above Genuman > mahn > mishd > mishd in (non-absolute 'ilha madhiba) — 'ilha al-ta'tilimiyya simply states the changes: wy > y, tw > t; the "why?", however, the explanation by means of estimating heaviness, istithkdl, comes from the nasar, from reflexion on linguistic behaviour, in the particular case. What then are we to think? After careful examination, we must conclude that it is the term 'ilha al-ta'tilimiyya and the abuse of useless questions that Ibn Djinni has rejected (see i, 172, l. 1 ff.), but that he intended to go beyond the simple grammatical statement and to set up, in the real causes, an explanation that comes from the working of linguistic feeling, such as his istithkdl, or from that which he believes appropriate to the Arabic language. Granting the cases referred to (mahn, mishd et al.), yet when we consider how far he carries his use of istithkdl, e.g., i, 55, l. 4-5, we see that he reaches the limit of what he believes appropriate to the Arabic speech, because remains for him a domain that has a clear first limit with the ta'tilimiyya, but extends, more or less rightly, into the nasariyya; reservations are made, here, about the question of the kiydsiyya, in view of the extent of Ibn Djinni's discussion of kiyds. Al-Dinawari (wrote before 538 A.D.; Broekkman, S I, 514), in the Kitab mentioned above (with the ghfr of Ibn Maktum) (in ad-Suyuti, and ma'dala: Divisions of the 'ilha, Ithirah, 56-8), also introduces two divisions. The second apparently corresponds with that of Ibn al-Sarradj, but he does not discuss it (ibid., 58, l. 14-5). The first enumerates the 24 well-known types (naw') of the grammarians' 'ilha: ta'tarid 'ala 'alr wa-sumsa al qanun lugathim, "valid for the whole of the Arabic speech and referred to the canon of their language". These, however, are no longer merely the ta'timiyya or Ibn al-Sarradj's first division. For example, an important kiydsiyya is in fact to be found there: the 'ilha taghbi, "the cause of resemblance", such as the 'irab of the mudaris because of its resemblance to a noun, and the bind (absence of 'irab) of certain nouns because of their resemblance to the haruf (ibid., 57, l. 5-6); and the 'ilha farh, the "cause of difference" (l. 7-9), a purely systematic 'ilha nasariyya. While Ibn Djinni's procedure with respect to istithkdl is seen, and his tendency towards pure systematic nasariyya, it is not surprising to find ad-Dinawari produce such a mixture, in his count of the 'ilha. This means that the grammarian, in his grammatical speculation, comes no longer to distinguish clearly between the actual rules of the Arabic language (the ta'tilimiyya) and all the "whys?" that they have accumulated to account for these rules, and that he thus comes to ascribe to the former the same objective value as to the latter. Besides, al-Suyuti, repeating the enumeration of the 24 types mentioned, in the biographical notice of al-Dinawari (Bughya, 236), introduces them simply as: 'ilha al-nahe al-makhkara, according to that author. A 'ilha may also be basila, "simple" or murakkaba, "compound"; this is the subject of al-Suyuti's 5th mahala (ad-Dinawari, 61-2). A good example of murakkaba is the explanation of man' al-sarf, "prevention of sarf" for nouns with only two cases, by means of the combined action of two manis, "obstacle" (see also Ibn Djinni, 1, 174-80). The important part ascribed to the 'ilha in the theory of kiyds should also be noted; it can be seen in the account of Ibn al-Anbari: Luma ad-adilla fi usail al-nahe (ed. Atta Ame), 53: kiyds 'ilha is accepted by all bi-ijima, with unanimous consent, and it is the only one that enjoys ijima; kiyds al-gabah, "the kiyds of resemblance", is accepted by akhbar al-ulama, "most scholars".

Remarks: (a) 'ilha, sabab. Ibn Djinni appears to make a distinction between the two terms: al-'ilha al-mujjawwa is really only a sabab that permits and does not necessitate (above and i, 164, l. 6). al-Suyuti (d. 911/1505) (Ithirah, 59, l. 14), in a note that follows the end (which is clearly marked) of the quotation of Ibn Djinni, decides in favour of a firm distinction between these terms by means of this difference that which necessitates is called 'ilha and that which permits is called sabab. This is developed by the commentator on al-Ithirah, Muhammad al-All b. al'Allan (d. 1057/1648), quoted by the editor of the KhaSaqis, i, 164, n. 4. If the latter had noticed the intha that closes the quotation from Ibn Djinni he would not have attributed to him (ibid.) a self-contradiction. For 'ilha and sabab in Ibn Hazm, see R. Arnaldez, op. cit., 186.

(b) For another sense of 'ilha: huruf 'ilha or al-'tilal or al-huruf of the mu'all' ila. These are alifi, waw, ya?, known as "sick" huruf, as opposed to the others, the "healthy" ones, al-huruf al-sahiba. The changes to which they are subject are dealt with in Arabic grammars in the chapter on 'ilha or 'tilal, e.g., R. al-Shartuni, Mabdi' al-sarabiyya, iv (9th ed., Beirut 1961), 34-50; H. Fleisch, Traite de philologie arabe, i, 118-37.

Bibliography: in the text. Ch. 4 of the Ithirah of al-Suyuti, which is made up of quotations, has the advantage of gathering together the important texts; the author, however, makes certain cuts in his quotations from Ibn Djinni. (H. Fleisch)

ii.—PHILOSOPHY

Cause, in the exact sense of Aristotle's to atna. The term was adopted by Shi'i thought, by the falsafa and by the later mutakallimun in their resumés and refutations of falsafa. The mutakallimun, however, tended rather, in order to denote a causal sequence and the production of an effect, to use sabab, pl. asbab, which implies primarily the idea of "channel", "intermediary". A certain confusion of vocabulary sometimes arises from this, and all the more since the falsafa, in particular al-Farabi and Ibn Sin, use sabab freely as a synonym of 'ilha.

The term 'ilha seems to have been adopted very early in the translations of Greek texts. It would be tedious to try to trace it through, and we may simply remark the influence that the Neo-Platonic writings attributed to Aristotle may have had in this matter as to many others: especially, here, the extracts from the Elementatio theologica of Proclus, which in Arabic became the "Book of the Explanation of Aristotle concerning the pure Good" (al-khayr al-makhd), and were known to the Latin Middle Ages as the Liber de Causis (Arabic ed. by Bardenhewer, Freiburg i. B., 1882; re-ed. by A. Badawi in Neo-platonici apud Arabos, Cairo 1935). From the very first lines of the work, the relationship of the first Cause (here 'ilha al-ulama) with the second cause, as described in the text, makes it clear that the thing caused (ma'sul) is maintained in being by the universal first Cause, even when the immediate second cause ceases to exert its influence: "and even if the second cause is separated from the effect that follows it, the first Cause, which is above it, is not separated from that effect, since it is the cause of its cause". The Latin Middle Ages incorporated
this relationship in a purely creationist view of the world, and one of a world "commenced" in time, while falsafa—at any rate eastern falsafa—interprets it as requiring a necessary and eternal emanation.

Here, as a guide, are some of the more important references.

I. Shi'î thought. An epistle of the Khwan al-Šafā' is entitled "on causes (ši'â) and things caused (ma'âlûlât)" (Rasâ'îl Ikhwan al-Šafâ', Cairo 1347/1928, ii, 324 ff.). One chapter is devoted to the ideas in question (ibid., 336-7). The definitions refer to the more traditional idea of sabab: ši'â is the "intermediate" (sabab) necessary for the existence of another thing, and the ma'âl ("thing caused"), effect) is that whose existence requires some "intermediary". As for the various kinds of causes, their possible enumeration is governed by two points of view. (1) An analysis very close to that of Aristotle (Physics, ii, 3 and Metaphysics, Δ, 2) distingishes the efficient cause or agent ([ši'â fâ'îl], the material cause ([ši'â kâtib], the formal cause [ši'â sâri'îyya] and the final or "perfect" cause ([ši'â tamâmîyya]). These four causes, according to the text, are to be found in every "produced" object. (2) To this is added the list of what the agent that produces an effect needs, according to its nature. If the agent is a man, he needs matter, place, time, members as instruments, implements and certain movements. A "natural" agent, on the other hand, needs only matter, place, time and movements; an "animate" agent, endowed with vital (naʃfârî), breath, needs only matter and movements. The paragraph ends with the statement that the Most High Creator (al-bîrî) "needs none of this, since His Act is absolute beginning and creation" with regard to both matter and time, and to movements, instruments and implements. The epistle adds that obstacles created by deficiencies in the matter (mâddâ), by the difficulties encountered by the first matter (hayâlîd) in receiving form, by lack of instruments and implements or by personal inadequacies, may all constitute hindrances to the action of the agent. "How far removed is God Most High from all this!"

Beings that are caused are divided, in their turn, into four categories: those produced by men; "natural" beings (minerals, vegetables, animals); then two categories the details of which depend on certain Ismâ'îli views: on the one hand the pure naʃfâmîyya beings (planets, stars, elements), on the other the rûhânîyya or "spiritual" beings (first matter, separate form, soul, intellect).

This description of the causes certainly borrows many of its elements from the Aristotelian tradition. It is expressed, however, in an analytic framework that is not Aristotle's; it is more descriptive and less careful to refer to the hierarchies of beings. The examination of the causes seems less to satisfy the intellectual grasp of what constitutes things than to define the intermediate conditions without which things could not be brought into existence. These conditions, however, establish necessary links between the causes and their effects, and thereby lead to the recognition of the efficacy (talîẖîr) of the first on the second. The Ismâ'îli theory of the first matter, which gives a spiritual (rûhânî) reality to the hayâlî [ge.], diverts the idea of material cause in a new direction; the Muslim faith states that God transcends any operation of secondary causality, in the absolute immediacy of His creative (emanative) Act.

Shî'î (Ismâ'îli) thought follows, with less technical precision, the same lines and somewhat accentuates them. The first Cause (al-ši'â al-tâlî) is sometimes God Himself, sometimes the first Emanation, thought of as God's knowable and nameable. This refer only to the Kitâb Dîjâmî al-khimanatayn of Naṣîr-i Khusraw (ed. H. Corbin and M. Mu'în, Paris-Teheran 1953), e.g., 7-9, where temporal and local causes are added to the four classic causes, and 67-70, on the first Cause. Six centuries later, the world-view of Mullâ Sadrâ Shirzâi, which was profoundly monist and emanalist, led him to deny the relationship 'ši'â-ma'âl on the level of the constitutive intrinsic causes of quiddity (mašîyya), while affirming it all the more vehemently on the level of existence (cf. Kitâb al-Masâ'îrî, ed. and trans. H. Corbin, Paris-Teheran 1964, 53-4180-1). "That which is called cause is the origin and source (aʃl)"; the absolute Origin is the first Cause (ibid., 41/162).

II. Falsafa. The idea of ši'â is common in falsafa. Al-Kindî refers to it frequently. Thus a rasâ'îla on "the proximate efficient cause (al-ši'â al-fâ'îl al-barhâb), the proximate formal cause (ši'â sâri'îyya) and the final or "perfect" cause (ši'â tamâmîyya). These four causes, according to the text, are to be found in every "produced" object. (2) To this is added the list of what the agent that produces an effect needs, according to its nature. If the agent is a man, he needs matter, place, time, members as instruments, implements and certain movements. A "natural" agent, on the other hand, needs only matter, place, time and movements; an "animate" agent, endowed with vital (naʃfârî), breath, needs only matter and movements. The paragraph ends with the statement that the Most High Creator (al-bîrî) "needs none of this, since His Act is absolute beginning and creation" with regard to both matter and time, and to movements, instruments and implements. The epistle adds that obstacles created by deficiencies in the matter (mâddâ), by the difficulties encountered by the first matter (hayâlîd) in receiving form, by lack of instruments and implements or by personal inadequacies, may all constitute hindrances to the action of the agent. "How far removed is God Most High from all this!"

Beings that are caused are divided, in their turn, into four categories: those produced by men; "natural" beings (minerals, vegetables, animals); then two categories the details of which depend on certain Ismâ'îli views: on the one hand the pure naʃfâmîyya beings (planets, stars, elements), on the other the rûhânîyya or "spiritual" beings (first matter, separate form, soul, intellect).

This description of the causes certainly borrows many of its elements from the Aristotelian tradition. It is expressed, however, in an analytic framework that is not Aristotle's; it is more descriptive and less careful to refer to the hierarchies of beings. The examination of the causes seems less to satisfy the intellectual grasp of what constitutes things than to define the intermediate conditions without which things could not be brought into existence. These conditions, however, establish necessary links between the causes and their effects, and thereby lead to the recognition of the efficacy (talîẖîr) of the first on the second. The Ismâ'îli theory of the first matter, which gives a spiritual (rûhânî) reality to the hayâlî [ge.], diverts the idea of material cause in a new direction; the Muslim faith states that God transcends any operation of secondary causality, in the absolute immediacy of His creative (emanative) Act.
ence of God as first Cause); Nadžūt, Cairo 1357/1938, 211-3 and 235-43 (where the usages sabab-asbd and 'illa-šial occur indifferently); Ighārāt, ed. Flügel, Leiden 1892, 139-43. To these may be added the shorter summaries of the Daneghāna (French trans. Le livre de Science, Paris 1955, 127-33), the Risāla fi 'l-hudūd, on the words 'illa and mašīl (ap. Tis' rasā'īl fi 'l-hikma wa-šābīyāyād, Cairo 1360/1908, 100-1) and the Risāla fi 'l-fābīryāyād (ibid., 4), where the term used is asbd.

We cannot hope here to deal in detail with Ibn Sīnā’s “Treatise on causes”. In any case, he depends directly on the texts of Aristotle, especially Book Δ of the Metaphysics, which he subjects to a most searching analysis (particularly in the Shifā, and the Nadžūt), completing, or rather, going beyond them, and also diverting them in a Neo-Platonic direction. He does not merely give an analytical list of causes, but deals with the actual theory of causality (Shifāyya) and of “causedness” (mashīliyya), as Mīlī Gūchon translates it (Lexique de la langue technique d’Ibn Sīnā, Paris 1938, no 451). A few remarks:

(1) In a distinction that became classic (adopted, for example, in the Ta’rīfāt al-Dījūrdīn: ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1845, 160), Avicenna calls the intrinsic causes, that is to say, material (in potentia) and formal (in actu), “the causes of quiddity” (mashīliyya); the extrinsic causes, efficient and final, are “the causes of existence” (or of being, waṣājdī) of a thing. “A thing may be caused either with regard to its quiddity or with regard to its existence” (Ighārāt, 139). We find here an echo not only of the real distinction between essence and existence but also of Avicenna’s “extrinsicism”, in which existence “happens” to essence.

(2) The efficient cause (al-šīla al-fālīla) is considered as the determining constitutive of the existence of a thing; this is a direct application of the major thesis that any possible thing that is brought into existence is necessary ab alio (a statement already found in al-Fāraḥīb). In the treatise in the Shifā (Ighārīyyāt, ii, 357), Ibn Sīnā distinguishes in this regard between the “physicists”, who see a motive cause in the fašilā and the falāṣifā, who define it as causing the beginning of, and maintaining, being; he designates it as “the cause, vis-à-vis the world. He afterwards affirms the existence of God as first efficient Cause, which creates all things of being (cf. Ighārāt, 140), and no longer only the motive Cause, as in Aristotle. It is possible to see in this a source for Thomas Aquinas’s “second way”.

(3) Stress is laid on the final (ghābiyya) cause, which, in a strongly emphasized formula (Ighārāt, 139), is called “the efficient cause of the efficient causes” (cf. the text from the Rasā'īl al-Kindī already cited, i, 248). It is the cause of the causes (Shifā, Ighārīyyāt, ii, 292). As Ibrahim Madkour remarks in his introduction to the edition of the Ighārīyyāt (17), Ibn Sīnā, making an analysis of the four causes from this point of view, attempts to lead them all back to the final cause (ibid., ii, 294-8). The interrelationship between the efficient cause and the final cause is no less penetratingly defined. It is “by virtue of its quiddity” that the final cause is a cause, and “the idea that it represents belongs to the causality of the efficient cause” (Ighārāt, 140; trans. A.-M. Gūchon, Paris-Beirut 1951, 356), for it is, in as much as it is caused, caused by the latter. There is, then, an incessant interaction between the two extrinsic causes.

(4) The affirmation of the existence of God as absolute first Principle follows from the demonstration first of the impossibility of an infinite number, in actuality, of efficient and material causes and then of the impossibility of an infinite number of final causes (Shifā, ii, 327-43; cf. Ighārāt, 141-2). God is thus called “absolute first Cause” (‘illa šīla mutlaša) and “Cause of all other causes” (Shifā, ii, 340). He is, without doubt, the supreme efficient Cause, since he is the Principle (mudābi) of all being and of all contingent being, while transcending in some way any distinction of efficiency-finality in “absolute innovation” (ibdā' mutlaš). In itself the thing caused is non-existent (lasya); its cause makes it exist (ayš) (ibid., 266).

(5) The relationships of concomitance and anteriority between cause and thing caused recur frequently in the treatises of Avicenna. The principal distinction is as follows: there is anteriority of sense (ma'nd; we find later: “anteriority of nature”), but not of time (samān). In time, the cause is really such, in actuality, only as a concomitant of the thing caused, and the latter exists, in actuality, only through the existence of the cause (ibid., 261). If, then, the thing caused is removed the cause is removed (Risāla fi 'l-hudūd), and vice versa, at least as far as the cause in actuality (bi-l-f̄urū) is concerned. A cause in potentiality (bi-l-khwāra) can be anterior to the effect (the inner before the outer, his wood; cf. Nadžūt, 232-233); it can outlive it or disappear before it. A cause always in actuality, however, cannot exist without its effect, and this effect cannot exist without its cause. In consequence, God, the absolute Principle and the supreme Cause, Who is always in actuality, cannot produce the world from all eternity. The existential determinism of falsafa, and the eternity of the contingent world, externally “commenced” (kātīb), are based on the reciprocal relationship of cause and thing caused, defined thus.

(6) The vocabulary used by Ibn Sīnā is a supple and rich one. (a) Together with ‘illa and mašīl the more traditional terms sabab and musabbab also occur frequently—sometimes in the etymological sense: cause as intermediary or occasion, sometimes as a synonym for ‘illa. (b) The distinction between efficient and formal cause is perhaps the most characteristic, for the Greek term f̄ilā and širāyya, the material cause refers rather to hayūdī (first matter) than to madāda. This latter term, however, is also used (usually as “second matter”, already with form), and sometimes ānsūr, “element”, in the sense of “first receptacle” (al-šīla al-lusūrīyya is an expression already found in al-Kindī). The final cause is called ghābiyya, but talmāmiyya is not excluded. (c) In the course of elaboration (this Nadžūt, ibid.) there are distinguished the cause per se (bi-l-f̄īlah), the accidental (bi-l-‘arad cause), the proximate (karib) cause and the distant (bakdīdī) cause, the particular (ḡisīyya) cause and the general (āmmā) or universal (kullīyya) cause, the receptive (kābihā) and the dispositive cause... A resume and an important application of Avicenna’s theory of causes appear in the Kitāb al-Nafs of the Shifā (ed. F. Rahban, Oxford 1955, 228-9), where it is stated that the body and the soul are not in the same relationship as cause and thing caused; that the body can be only the receptive and accidental cause of the soul, and that the soul receives existence only through “separate causes” (al-šīla al-muʃāfīb). It would be interesting to compare Avicenna’s analyses and the corresponding ideas of S. Y. Suhrwardi, for example, in his Kitāb Ḥikmat al-istanbūl
 length (19 ff.)  

**Bibliography:**

**ILLSYÝN** (gentitive *illsiyyn*) is used in Sûra LXXXIII, 18 to mean the place in the book where the deeds of the pious (abrûr) are listed. In the two following verses (19 ff.) *illsiyyn* is described as an inscribed book (*kûdûb markûm*). In verse 21 it is said of this book that those close (to God) bear witness to it. Correspondingly in verse 7 of the same Sûra the place in the book where the deeds of evil-doers are chronicled is called *sidîdîn*. In the two following verses (9 ff.) *sidîdîn* too is defined as an inscribed book. In Tabari's view *illsiyyn* may be identified with the seventh heaven or the right foot of the divine throne, or some other place in heaven. He gives no explanation of the fact that *illsiyyn* and *sidîdîn* are themselves described both as books and as the place where the book of the pious or the book of the evil-doers may be found. Zamakhshari assumes that the book in which the deeds of evil-doers or the pious are recorded is, so to speak, a part of a main book (*kûdûb djîmân*, *dûunîn*) which is called *sidîdîn* or *illsiyyn*.  

---

(Ed. H. Corbin, Paris-Teheran 1952, 62-3, 91, 94-6, 147-8, 184, 186, 195); they have a basis of common ideas, but the latter exhibits a greater independence of the Aristotelian source and forgets a close link between the theory of emanation (and its descent from the luminaries) and the idea of cause; whence the expressions "effusive (fayydda) cause", "illuminating (nûrîyya) cause" and "existential illuminating (wud[udiyya nuriyya) cause" (195). The *illa* becomes the effusion from the "victorious luminaries", in which cause and thing caused correspond in an intellectual (*'âli) priority, "but not a temporal one; cause and thing caused remain both together in time" (63).  

If we turn now to western falsafa, we find an equally frequent use of causes (*'âli*) and of the principle of causality, the ideas and vocabulary of which are well established. Thus, a whole theory of causes can be extracted from the writings of Ibn Rushd, not only in his commentaries on Aristotle but also in the *Tadhfut al-tadhfut*, when he is replying to al-Ghazali concerning the eternity of the world (ed. Bouyges, Beirut 1930, 4 ff.; cf. Eng. tr., S. van den Bergh, London 1954, 1, 1 ff.). Reference to the four Aristotelian causes leads Ibn Rushd to state that the very idea of cause is analogical, and that only efficient causality is appropriate to the first Cause that produces the world. He also emphasizes that the infinite regression of causes is impossible as far as causes *per se* and direct causes are concerned, that is to say, "if every cause is a condition of the existence of that which follows from it"; this regression is not, however, impossible for causes *per accidens* and "circular" causes. It should be added that, the more Ibn Rushd reacts against the Neo-Platonism of his eastern (and Maghribî) predecessors, the closer he comes, on the subject of causes, as on so many others, to the historical Aristotle.  

III. *Ilm al-kalâm*. When it began, *ilm al-kalâm* was scarcely aware of the "theory of causes". When it encountered the idea, or one very similar, moreover, it expressed it by *asbab*, not by *'âli*.

Originally, the problem is not the relationship between first Cause and second cause, but the production of "commenced" actions, especially human actions. The various answers of the Mu'tazîlis, Aş'arî and Hanafi-Mâtûrîdî schools are known [see *Allân*, II, B]. Whereas the Mu'tazîls affirm the efficacy of the created agent on his effects, the predominate lines of the other schools hold to a non-necessary sequence of *sabab* and *masabab*, directly created by God, without intrinsic efficacy (*ghayr ta*ârîf) of the first on the second. In order to combat eastern falsafa in the *Tadhfut al-faldsifa*, al-Ghazâlî was obliged to borrow its ideas and vocabulary concerning cause and thing caused. Under the same influence, the usages *illa*, *illsiyyn*, *ma'srub* and *mâ'llîyya* appear more and more frequently in the major manuals of the following period, in general towards the end of the "philosophical preambles". An example of this is the *Muhâassal* of Ta'hâ al-Dîn al-Râzî (Cairo n.d.), where the four causes are mentioned (89-90), and a chapter is devoted to "cause and thing caused" (104-6). The *Mawâhib* of A'dûd al-Dîn al-Idjî, and the commentary on these by al-Djurdjâni, elaborate the same subject at some length (*Sharh al-mawâhib*, ed. Cairo 1325/1907, IV, 98-201). An analysis of the causes and a long discussion on the relationship between cause and thing caused are to be found there. The predominate idea is that "causes" are only the "condition" (*ghurî*) of their effects, and that there can be no efficacy (*ta*ârîf) of the first on the being of the second. It is with reference or non-reference to *ta*ârîf that al-Djurdjâni, in his *Tadhfut* (ed. Pfleger, Leipzig 1845, 160 and 121) appears to distinguish the ideas of *illa* and *sabab*. Later on, the vocabulary does not retain this precision, and the term *illa* goes somewhat out of favour. The *Muhaddîmât* of Ibn Khaldûn speaks only of *asbab*. The contemporary manuals, such as the *Muhaddîmât* of al-Sanûsî of Tlemcen or the *Hddîyya* (. . .) *alJuwaris* (Tahâ al-Juwâri), condemn the *Mufîrs* (the *illa* of Fâlqar, more strongly than the former) for *shirk al-asbab*, associating an operation of second causes with the divine Omnipotence (see *Muhaddîmât*, ed. and trans. Luciani, Algiers 1908, 92-5, 108-13). The existence of *asbab* is not denied, but they have no efficacy (*'adam ta'ârîfîn*) on the "effect" with which "they usually coincide". The affirmation of a *ta*ârîf of the cause on the thing caused, even when it is the result, as the Mu'tazîlis claim, of a "commenced power" (*hûdra khdîhâ*) created by God in the agent, is still considered by Aş'arism as being in opposition to the Power of God, or at least confining it. This entrenched position has weighty consequences for the problem of human freedom, which it leads its followers to deny. It may be asked, however, if it does not stem from a misunderstanding. Avicenna's theory of causes, for example, and his analysis of the very idea of causality is one thing; another, a view of the world dominated by a creation-emancation, doubtless willed by the first Being, but which is necessary and thus eternal. For Ibn Sinâ, as we have seen, a cause in actuality cannot not produce its effect, and maintain it, by its intrinsic efficacy. This is true, according to him, for the relationship of God with the world, but equally true for the action of second causes, which, in his view, thus remain part of an absolute existential determinism. Consequently, to admit the *ta*ârîf, the influence, of the cause on the thing caused appears to the *mu'takalûmun* as a denial of the divine free Will and free Action. The two questions of the intrinsic reality of the causal relationship and of the freedom of God in His creative Act (and thus of his transcendence of the created thing) are thus blocked together in the discussions of the schools.
The Arabic ʿillīyyūn is undoubtedly derived from a misunderstanding of the Hebrew ʿelyon (the highest), ʿalā ʿlā yān and may perhaps be explained on the following ground, that he had learned that the book in which were recorded the deeds of men was kept by the ʿelyōnīm; for this is the name which is frequently applied to the heavenly beings, who are called taʿfīt ʿnim, e.g., the highest). "Mohammed’s mistake can perhaps be for this is ʿelyon ʿnim, a misunderstanding of the Hebrew *elyonim, for he heard the word from Jews" (Horovitz).

The verb maʿrifa, fikh, hikma, and on the other hand with a number of shuṣur; is however the nuance of laborious study is implied; ʿilm Him taʿallama result of this action. is the first term in referring to the composite and to the imperfect, and also in the imperative, with the meaning of "to know", but in the imperative and in the perfect it seems often to mean basically "to learn" (without effort, the fifth form taʿallama being used when a nuance of laborious study is implied); ʿilm is the result of this action. ʿArafa means "to know" but, perhaps as a result of the particular meaning of certain early derivatives such as ʿarif or ʿarrāf (see T. Fahd, Division, index; al-Dāhibī, Tarbī, index), a difference appeared at an early date in Muslim thinking between maʿrifa and ʿilm, the first tending to be used of knowledge acquired through reflection or experience, which presupposes a former ignorance, the second a knowledge which may be described as spontaneous; in other words, maʿrifa means secular knowledge and ʿilm means the knowledge of God, hence of anything which concerns religion. In fact these distinctions are quite artificial and it is doubtful even whether a semantic study of the two terms based on an extensive collection of examples would throw any light on this problem, so personal is the way in which the different writers use them and so varied according to their various disciplines. In the field of mysticism, the relations between ʿilm and maʿrifa will be dealt with under maʿrifa and taṣawwuf; the theory of knowledge on the philosophical and theological plane will also be covered in the article maʿrifa. We merely state here that ʿilm had to fit in with the exigencies of the system of the mutakallimûn, who assigned to it a place in the schema of the Aristotelians; ʿilm is an accident (ʿarad) characterized by life (muhktās bi ʿl-haydt) and forming, with the will, power, etc., part of the class of the modalities (kayfīyydt) of the inferior appetitive soul (see al-Tiglī, Mawāṣif, with the commentary by al-Dījrī, Būlāk 1266, 272 f.; al-Tahānawī, Dict. of tech. terms, 1055-66). ʿilm is either eternal (ḥadīm) or produced within time (ḥadīṣ, muḥādāt) according whether it exists in God or in a created being, and there is no analogy between these two types. The mutakallimûn, who made a distinction between ʿilm and maʿrifa, used the first term in referring to the composite and to the universal, and maʿrifa for objects which are simple (bassī; see al-Dījrī, Tawīlī, s.v.) and particular (al-Taftazānī, on al-Nasafi, 40).

On the theological plane another difference concerns the relations between ʿilm and ʿamal, "works"; there is in fact a ʿilm naṣari, such as the knowledge of things, and anyone who possesses it may stop at that, and a ʿilm ʿamali, knowledge of religious obligations (iḥsādat), which is complete only when these obligations are fulfilled (al-Raghib, Muṣafādāt, 348). Al-Kairāwī’s explanation in the Tanbih (Cairo 1306, 193) is somewhat different: whoever possesses the knowledge of things and does not act according to what it teaches is only half obedient, whereas he who possesses it and also acts according to it has a double merit.

On a more general plane, ʿilm, applied to knowledge of a religious character, is contrasted both with maʿrifa, in the sense of profane knowledge, and with adab (q.v.), the meaning of which it is difficult to define precisely, but which refers in particular to a literary and professional training rather similar to maʿrifa. The active participle, ʿāsid, acquired at the same time the meaning of a scholar learned in religious matters [see ʿulaMA], and then, at a later period, simply scholar, for which formerly other terms were used (in particular baṣtim), whereas ʿilm acquired at a much earlier date that of learning in general.

It is true that in the expression faṣab al-ʿīlam the last word was regarded by the majority of Muslims as meaning “traditions” the search for which had involved long journeys, but it is doubtful whether the Prophet intended simply to allude to this activity in the numerous ḥadīths exhorting the faithful to seek for ʿīlam (“even in China”); therefore in the traditions in question this word should be translated by “knowledge”, just as it should be given the meaning of “learning” in texts dating from the first centuries of Islam. Furthermore the arts and the sciences were made, first by the philosophers and then by various thinkers and writers, the object of a series of lists (iḥsā al-ʿulām) and classifications of the sciences (marātib al-ʿulām), the evolution of which from the 3rd/9th century to today is particularly instructive: L. Gardet and M.-M. Anawati have drawn up a very instructive table of them in their Introduction à la théologie musulmane, Paris 1948, 101-24, where, in considering the place of baṣtim in the organization of knowledge, they present the various classifications of al-Fārābī, of the Ḥikwān al-Ṣafā, of al-Khuwārizmi, of Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Ghazālī, Ibn Khaldūn, mentioning also those of Avicenna (102, note 2) and of Dījrī Zaydān; to this table there may be added: Ibn ʿUtayba (G. Lecomte, Ibn ʿUtayba, Damascus 1965, 445-9); Aḥū Maʿyān al-Tawhīdī (see M. Bergé, in BEO, xviii (1963-4), 241-99); Ibn Ḥazm (Marātib al-ʿulām, ed. S. Al- ʿAhdīnī, Miskawayh (K. al-Sādā, Cairo 1948, 48-60), and probably some other writers.

It is surprising, on examining these lists, to see the relative importance given to the Arabo-Islamic sciences and the foreign sciences, the latter occupying progressively less space as the dates get later. Al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1112) seems to have played in this field a determining role by establishing a clear distinction between worthless (muddāmūd) and blameworthy (maḥḍīmmā) sciences, the latter including all the disciplines considered to be useless,
even harmful, to life on this earth and to the health of the soul in the hereafter (see *Ibid*, book i, ch. iv). A similar conception is merely the application of a more generally accepted principle according to which the true Muslim must "pay no attention to that which does not concern him" (*tark mdya*nta); see I. Goldziher, *Muh. St.*, ii, 137), and this attitude of mind clearly explains the indifference of Islam towards many of the sciences whose interest is not immediately obvious.

The general tendency did not however prevent a number of Muslims from transmitting the heritage of antiquity while adding to it their own contribution. Details of the various disciplines will be found in the articles on mathematics (*AL-DIJABR WA L-MUKABALA; AL-ILM AL-HISA*), medicine (*TIBB*, *BOTANY [NABAT*), alchemy (*KIMA*) , zoology (*HAYawan*), etc., while for general surveys of the history of the sciences in the Muslim world there may be consulted G. Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science*, 1927-31, 2 vols.; A. Mieli, *La science arabe*, Leiden 1953; M. Kraus, *Ifryd*, *Al-Shanfara*, in *Aghdnl*, iii, 23, verses 3, 9, 10.

From these details there become apparent certain elements of Arab aesthetics such as the symmetry between the two halves of the body produced by slender hips, the contrasts of forms and colours: the hair (*fakhs* and the face (*aba*), the lips (*tama*), and in the poems of the *ghazal*), the figures were represented in the frescoes and sculptures of the Umayyad castles (R. Ettinghausen, *Arab Painting*, Geneva 1962, 31; D. Schlumberger, *Kasr al-Hayr al-Gharbi*, Ar. tr., Beirut 1945, pl. 186). It is interesting to note that the principles of unity and continuity were manifested in the mosques with their forest of columns and that symmetry appears most prominent in the poems of al-Salghra, of Kasr al-Tubab, of Mahatta and in the decoration of its facade. There should also be noted the contrast of the light and dark colours in the frescoes of Kasr al-Hayr al-Gharbi (Creswell, *A Short Account of Early Muslim Architecture*, 1958, 124 ff.; D. T. Rice, *L'Art de l'Islam*, Paris 1966, 21 ff.).

The idea of beauty underwent certain modifications under the *Abbasids*. Most characteristic of it during this period was the tendency to equilibrium, the interest accorded to spiritual beauty and the importance given to the harmony of the body (S. al-Munadjidji, *DJaml al-mar'a* 'inda *al-Arab*, Beirut 1958, 35-40). Beauty was a favourite subject of *adab*. Although it did not constitute an *ilm, djaml* was nevertheless a knowledge of some degree; whence the expression *al-basar bi* l-gharabi. The evolution of the study of human beauty has influenced literary criticism to the extent that we have Ibn Rašîk allowing a reduced form of *dād* to be compared to certain faults praised in the *gārîya* (al-`Umdu, Cairo 1934, i, 177). Literary criticism, given the lack of art criticism, illustrates the characteristics which are found in the *ghasar* and in the arts in general. It is a formal criticism expressed in concrete terms which may often be applied either to a person or to an expression (al-`Askari, *Sin`ululm*, Istanbul 1930, 131; Ibn Rašîk, op. cit., i, 106). The critics (al-`Askari, op. cit., 202; Ibn Rašîk, op. cit., ii, 3) insisted on symmetry (*tawdzun, tawdzla*) and contrast (*takd`*, *tibak*). Their analysis is only a partial one, since it deals not with the poem but with words, verses or expressions (Ibn al-`Aṣir, *Al-Mathal al-sal`ir*, Cairo 1952, i, 384, 386; al-Djurdjani, *Daw`al al-rid`a*, Cairo 1931, 31 ff.). The separation of art and religion which became the rule from the Umayyad period onwards is sufficiently clear in *Abbasid conception* (Kudama, *Nukh al-`Aṣir*, Cairo 1948, 14; al-Djurdjani, *Al-Wishts*, Sidon 1937, 57, 58). These same features can be found in the arabesque, in which the repeated continuation of a single decorative theme corresponds to the verse in the poem and the column in the mosque, in which abstraction is only a form of Arab idealization, where art has no goal outside itself, and where the unity of the whole is in agreement with a certain tendency towards unity in the attitude of the critics (Ibn al-`Aṣir, *Al-Mathal al-sal`ir*, Cairo 1932, 268; Ibn Tabashaba, *Ify al-`Aṣir*, Cairo 1956, 17, 112).
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beauty by several other names in Arabic), is that branch of
knowledge which deals with the geometrical structure
of the universe, and which invents and employs
the instruments necessary to guarantee the utmost
accuracy in observations.
The geometrical structure of the universe, as con-
ceived by Muslim astronomers after about 800 A.D.,
by and large coincides with that expounded by Ptole-
my in his Almagest. The earth rests motionless near
the centre of a series of eight spheres which encom-
pass it. The eighth sphere, studded with the fixed
stars which were duly catalogued by such scholars
as al-Sufi (d. 376/986), revolves daily from East to
West; it also moves in the opposite direction at an
appropriate rate of precession, or oscillates with a
motion termed tredipation (this theory is primarily
known through Thabit b. Kurra and various Spanish
astronomers). The spheres of the five “star-planets”,
which are eccentric to the centre of the earth,
revolve in such a fashion that their centres of uniform
motion (equants) are not identical with their geo-
metrical centres; the model of Mercury has, as a special
arrangement, a “crank mechanism” which produces
two perigees in its orbit. On the surface of these
spheres are situated the centres of the planets’
epiphanies. The model of the Sun, however, involves
only an eccentric circle, while that of the Moon
utilizes both a “crank mechanism” which causes
the centre of its deferent to revolve about the centre
of the earth, and an epicycle in which the anomalous
motion is counted not from the epicyclic apogee, but
from a point on the line extended from the “opposite
point” on the circumference of the deferent to the
epicycle. Muslim astronomy is largely concerned with expounding the
intricacies of this system and with refining the
parameters which transform it from a qualitative
to a quantitative model of celestial motions; the core
of the cijles is constituted by the tables based on
the regular motions of the various parts of the model
and their determined parameters. It might be well
to mention here that the interference of Ibn al-
Hajjala al-Maghribi attempts to define the terms used in this
field, such as djamil, hasan, malih, etc., and to
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eastern, are similar in their general conception, the
beauty celebrated by the earliest Arab poets ten
centuries previously.
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'ILM AL-DJAMAL — 'ILM AL-HAYA'

Bibliography: in the art.; see also FANN.

'ILM AL-HANDASA' [see Supplement].

'ILM AL-HAYA', the "science of the figure (of the heavens)" or astronomy (which is also known
by several other names in Arabic), is that branch of
knowledge which deals with the geometrical structure
of the universe, which determines the laws governing
the periodic motions of the celestial bodies, which
devises cinematic models to describe these motions,
which reduces them to tabular form so that a
computer can, with as much precision and ease as
possible, determine the positions of the heavenly
bodies as seen from any particular locality on the
surface of the earth, and which invents and employs
the instruments necessary to guarantee the utmost
accuracy in observations.
The geometrical structure of the universe, as con-
ceived by Muslim astronomers after about 800 A.D.,
by and large coincides with that expounded by Ptole-
my in his Almagest. The earth rests motionless near
the centre of a series of eight spheres which encom-
pass it. The eighth sphere, studded with the fixed
stars which were duly catalogued by such scholars
as al-Sufi (d. 376/986), revolves daily from East to
West; it also moves in the opposite direction at an
appropriate rate of precession, or oscillates with a
motion termed tredipation (this theory is primarily
known through Thabit b. Kurra and various Spanish
astronomers). The spheres of the five "star-planets",
which are eccentric to the centre of the earth,
revolve in such a fashion that their centres of uniform
on astrology involving a knowledge of astronomy) were translated into Arabic from Sanskrit, Pahlavi, Greek, and Syriac. For the first half or so of this period of translation Arabic astronomers were extremely eclectic, and this trend toward eclecticism continued to be strong for a much longer period in certain areas such as Spain. But the introduction of Ptolemy's rigorous methods and geometrical proofs at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century led to a rapid growth of observational astronomy, designed partly to investigate the discrepancies among the Greek, Iranian, and Indian systems, and partly to improve the Ptolemaic parameters. With the gradual recognition of the superiority of the Ptolemaic system, at least within the terms of the strongly Greek-oriented intellectual atmosphere that developed in Islam, the Almagest usurped a position of unchallenged pre-eminence in the estimation of most Muslim astronomers. This process was completed by the time of the publication of his Zīdī al-Šābī by al-Battānī in about 900 A.D.; and, despite the Indianizing tendencies of the Khawājahs, the attacks of the Aristotelians, and the successes of the School of Marāḡa, Ptolemy remained in his position of dominance until the introduction of modern Western astronomy in fairly recent times.

The translations from Sanskrit.

The earliest translation of a Sanskrit astronomical text into Arabic was apparently that of the Zīdī al-Ārkand (arkhand is a corruption of the Sanskrit ahargana) made in Sind shortly after 117/735; on it were based two other sidjes, the Zīdī al-Ḥasūr and the Zīdī al-Dīāms, both composed in Kandahār in the 2nd/8th century. The elements of the Zīdī al-Ārkand evidently were largely derived from the Khājahahbāyahākārī written by Brahmagupta of Bhilāmā in A.D. 665, though it was also influenced by the Zīdī al-Sīhā of Yazdīdīrīd III (632-652), which, like the Khaqānahbāyahākārī, belongs to the Midnight School (ādhrāʾābīrīhā) of Āryabhāṭa (b. 476).

In 742 yet another Sanskrit sidji was translated into Arabic. This work, composed in verse in imitation of the Indian texts, was given the name Zīdī al-Harbān, wherein ḥarbān clearly represents another corruption of the Sanskrit ahargana. This sidji was based on the Sunrise School (aṣūdāyāhā) of Āryabhāṭa—i.e., on the Āryabhāyśa that he wrote in 499.

The most important translation from Sanskrit into Arabic, however, was that of the Mahāsiddhānātha belonging to the School of Brahma (brāhmaṇaṇa); the Mahāsiddhānātha was primarily based on the Paitāmahāsiddhānātha (first half of the 5th century) of the Viṣṇudarmottaratpurāṇa and on the Brahmā-svarōṣasthīśāhāṭa written by Brahmagupta in 628, though some elements derived from the Āryabhāyśa are discernible in its fragmentary remains. The occasion for the translation was provided by the visit to the court of al-Mansūr at Baghdād of an embassy from Sind in 154771 or c. 156773; the translator is alleged to have been al-Fāzārī, who, in his Zīdī al-Sīnḥīndī al-habīr, mixes Iranian material in with the Indian. Al-Fāzārī also wrote a Zīdī al-aṭār sīm al-ʿābī, based on his earlier work, which must have been the first set of astronomical tables to employ the Arabic calendar; the date of this work is c. 790. Another scholar who evidently had independent access to the Mahāsiddhānātha, Yāʾkūb b. Ṭairīk, composed a Tārkīb al-aṣīhāk in 777 or 778 A.D. as well as a sidji and a Kībūb al-ṭalī, all of which reflect a mixture of Indian and Iranian elements. These works of al-Fāzārī and of Yāʾkūb constitute the basis of the Sīnḥīndī tradition, which will be discussed further below.

At some time around 800 another Arabic version of the Ārāhathāyśa known as the Zīdī al-Arīγābāhī began to circulate among Muslim astronomers. The only one to follow it was apparently one Abu l-Ḥasan al-Awzālī, though it was also certainly known to Abū Maṣʿūr (qq.v.) (d. 727/886). None of the works mentioned in this section or in the next, it should be noted, is extant; the account given here, then, may well be in need of some revision, and certainly will not be free from controversy.

The translations from Pahlavi.

Sasanian literature on astronomy, like that on astrology (both are known primarily through Arabic translations and adaptations), was an amalgamation of Greek and Indian material. Ptolemy's Almagest existed in a Pahlavi translation already in the third century, and a text belonging to the Midnight School of Āryabhāṭa was available by 556; one belonging to the brāhmaṇaṇaṇa has been published under Yazdīdīrīd III, was turned into Arabic, however, by one al-Tamūlī under the title Zīdī al-Sīhā. This was drawn upon by al-Fāzārī (especially for its planetary equations) and by Abū Maṣʿūr; manuscripts of it were still circulating in the time of al-Bīrūnī (qq.v.).

The translations from Greek and Syriac.

The most important Greek text on astronomy translated into Arabic was, of course, the Almagest of Ptolemy; translations were made from both the original Greek and a Syriac version. That due to al-Hagīdīrī in the first years of the 3rd/9th century exercised a strong influence over the astronomers gathered together by al-Maʿmūn; but the most authoritative version was that produced by ʿIṣḥāk b. Ḥunayn and corrected by Thābit b. Qurra (qq.v.). During the course of the 3rd/9th century Ptolemy's Hypohthesēs, Thēon's "Handy Tables", and the corpus of minor Greek astronomical writings known as the "Little Astronomy" were, later, when it became convenient to begin the study of astronomy by mastering Euclid's Elements, as the "Middle Astronomy") were also translated into Arabic, and a number of treatises on the astrolabe based on Greek and Syriac sources were published. This material, to a greater or lesser extent influenced by the translations from Sanskrit and Pahlavi (the most impressive influence is to be seen in the Muslim development of a trigonometry far more effective than Ptolemy's out of the Indian system which employs only the sine, cosine, and versine functions), forms the central core of Islamic astronomy after the ninth century.

The Ptolemaic tradition.

Arabic texts on planetary theory and the structure of the universe, as indicated above, normally reflect the Ptolemaic system. But, because of the paucity of detailed studies, it is at present difficult to assess the extent to which any particular set of astronomical tables or sidjes has depended on Indian, Persian, or Greek material. It is clear, however, that even in the majority of Ptolemaic sidjes one will find parameters, methods of computation, or other elements derived from the Sīnḥīndī or the Sīhā. This is true of the Zīdī al-muḥālaḥan of Yāḥyā b. Abī l-Mansūr.
c. 214/829) and in the several zidies of IJabash (c. 235/850); Abu Ma'shar in his Zidi al-hazdrdt made a conscious effort to combine the three systems in order to substantiate his claim that they are all descended from a unique ante-Diluvian revelation.

The Zidi al-Sābī of al-Battānī (c. 287/900), however, is almost entirely Ptolemaic; in this it presumably reflects the strong Hellenistic atmosphere of the Syrian, and particularly the Harrānian, astronomical and astrological schools. Al-Battānī's parameters were adopted by Kūshyār b. Labbān (c. 400/1010), though Kūshyār was generally a follower of Abu Ma'shar in his astrological works, and one suspects that this influence can also be traced in his zidies. The Zidi al-kabīr al-Hikimi written by Ibn Yūnis (c. 380/990) in Cairo is extremely important for the historical information it contains.

Al-Kānum al-Mas'ūdi of al-Bīrūnī (421/1030), whose works are also of immense importance for their historical information, often reflects the author's interest in Indian astronomy. The Zidi al-Sangarī was composed by al-Khāzīnī (c. 514/1120) in Iran; a later epitome was translated into Greek by Gregory Chioniades, who obtained the manuscript at Tabriz, in c. 700/1300. Al-Khazinī, despite his interest in Abu Ma'shar's Indian theory of cycles, continues to compute according to the Ptolemaic tradition. And the Zidi al-Ālā'ī of al-Fāhhab (c. 545/1150), not extant in its original form, was one of the texts translated into Greek by Chioniades, and its elements were used by al-Fārisī (c. 658/1260) in his Zidi al-nimaršṭan al-Musafīrī.

The Sindhind tradition.

The foundation of this tradition lies in the works of al-Fazārī and Ya'qūb b. Tātīk, wherein already, as we have seen, some Sasanian and Greek elements had been mingled with the brāhmaṇapakṣa and Āryabhaṭiya material. But the most influential representative of this tradition was the Zidi al-Sindhind of al-Khwārizmī (q.v.) (c. 215/830). Only fragments of the original text survive, but we do have a Latin translation of the revision made by al-Majrīqī in Cordova (c. 390/1000); the translator was Adelard of Bath (c. 1126). We also have commentaries on al-Khwārizmī's zidi written by al-Masūrī (c. 261/875) and by Ibn al-Muḥannā (4th/10th century; this commentary survives only in Latin and Hebrew translations made in Spain) as well as fragments of the commentary composed by al-Farghānī (q.v.) (c. 235/850). The details of the preservation of al-Khwārizmī's work that have just been given are indicative of the strong Andalusian predilection for the Sindhind; this impression is strengthened by the fact that the Naṣīm al-ṭiḥb of Ibn al-Adami (c. 308/920), one of the principal Eastern representatives of the Sindhind tradition, is primarily known through a quotation in Sā'īd al-Andalusi. The two other Eastern zidies which followed the Sindhind after 900—the zidi of al-Nayrīzī (c. 287/900) and that of the Banā' Amādīr (c. 297/910)—are mainly known from citations in Ibn Yūnis and in al-Bīrūnī.

In Spain the tradition was continued by al-Majrīqī's pupil, Ibn al-Samb (416/1025), whose zidi is available in fragmentary form; the zidi of Ibn al-Ṣaffār is probably also lost, though a manuscript in Paris may contain it. But the principal zidi of Muslim Spain was the "Toledan Tables" of al-Zarqallā (c. 473/1080); this work is a mixture of materials from al-Khwārizmī and al-Battānī. It had an enormous influence among Muslim (Ibn Kāmīnār, Ibn al-Bannā', etc.), Jewish (Abraham ben Ezra, Proflatius, etc.), and Christian (the "Aulonson Tables" and its successors) astronomers in Western Europe until the end of the 15th century.

The School of Marāgha.

Spain, as we have seen, was the home not only of the Sindhind tradition, but also of the Aristotelian assault on Ptolemy. Far more impressive astronomically was the effort generated at the observatory at Marāgha (founded by Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī in 657/1259) to modify Ptolemaic theory, and continued at its successors at Tabriz and Damascus. At Marāgha itself, where Chinese astronomers assisted their Muslim colleagues, the problem of revising Ptolemaic astronomy was seen as being essentially that of replacing the equant of each planet so that all celestial motions might be uniformly circular. The Tūsī couple invented by Naṣīr al-Dīn and explained in his Tadhkīra provided the basic approach for the solutions later proposed by his pupil, Kutb al-Dīn al-Shāṭīr, in 680/1281 and 683/1284, and by Ibn al-Shāṭīr of Damascus in c. 750/1350, though each of them advocated different numbers, dimensions, and arrangements of the epicycles. It was only Ibn al-Shāṭīr who finally reached a satisfactory solution for the two most difficult planets, Mercury and the Moon; but by the middle of the 8th/14th century, then, Muslim astronomy had worked out planetary models that depended solely on combinations of uniform circular motions, eliminating the equants from the models of the five "star-planets", and the "crank mechanism" and "opposite point" from that of the Moon.

This accomplishment of Ibn al-Shāṭīr shares many features with the models proposed by Copernicus two centuries later; in particular, their models of the Moon and of Mercury are identical, they both employ the Tūsī couple, and they both eliminate the equants in essentially the same way. There can be little doubt, then, that Copernicus knew of Ibn al-Shāṭīr's work; the details of the transmission, however, remain obscure. It is true that manuscripts of the Greek translations of various Arabic zidies made by Gregory Chioniades in c. 1300 upon his return to Constantinople after his studies at the observatory at Tabriz were in Italy by the middle of the fifteenth century, particularly those containing diagrams apparently illustrating the Tūsī couple, but they contain no details about Kutb al-Dīn's work and are, of course, too early to have been influenced by Ibn al-Shāṭīr. Some other intermediary must have existed.

The later observatories.

The observatory at Marāgha and the zidi which it produced—the Zidi-i Ilkhānī—served as a model for later Muslim astronomical efforts, though the modifications of Ptolemaic theory that we have just described are not known to have been influential in Islam after the 8th/14th century. The most famous imitator was the observatory founded by Ulugh Beg at Samarqand in 623/1228, where a number of astronomers headed by al-Kāshi and Kādżāda prepared a Zidi-i Sulṭāni (c. 84/1440); al-Kāshi also published a zidi of his own, the Zidi-i Khābānī. All three of these zidies are essentially Ptolemaic, though improvements are made in the parameters and in the structure of some of the tables, and material on the Chinese-Uyghur calendar is added to the other calendrical information common to all astronomical tables.

The last important Muslim observatory was built for Taḳī al-Dīn in Istanbul between 983/1575 and
985/1577. But the five observatories built in imitation of that at Samarkand by Djayasimha, the Maharadja of Amber from 1693 to 1743, at Diayapura, Udilga-
yin, Delhi, Mathurâ, and Vârânâsat desirous to be men- tioned, as they represent an attempt, though an abortive one, to revive Indian astronomy so as to make it conform to the Muslim Ptolemaic tradition. A more fruitful influence of the later Muslim observatories on their neighbours was that exercised by Marâghâ, Samarkand, and Istanbul upon European astronomy; several of the instruments and some of the organizational features of these establishments appealed to Tycho Brahe (1546-1601) and his collaborators at Uraniborg (1576-1612) and Stjerneborg (1584) observatories. The development of the astronomical observatory, the achievement of the School of Marâghâ, the advances in trigonometry and in the structure of tables, and the constant attempts to improve parameters stand out as the most impressive accomplishments of Islamic astronomy.

**Bibliography:** The vastness of the field of Muslim astronomy obviously precludes any extensive listing of the relevant literature; the following notice mentions only standard reference works and the latest books and articles reflecting advances in our knowledge of specific aspects of the subject. The standard reference work for the astronomers themselves and their works remains, despite its age, H. Suter's *Die Mathematiker und Astronomen der Araber und ihre Werke, Abhandlungen zur Geschich-
te der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, s. 1, Leipzig, 1900* (reprinted Ann Arbor 1963); this can be supplemented by H. P. J. Renaud's article in *Isis*, xviii (1932), 166-83, by C. Brockelmann's *GAL*, Pearson, and by the relevant articles in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* and in the forthcoming *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*. The fullest account of the *qîdâs* is E. S. Kennedy's *A Survey of Islamic Astronomical Tables, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, NS xiv/2, Phila-

For the literature concerning the period of translations the reader may refer to the references given in D. Pingree, *The fragments of the works of al-Fâsîrî*, in *JNES*, xxvii (1968). The history of Islamic astronomy in Spain and its influence on Latin and Hebrew astronomy is dealt with in a series of articles by O. Neugebauer, J. M. Millâs Valllicrosa, B. Goldstein, P. Kunitzsch, G. Toomer, and others; there are articles on the influence of Muslim astronomy on Byzantium by O. Neugebauer, D. Pingree, and P. Kunitzsch. Muslim astronomers are investigated in A. Sayîlî's *The Observatory in Islam, Publications of the Turkish Historical Society*, series vii, no. 38, Ankara 1960. And a summary of the recent work on the School of Marâghâ together with the relevant bibliography will be found in E. S. Kennedy's *Late medieval planetary theory*, in *Isis*, lvii (1966), 365-78.

Each of the subjects mentioned in this paragraph is presently being intensively explored; any future reader of this article should expect to find that enormous advances have been made in our know-
ledge of them. **(D. Pingree)**
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of the quadrivium (geometry, astronomy and music), classifications of numbers; perfect, over-perfect and deficient numbers; amicable (mutalfi'daa baa) numbers; series, etc. The influence of this work can be seen in the writings of the Ikhwan al-Safa' [q.v.], whose first Risāla, "On Numbers" (English trans. by B. Goldstein, in *Centaurus*, 1964, 129-60), is in large part a paraphrase of the *Introduction*, and in which the authority of Nicomachus and Pythagoras are repeatedly invoked. According to the Ikhwan, arithmetic, the first stage on the way to wisdom, is a study of the properties of existing things through a study of the individual numbers corresponding to those things: "existing things are in accordance with the nature of numbers". Even when a conventional classification of numbers is made, such as their classification into units, tens, hundreds and thousands, it is inspired by a universal pattern in nature—in this case, the four natures, the four elements, the four humours, etc. The prototype of the number one is The One; and just as all things proceed from the One, it may be seen that everyone of the principle of numbers but is not itself a number. Speculations of this kind are not to be found solely in scientifically weak writings; one of the great mathematicians of Islam, Ḥumar al-Khayyāmi [q.v.], believed that the study of mathematics—being the purest part of philosophy—was the first step on the ladder that leads to salvation and to knowledge of the true essence of Being (Risāla fi sharh má agha'ala min muṣūndarī d Uḥdīdate, ed. A. I. Saba, Alexandria 1961, pp. 3 and 75). And we should remember that the translator of Nicomachus' *Introduction* was one of the ablest mathematicians of the 3rd/9th century.

One is struck, however, by the paucity of writings on *ilm al-ṣadīd proper*. A somewhat extended treatment of this subject is Marāṣīn al-intisāb fī *ilm al-ḥisāb*, written in Damascus in 774/1373 by the Spanish Arab Ya'qub b. Ibrāhīm b. Yūsuf al-ʿUmawi; it contains a treatment of pyramidal numbers (Saidan, in *Ivii* (1966), 475-90). As well as applying Indian schemes of calculation to the old finger arithmetic (see below) and to sexagesimal place ( diferentia, mansio: ṭartaba, ṭansia); the Liber algorismi also calls zero ciffre or siffre, reflecting the Arabic  šifr, "empty". In performing the fundamental arithmetical operations the numbers are placed one above the other and the process begins on the left. Erasure and shifting of numbers are used, thus clearly implying that the operations were performed on a dust-board. A particular feature of the book is the treatment of duplumination and mediation as separate operations; this practice was preserved by Arabic arithmeticians as late as al-Kāshī in the 9th/15th century (though not in al-Karaji's *Summa Banā'a*, c. 619/1222, or al-Kalāṣādī, d. 882/1477 or 897/1490, and was also continued by many writers in Europe up to the 16th century.

Extant among the earlier introductions to Indian-type arithmetic is the *Uṣūl hisāb al-hind*, which Abu 'l-Ḥasan Kūshyār b. Labbān al-Dilli composed in about 390/1000 (*Principles of Hindu Reckoning*, facsimile of the Arabic text with English translation, etc. by Morris L. Levey and Marvin Petrucci, Madison and Milwaukee 1965). It is in two parts. The first part introduces the 'nine letters' and the principle of decimal place value. A small circle, 'ṣifr', indicates the absence of number from the place position (martaba) which it occupies. Kūshyār then deals with addition (ṣiyāda), subtraction (nuksan), multiplication (gār) and division (kisma). Duplication (lādīfī) and mediation (lansīf) are described as 'other kinds' of addition and subtraction respectively. There follows a treatment of the square root (dahr) and this part ends with a short chapter on maedalīn, in which the check by casting out nines is applied to multiplication, division and the extraction of square roots. Fractions are here expressed exclusively in the sexagesimal scale. A half, for example, is thirty parts of one, and accordingly the final result of halving 5025 appears as 2812. Similarly the re-

minder in a division is multiplied by powers of 60, then divided by the divisor. The second part is entirely devoted to the 'compound' sexagesimal system of calculation (including the calculation of square root) with the help of multiplication tables of numbers up to 60 (missing in the extant text). In these tables numbers were expressed in the traditional abjad notation, but the calculations themselves employ a pure place-value system of numeration using the nine figures and zero. A final chapter illustrates the process of extracting the cube root (kāb) in the decimal system. Throughout the book the calculations are performed on a dust board (takht) and involve rubbing out and displacement of numbers, the final result replacing one of the given numbers. To multiply 325 by 243 the following figures successively replace one another on the board: 325 6 325 72325 72925 77765 243 ' 243 ' 243 ' 243 ' 243 ' 78925 78975 78975 243 ' 243 ' 243 ' 243 ' 243 ' 243 ' 243 ' 243 ' 243 '

But already before Kūshyār's time highly sig-
ficant innovations were being introduced, as is witnessed by Kitāb al-Fusul fi 'l-ḥisāb al-hindā, which Abu 'l-Ḥasan Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Uklidisi composed in Damascus in 341/952-3. Though not yet published, this important book has recently been studied by A. S. Saidan in the unique Istanbul MS Yeni Camii 802 (*Ivii* (1966), 475-90). As well as applying Indian schemes of calculation to the old finger arithmetic (see below) and to sexagesimal
fractions, al-Uklidisi set out to alter the dust-board methods to suit ink and paper. Not only was the awkwardness of these methods apparent, but the association of the $takāb$ with astrologers earning their living by casting horoscopes and the unbecoming practice of rubbing off the sand with the hand made it undesirable. Thus it is interesting to note that when, in the same century as al-Uklidisi, Abu 'l-Wafā al-Buzjdani wrote his handbook of arithmetic for the use of the government bureaucracy (Mā yaḥttd dīyāt al-khullāb wa 'l-ummāl min sin'āt al-hisāb; cf. M. Medovoi in $Isto rico-matemati shke$ Issledovanii, xiii (1960), 253-314), he showed the Indian type schemes which he sometimes employed from the dust-board and erased. Al-Uklidisi claimed to be the first to offer a satisfactory treatment of cube root; but the most surprising feature of his book is the explanation and application of decimal fractions, an innovation which until very recently was attributed to al-Kāshī, five centuries later. The idea reappears in some form in the $Takmīla fi ʿtim al-hisāb of Abū Maṣūr ʿAbd al-Kāhir al-Baghdādi (d. 428/1037), who expressed our 17.28 by the arrangement 02 (see Saidan in $İs is$, loc. cit., 487-8 08 and in ĮC, xxxix (1965), 210, 220). But the invention appears to have been generally lost until, five centuries after al-Uklidisi, al-Kāshī re-introduced decimal fractions ($al-kusūr al-aśhdriyya$) in his $Mīfṭdh al-hisāb: $These are the $gdhrāriyya (numerals),$ and they are also called Indian, but their use has become prevalent among the people of the Maghrib and among those who follow them" (MS. Princeton University Library, Yah. 3407, dated 1037/1627-8, fol. 827).

Both forms of the numerals were known to the Arabs by A.D. 733, if not earlier. It may be noted, however, that up till now no one has found in Arabic treatments on arithmetic any reference to Indian authors or titles—unlike the situation in Arabic astronomical writings. Moreover, these treatises show no trace of the Hindu division of arithmetic into some twenty operations but rather follow the familiar Greek division; and in their designations of powers higher than the square and the cube they always considered the sums, as in Diophantus, not the products, as was the Hindu practice. They expressed the sixth power, for example, as $kāb kāb (kubōkubō), not as the square of the cube or the cube of the square (cf. H. T. Colebrooke, op. cit. in Bibl., p. xii). On the other hand, the phrase $hisāb al-ţahh wa'-l-tarfūb ("board and dust calculation") is clearly the equivalent of the Sanskrit padaśaṇa and dhaši-karma (Datta and Singh, op. cit. in Bibl., l, 123-4). And there is a parallel in Sanskrit usage for the fact that $al-djamʿ wa'-l-tarfūb (or, as in Ibn al-Raḥli, al-damn wa'-l-tarfūb), two terms which in the extant treatises always denote addition and subtraction respectively, could also designate the whole of arithmetic (ibid., l30; and cf. J. Ruska, in $B. Heid. Ak. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., 1917, 14-21). Thus the Īghvān al-Ṣafā defined $hisāb as $al-damʿ al-ṣadd wa-tafrikuhu (the combining and separating of numbers); and al-Khwārizmī is reported to have written a book on al-djamʿ wa'-l-tarfūb, which could not have been restricted to the elementary operations of addition and subtraction.

Before the spread of Hindu methods of reckoning there prevailed in the Islamic world a kind of arithmetic which al-Uklidisi called $hisāb al-Rūm w'al-'Arab. Books dealing with it (such as the treatise of Abu 'l-Walī mentioned earlier) gave rules for effecting the arithmetical operations including the approximate determination of square roots. These operations were usually performed mentally, and the partial results obtained in the process of reaching the final solution of a problem were 'retained' by holding the fingers in certain positions. Because of these features this arithmetic came to be known as $hisāb al-yad (hand reckoning), $hisāb al-ʿuḥd (finger reckoning), $hisāb al-ha-waʿi (mental, or literally, air reckoning). To deal with fractions, finger reckoning applied the sexagesimal scale or converted the fractions into parts of the local units of currency or measurement. Another system used by it appears to have been suggested by certain characteristics of the Arabic language, in which only the fractions 1/3, 1/4, ..., 1/10 are expressible by words derived from names of their denominators (′third′ from ′three′, etc.) (′Half′ is not derived from ′two′ and is therefore called $mawdū, i.e., formed by convention.) Some other fractions can be reduced to fractions of the former group: 1/12, for example, is half one sixth. Others, such as 1/11 or 1/13, cannot
be so expressed and for this reason they and their denominators are called asamm. In this sense of the word the ʿIİfğwān al-Šāfī‘a speak of 11 as 'the first asamm number'. To express 1/n one has to say: ‘one part out of eleven’. In other contexts asamm was used to render Euclid’s ṣIRRJOS as applied to a number, such as $\sqrt{2}$, that cannot be expressed as the ratio of two natural numbers.

Although treatises on finger computation continued to be written even after the advantages of Hindu reckoning were clearly recognized, the general aim of Arabic arithmeticians, and perhaps their chief achievement, was to fuse together the methods available to them into one system of arithmetical notation according to the theories of N. Bubnov, in Isis, xix (1933), 181-94; Rida A. K. Irani, Arabic numeral forms, in Centaurus, iv (1955), 1-12; idem, A sexagesimal multiplication table in the Arabic alphabetical system, in Scripta Mathematica, xviii (1952), 92-3; M. Destombes, Un astrolobe carolingien et l’origine de nos chiffres, in Archives internationales de l’histoire des sciences, xv (1963), 3-45; H. T. Colebrooke, Algebra from the Sanscrit, London 1817; B. Datta and A. N. Singh, History of Hindu Mathematics, pts I and II, Bombay 1962; G. Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science, i-liii, Baltimore 1927-48 (contains articles and bibliographies on individual authors); H. Suter, Die Mathematiker und Astronomen der Araber und ihre Werke, Leipzig 1900. (A. I. SABRA)

I.—Definition. It is difficult to establish precisely when ʿilm al-kaldm came to mean an autonomous religious science (or branch of knowledge). In any case, whereas the term fikh meant originally —especially in the Ḥanafi school (cf. fikh ʿakbar) —speculative meditation, hence distinguished from ʿilm in the sense of traditional knowledge, the term kaldm, literally ‘word’, quickly acquired the senses of ‘conversation, discussion, controversy’ (cf. A. J. Wensinck, The Muslim creed, 1933, 70), including two hadITHS of Muslim. In his ḤaḍITH ʿuṣūlām, al-Fārābī regards ʿilm al-kaldm as ‘a science which enables a man to procure the victory of the dogmas and actions laid down by the Legislator of the religion, and to refute all opinions contradicting them’. The doctors of kaldm (mudahlillim) themselves were to take a very similar view: this is one of many well-known definitions: kaldm is the science which is concerned with firmly establishing religious beliefs by adding proofs and with banishing doubts” (from the Mażāhīl of al-IJJ, 8th/14th cent.). Similar
definitions are to be found in Ibn Khaldûn, and again in Muhammad ’Abduh: they summa-

ize a place for reflection and meditation, and hence for reason, in the elicitation and defence of the content of the faith. It takes its stand firstly against “doubters and deniers”, and its function as defensive “apologia” cannot be over-stressed. A fairly common synonymous term is ‘ilm al-tawhid, the “science of the Unity (of God)”. The great schools did not merely use the divine unity but with all the bases of the Muslim faith, especially prophecy (e.g., al-’Ofir, al-Shahrastâni, Ibn Hazm) and refutations. Again, it is not always the same thinkers who are linked together under this or that comprehensive label (e.g., Kâddrijya); and mere tendencies should not be transformed into “schools” in the strict sense. This or that mutualism may be presented as showing diverse—even opposing—tendencies according to the problem he is dealing with. There follow here, as a general indication, a few points of reference.

The Kâddrijya were those most opposed to the Umayyad régime, most critical of the ways of the court at Damascus. The name was ordinarily applied to those who recognized that man had a power (kudra) over his acts so extensive that determination (kadar) belonged to man alone, and who saw in “works” thus freely performed an integral part of the faith. Hence the man who deliberately committed a great sin became khâtir, infidel. This last notion, which does not seem to have been supported by all, was to remain one of the characteristics of Khâridji thought. Ghaylân and Ma’bad al-Djushâni are the members of the Kâddrijya most frequently quoted. To them may be added, but with reservations, Wâsîl b. ’Ataâ and ’Amr b. ’Ubayy (2nd/8th century), who are regarded as the founders of the Mu’tazili school and are, with them, sometimes called “political mu’tazîlis”. This tendency re-appears in later Khâridji or Shi’î kalâm. The term Kâddrijya was later readily applied to the Mu’tazili proper, who disclaimed it. Some of them, interpreting differently the etymology of the term, used it of those who upheld the absoluteness of the divine Decree (kadar); this interpretation is found later in the works of their opponent Ibn Taymiyya.

In this second sense, Kâddrijya becomes practically synonymous with what had been its opposite, the Mu’taziliyya (or Mudjibira (q.v.)), the upholders of djibrîyâ, the divine “compulsion”, which creates man’s acts, good or bad, so that nothing is attributed to the man who performs them. The Mu’taziliyya is called djibrîyâ those (including Ash’aris) who rejected their doctrine of kadar. Ash’arî heresiographers accorded the term djibrîya—perhaps somewhat hastily—to the disciples of Djâhm.

It was on the question of faith, sin and salvation that the Murdji’a (q.v.) disagreed with the Khâridjîa. A great sin (kabira) does not involve loss of faith. On the basis of Kûrân, I, 106, the sinner’s future fate is left in suspense (iridîd), awaiting God’s decision. It is Ghaylân and Chassân (who seem to have had Hanafi connections) who are usually (e.g., by al-Shahrastâni) named as belonging to the Murdji’a.

Later heresiographers constricted these diverse tendencies into condensed formulas, which probably over-simplified and distorted them. But in these very first efforts to support politico-religious attitudes by means of rational argument the main lines of later discussions are already drawn. With greater or less success, the Kâddrijya anticipate some of the main theses of the Mu’tazila; the Ash’aris were to seek a “happy mean” to reconcile the “compulsion” of the Djâbriyya and human responsibility; the Murdji’a prefugre, to some degree, in their treatment of the problem of retribution in the next world, the explanations of the Mâurîlâ-Hanafîs and many Ash’aris. Full discussion of this question would re-
quire a detailed study (which would however be risky for lack of documentation) of Ghaylan, who is sometimes classed with the Kadiariyya, as having asserted the human liberty of choice, and sometimes with the Murdja', thanks to his theory of the future lot of the sinful believer.

We are dealing therefore with tendencies rather than with established "schools of theology", and with overlapping views which later were to diverge. Thus it is with the adherents of the sect of the Djahmiyya (q.v.), who regarded as their founder Dja'm b. Sa'faw (executed in 128/746) but whose thought they took from different sources of their opponents. To summarize: on the problem of kadar they would ally themselves with the Djabiariyya, and on that of faith with the Murdja'. Beyond this, however, they refused to recognize any distinct existence of the divine attributes, stripping them away (ta'fil) from the divine essence in order for the better to protect its perfect and absolute unity. Finally, they supported the thesis of the created God acts with a via remotionis (tanzih), which their opponents readily identified with the ta'fil of the Djahmiyya. God the Creator, an absolutely spiritual being, is inaccessible and can be seen neither in this world nor in the next. (2) Justice (al-aslah): God acts with a purpose. Things, by their nature, contain both good and evil. God can will only the good, and is obliged to accomplish that which is better (al-aslah). Thus He neither wills nor commands that which is evil. Man, "creator of his own acts" by a contingent power (kadra) which God has created in him, is responsible for what he does, and God is obliged to reward or punish him accordingly. (3) "The promise and the warning" (al-wad' wa 'l-wa'id) or "the names and the decrees" (al-asma' wa 'l-akhdam): to possess faith is to perform the acts prescribed by the Kur'ân. Whoever commits a "great sin" and does not repent is destined for hell. The thesis elaborates the "decrees" for the believer and the unbeliever. It deals also with "traditions" (ahhab): contrary to the normal doctrine, it does not insist that all the "transmitters" should be believers; and sifmâ (q.v.) is not infallible. (4) "The intermediate state between faith and lack of faith (al-mansia bayn al-mansilatayn)—the position of the "believer who sins" (fâshi (q.v.), a characteristic thesis of the school. The sinner is neither a true believer (mu'min), nor a true infidel (kâfir). He has failed to perform the "witness of the limbs", but his faith in God keeps him within the Community. It is here that are discussed the conditions for imdama and the respective merits of the first four Caliphs: (5) "The enjoining of what is good and the forbidding of what

The school of Baghdad was perhaps less illustrious than that of Basra. It derived from Bîghr b. al-Mu'tamir (d. between 210-268/825-90), who was for a time imprisoned by Hârûn al-Rashid, was criticized by Abu 'l-Hudhayl, and was to influence Mu'ammar, Al-Murdj, Thumâma, Al-Khayyât and Al-Kâbî (d. 319/931) brought fame to this group.

As the oft-quoted remark of Ahmad Amin (Duhâ al-Islâm, Cairo, iii, 204) puts it, the Mu'tazzils were "firstly men of religion and secondarily philosophers". It is not (pace D. B. Macdonald in E.J., s.v. Kalâm) the atomic theory (nor that of the "models") which characterizes the mutakallimun, but their primary concern to engage in disputation and argument to defend the faith against the sanadikâ of the period, the "free-thinkers" inspired by Mazdeism or Manichaeism, and later by pure Greek rationalism. Although nuances of doctrine, sometimes important, divided them, they were inspired by one and the same spirit: respect for reason (âbâl in the defence of religious tenets (âbâl becoming even the criterion and can be seen neither in this world nor in the next). (2) Justice (al-'adâ): God acts with a purpose. Things, by their nature, contain both good and evil. God can will only the good, and is obliged to accomplish that which is better (al-aslah). Thus He neither wills nor commands that which is evil. Man, "creator of his own acts" by a contingent power (kadra) which God has created in him, is responsible for what he does, and God is obliged to reward or punish him accordingly. (3) "The promise and the warning" (al-wad' wa 'l-wa'id) or "the names and the decrees" (al-asma' wa 'l-akhdam): to possess faith is to perform the acts prescribed by the Kur'ân. Whoever commits a "great sin" and does not repent is destined for hell. The thesis elaborates the "decrees" for the believer and the unbeliever. It deals also with "traditions" (ahhab): contrary to the normal doctrine, it does not insist that all the "transmitters" should be believers; and sifmâ (q.v.) is not infallible. (4) "The intermediate state between faith and lack of faith (al-mansia bayn al-mansilatayn)—the position of the "believer who sins" (fâshi (q.v.), a characteristic thesis of the school. The sinner is neither a true believer (mu'min), nor a true infidel (kâfir). He has failed to perform the "witness of the limbs", but his faith in God keeps him within the Community. It is here that are discussed the conditions for imdama and the respective merits of the first four Caliphs: (5) "The enjoining of what is good and the forbidding of what
is evil" (al-amr bi 'l-ma'ruf wa 'l-nahy 'an al-munkar): this thesis at first was of major prominence, but later lost relevance. "The enjoining of what is good" is an obligation upon every Muslim (contrast with 'ilm al-kalâm, of Basra). As against the more prudent view prevailing later, the Mu'tazilis advocated direct intervention, if necessary with the sword. One may and should deploir guilty leaders, one may and should compel opponents, on pain of death, to profess the true doctrine (cf. al-Ash'ari, Mabālīlī, ed. Cairo, ii, 466). This was the attitude of the Mu'tazilis in their days of triumph under al-Ma'mūn, when they denounced to the courts the supporters of the doctrine of the uncreated Kur'ān. The fact remains that the writings of the great Mu'tazilis, apart from the polemical Intiṣār (a defence of Mu'tazilism by al-Khayyat, against Ibn al-Rāwandi), are available to us only at second hand. After being for a time the official doctrine, Mu'tazilism was in its turn condemned and most of its productions were destroyed. It is only recently (in about 1958), that there have come to light, in the Yemen, the writings of a Mu'tazzī (unfortunately, late), the kāfī ʿAbd al-Djabār (d. 415/1025): first al-Mukhīl fi anwār al-ta'wīd wa 'l-ladī, a true "summa", now (1965) being edited in Cairo, and second the Kitāb al-Madīmī (ed. Cairo 1584/1965 by ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Mājudt, probably composed by a Zaydi disciple, the imām al-Mandakīm. We may mention also, in the line of ʿAbd al-Djabār's teaching, the Mu'tamād fi wasl al-fikhr, by his disciple the jurist Abū l-Husayn Ibn al-Tayyib al-Bāsiri (ed. Damascus by Hamidullāh). ʿAbd al-Djabār makes frequent reference to the "early masters" of the school ("our gharāʾib"), more readily to the school of Baṣra, and especially to al-Džubba and Abū al-Hāšım. Thus we now possess quotations from the early doctors and resumés of their thought presented from the Mu'tazī viewpoint: this reveals, incidentally, how objective are the Maḥālīl of al-Ash'ārī (and tends to prove that the first part at least of this work was composed during the years that the author adhered to Mu'tazilism). Again, the late date when ʿAbd al-Djabār was teaching induced him to conduct polemic against the Ash'ārīs and set out the replies of the Mu'tazīs to the attacks mounted against them. The discovery of these works in the Yemen is another proof that under the challenge of the 5th/11th century reaction the influence of the school continued to be felt in non-Sunni milieus.

Before passing on from the climate of thought of the first great schools of ʿilm al-kalām, we may mention the group whom al-Ash'ārī calls Ahl al-ihbāt or Muḥībbīna (cf. W. Montgomery Watt, op. cit., 194). It is by no means easy to define it precisely. It comprised a certain number of thinkers, Dirār, al-Naḍījīr, Muhammad Burghēt, whom later heresiographers readily classed as Mu'tazīs; but they were opposed by various supporters of the school of Baṣra (thus al-Nadījīr was opposed by Abū l-Hudhayl and al-Nazzām), and al-Ash'ārī saw in them his forerunners. They are said to have taught, inter alia, that God is the creator of human actions, and to have foreshadowed the theory of kasb or ikhtīsāb, which defined and limited man's possession of the acts thus created. Reference to the Ahl al-ihbāt allowed al-Ash'ārī to present himself as being in no sort an innovator in the field of ʿilm al-kalām.

C. The Ash'ārī reaction. — The "resurgence of Sunnism" under al-Mutawakkil and throughout the 5th/11th century was accompanied by an indictment of Mu'tazilism and concurrently, at least by ʿAbnā and Zāhirī traditionists, of kalām as such: what was questioned was the basic principle of reasoned and discursive argument starting from the tenets of the faith. ʿīm al-kalām however not only survived but renewed itself, thanks to the new direction given to it by Abū l-Husayn al-Āsh'ārī (260-324/873-935), a former Mu'tazzī. He is rightly regarded as the founder of the Aghā'īryyya (q.v.), of the most accepted and official school of kalām from the 4th/10th century to the 19th century. A certain number of his works (notably Luma, Ibnāna) have survived, and his Maḥālāl al-Īslāmīyyīn remain to-day an unrivalled source for our knowledge of the earlier tendencies and schools.

Throughout the centuries, several very famous names brought the Ash'ī to renown: to Ash'ārī kalām. It is certain that manifold tendencies appeared in this school, and that varying—even divergent—attitudes were adopted. Thus al-Bākīllānī summoned to the service of Aghā'īren the atomism first expounded by Abū l-Hudhayl; however, al-Diwa'nī did not follow him at all on this point, but took up again the theory of "modes" of Abū al-Ḥāšım (and Bākīllānī), which was abandoned by al-Ghazālī. But the basic viewpoints from which the major tenets of the faith are thought out remain the same; in spite of doctrinal differences—due largely to historical accidents and the diversity of the opponents it was necessary to refute—it is legitimate to speak of an Ash'ī "school" (singular), perhaps more coherent than the Mu'tazzī schools had been.

Is it necessary, as has been suggested, to admit a radical distinction, even a split, between the thinking of the school's founder and that of the school named after him? It is true that in the Ibnāna, al-Ash'ārī preceded his "credo" by a declaration of obedience to the teaching of Ibn Ḥanbal, and that although the declaration of faith which became traditional in the school could find justification in the Luma yet it is notably different from those set out in the Ibnāna and the Maḥālāl. Nevertheless, the obedience to Ibn Ḥanbal declared by al-Ash'ārī did not deceive the Ḥanbalis, who violently attacked the very principle of the defence of the faith by rational argument; and again, many propositions of the Luma had to await elucidation by later disciples, who were influenced in their turn by new historical circumstances. Thus there are not two "Aghā'īsmes", one of the founder and one of his followers, but, fundamentally, a single common attitude which was to be progressively developed and variously coloured by successive apologetic discussions.

This common attitude is the unblurred affirmation of God as the inscrutable Almighty. Who does not act "with a purpose in view" and Who "is not to be questioned"? In the strictest sense, God is "the sole Being and the sole Agent". He does not command an act because that act is just and good; it is His command (amr) which makes it just and good. God is the creator of human acts, of which man is merely the receiving subject (maball). But God "attributes" to man his acts (theory of kasb or ikhtīsāb), and hence are justified both human responsibility and the Judgement promised in the Kur'ān. Every statement of the Kur'ān corresponds to reality; the "ambiguous"
(mutashdbih) verses are absolutely true as regards their affirmation of existence, but the anthropomorphisms which they present must be accepted literally, but without asking how. With a return to Hanbali attitudes and against the Mu'tazilis it is asserted that the Kur'an is uncreated (ghayr maklük) and that the divine attributes are real. The attribute of the Word is not that it is "contingent": it subsists in God. But the school later taught the existence of the interior (zahir) divine Word, which is uncreated, and tended to admit that the "signs" which express it are created: such a distinction was to incur the vehemence of criticism of the Hanbalis, and a return to their methods of argument, so that it is possible to establish the following distinct chronological phases: (1) the works of the founder, al-Ash'arī; (2) the first disciples: al-Bākili, who adopted the theory of atoms and the theory of modes, which later were sometimes accepted and sometimes passed over in silence or rejected; al-Baghdādi; Ibn Furāk, the opponent of the Karrāmiyya; al-Bayhaki and al-Diuwany, supporters of the "modes"; (3) this last, al-Diuwany, al-Ghazālī's teacher in kalam, is already a forerunner of that line which Ibn Khaldūn calls "the moderns" and which continued to summarise and discuss the attitudes of the great falsafīs; this line gained glory from the most renowned mutakallimūn': al-Ghazālī, al-Shahrastānī, Fālārī-Dīn al-Rāzī (one of the most original thinkers of this school), al-Iṣfahānī, al-Tāhlīlī, al-Durrādīnī, al-Dawānī (on whose works Muhammad ʿAbduh later wrote a commentary): these "moderns" did not refrain from employing a certain degree of (moderate) tawīl to explain the anthropomorphic elements in the Kur'an (cf. al-Rāzī's Kitāb ʿAṣās al-tadbīd); (4) the manuals of "fossilized conservatism", which merely repeated and systematized the solutions presented by the masters of old time, reproducing their replies to Mu'tazili or falsafīs who were progressively less familiar directly: the works of al-Sanūsī of Tlemcen, al-Lākānī, al-Fudlālī, al-Bāqīrī.

D. Māturīdī-Hanafi tendencies. These became, with Ash'arīsm, the second officially approved line of teaching. "Tendencies", we say deliberately, and not "school", believing correct the remarks of Father Allard on this subject (Le problème des attributs divins dans la doctrine d'al-Asfari et de ses premiers disciples, Belrut 1965, p. 420). Al-Asfārī himself treated the Hanafīyya as a branch of the Mūjidīya (Makhlūkāt, I, 202-3). However, we are here concerned with a line of thought sufficiently coherent to deserve study in its own right.

It appeals on the one hand to the ancient texts entitled al-Kindī al-akbar and Wasīyat anbi Hanāfī, and on the other to al-Māturīdī of Samarkand (d. 333/944), the author of a Kitāb al-Tawhīd edited by one of his pupils. The Hanafī professions of faith (see A. J. Wensinck, op. cit.) have their peculiar characteristics: the connexion between ʿilm and imān, the statement of faith by baṣil, etc. But al-Māturīdī, in advance of his contemporary al-Asfārī, seems to have combated various falsafīs (and also dualists, materialists, esoteric sects; secondarily, Mu'tazilis and anthropomorphists). Although he, like others, deals with the divine attributes and Names, the main question which concerns him is the creation of the world. It is very possible that he did not literally "found" a school, but all the same many mutakallimūn looked to him as a point of reference. In later years it becomes difficult to distinguish clearly between followers of al-Asfārī and of al-Māturīdī: although Fālārī-Dīn al-Rāzī, al-Dawānī, al-Lākānī are ʿAshārīs under the influence of al-Māturīdī, Abu l-Barakāt al-Nasafī and al-Taftāzānī may be regarded as belonging primarily to the Māturīdī-Hanafi line and only secondarily to ʿAshīrīsm (they accepted the theory of atoms).

Indeed as compared with ʿAshīrīsm, Māturīdī-Hanafism, as presented by certain manuals (e.g., ʿAbd al-Rahmīn Ibn ʿAllī, Kitāb Naṣm al-jārāṭ, Cairo, 2nd ed.) puts forward solutions which are more psychological and intellectualist in character. As to the first: God creates in man the aṣīr, the root of his acts, whatever they may be, but it is human freewill which gives them a good or an evil specification. As to the second (see Allāh, p. 413): the divine decree (kādār) and predetermination (kādār) are no longer related to the divine will (as with the ʿAshīrīs) but to the divine knowledge; and the connexions between one and the other in time and in eternity are reversed (see al-Risdāl wa'l-kaldār).

E. Modern period. The revival (nahda) of ʿArabīo-Muslim thought, which has taken place from the end of the 19th century, has concerned particularly culture in the general sense, predominantly in the field of literature and under the strong influence of modern Western thought, but it has had its repercussions upon the "religious sciences". We have in mind here the reformism of the Salyafīya, and thus in exegesis (tafsīr) and in ʿusūlī fīlāh. Is it legitimate to speak of a resurgence in ʿilm al-kaldār? To answer this question we adduce the Radd ʿalā Dahrīyya ("Refutation of the materialists") of Dja'far ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmīn Ibn ʿAllī (Cairo, 2nd ed.) puts forward solutions which are no longer related to the divine will (as with the ʿAshīrīs) but to the divine knowledge; and the connexions between one and the other in time and in eternity are reversed (see al-Risdāl wa'l-kaldār).

This interest of the Risdāl al-tawhīd arises from the fact that it claims to reject nothing inherited from the great periods of the past and to put to profit the positive achievements of every school. Muḥammad ʿAbduh adheres primarily, but without rigidity, to ʿAshīrīsm (divine names and attributes; no "end" to God's actions, etc.). But he does not hesitate to draw inspiration from attitudes customarily regarded as Māturīdī, or even to adopt Muʿtaṣīlīl positions. Hence arises his famous declaration: "The Law came to reveal what exists; but it is not the Law which made this good (ḥasan)" (ibid., 80). ʿAbduh seeks to pass beyond the disputes of past ages in order to reconcile the various tendencies in kālām.

All the same, his rôle was less that of a thinker (or "theologian") than that of a reformer. When he
comes up against the mystery (ghayb) of divine Action on the world, he does not attempt to bring to bear on his intelligence as illuminated by the revealed truth, in the way that such a thinker as Fākhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī felt himself obliged to do. In order to maintain both the affirmations of the faith and of human experience, he prefers to take refuge in an admission of ignorance: “As for going further, seeking to reconcile God’s Omniscience and Will (which are proved to us) with man’s freedom of action (which are demonstrated by evidence), that is to seek to penetrate the mysteries of the divine Decree; and to open the door (so that) men plunge into this abyss and concern ourselves with matters that reason is nearly incapable of grasping” (ibid., 61; cf. Fr. tr. by Michel and M. Abd al-Rāzik, Paris 1925, 43). The distinction should be noticed between “proof” (by the Kūr’ānic text) of divine Omniscience and Will, and the (experimental) “evidence” of his freedom which man achieves. It may be said that in giving this reply Muhammad ‘Abdūraham is not carrying forward ‘ilm al-kalām but re-stating in new terms a traditional problem and leaving it open.

III.—Method and problems

A. Argumentation and types of reasoning.

Thus the solutions advanced and the criteria selected are extremely varied; but they have in common the fact that they always vary according to the doctrine being defended or the adversaries being opposed. We will limit ourselves to a few remarks on the two great “schools”. Mu'tazilism sought to valorize, under the attacks of the sandaliba, the absolute Unity and the absolute Justice of God; but this valorization quite quickly becomes, thanks to the arguments advanced to bring conviction, a “justification”: the divine Essence and Action become justified before and through human reason (‘aql). It is to counter this reduction of the mystery that the Ash'ariyya take their stand, proclaiming the Omnipotence and the Omniscience of God, rejecting any ontological basis for human freedom of action, but seeking to refute the Mu'tazilis (using the same weapons as they) and at the same time, on the other flank, and inopportunists (mujazzima) of every shade.

In both cases, for Ash'ariyya as for Mu'tazilis, the starting point for the dialectical arguments assumes that confidence may be placed in 'aql, and that a harmony is to be acknowledged between religious law and the efforts of reasons brought to bear on it. This is, we believe, the primary basis of 'ilm al-kalām, that which above all makes of it an autonomous discipline—and not this or that cosmological or noetic theory, whether it is dealing with atoms or with modes. But whereas in Mu'tazilism reason may and should account for its agreement with the Law, in Ash'arism it is the Law which defines the limits of reason and controls its activity. In both cases, the religious Law is the bearer of absolute truth—delimited, in the view of the Mu'tazilis, by the criterion of 'aql, whereas for the Ash'ariyya it is only because the Law enjoins upon him to do so that a man may “reflect upon the signs of the universe”.

The method of 'ilm al-kalām is thus basically explicative and defensive. It always postulates the existence of an opponent who is to be won over. Not merely the choice of arguments but even the method of presenting them will vary according to the nature of the opponents. It is noteworthy that “rational” arguments were often the first to be advanced; they are primarily dialectical, and pursue very subtle lines of reasoning; whereas the “modern” manuals clothe them in a syllogistic guise. Up to al-Djuwayni, and sometimes also with the “moderns”, they are based on logic “with two terms”, on the classical Semitic pattern, by way of implication and involution, or concordance, or opposition. A suggestive summary is found in the Bayā'an 'an usul al-imān of al-Sumnānī, a disciple of al-Bākīlānī (cf. Gardet and Anawati, Introduction à la théologie musulmane, Paris 1948, 358-61, 357).

“Rational” arguments are followed (or sometimes preceded) by “traditional” arguments, or, in other words, arguments from authority. These revolve around citations from the Kūr’ān, on the one hand those added in direct support of an argument and on the other those quoted by opponents whose faulty interpretation of them is attacked. To these may be added hadīths, sometimes numerous, sometimes few. This is especially the procedure of the first great Ash'ariyya. Most of them also rely upon texts guaranteed by īdma; “It is agreed that...” is a favourite argument. Al-Djuwayni, among others, gives an important place to īdma. The fact that these “traditional” arguments are in some manuals listed after the “rational” arguments indicates that the former are to be regarded as a confirmatur to the results of dialectical reasoning. The defensive and apologetic character of kalām is thus manifested in its very recourse to the tenets of the faith to supply arguments.

From al-Djuwayni onwards, the old-style dialectic and its reasoning from two terms yields place (without disappearing) to reasoning in three terms of the syllogistic type, with its universal middle term, and its recourse, implicit or explicit, to the principle of causality [see ʿILLĀ]. The falsāfsa now become the usual opponents, as much as or more than the Mu'tazilis. They must therefore be refuted on their own ground, and Aristotelian logic (with Stoic influences) becomes more and more influential in the arguments of kalām. The first manuals of the so-called “modern” tendency (the Muhāṣṣāl of al-Djurdjum, etc.) introduce questions regarding God and His Action with extended and purely rational discussions in which they are surveyed the logical, cosmological, noetic and metaphysical themes of the falsāfsa. Logic is here treated according to the Aristotelian schemas, sometimes with modifications (notably the four or even five figures of the syllogism). Yet the old argumentation from two terms does not entirely disappear; an indication of this may be found in the favourite selection of reasoning by the dilemma: this is probably Aristotelian in manner, but the implicit middle term is often suppressed in favour of the argument from authority (of a fact or of a text) or in favour of the dialectical judgement of existence [see BURHĀN].

The school of the “moderns” may be distinguished from the first generations of the Ash'ariyya by its advancing of more subtle solutions and its posing of some new problems. It is distinguished particularly by its use of the syllogism with a universal middle term and by its recourse to causality, even when, on the ontological plane, the efficacy of secondary causes is denied. Hence, to take a rather summary view, it is possible to re-classify the schools as follows: Mu'tazilī kalām and early Ash'arī kalām are opposed in the doctrines they maintain but may share the same attitude to the problems and use the same methods of reasoning; early Ash'arī
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kalām and the Ash‘ariism of the “moderns” support practically the same doctrines but differ perceptibly in their approach to the problems (adoption of “philosophical dreams”) and most still in their methods of reasoning; finally, “fossilized conservatism” took up again the now classical doctrines and combined the dialectical and the syllogistic approaches, without always distinguishing one from the other.

Early Ash‘ari kalām (al-Bakillānī, al-İsfa‘arînî, and al-İshārî himself) professed, according to Ibn Khaldûn in his Mu‘addalatīs (Cairo ed., 191, tr. de Selincourt, 192, French tr. 192, i.e., “the nullity of a proof implies the nullity of that which it was sought to prove”). It is thus, according to L. Massignon’s comment (Passion d’al-Hallâj, Paris 1922, 550, n. 1), that al-Bakillānī declared the atomistic view of the world to be “co-essential” with the text of the Kur‘ān. Such a procedure, Ibn Khaldûn adds, in which truths to be proved and probative arguments are interwoven, does not “conform to the rules of the art”. This remark would be fully justified for a logical statement in three terms, but not in a dialectic of like and like (or its opposite). The “proof” to be adduced is no longer the result of a deduction. It, too, is a fact, a witness of truth. For al-Bakillānī, the atomistic discontinuity of the thing created “proves” the absolute transcendence and subsistence of God, the sole Agent, in the sense that this is its opposite correlative, its mubābal, and that these two facts, presenting themselves to the spirit in a single apprehension, can only affirm themselves or deny themselves together (cf. Gardet and Amawātī, op. cit., 155). L. Gardet, La dialectique en morphologie et logique arabes, in L’ambivalence dans la culture arabe, by J. Berque, J.-P. Charnay, and others, Paris 1951, 255-305. It is less the strictly logical validity of reasoning by implication and its “conformity with the rules of the art” that is in question here than the degree of universality and probative validity of the two procedures, dialectical (with two terms) and syllogistic (with a universal middle term). For the formulation of problems. This study of the methods of thought and of argument employed in ʿilm al-kalām emphasizes that the struggle of Ash‘arism with Mu‘tazilism is part of a continuous process. There is a split as to the chief doctrines professed but not (we cannot repeat too often) as much as to the type of arguments or the method of reasoning employed, nor as to the general lines or the plans of the treatises. From this point of view, kalām, as an established discipline, is greatly indebted to the Mu‘tazilīs. Their five ʿusūl continue, with some variants, to dominate the whole question: so it is in the Luma‘ of al-İshārî, and to a large extent also in the Tamlakī of al-Bakillānī.

From al-Djuwaynî onwards, however, and particularly from al-Râzî, new three main importations appear: (1) introductions or preliminary remarks, on the character of reasoning (al-Djuwaynî, İrshād), on the nature of kalām (al-İshārî, İhbayd), and finally in the general principles of logic, natural philosophy and ontology (al-Râzî, al-İdīj, al-Djuwaynî) become of ever increasing importance until they figure in the actual treatises themselves. (2) In the more strictly “theological” themes, a distinction arises between on the one hand the ʿakīyyāt, i.e., the chapters concerning God, which (some attributes excepted) consist of a rational elaboration built up on scriptural bases, and on the other the sam‘iyyāt, the “traditional” (ex auctó) chapters, whose very argumentation depends on positive data. The philosophical chapters and the ʿakīyyāt are combined under the term ʿakīyyāt; the sam‘iyyāt deal with “prophecy”, with eschatology, with the descriptions and the names (problem of faith) and with the enjoining of good. Some authors (al-Djuwaynî, al-İghazâlî) make prophecy a link between ʿakīyyāt and sam‘iyyāt. (3) Finally, a distinction is made (a matter reconsidered by Muḥammad ʿAbduh) between “that which is necessary in God” (existence and attributes), “that which is possible for God” (visibility, creation of human acts, justification and reprobation, prophecy), “that which is impossible for God” (God and for God (the contrary of the attributes)). These various additions are often intermingled. Al-Djuwaynî, insisting on the tripartite division of the necessary, the possible and the impossible, included prophecy and the creation of acts in the chapter treating of “what God can do”, reserving the term sam‘iyyāt for the other “traditional” chapters.

These new principles of distinction seem to be due to the influence of falsafa. It was in order to reply to the falsafa that the Mu‘tazilīs, who had already elaborated philosophical chapters became more numerous; the term ʿakīyyāt is part of the vocabulary of the falsafa, and the distinction of the necessary, the possible and the impossible was made by them. The formulation of problems of the great Ash‘arî treatises of the “modern” age will therefore derive certainly from the old formulation of Mu‘tazilism and its “five bases”, but also from the organization of philosophical knowledge characteristic of the falsafa (and in particular as presented by the summa or the compendium of Ibn Sīnā).

The richest and most detailed manual, the Sharḥ al-Ma‘ṣūbīf of al-Djuwaynî, still studied in specialist courses of the great teaching-mosques, is arranged as follows: Two-thirds of the work (books-i-iv) treat of logic, natural philosophy and general ontology. The last third is divided between the ʿakīyyāt (the divine essence, the unity and unicity of God, His positive attributes, and His “possible” attributes, namely, visibility and cognozibility), the Actions of the Almighty (creation of human actions), the divine names, and the sam‘iyyāt (which are relatively short). There is no question here of a distinction between “philosophy” and “theology” in the Western sense and the attempt to harmonize them, but of a reply, which seeks to be exhaustive, to the treatises of the falsafa or of the Mu‘tazilīs. Since this reply seeks to use the weapons of the opponents, the vocabulary and the arguments of falsafa are found widely incorporated in ʿilm al-kalām. It is in sense through the intermediary of the mutakallimūn that the influence of the “philosophers” penetrated Sunni thought in general.

IV.—The position of ʿilm al-kalām in Muslim thought.— ʿIlm al-kalām remains one of the officially recognized religious sciences. But in the universities of Muslim countries the faculties of religious sciences are called kulliyāt al-şari‘a, a term generally rendered by “Faculties of theology”; fiqh is there taught as much as, if not more than, kalām. Kalām, based as it is upon its function of defensive apologia, does not hold the leading place in Muslim thought that theology does in Christianity. To find an equivalent for “theology” in the Christian sense it is necessary to have recourse to several disciplines, and to the ʿusūl al-fiḥk as much as to kalām. We turn now to establish the limits and results of this fact, and to place it in its historical context.
A. Three opinions. (a) In his Iḥṣād al-ʿulūm, al-Fārābī groups the sciences according to the schemes of Aristotelian classification, appending to them the strictly Muslim disciplines of fikhr and kalām. His summary of the methods of argument employed by the mulakkālimān is far from being laudatory; he emphasizes, to put it at its highest, its apologetic character, and seems to make of kalām an extension of fikhr: "the mulakkālim procures the supremacy of the principles which the fikhr uses as bases but without deducing from them any new consequences" (ed. Žabálka 1912, 56).

(b) In his Ḥṣāṣṣāl, al-Qazzāl devotes three of the four chapters of his introduction (ed. Ankara 1962, 11–15) to the nature and the role of ʿilm al-kalām. This discipline has its place among the religious sciences because it is concerned with curing doubters and refuting the denials of those who deny it. But its role is essentially "medical"; hence the study of it, as the ʿilm al-ʿulūm al-dīn states (ed. Cairo 1352/1933, 1, 3), is an obligation upon the community (ʿād al-ʿam) but not the concern of every individual Muslim, for it could be dangerous for a simple soul firmly anchored in its faith. And the Munkhādīn al-ṭalālī (ed. Cairo 1372, 1952, 56) reproaches kalām for its insufficiently proved rational principles. (c) The authors of the great "modern" manuals (hence Idji-Djurdjam) on the contrary esteem kalām so highly as to define it as the most exalted science of all, since it "proves the truth known by faith. Some would make the study of it a personal obligation (fard al-ʿayn) on every Muslim capable of undertaking it. This estimate is repeated verbatim by the manuals of "fooled conservatism". For al-Bājduri, for example (ʿĀṣhīyaʿ alā ..) Ḥqawwarat al-ṭauhīdīd, ed. Cairo 1352/1934, 26), faith through tahlīd (meaning here mere acquiescence in what has been handed down) loses all value as compared with faith firmly rooted in science, ʿan ʿilm, such as kalām can provide.

B. Opposition. In fact throughout its history kalām had two great lines of opponents. on the one hand the Hanbali (and Zāhirī) traditionists, who refused to bring rational arguments to bear on the absolute truths provided by faith; and on the other, the ṣalāfīs, who passed from silence, indeed from acquiescence in what has been handed down) were able to speak of a second mīna when, after the death of al-ʿAṣḥārī, his tombstone was destroyed in the cemetery of Baghādad. In the 5th/11th century, the vizier al-Kunduri had Ḥṣāris could be argued as the next step was to establish a second school of kalām. A. After objectively sum-
marizing their thought in the Mašāṣī, al-Ghazālī undertook to refute them in the famous Tahdfut al-falāṣīfā (ed. Bouyges, Beirut 1927). He there denounced twenty of their tenets as erroneous, and branded four of them as incurring infidelity (taḥfir); the eternity of the world ante, the eternity of the world post, the symbolic interpretation of the resurrection of the bōdy, and the divine lack of knowledge of the individual as such. The autobiogra-

phy of the Munkidh min al-dulād (ed. Bouyges, Beirut 1927). He there branded four of them as incurring infidelity (taḥfir). His work was undertaken to refute them in the famous Tahdfut al-Tahdfut of Ibn Rushd (ed. and Fast al-mafāfī, apologia sua "adversary of the falsafa, and Kur'anic teaching; the agreement between al-Razi and the Munkidh min al-dulād, the literalists and the Zanddika that Muḥazilism combated the falsafa. It is nearly always eastern falsafa; but proposal is sometimes in a Hanafi, and sometimes in a Ḥanafī, and in the great mosques had been given only by means of "fossilized" manuals, without any striking intrinsic merit and without originality. (2) The subject-matter of a defensive apology must be based on new themes. Are the attacks failed to shake the legitimacy which the Hanbalis and the "pious men of old", on the other hand, left a legacy of distrust and suspicion. Thus if one wishes to establish the place of "ilm al-kalām in Muslim thought, it should not be regarded as a discipline developing in a self-sufficient manner; it is linked with the other religious sciences, particularly usul al-fikh, as a discipline developing in a self-sufficient manner. We find some traces of this at the present day, to the extent that the influence of the "men of old" (salaf) inspires the "return to the sources" advocated by modern reform movements. It is true that "ilm al-kalām, as embodied in its most eminent doctors, remains as a venerated achievement of the great cultural centuries of Islam. But if one excepts the attempt of Muḥammad ʿAbdūh, it is difficult to point to any modern and living renewal; it might be truer to speak of a certain alienation from kalām.

Two reasons may, it appears, be advanced: (1) For too long the teaching of this "religious science" in the great mosques had been given only by means of "fossilized" manuals, without any striking intrinsic merit and without originality. (2) The subject-matter of a defensive apology for the faith is meaningful only so far as it relates to immediate issues. Now the content of these manuals is dictated by the refuta-
tion of adversaries (the Muṭazilis of the 3rd/9th century and the falāṣīfā of the 4th/10th century) who have long since vanished from the scene, whereas the burning problems of today are ignored. A defensive apology must be based on new themes. Are the efforts of al-Afghānī and ʿAbdūh in this direction to be continued? Interesting as their attempts are, they fall far short of the philosophico-theological standard achieved by the great doctors of the past. Al-Afghānī and ʿAbdūh were first and foremost reformers and men of action, not muṭakallīmūn.

We can conclude only with a series of questions. Will anything take the place of "ilm al-kalām, with more widespread perspectives and serving a practical, rather than a speculative, attitude? Or shall we see a renewal, with regard to the tenets of the Muslim faith, in which the great questions raised in the past regarding God and man and the conditions for man's salvation will be taken up again, but this time taking account of the demands of scientific discoveries and present-day thinking? For this the

C. ʿIlm al-kalām and the juridical schools.

—ʿIlm al-kalām presents itself as an explanation and a defence of the faith. It is on these grounds that Muṭazilism combated the zanddika and the literalists of the first centuries, and that the Ḥanfīs challenged the Muṭazilis, the literalists and the falāṣīfā. We find however that the Hanbalis and the Zanddika refuse to recognize the legiti-
macy of this undertaking. Now Ḥanbalism and Zanddīrīsm are schools of fiqh, and it is as such that they reject the dialectical argument of the muṭakallīmūn but propose to ensure, by their own procedures, this defence of the faith which kalām claimed for itself. Thus one may find in the works of such writers as Ibn Ḥazm or Ibn Ṭaymiyya many expositions on the attributes of God, human actions, prophetic-
schor would require a two-fold objective acquaint-
ance both with the great works of the classical age
and the contemporary problems.

It is appropriate to emphasize here the recovery of fav-
our enjoyed today by Mu'tazilism: not directly for its de-
fence of the Unity and the justice of God,
but for its assertion of human liberty, in the very language of
belief in the One God, the Creator, the All-mighty. Ash'arism no longer appears to be necessi-
ted by the demands of the faith. Will there take place a synthesis of the different tendencies of 'ilm al-kalâm, operating through a revised set of philo-
osophical equipment? The study of the text of the Qur'an and a more fully developed anthropo-
logy seem here to be called for, not to replace the "que-
tions concerning God" (jāhāyāt), but to open wider perspectives for their discussion. From the 3rd/9th to the 9th/15th century 'ilm al-kalâm enjoyed a glorious past and produced works which
demand the historian's fullest respect. It may be
hoped that a new kalâmiyya will arise, to play its part in animating the old in its methods, its arguments and its approach,
will one day arise, to play its part in animating a cultural recovery in the religious sciences of Islam.

Bibliography: I.—Some classic works of
(or concerning) 'ilm al-kalâm beyond those mentioned in the text: Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, al-Radd 'alā 'l-şarhā'ī wa 'l- outputFile of the persons figuring in
isndds, or concerning either the materials transmitted or the
details which will provide the necessary checks on
the technical meaning, is the science devoted to the study of
theology of al-Ash'ari, Beirut 1953; Abu Bakr al-Muhassal, Falsafat Qutb, Paris 1956; Ch. Pellat, Le doctrine of *Abd al-Diubbdr on the Kurgan as the
created Word of Allah, in JRAS, 1948-9). (L. GARDET)
appear the best-known partisans of 'Ali or of one of the first šudmailin, gradually became confused with *ilm al-tardjim (which forms an integral part of ibadim), although both of them claim to conform to precise and distinct Kur'anic precepts. Hence there does not seem much point in the distinction made by some authors, which shows as the ancestor of the Twelver authors of *ridjl the Raḍīf (or perhaps Wākīfī) Kūfan Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. Dhaḇala b. Ḥayyān (or Ḥanān) Ḍabbār (or b. al-Ḥurr) al-Kaṇānī, d. 219/834 and referred to as of al-fasl in the Tābit al-Shī'a (p. 232, with many traditions taken from al-Nāḏajjī, p. 160, who gives the variants of the name), while, on the other hand, giving as the first author of *talāḏir (Tābis, loc. cit.) the Munḥī of 'Ali b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Rāfī', whose name appears, with others, in al-Nāḏajjī (p. 4-5), who took a particular interest in *ridjl, and in the Dhārīa (x, no. 84), according to which he is one of the most competent of the early writers in this field. It is therefore not surprising that the meaning of *ridjl changed from that of reporters of traditionists respectively.

The strict limitation of the term *ilm al-ridjl would exclude such works as the Māḏalīs al-muʿmīnin or the Kissā al-ulamā', without which we should have a confused and inexact idea both of the importance and of the Twelver *Shī'ī conception of the biographical science, an interesting expression of a culture pivoted on a precise sense of the need to refer, in every case and in whatever specific context, to the ever present šudmailin model. To draw up a complete list of the Twelver biographical works, which has not yet been done and which would be very useful, would involve three sorts of difficulty: the enormous quantity of material which it is difficult to classify under one or other of the two genres because of the confusion mentioned above; the fact that many of the works mentioned in the various lists has not been published; and finally the fact that, without a published edition and the necessary comparison of manuscripts, it is always possible to distinguish, by reference to the title alone, between works which are substantially independent and those which are merely elaborations and adaptations of others.

The first great names which may be mentioned are those of the Fīrīṣr of Ibn al-Nadīm and the Fīrīṣr of al-Ṭūsī, the second based directly on the former (cf. Abāṣ al-Ikbal, preface to his ed. of the latter, pp. 2-3, no. 6), and both of a bibliographical character: this explains how, among texts considered as basic for biograhy, purely bibliographical compilations are often cited. We give here a brief list of some of the most important of the early works:

1) Māʿṣīṣa aḥḥāb al-ridjl of al-Kaẓḥalī (q.v.).
2) Fīrīṣr of shaykh Abu ʿl-Farāḍī Muḥammad b. Ḥishāb b. Abī Yākūb al-Nadīm, compiled circa 377/987. It concerns our subject in two places: in al-fann al-ṭāblīn min al-maḥāla al-šamīsīn, and in al-fann al-ṣāḥīn min al-maḥāla al-ḥāmisīn, in which it deals with the *Shī'ī ridjl, mutakallimīn as well as with Twelver, and, more specifically, in al-fann al-štāmis and in al-fann al-ṣāḥīn min al-maḥāla al-ṣādīsīn, devoted to the ḥajām and grammarians and to the traditionists respectively.

3) Fīrīṣr kutub al-Shī'a (Nāḏajī 1937) of the shaykh al-taṣʿīf Abū ʿl-Dīfā'ī Muḥammad b. Ḥasan b. ʿAlī al-Ṭūsī, d. 450/1067; this is the earliest work specifically devoted to this subject and it has been much used by the Sunnis, who have a high regard for it. Although it is based on material provided by the Fīrīṣr of Ibn al-Nadīm, it completes it and adds more precise details on *Shī'ī works and writers on *ridjl. Among the more specific writers the subject of the *ridjl mention should be made of Abū ʿl-ʿAmīr al-Kaḥṣānī, whose many (according to al-Nāḏajjī) inaccuracies he corrected, and Abu ʿl-Ḥasan b. Ḥusayn b. ʿUbayd Allāh b. al-Ghādirī, a famous writer whose work was later taken up by, among others, Ibn Ṭābūs.

4) Kitāb al-ridjl (Nāḏajī 1961) by the above-mentioned al-Ṭūsī; it deals in particular with the badīmūn stemming from the Prophet and the first šudmailin and lists the names in alphabetical order with numbers within each letter.

5) Asmā' al-ridjl by the shaykh Ahmad b. ʿAlī al-Nāḏajjī, d. 455/1063. This work, sometimes listed under the title of Kitāb al-ridjl, is one of the most often quoted and cited. It deals briefly with the first *Shī'īs, after which the *ridjl follow in alphabetical order. One bāb is devoted to each ism and a final bāb contains the kunyas. To judge from the index of the edition by Muṣṭafawi, Tehran n.d., it covers 1226 persons.

6) Asmā' maḏalīs al-shaykh al-ridjl wa-ṣawmaṣṣaftihim, of Muntāḏjab al-Dīn Abu ʿl-Ḥasan 'Abī b. Abī ʿl-Ḥasan b. ʿUbayd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan . . . b. al-Ḥusayn b. Bābāya the Kummī. This work has been commissioned by the nāḏkī of the Ahmadī, Rayy and Abāh, ʿIzz al-Dīn Yābī b. Abī ʿl-Ḥāfī Muḥammad al-Ṣarīf al-Muṭtajdā, who, in entrusting the author with this task, informed him that nothing had been done in this field since al-Ṭūsī (which seems to indicate that Muntāḏjab al-Dīn did not know of the work of his contemporary Ibn Shahrāḡī). The date of this compilation cannot be later than 522/1196, the date when the nāḏkī died, or earlier than 573/1178, the date of the death of Kutb Rūwandī, mentioned as marāḥim in the work; it deals with the authors and shaykhs who were contemporaneous with or later than al-Ṭūsī and who are not found in the Fīrīṣr.

7) Muʿalīm al-ulamā' (ed. A. Ikbal, Tehran 1934), of Abū ʿl-Dīfā'ī Muḥammad Raḍīd al-Dīn b. 'Abī b. Shahrāḡī al-Māḏandarānī al-Sārāwī [see ibn Shahrāḡī(9), d. 588/1192. This work, like all the above-mentioned, was written in Arabic, and is similarly conceived as a complement to the Fīrīṣr of al-Ṭūsī, to which are added 300 brief biographies of shaykhs up to the compiler's contemporaries; it must have been compiled before 582/1186, the year during which the author mentions the Muʿalīm in an isgāza. Among the teachers listed are Abu Maṣūr Ahmad b. ʿAbī Ṭabaršī and Abu ʿl-Ḥāfīd b. Ḥasan Ṭabaršī, Kutb Rūwandī and Abu ʿl-Futūḥ Rāzī, the father of the author, Zayy, and Abu ʿl-Ḥasan Bayḥakī; these names reveal the *Shī'ī aims of the author. In the edition consulted, the number of persons described is 990; the first 874 are arranged in alphabetical order, divided into bābīs consisting of one or more letters of the alphabet, with subdivisions of fāsī; numbers 875 to 962 are given under their kunya, and numbers 963-990 under their latāb or a
nisba. The work ends with a bibliographical nisba incorporated in the bob al-djdmi*, which is followed by a very short devoted to the poets of the akh al-bayit; these are divided into four groups according to the genre of their compositions.

There follows a period of mere compilation until the Ridlj of Ta‘l al-Din Hasan b. ‘Ali b. Dâwûd al-Hilli, born in 647/1249-50, a pupil of al-Mubâqbkî al-Hilli (Tehran 1932-3), and the work of Abû Mansûr Dâjm al-Din Hasan b. Yûsuf b. ‘Ali b. Mu‘âmmad b. Mu‘âshar al-Hilli, d. 725/1325, who was the author, in particular, of a famous new Kitâb al-Ridjâl (Tehran 1932). These latter represent, in addition, five special judges (miifettishes) for wakf affairs—three in Istanbul (dealing with the

These latter were, at least for their successors, the undoubted masters in this period and they paved the way for the characteristic productions of the Safawid period; in that period, within the framework of the genre of biography, the encyclopaedic spirit which prevailed from then on (as shown, e.g., the Majdalis al-mu‘minin, Tehran 1286/1865 and 1292/1872, written in Persian in 990/1582 by the sayyid Nîr Allâb b. Sharîf al-Mar‘ashi [q.v.], who had the rank of the highest order of Ottoman ulamd* and was interested in the local scholars who proclaimed the victory of Shi‘ism in Iran: Amâl al-âmîl fî ‘ulâmâ‘ al-wâlî al-mu‘minin wa-l-sâlat, Tehran 1300/1920-23) of Mu‘âmmad b. Hasan b. ‘Ali al-Hurr al-Âmîlî, d. 1097/1686, or Lu’lata‘ây al-Bahrayn (Tehran 1269/1853) of Yûsuf b. A‘âsh b. Ibrâhîm al-Bâbrâni, d. 1187/1773-4. These lead directly to the most modern bibliographical dictionaries, the most important of which is given in the bibliography and which, so far as material on the early Muslims is concerned, consist of a systematized reproduction of the details already collected since the early centuries of Islam rather than original monographs written by specialists.


ILMIYYE, the body of the higher Muslim religious functionaries (‘ulâmâ‘ [q.v.]) in the Ottoman Empire, especially those administering justice and teaching in the religious colleges [see M ADARAS]. Their elaborate hierarchy, unprecedented in Islam, was headed, from the 10th/16th century onwards, by the mufît [q.v.] of Istanbul called shaykh al-‘ulâm [q.v.].

The organization of the bâdîs, who formed the highest order of Ottoman ‘ulâmâ‘, changed over the centuries as a result of Ottoman expansion and withdrawals and of the variations in the relative importance attached to certain posts. Their division into several classes evolved gradually until it assumed a more or less definitive form in the 12th/18th century. The chief positions were the Kâdi‘-’asker [q.v.], or, after his office was divided into two towards the end of the reign of Sultan Mehmed II (d. 886/1481), the Kâdi‘-’asker of Rûmî (sadîr-i Rûmî) and that of Anatolia (sadîr-i Anadolî). Both were ezârîs i.e. officials members of the olive and were behind, the shaykh al-‘ulâm, until the nineteenth century, was not. They nominated the provincial bâdîs with the exception of the higher ones (mollâs) who, as well as the müddîries and the wad’ûs of Istanbul mosques (see below), were in later centuries appointed on the advice of the shaykh al-‘ulâm.

Below the Kâdi‘-’askers ranked the greater mollâs, the highest of whom held the judgships of the principal cities of the Empire with a salary of 500 akçe a day. Later on they were subdivided into several classes. The highest was that of the judge of the capital (İstanbul bâdîsi or efendisi), whose importance was enhanced by his authority over the guilds and responsibility for provisions and prices in the capital. Moreover, he and the judges of the town suburbs (see below) disposed justice in the Grand Vizier’s davâm.

Further down in the hierarchy were the judges of the two Holy Cities (harameyn), Mecca and Medina. The latter was raised to the status of Mecca in 1355/1722 (Kûcûk Celebi-zâde ʿÂsim, Ta‘rîkh, Istanbul 1328/1871, 161 f.).

They were followed (since the eighteenth century) by the judges of the four Cities (bîldî-i erba‘a‘): the two former capitals, Edirne and Bursa, and the two ancient seats of the caliphate, Cairo and Damascus. At a certain period Filibe (Plovdiv) was added as the fifth of the bîldî-i erba‘a.

The next lower group included, in varying order, the judges of the suburbs of Istanbul (Galata and, at times, Eyyûb and Usküdâr), Jerusalem, Aleppo, Izmir, Salonika and Yehîşîhehir (Larissa), as well as, in certain periods, Trabzon, Sofia and Crete. They had the rank of mağârî mollâlar, since these posts were given to müddîries “going out” of their class for the first time.

The judges mentioned so far were, strictly speaking, the only ones to carry the title of mollâ (also mondâ or mondî, from Arabic mawdûl [q.v.]). In practice, however, this title was also granted to those immediately inferior to them in rank, the leaders of the so-called devriyeye posts. These were (since the eighteenth century) the judges of 10-13 important towns—Belgrade, Bosna-Saray (Sarajevo), Baghdad, Aynâbî, Mar‘a‘î, Diyar Bakr and others. To the highest class of mollâs also belonged in most periods the preceptor (mu‘allâm, or bâdî) of the Sultan, his two private smâmans, the chief Palace physician (hokîm-bâshî [q.v.] or re‘îs al-atîbbà) and the chief astrologer (mûnedîsîm-bâshî [q.v.]). From the end of the 18th/17th century the office of Dean of the Descendants of the Prophet (nasîb al-aşhaf [q.v.]) used also to be bestowed on a mollâ of this class descended from Muhammad.

Lower in rank than the greater mollâs there were, in addition, five special judges (mujâfîtîyes) for wa‘âf affairs—three in Istanbul (dealing with the
Almost all higher judges were recruited from among the professors (mediresses) of these colleges, who formed the other principal hierarchy of Ottoman 'ulamā'. In earlier times there existed no strict rules for the promotion of the mediresses and their appointment to judicial posts. Later, however, admission to the clan of greater mollās was granted only to the hibār-i medierrisin, i.e., professors at the Istanbul mediresses which belonged to one of the four highest of the twelve grades—Müşille-i Süleymaniyye, Khawāmis-i (Kayibe-i) Süleymaniyye, Süleymaniyye, and, of the highest of all, Dār-al-Hadith.

Since every year only eight (later eleven) of them "passed out" into this class of judges, promotions to the higher ranks of medierrises were necessarily limited. The main bottleneck was the important sixth grade of mediresses, the Şahni-iThemān or "Courtyard of the Eight [Medresses at the Fāṭih Mosque]". Most of the numerous aspirants to these eight medierris posts got stuck in the immediately lower grade of the Müşille-i Şah, therefore called 'the bog' (bataş). To satisfy those waiting for promotion, the number of high medierris posts was gradually increased, and many nominal appointments were made at mediresses that no longer existed. Medierrises at the lower-ranking mediresses of Istanbul and the provinces, including even the ancient colleges at Bursa and Edirne, could in later times apply only for a dewriyye post or become ordinary kadis. In the provinces many medierrises served simultaneously as mufīfs. Students (softa, dārmgh-mend) who had not graduated from one of the higher-ranking mediresses of Istanbul were appointed nā'ibs or mufīfs.

The preachers (waqt) of the main mosques in Istanbul and other cities of the Empire formed a distinct order of the 'ulamā'. They were organized in a definite hierarchy, the highest position being that of the Şaykh of Ayasofya.

The 'Ilmiyye, like the other ruling institutions in the Ottoman Empire, began to decay about the end of the 19th/20th century. Favouritism, corruption and inefficiency increasingly spread among the high-ranking 'ulamā' charged with the administration of justice in the provincial and the provinces (for details see 'ulamā'). The teaching of the mediresses suffered also from the general decline in the religious institution. Dogmatism more and more replaced the creative rationalism developed in the Ottoman mediresses under Mehemmed II and Süleyman. The ignorance of the 'ulamā' trained in the mediresses could not but adversely affect the social and economic life of the Ottoman Empire. However, the 'ulamā' enjoyed the respect of the common people even in the 12th/18th century, when the abuses in the 'Ilmiyye reached their peak. This was probably due to the better conduct of the lower ranking 'ulamā', who were in closer touch with the people.

By this time the 'Ilmiyye had become a conservative class led by an aristocracy of Molla families, collaborating with the Janissaries to maintain their privileges. The spoils of war and peace also increased for the remaining number of candidates, the usual term of office was gradually reduced to one year for mollās and to 24, 20, 18 and finally 12 months for ordinary kadīs. While out of office (ma'sīl), they waited in Istanbul for a new appointment, presenting themselves every Wednesday at the divān of their kadīs-mashrej. While out of office (or in retirement) many mollās resumed teaching at a medressa.
zimát period restricted the jurisdiction of the sharí' courts to the area of personal law. Similarly, the establishment of secular schools largely took over the function of the medreses in the field of education. Attempts to reform the Ilmiyye were undertaken from the early years of the eighteenth century. The hânıms issued by Sultan Selim III (1789-1807) in the kdnuns (1854) to train competent nuwwâdb for the modernization of the Ottoman religious institution took place under the Yong Turk regime. Indeed, in 1914 the Mu'allimkhâne-i nuwwâdb became the Medreset al-şu'dâl, and the Dâr al-khildfe was established in the same year in Istanbul to train able ulema for the modernization of the Ottoman religious institution.

Attempts to reform the Ilmiyye did not bring lasting results; the newly established Turkish Republic abolished the Caliphate on 3 March 1924 and the suppression of the 'ułamâ' and the laicization of the State followed.


The unfinished draft of this article was found among the papers of the late Professor Heyd (cf. the Editors are very grateful to Professor Kurban for completing the text and supplying the bibliography).

(U. Heyd and E. Kurban)

ILSH [see ALSH].

ILTIZAM, as a term of rhetoric [see LUZUM MA LÂ VALZAM].

ILTIZAM, a form of tax-farm used in the Ottoman Empire. On the Ottoman Ilti zam in general, see MUTelegram. The immediately following article deals with the iltizâm in 19th century Egypt. (Ed.)

The iltizâm as an agrarian system was incompatible with Muhammad 'Ali's endeavour to establish a centralized bureaucratic régime in Egypt. During the period preceding his rule, iltizâm had come to be granted no longer for a year or even for a few years but for the lifetime of the holder, or even as heritable and alienable property. Thus the state was deprived of part of the agricultural revenues. In addition, the hereditary iltizâm formed the basis for the emergence of new centres of power. Important iltizâm of that period were tribal sha'yhs and 'ułamâ', who in this capacity amassed considerable riches and achieved great political influence.

During the French occupation of Egypt an attempt had been made in 1814 to abolish iltizâm (cf. the Editors are very grateful to the Bibliography: M. O'Dohsson, Tableau général de l'Empire ottoman, Paris 1787-1791, iv, 482-616; Djedvet, Tavhit, Istanbul 1909, i, 105-17; Mustafa Nuri, Nedâd-i al-ulmahâ, 4 vols., Istanbul 1827, passim; Ilmiyye sâlihdimesi, Istanbul 1934, 308-20, 642-52; Pâkalin, s.v.; Gibb-Bowen, i/2, chapters 9-12; Niyazi Berkes, The development of secularism in Turkey, Montreal 1964, index; Ismail Hakki Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devletinin Ilmiye teşkilatı, Ankara 1965; Bernard Lewis, The emergence of modern Turkey, London 1968, index s.vv. Islam, Şeriat, Ulema. See also R. Mantran, Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle, Paris 1962, 120-43; U. Heyd, The Ottoman 'ulama and urbanization in the time of Selim III and Mahmud II, in Scripta Hierosolymitana, ix (1961), 63-96. See further Bâb-i MASHKIT, and the bibliographies to the articles on officials and institutions mentioned in the text.

The unfinished draft of this article was found among the papers of the late Professor Heyd (cf. the Editors are very grateful to Professor Kurban for completing the text and supplying the bibliography).

(U. Heyd and E. Kurban)
state to take over services or levy dues directly. The abolition usually resulted in a considerable rise in revenue.


ILTUTMISH, b. Ėlām Kīrān, the greatest of the so-called Slave kings who laid the foundations of Muslim rule in India, came of the Iberi (or Alp-) branch of the Karakhita'i Turks. The third sultan of the Slave dynasty and the founder of the Shamsiya line of rulers, he ascended the throne of Delhi in 607/1211 after defeating Arām Shāh, son and successor of his master Kūb al-Dīn Aybak [q.v.], who had purchased him as a slave in Delhi. Nothing in detail is known about his early life except that he spent a part of it in slavery at Ghazna, Bukhārā and Baghdād. He very soon won the confidence of Aybak, who rapidly promoted him to high offices of state and married his daughter to him. Before his accession to the throne he successively held the governorship of Gwālīyār [q.v.], Baraṅ and Bādāwān [q.v.], and finally became the commander-in-chief. Historians do not brand him ungrateful, for he occupied the throne only with the approval of the ‘ulama' and at the invitation of the nobles, who were dissatisfied with the rule of Arām Shāh. The first three or four years of his reign were spent in preparing to meet the threat posed by Tādī al-Dīn Yildīz, governor of Ghazna as the suzerain of India. In fact he issued letters patent to Iltutmish as his viceroy. On being driven out from Ghazna by ‘Alī al-Dīn Muḥammad Khwārazmshāh in 611/1214, Yildīz took refuge in Lahore, seized the city and expelled the governor who held it on behalf of Nāṣir al-Dīn Kābācā, the ruler of Multān and also a son-in-law of Aybak. Iltutmish, as Kābācā's sovereign, protested, and on Yildīz's refusal to withdraw marched against him and defeated him in a pitched battle at Tārāqūt in 612/1215. Yildīz was taken prisoner and despatched to Bādāwān, where he died in confinement the same year. Thereafter Kābācā re-occupied Lahore, and in 614/1217 Iltutmish had to dislodge him forcibly. In 619/1221 Djalāl al-Dīn Khwārazmshāh, fleeing from the Mongols, also sought refuge in Lahore and asked Iltutmish for asylum. Sensing danger to his dominions, Iltutmish diplomatically warned off the threat by diverting the Khwārazmians towards the refractory Kābācā whose territory they plundered and on whom they also levied heavy tribute.

Feeling now secure at home, Iltutmish in 622/1225 marched against Bengal, where Ghiyāth al-Dīn ‘Īwād Kāhādī had declared his independence. On Iltutmish’s approach ‘Īwād lost heart, submitted to the sultan and acknowledged his overlordship. Next year Iltutmish turned his attention to Multān and Mandāwar (near Bījnāwū) and captured both places.

Firmly settled on the throne, he now decided to settle old scores with his rival Kābācā. He consequently attacked in 625/1227 Utch [q.v.], the seat of Kābācā's government, and invested the town, which surrendered after a heroic resistance of some three months. In the meantime Kābācā, who had fled to Bhakkar [q.v.], was drowned in the Indus while trying to escape.

After the defeat of Kābācā, Malik Sinān al-Dīn Ėnāsīr, the ruler of lower Sind and Daybūl [q.v.], acknowledged the supremacy of Iltutmish and became his vassal. In 626/1229 an embassy, led by Raḍī al-Dīn Ḥasan al-Ṣāḥbānī [q.v.], bringing the robes of honour for the sultan, his sons and the nobles, arrived from the Ambāсид caliph, al-Mustanṣīr bi'llāh [q.v.] and was received with great pomp. This was the first occasion when an Indian Muslim ruler was recognized by the caliph as the sultan of India. To mark the occasion Iltutmish issued a new silver coin bearing the legend "Nāṣir Aml al-Mu'mīmin", showing his allegiance. It was also inscribed in Nāgāri on the billion currency.

Next year (627/1230) Iltutmish had again to march to Bengal, where, on the death of his son and deputy Nāṣir al-Dīn Māhmūd, confusion prevailed and a certain Bahlāl Kālājī had risen in revolt. The sultan was brought to book, peace was restored in the country and the sultan returned to his capital. In 630/1233 Iltutmish after a prolonged siege recaptured Gwālīyār which had reverted to the Hindūs. In 632/1234 he invaded Mālwā, captured the fort of Bīlsīs, sacked Udījayān and demolished the sacred temple of Mābākālī, together with the stone image of Rādā Vikramadītyā, after whom the current Hindū era is known.

Soon after his triumphal return from Mālwā a serious religious disturbance broke out at Delhi. The Ismāʿīlīs, who had come to establish themselves at Delhi, after having been driven out from their former stronghold of Multān by Muḥammad Ghiyār, made an attempt on the life of the sultan while engaged in the Friday prayer. The sultan escaped unhurt but the heretics were hunted down and killed. As a measure of retaliation and in order to mop up suspected pockets of Ismāʿīlīs in Multān, Iltutmish in 633/1235-6 mounted an expedition against the Gakkhārs [q.v.], who then professed Ismāʿīlism. There was reason to suppose that it was they who were behind the plot against his life. He, however, fell seriously ill on the way, was carried back to Delhi, and after a rule of 26 years, died in Sha'bān 633/July 1236.

An enterprising, able and efficient monarch, he has been described as the foremost of the slave kings. A deeply religious man, he had great respect for the magāşāhs and ‘ulama'. Among the literati who adored his court were Amīr Rūhānī, the poet and philosopher, who had migrated from Bukhārā, Sadīd al-Dīn Muḥammad ‘Awfī, author of Lubb al-Dīn, ‘Īlābād and ‘Īlhām al-‘īlādāh, and Mas‘ūdī-ālī Sīrāj al-Dīn Djalālī [q.v.], the celebrated historian. In 629/1231-2 he founded the famous Kūt Mānkā in honour of the saint Khwādā Kūt al-Dīn Bākhṭyār Kākī, to whom he was deeply devoted, and in 627/1229 built the Hawā Shamsī, the water reservoir of old Delhi. For those seeking justice he had a bell with a chain installed on the gate of his palace which anyone could ring (cf. Ibn Batūṭa, iii, 164). Ably helped by the capable vizier Fakhr al-Dīn Muhammad adja Kutb al-Dīn Bakhtyar [q.v.,] who had served the caliphs in Baghdad, he streamlined the administration, as is reflected in the manual of Fakhr-i Mudabbir, the Adīb al-barš wa‘l-ḥādā‘a, which was presented to the sultan. The inner circle of ghulāms, known as the ṭab ‘alā, was very powerful and gained historic significance during his reign. It was they who op-

**ILYÂSÎS, a minor dynasty which ruled in Kîrmân in south-eastern Persia during the middle decades of the 4th/10th century. Their establishment there marks the final severance of Kîrmân from direct Caliphal control, which had been restored earlier in the century after the collapse of the Saffârîd empire.**

The founder, Abû 'Ali Muhammad b. Ilyâs, was a commander in the Sâmâdîn army and of Soghdian origin. He was involved in the revolt against the Sâmâdîn Amir Nasr b. Ahamd of his brothers in 317/929, and when the rebellion collapsed in 320/932, he withdrew to Kîrmân and seized power there. He withstood Sâmâdîn forces sent against him, but in 324/936 had to flee temporarily to the Saffârîd in Sîstân when a Bûyîd army under Ahamd b. Bûya (the late ruler of Transoxiana) defeated the Sâmâdîn, and, on the other hand, the Arab geographers credit him with considerable activity in building and charitable works throughout the province. During his reign, the capital of Kîrmân was transferred from Srajdân in the west, which had been the chief town in the early Islamic period, to Bardasîr or Gwâdîsîr (the later city of Kîrmân), apparently as a protective measure against the neighbouring Bûyîdîs of Fârs. The Bûyîd forces later withdrew and Muhammad b. Ilyâs returned; he was now unmolested in his principality, whilst recognising the nominal overlordship of the Sâmâdîns. Some sources condemn Muhammad b. Ilyâs as an *âyyâr* and *âlîb*, i.e., as an adventurer and brigand, and it does seem that he had understandings with the predatory Kûfs and Balûkh mountaineers of Kîrmân for the division of their spoils. On the other hand, the Arab geographers credit him with considerable activity in building and charitable works throughout the province. During his reign, the capital of Kîrmân was transferred from Srajdân in the west, which had been the chief town in the early Islamic period, to Bardasîr or Gwâdîsîr (the later city of Kîrmân), apparently as a protective measure against the neighbouring Bûyîdîs of Fârs.

Muhammad b. Ilyâs died in 356/967, having at some time before this made over Kîrmân to his son Ilyâsât. Ilyâsât maintained his power against his brother and rival Sulaymân. However, he was not long able to withstand the powerful and aggressive Bûyîd Amir 'Achûd al-Dâlwa (q.v.). He was speedily driven out by the latter, and fled to the Sâmâdîns (357/968). This really marks the end of Ilyâsid rule.
in Kirmān, except that further members of the family continued for some years to hover round the borders of Kirmān seeking an opportunity to interve-

n. Sulaymān and another Ilyāsīd, al-Ḥusayn, led armies in Kirmān, aided by the turbulent Kufis and Bahlī, but without success. After 364/975, the Ilyāsīds disappear from recorded history, and the Būyids hold on Kirmān was henceforth undisturbed until Ghaznavid times.

Bibliography: The main sources are Mis-
kandīsh and the Fāris ibn al-Ḍhībīr, to be supplemented by Usbīt’s Yāmīnī, by scattered notices in the geo-

graphers and by the 6th/12th century local history of Kirmān, the Ṣfd al-latūd al-Dīn Ahmad b. Ḥāmid Kirmānī; see also Zambaur, Manuel, 216. All these sources are utilized in the study of C. E. Bosworth, The Banī Ilyās of Kirmān, in the Minorsiyān memorial volume (forthcoming).

IYĀSIDS — IMĀD AL-DĪN

IMĀD AL-DĪN, All b. Buwayh (of Būyeh), the eldest by many years, but the least known, of the three Daylamīs [q.v.] who became the founders of the dynasty of the Buwayhīds or Būyids [q.v.]. At first in the ser-

vice, together with a group of his compatriots, of the Sāmānīd Naṣr b. Ahmad (321-9 [q.v.]), then of his lieutenant in Iran, Mākān b. Kālī [q.v.], he be-

trayed the latter in favour of the rival Zangādīdī [q.v.], from whom he obtained, in equivocal circum-

stances (and thanks to his relations with the secretary of the governor of Rayy, the father of the future vizier Ibn al-ʿAmīd), the governorship of Karadād and of the Māh al-Brāṣra [q.v.]. By means of calculated acts of generosity with funds drawn from the treasu-

ries and storehouses, in particular of the Khurramīs, to which he managed to gain access, he gathered round him there a large number of Daylamīs ready to serve the employer who offered most. This natural-

ly aroused the anxiety of Mardāwīdī, who prepared to attack him. Then ʿAll, taking the initiative, occupied for a short time Iṣfāḥān, which he was unable this time to hold, and then, definitively, the citadel of Arradjan [q.v.], where he set himself up in open rebellion (321/923). In the following year he drove out from the caliph’s governor Yāqūt, in spite of the support received by the latter from the independent governor of Braṣra, al-Bardī [q.v.]. Threatened by a combined offensive by all his enemies, he obtained from the caliph’s vizier Ibn Mūkla [q.v.] his official recognition as mūḥāfīz of Fārs, attempted to negotiate with Mardāwīdī, and was finally saved, without apparently being involved himself, by the assassination of Mardāwīdī at his youth in his native town and at Kashan, but returned to private life and devoted himself to literary and historical works, which earned him the favour of al-Thālabī, the governor of Rayy, the father of the future vizier Ibn al-ʿAmīd, the governorship of Karadād and of the Māh al-Brāṣra [q.v.].

IMĀD AL-DĪN MUḤAMMaD b. MUḤAMMaD Al-KĀThīR Al-ĪṣFĀḤĀNī, famous stylist and his-

torian, born at Iṣfāḥān in 519/1125 of a distinguished family to which belonged also the famous kātib al-

ʿĀzīz, whose biography is given in Ibn Khalīlīkīn, Wafayāt, ed. Wüstenfeld no. 77 (cf., concerning him, Houtsma. Recueil, ii, preface, XIX ff.). He spent his youth in his native town and at Kāhān, but studied in Baghdad, in particular the fikhs, and made a journey to Mosul and other places. When the Saljūqīs turned to the Zangīs of Syria, who knew his family, especially his uncle Al-

ʿAzīz mentioned above, for help, from whom he received the independent governor of Braṣra, al-Bardī [q.v.]. Threatened by a combined offensive by all his enemies, he obtained from the caliph’s vizier Ibn Mūkla [q.v.] his official recognition as mūḥāfīz of Fārs, attempted to negotiate with Mardāwīdī, and was finally saved, without apparently being involved himself, by the assassination of Mardāwīdī at his youth in his native town and at Kashan, but returned to private life and devoted himself to literary and historical works, which earned him the favour of al-Thālabī, the governor of Rayy, the father of the future vizier Ibn al-ʿAmīd, the governorship of Karadād and of the Māh al-Brāṣra [q.v.].

IMĀD AL-DĪN—MUḤAMMaD b. MUḤAMMaD Al-KĀThīR Al-ĪṣFĀḤĀNī, famous stylist and his-

torian, born at Iṣfāḥān in 519/1125 of a distinguished family to which belonged also the famous kātib al-

ʿĀzīz, whose biography is given in Ibn Khalīlīkīn, Wafayāt, ed. Wüstenfeld no. 77 (cf., concerning him, Houtsma. Recueil, ii, preface, XIX ff.). He spent his youth in his native town and at Kāhān, but studied in Baghdad, in particular the fikhs, and made a journey to Mosul and other places. When the Saljūqīs turned to the Zangīs of Syria, who knew his family, especially his uncle Al-

ʿAzīz mentioned above, for help, from whom he received the independent governor of Braṣra, al-Bardī [q.v.]. Threatened by a combined offensive by all his enemies, he obtained from the caliph’s vizier Ibn Mūkla [q.v.] his official recognition as mūḥāfīz of Fārs, attempted to negotiate with Mardāwīdī, and was finally saved, without apparently being involved himself, by the assassination of Mardāwīdī at his youth in his native town and at Kashan, but returned to private life and devoted himself to literary and historical works, which earned him the favour of al-Thālabī, the governor of Rayy, the father of the future vizier Ibn al-ʿAmīd, the governorship of Karadād and of the Māh al-Brāṣra [q.v.].

IMĀD AL-DĪN MUḤAMMaD b. MUḤAMMaD Al-KĀThīR Al-ĪṣFĀḤĀNī, famous stylist and his-

torian, born at Iṣfāḥān in 519/1125 of a distinguished family to which belonged also the famous kātib al-

ʿĀzīz, whose biography is given in Ibn Khalīlīkīn, Wafayāt, ed. Wüstenfeld no. 77 (cf., concerning him, Houtsma. Recueil, ii, preface, XIX ff.). He spent his youth in his native town and at Kāhān, but studied in Baghdad, in particular the fikhs, and made a journey to Mosul and other places. When the Saljūqīs turned to the Zangīs of Syria, who knew his family, especially his uncle Al-

ʿAzīz mentioned above, for help, from whom he received the independent governor of Braṣra, al-Bardī [q.v.]. Threatened by a combined offensive by all his enemies, he obtained from the caliph’s vizier Ibn Mūkla [q.v.] his official recognition as mūḥāfīz of Fārs, attempted to negotiate with Mardāwīdī, and was finally saved, without apparently being involved himself, by the assassination of Mardāwīdī at his youth in his native town and at Kashan, but returned to private life and devoted himself to literary and historical works, which earned him the favour of al-Thālabī, the governor of Rayy, the father of the future vizier Ibn al-ʿAmīd, the governorship of Karadād and of the Māh al-Brāṣra [q.v.].

IMĀD AL-DĪN MUḤAMMaD b. MUḤAMMaD Al-KĀThīR Al-ĪṣFĀḤĀNī, famous stylist and his-

torian, born at Iṣfāḥān in 519/1125 of a distinguished family to which belonged also the famous kātib al-

ʿĀzīz, whose biography is given in Ibn Khalīlīkīn, Wafayāt, ed. Wüstenfeld no. 77 (cf., concerning him, Houtsma. Recueil, ii, preface, XIX ff.). He spent his youth in his native town and at Kāhān, but studied in Baghdad, in particular the fikhs, and made a journey to Mosul and other places. When the Saljūqīs turned to the Zangīs of Syria, who knew his family, especially his uncle Al-

ʿAzīz mentioned above, for help, from whom he received the independent governor of Braṣra, al-Bardī [q.v.]. Threatened by a combined offensive by all his enemies, he obtained from the caliph’s vizier Ibn Mūkla [q.v.] his official recognition as mūḥāfīz of Fārs, attempted to negotiate with Mardāwīdī, and was finally saved, without apparently being involved himself, by the assassination of Mardāwīdī at his youth in his native town and at Kashan, but returned to private life and devoted himself to literary and historical works, which earned him the favour of al-Thālabī, the governor of Rayy, the father of the future vizier Ibn al-ʿAmīd, the governorship of Karadād and of the Māh al-Brāṣra [q.v.].

Imād al-Dīn was in the company of Afdal al-Dīn Ahmad ibn al-Aswad in Baghdad, in spite of the superiority which this conferred on him in the eyes of many Muslims, never prevented ʿImād’s considering himself, and being considered by others, as an equal to his brothers, as his works show (cf. especially his other works, in a scholarly and mannered style, in the tradition of the kutābī, the high-ranking secretaries-epistolographers of the administration — 1157 }
In the same style and on a wider scale, he wrote the most remarkable work of his time, the Recueil (q.v.), covering the years 573/1177-575/1179, and part v, covering the years 578/1182-579/1183. An abridgement by al-Bundari of the first (?) half, entitled Sanâ al-Bark al-Shdmi, exists in a unique manuscript in the Esad Efendi collection in Istanbul, and will shortly be published in an edition by Dr. R. Šešen. It contains the years 569/1174-572/1177. There are extensive and numerous citations from the Barkh, in an abridged form, in the Rawdatayn of Abu Shâma (q.v.).

Continuations after the death of Saladin, up to ? 597 are cited as al-Uba wa'l-Uba (Abû Shâma, ii, 226-31), Nišâlat al-Râhî (ibid., i, 231-2), Khâfâf al-Bârîk wa'ajat al-Shârîk (ibid., ii, 233-45). They are also mentioned by al-Bundari in his introduction to the Sand, as three volumes on three years.


'IMÂD AL-DÎN ZANKÎ [see ZANKI].

'IMÂD AL-MULK, GHÂZî 'L-DÎN KHÎN, FIRÔZ DIANG (III), was named Shîhâb al-Dîn after his great-grandfather Ghâzî 'l-Dîn Khân, Firûz Diang I [see Shîhâb al-Dîn, Mir]. His mother was the daughter of the wazar, Kamar al-Dîn Khân (d. 1101/1746). He was eight years old when his father, (Mir) Muhammam-

mad Panâh (q.v.) died suddenly at Awrangâbâd in 1165/1754 during his abortive attempt to seize the viceroyalty of the Deccan. On his father’s departure for the Deccan, Shîhâb al-Dîn had been left behind at Delhi in the care of the minister, Abu 'l-Manṣûr Šâfîr Diang (q.v.). He seems to have been a precocious but cunning child, much older than his years, for he ingeniously obtained, early in life, the office of Mir Bahâshî (Quartemaster-general) with the help of Šâfîr Diang. Fired with ambition, he turned against his former guardian, invasion, captured the Marâthâs, who deposed and blinded Ahmad Shâh, the sultan (1161-7/1748-54) and installed 'Aliamir II as emperor of Delhi. A born diplomat, he was well-versed in the art of statesmanship. In 1169/1755, on the death of his maternal uncle Mir Muîn al-Mulk (Mir Munnu) b. 'Imad al-Dawla Kamar al-Dîn Khân, who was governor of the Pandjâb, he captured Lahore and made it over to Âdina Bêg Khân, the paramour of Mughulani Bêgum, widow of Mir Munnu. Ahmad Shâh Abdalî (q.v.), furious at the rise of this upstart, at once marched on Lahore (1170/1756), expelled Âdina Bêg Khân and soon thereafter went to Delhi with 'Imad al-Mulk in attendance. 'Imad al-Mulk now sided with the Durrani chieftain and took part in the operations against Sûrajî Mal Dîst of Bâharapur (q.v.) and Shoûdîî al-Dawla of Awadh (q.v.). His ingratitude earned the displeasure of the Abdalî, who appointed Naqîb al-Dawla Âmîr al-Umarî of Hindustan. On Ahmad Shâh’s departure from India 'Imad al-Mulk, seeking revenge, besieged Naqîb al-Dawla in the fort of Delhi and with the help of the Emperor of the Marâthâs, allies of 'Imad al-Mulk, at the battle of Pânîpât in 1761.

'Imad al-Mulk’s game of power-politics was now practically over. Afraid of his powerful adversaries, he sought protection among the Dîstas and stayed for a time with Sûrajî Mal; on his death in 1177/1763 he went to live with Ahmad Khân Bangash, Nawwâb of Farrûkhsâb (d. 1185/1771). Two years later, he went to the Deccan and received some land in Kâlpî from the emperor, and in 1179/1765 called in the Marâthâs in his services. Feeling insecure there, he went to Sûrat to live with the British; he was seen by Col. Goddard disguised as a pilgrim and was for a time put into confinement (cf. Mill, History of India, ii, 414). After his release he went on the Pilgrimage to Mecca, and was seen in Sîn in 1195/1781, having returned to India via Bârzâ and Kandâhâr. He subsequently sought service with Timûr Shâh Abdalî (reg. 1187-1207/1773-93) and was in 2nd employment of Zanîn Shâh (reg. 1207-16/1793-1801) when he invaded the Pandjâb in 1211/1797. He lingered in obscurity for some time and died at Kâlpî on 29 Rabi‘ II 1215/ 1 September 1800, aged 54 years.

A hafiz, a good scholar and a fine penman, he composed poetry in Persian, Arabic, Urdu and Turkish under the pseudonym (takhlîs) of “Asâf”, which he later abandoned for “Niżâm”. His Persian diwan (Malkât al-Shâhînâbâdî) was published in 1301/1883-4. His other poetical compositions include a poem in praise of ‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib (Mankabat-i Niżâm dar madh-i ‘Ali), a κατάδικα and some mathnawis on the miracles of the saint Fâhîr al-Dîn Chîhî Shâhîjâhânâbâdî, whose life also he wrote under the title Manâkib-i Fâhîrîyya (ed. Delhi 1315/1897). He had four sons, of whom Hamîd al-Dawla entered the service of
Nizam al-Mulk Asaf Djah II and obtained the rank of "5,000".

**Bibliography:** Abd al-Kadir Khan, Dirasat, Ta'rikh-i 'Imad al-Mulk (MS India Office 4000); Samjam al-Dawla Shah-nawaz Khan, Ma'qil-ab al-umara (Bibl. Ind.), ii, 847-56, Eng. tr. H. Beveridge, 674-8; Azad Bilgrami, Khishtana-i 'amira, Cawnpore 1900, 50-4; Ghalam Hasayn Khan, Gulsar-i 'Afasyiya, Bombay 1308/1892, 68-70; Cambridge History of India, iv, 415-6, 425-40, 444-8; W. Irvine, Later Mughals, Calcutta 1922, ii, 141, 295, 300; Storey, ii, 623, i/2, 1028-30 (where several other references are given).

(See also Anwari)

'**IMAD AL-MULK** — 'IMAD SHAHI

'Imad Shahi, the title of a ruling family, founded by a Hindu convert to Islam, which ruled over Berar [q.v.] for nearly a century from 866/1459 until 928/1524. The founder of the dynasty, Daryay Khan, better known to history by his title Fatih Allah 'Imad al-Mulk, was descended from the Canarese Brahman of Vidyanagar [q.v.]. He fell as chief minister of Adil Shah Bahmani II (reg. 866/1459-827/1423) into the hands of his master, Path Allah joined the court at Bidar in 881/1475, and through the good offices of the chief minister Khwaja Darya Khan, better known to history by his title Fatilj (the king being a minor). At the same time Shaykh Ali Barid, who was exploiting religion only for his own ends and not for references to this dynasty in the histories of the neighbouring kingdoms, practically nothing is known of the history of this dynasty. No buildings or works of art or public utility constructed during their rule have been discovered; they rather devoted their time to the welfare of their subjects and the prosperity of their state. Another reason for not finding a historian to record their deeds was that theirs was the only Sunni kingdom in a region, including the site of the present-day city of Nagpur, was covered with jungle.

Partly because the founder of the dynasty was a convert, who had risen to power through military exploits, and partly because the rulers had little love for literature and art, no history of this dynasty was ever recorded and no man of letters paid any attention to the story of their rise and fall. Were it not for references to this dynasty in the histories of the neighbouring kingdoms, practically nothing would be known about them (Firishta devotes a separate section of his work to this dynasty). No buildings or works of art or public utility constructed during their rule have been discovered; they rather devoted their time to the welfare of their subjects and the prosperity of their state. Another reason for not finding a historian to record their deeds was that theirs was the only Sunni kingdom in a region, including the site of the present-day city of Nagpur, was covered with jungle.

So powerful that in conjunction with Nizam al-Mulk he conducted all the affairs of the government during the minority of the king, enjoying throughout the support of the queen-mother. Mahmud Shah, smarting under the overbearing attitude of the two ministers and provoked by the casual remark of a Habshi [q.v.] courtier, ordered their assassination. Both of them, however, managed to escape with their lives, being expert swordsman. 'Imad al-Mulk retired to his government of Berar, nursing a grudge against the monarch and watching for an opportunity to shake off his yoke. A few years later he declared his independence in 896/1489, striking his own coins and causing the Shah to be read in his own name. Yet he refrained from calling himself "Shah", either out of respect for the royal family whom he had once served or (more probably) out of political expediency. He was not destined to enjoy the fruits of independence long, as in that very year he died. He was succeeded by his son 'Ala al-Din, who, confident that the effete Bahmani monarch could not assert himself, assumed the title of Shah in 896/1490; he established his court at Kavel, following the example of Malik Ahmad Bahri, son of the late Nizam al-Mulk and Yusuf 'Adil Khan of Bidjar, who had earlier in 894/1489 declared their independence, the former founding the city of Ahmadnagar [q.v.].

In 910/1504 Amir 'Ali Barid, son of Kashim Barid, the regent of Bidar [q.v.], who had won full control over Mahmud Shah Bahmani, in league with Malik Ahmad Bahri in league with Malik Ahmad Bahri, a lad of twelve, who was later designated to become the founder of the 'Adil Shah dynasty of Bidjar, took part in the expedition against Belgam, which was conquered and added to the jagir of the chief minister. On the execution of Mahmud Gawan on a charge of treason in 886/1578, 'Imad al-Mulk became apprehensive of his own safety and showed signs of disaffection. Mahmud Shah Bahmani II, fearing an open rebellion, placated him by confirming him in his government of Berar. In 889/1482, on the accession of Mahmud Shah Bahmani II, a lad of twelve, he was raised to the office of a minister in reward for the slaughter of "foreigners" (gharibdn), the supporters and adherents of Yusuf 'Adil Khan, the governor of Bidjar, thus paving the way for Nizam al-Mulk, a Dakhini nobleman, to usurp all power for himself (the king being a minor). At the same time Shaykh Ali Barid, who was exploiting religion only for his own ends and not for references to this dynasty in the histories of the neighbouring kingdoms, practically nothing is known of the history of this dynasty. No buildings or works of art or public utility constructed during their rule have been discovered; they rather devoted their time to the welfare of their subjects and the prosperity of their state. Another reason for not finding a historian to record their deeds was that theirs was the only Sunni kingdom in a region, including the site of the present-day city of Nagpur, was covered with jungle.

This "aged and experienced statesman" as Firishta describes him, resolved to maintain strict neutrality, and having perceived the intentions of Amir 'Ali Barid, who was exploiting religion only to destroy Yusuf 'Adil Shah, intervened with the king on behalf of Yusuf 'Adil Shah. Amir Barid, now left practically alone, fled from the field along with the king, leaving the royal camp to be looted by the allies.

Yusuf 'Adil Shah struck back strongly, compelling Mahmud Shah and Amir 'Ali Barid to seek help from others, including 'Imad al-Mulk. This aged and experienced statesman, as Firishta describes him, resolved to maintain strict neutrality, and having perceived the intentions of Amir 'Ali Barid, who was exploiting religion only to destroy Yusuf 'Adil Shah, intervened with the king on behalf of Yusuf 'Adil Shah. Amir Barid, now left practically alone, fled from the field along with the king, leaving the royal camp to be looted by the allies.
Ten years later, in 920/1514, Mahmūd Shāh, whose prestige had suffered considerably and who was now tired of the overbearing behaviour of Amir ʿAli Barid, eventually decided to drive him out. ʿImad al-Mulk’s troops, marshaled on Gulgarga [q.v.], the capital of Barid, decided to give battle and sallied forth from the citadel. Meanwhile, Mahmūd Shāh, who was weak both in body and mind owing to old age, suddenly decided to change sides and join the troops of Amir ʿAli Barid, thus putting ʿImad al-Mulk in a difficult situation. ʿImad al-Mulk immediately repaired to his own country, leaving the fickle king to his fate. After this mishap without a blow, he proceeded to annex them to his own kingdom. This act of usurpation aroused the hostility of Burhān Nizām Shāh I [see niẓām Shāh-i]. Consequently, frequent battles were fought between the two ruling houses, who were also related to each other, resulting in the defeat of ʿAllāʾ al-Din ʿImād Shāh.

In 930/1524-5, ʿAllāʾ al-Din joined hands with Burhān Nizām Shāh I, his former enemy, to recover the fort of Shālpur, which Ismāʿīl Ṭāhir Shāh had promised to give to his sister Maryam as part of her dowry when she was given in marriage to Burhān Nizām Shāh. Ismāʿīl Ṭāhir Shāh stoutly opposed this joint invasion and finally ʿImad al-Mulk fled. Yet he continued to smart under the insult that he had suffered at the hands of Burhān Nizām Shāh. Consequently in 933/1527 he occupied the fort of Pātrā, belonging to Burhān Nizām Shāh, at the instigation of Ismāʿīl Ṭāhir Shāh and Sultan Kuli Khān Shāh of Golconda [q.v.]; it was recovered after a siege of two months by Burhān Nizām Shāh, who later completely destroyed it. Flushed with his victory Burhān Shāh proceeded to reduce some other places in Berar, spreading panic in the land. ʿImad al-Mulk, finding himself unable to withstand alone the onslaught of the Ahmadnagar troops, fled to Būchānpīr [q.v.] and sought the help of its ruler Mirān Muhammad Shāh Fīrūzī in repelling the invasion. The allies, however, suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of Burhān Nizām Shāh, losing their guns and elephants. Mirān Muhammad Shāh, burning for revenge, appealed to Bahādur Shāh (reg. 932/1525-943/1537) of Gujjarāt, who was also his maternal uncle, to come to their relief. Bahādur Shāh readily agreed and marched in 934-5/1527-8 towards the Deccan with a large army. When he reached Dīalānpīr [q.v.] he overtook the enemy, crossed the river and proceeded to advance. ʿAllāʾ al-Din ʿImād Shāh, sensing his intentions, lost no time in satisfying his vanity and readily acknowledged his supremacy by having the ḥaḍbaa read in his name. By this act of expediency he not only saved his own territory but induced Bahādur Shāh to attack Ahmadnagar and humble its sovereign. Burhān Nizām Shāh, being unable to resist such a powerful monarch as Bahādur Shāh, had to flee. Consequently the joint army of Shāh and Fīrūzī reached Ahmadnagar unopposed and took up its residence in the palace of Burhān Nizām Shāh I, where he regaled himself for forty days. Burhān Nizām Shāh I, however, continued to harass the Gujjarāt troops by frequent skirmishes until he was obliged to sue for peace and to promise to return the forts and elephants he had captured (although he later broke his word). The object being achieved, both ʿImād al-Mulk and Mirān Muhammad Shāh returned jubilantly to their respective capitals.

Two years later, in 937/1532, ʿAllāʾ al-Din ʿImād al-Mulk died and was succeeded by his eldest son Daryā ʿImād Shāh. He was married to Khādijā, a sister of Ismāʿīl Ṭāhir Shāh of Bidjāpur (and not to his daughter as inadvertently stated by Fīrūzī in another place, cf. Brīg’s trans., iii, 458), and born of a Hindu princess whom Yusuf Adil Shāh had married. A consummate statesman, he was well-versed in the art of diplomacy, as was shown on the occasion when he found himself in a difficult situation as a result of the march of Bahādur Shāh against Ahmadnagar, whose ruler, although his close relative, did not scruple to engage in an armed conflict with ʿImād al-Shāh, and who had to pay for his fault by submitting to the Gujjarāt monarch.

The history of the reign of Daryā ʿImād Shāh is so dispersed throughout the pages of Fīrūzī that it requires patient research to piece it together. His account is extremely meagre; nevertheless, it is from the work of this author supplemented by the Būrān-i māłātār, that a readable account of his reign can be gleaned. The story is so involved and entangled that even a clear-headed and experienced historian like Fīrūzī confused Daryā ʿImād Shāh with his father ʿAllāʾ al-Din ʿImād Shāh in describing the events after 939/1532 (although on Fīrūzī’s own showing ʿAllāʾ al-Din ʿImād Shāh had died in that year). He admits that he failed to obtain any written account of the ʿImād Shāhis and hence had to depend on oral traditions and hearsay (cf. Brīg’s trans., iii, 500).

In 949/1542 Burhān Nizām Shāh along with his ally Amir Barid, taking advantage of a serious rift between Ibrahim ʿAdil Shāh and his able minister Asad Khān Lārī, marched against Bidjāpur and besieged it. Ibrahim ʿAdil Shāh, deprived of his experienced minister’s advice and finding himself unable to oppose the invaders single-handed, approached Daryā ʿImād Shāh, his kinsman (here Fīrūzī confuses him with his father. cf. Brīg’s trans., iii, 92) for help, who readily acceded to his request; the combined forces of Barer and Bidjāpur compelled the invaders to raise the siege and to sue for peace. This successful military adventure raised the ʿImād Shāhis prestige high and the ruling prince came to be looked upon as a powerful monarch whose voice counted in the Deccan. To strengthen his position further, ʿImād Shāh married his sister Rābi’a to Ibrahim ʿAdil Shāh in 950/1543. This naturally aroused the jealousy of Burhān Nizām Shāh, the old enemy of his house, although Daryā ʿImād Shāh soon after his accession had tried to placate him by marrying his daughter Bibi Dawlat to Husayn Nizām Shāh, a son of Burhān Shāh by his wife Amina, who was later to succeed him. The very next year (951/1544) some differences cropped up between Ibrahim ʿAdil Shāh and Daryā ʿImād Shāh, which provided Burhān Shāh with an opportunity to invade Bidjāpur. He formed an alliance with Sadgījarīvārī (Kāmaradā of the Muslim historians), the Hindu ruler of Vīdīyanagar [q.v.], and the Shī‘a ruler of Golconda. It is not known what the results subsequently played by the ʿImād Shāhs in the battles that took place between the combined Muslim forces and the troops of Vīdīyanagar. It is hard to believe
that while the combined Muslim states were closed in a fierce struggle against the Hindus, the state of Persian expression or orthodox faith, should have remained aloof. It is probable that personal grievances, such as the murder of Diqāngir Khān, rather than religious motives were responsible for the estrangement between the kingdoms of Ahmadnagar and Berar. Soon after Husayn Nīzm Shāh's accession, his full brother 'Abd al-Kādir fled from Ahmadnagar and sought asylum in Berar. Earlier, such a prominent noble as Sayf 'Ayn al-Mulk, who held the rank of commander-in-chief under Burhan Nīzm Shāh I, had similarly sought refuge in Berar from the oppression of Husayn Nīzm Shāh. Fīrūṣta places this event in 959/1552—which is puzzling, as Burḥān Nīzm Shāh I was still alive in that year. The authorities agree that he died in 961/1554 (corroborated by the chronogram sawāl-i ʿabūrāwān), the year in which also Mūṭād Shāh III of Gujjārāt and ʿĪṣān Shāh Sūr (qq.v.). In any case, we find him on the side of Ibrahim 'Adī al-Mulk, his brother-in-law, who was then espousing the cause of Shāh 'All, his nephew, a son of Burḥān Nīzm Shāh and his sister Maryam. He was a pretender to the throne of Ahmadnagar against his step-brother Husayn Nīzm Shāh, the ruling prince. Dārūy 'Īmād Shāh seems to have been drawn against his will into this struggle for power, inasmuch as we find him playing only a passive role, most probably out of regard for his sister's son. Here Fīrūṣta's account is both perplexing and confusing. He places the insurrection of prince 'All, while describing the events of the reign of Ibrahim 'Ādī Shāh, in 959/1551 (cf. Briggs's trans., iii, 106), yet while writing the history of his father Burḥān Nīzm Shāh he says that the latter was still alive in 961/1553 (cf. Briggs's trans., iii, 235). It is difficult to reconcile the dates.

However, in the engagement that took place at Shālpārr between the 'Ādī Shāhī forces and the Nīzm Shāhī forces, Dārūy 'Īmād al-Mulk was put in charge by Ibrahim 'Ādī Shāh of the right flanks (maymāna), while he commanded the centre in person. At a critical juncture Ibrahim 'Ādī Shāh lost heart and fled from the field, wrongly believing that his ally Sayf 'Ayn al-Mulk had crossed over to his former master's son and successor Husayn Nīzm Shāh. The fate of Ibrahim 'Adī al-Mulk is not known, but it may be assumed that he too returned to his capital unmolested. Thereafter he is not heard of any more, and in the words of Fīrūṣta seems to have enjoyed a reign of great tranquillity and peace till his death in 969/1561 (cf. 'Abbād al-Ḥaḍārī, Taʾrīkh-i Dākan, ii, 79). He was succeeded by his son, Burḥān 'Īmād al-Mulk, who was then only three years old. Tūfāl Khān Dāhan, his minister, began to rule in his reign. An ungrateful and ambitious man, he usurped all power in 976/1568 and placed the young king in confinement. This usurpation was much resented by the people of Berar, who began to seek an opportunity to restore the boy-king to the throne.

In 973/1565 Mūṭād Nīzm Shāh, taking advantage of the minority of the king, invaded Berar in conjunction with 'All 'Ādī Shāh of Bigāspūr. They laid the country waste, and on the approach of the rainy season retired to their capitals. Soon afterwards Berar was invaded by Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh, the ruler of Khāndesh. Burḥān 'Īmād Shāh appointed Diqādev Rā'ū, the disaffected minister of Golconda, to command the forces of Berar, and he defeated the Khāndeshī troops in several engage-
of Ghaznin (d. 508/1114), and later migrated to the court of lmadi al-Dawla Fararsar at Rayy, in whose praise he composed the largest number of odes. Some time before lmadi al-Dawla’s death, lmadi made a second migration to the Court of the Saldjukid Sultan Tughrul b. Muhammad b. Malik Shih (d. 529/1134). Among his many patrons, the following may be mentioned:

Malik Arghun b. Alp Arslan (d. 499/1056); Malik Tughlan b. Alp Arslan; lmadi al-Dawla Fararsar (d. 530/1135); Sultan Tughrul b. Muhammad; Kawsami al-Din Abu ‘l-‘Ism; and Almadi’s minister of Tughrul (d. 527/1132); Abu Mansur al-Muzaffar ‘Abbd-Allah b. Abil-Rahman (d. 547/1152); Amir ‘Abd al-Rahman Tughryak (d. 541/1146). lmadi’s original Divan has been lost. Taki Kashi claims to have seen four: three in the British Museum and one in the British Museum Library contains the largest number of lmadi’s extant verses, namely 1174.

lmadi’s reputation as a poet is indicated by the fact that several notable contemporary poets, namely Sayyid Hasan-i Ghaznawi, Abild-Sahib b. Isma’il Tirmidhi, Falaki Shirmpani, Kawsami Razi, Sa’d al-Din As’sad b. Shibh b. Bughra, Majd al-Din b. A’mdn, Yusuf b. Naqr al-Katib, took his verses as a model. lmadi is highly praised by most of the notable biographers of poets.

lmadi’s death took place between 530/1135 and 550/1155, probably nearer the former than the latter.
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IMADA — IMALA

"inflection" (verbal noun of fourth form, amala), a phonetic phenomenon. It consists in "alif’s "tending towards y and "alif’s "tending towards kasura" (Ibn al-Sarrad, Masa’di, 139). Modern phonetics regards it as a palatalization, produced by a rising movement of the tongue towards the roof of the mouth. Since the extent of this movement, the vowel a shifts from its zone of articulation to that of e or to that of e (or even to that of i). Arab grammarians distinguish an amala shadda, "strong" (probably a > e) and an amala mutawassita, "medium" (probably a > a). The question arises particularly with regard to long a, and it is this that will be considered here.

Arab grammarians speak of imala as a phenomenon conditioned by the presence of a kasra (i) or a y (y) in the neighbourhood of the alif (a); these draw the alif towards themselves, in order to make it more like them. Chapter 477 of Sibawayhi deals with the imala of alif when there is a kasra in the syllable that immediately follows or precedes it, such as: ‘alim "knowing", masajd ‘mosques’, hild ‘dogs’, gima‘ld ‘swift (she-camel)’; similarly bayydy ‘seller’, bayydy ‘measurer of grain’. The following, however, are without imala (i), (ii, 280 lines 2, 4-6); ajisser ‘bricks’, tal ‘condiment’, ggamd ‘mineral’, albalal ‘the great disturbance’, gwm ‘reunion of people of all kinds’. One says: ra’aytu Sasya, but ra’aytu ‘Abd ("I saw Sayyid... ‘Abd") (i, 282, lines 6-7). Chapter 480 of the same author mentions, rightly, the hur ‘that inhibit imala. This kind of inhibition may be found, whether or not the imala is conditioned, but Sibawayhi here considers it from the point of view of the conditioning indicated. These are the seven musarfiya, the four emphatics, the velars th and kh and kaf, whether they are the first, second or third consonants of the root, for example, as first: s’did "going up", qsid ‘absent’, ksid ‘sitting’; as second: qsid ‘sneezing’, ndkid ‘criticizing (a written work)’, ndkid ‘sieveing’; as third: nhd ‘rising’, nhd ‘blowing’, nd ‘selling well (merchandise)’, md ‘straps’, mharid ‘scissors’. An i, however, in the syllable preceding a long a (provided that an emphatic does not open the latter syllable) restores the operation of the imala, thus: si’pb pl. of sa’ ‘difficult’, kdb ‘doses’, kdb pl. of khabh ‘bad’, misbah ‘lamp, torch’.

All this clearly points to a conditioned imala, and there are other clear examples in chapter 478 of the Kitab (ii, 283, lines 6-7, 10, 12-3); there are, however, also a number of cases that are less clear: imala of: ramd (radical: md)r’al ‘threw’, r’al (r. d ‘us, passive d’ta) ‘he called’, khd, k kh w j, jst pers. khfsu ‘he feared’, nd pl. niy ‘canine (tooth)’, ho ‘pregnant (woman)’. Arab grammarians adduce the influence of morphological associations [see the data given in the parentheses] where they find the kasa or the ya? that they require. They can find no arguments, however, in the cases of kdsalid ‘proper name, bdb ‘door’, m ‘moose, reed’.

In the writer’s opinion, in addition to a conditioned imala, which is widely used, there exists an unconditioned imala, which Arab grammarians have not recognized as such and have forced into the framework of the first, without, however, leaving us the means to discriminate precisely between the two. Furthermore, they have not answered all the questions; for example, what was the situation with alif mandada from this point of view? At all events, we cannot follow J. Canetineau when he states (Cours. 98): "imala must be considered as an unconditioned phenomenon, which affects every long a (however with a possible distinction between an internal a and a final a), provided that no preservative action is brought to bear on them".

Imala was not general among the Arabs; it appears that it have had a different meaning in the East; in the East, in the East, and others, as opposed to the Hidazis (cf. Sibawayhi, ii, 280, line 1, 281, line 5, 283, line 16). It is, however, received in Kur’danic recitation (see al-Duni, Taysir, 46-68, Bibl. Isl. 2). It was a simple realization of the phoneme ã. In modern dialects it comes to acquire a distinctive value; thus in Kfarabad (M. T. Feghali, Ifardu d’Arabic (Liban-Syrie), 96): rã ‘returning’ and rã ‘begin again’, rã ‘flowing’ and rã ‘more, more’.

Remarks: (a) Sibawayhi (ii, 284, lines 1-3) stresses the diversity that is to be found in the practice of imala, and it is probable that he does not produce all the facts concerning this phenomenon. When one has experience of modern dialects with imala, as for example the Lebanese vernaculars, one can only agree with Sibawayhi; each region has its own system, and indeed the system may differ from village to village. That of Kfarabad (94-5), for example, is not free from "exceptions" (see 95, 3°).

(b) The case of li ‘he was good’ (Sibawayhi, ii, 281, line 13), ãra ‘he became’ (ibid., line 14) is separate. Either it is a matter of non-valorized emphatics, of a type compatible with imala, or one should read: ãba, ãra, forms comparable with those of Ethiopic, such as ãa ‘he walked’, ãi ‘he ran’.
without wishing to go back to an ancient phoneme e
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IMĀLA — IMAMA
IMAM A'ZAM [see KHALIFA]
AL-IMĀM AL-A'ZAM [see ABU BANIFA]
IMAM AL-HARAMAYN [see AL-JUWAYNI]
IMAM AL-HUDĀ [see ABU L-LAYTH AL-SAMAR-
KAN JABRAS]
IMĀM-BĀRA, literally "enclosure of the Imāms", is a term used in India for the buildings where the
Shī'īs assemble during Muharram and recite elegies on the martyrdom of Hasan and Husayn and in which the taʾṣīyas (q.v.) are stored. The Imām-bārā is an Indian institution, whose beginnings may be traced to the 18th century, when many of the Shī'ī institution and practices took their ritualistic form. Sa'dar Djang (1708-54) constructed a building in Delhi for the purpose of the Muharram rituals; it was not known as Imām-bārā, but may well be considered its forerunner. An almost similar building constructed by his grandson Aṣaf al-Dawla in Lucknow, however, became known as "Imām-bārā-i Aṣa-
fi". After that it became a practice with the Nawwabs of Awadh to build Imām-bārās, which came to be used also for the final resting-places of the heads of the families to which they belonged. The Imām-
bārā of Husaynabād built by Muhammad 'Ali Shāh (1837-47) shows the influence of European architecture. According to Dja'far Sharif, the 'Aqīṣur-
khāna of Southern India is replaced in the north by the Imām-bārd.
(K. A. NIZAMI)
IMĀM SHĀH, IMAM AL-DIN 'ABD AL-RAḤIM B. Ḥasan (b. 856/1452; d. 919/1513), was a saint (pir) of an Isma'īlī sect known as Imāmshāhs, and better known as sat-pañthis (followers of truth). Sat-panñh (the true path) was a term applied originally to Eastern Isma'īlism in India. Later the sat-panñhists denied all connection with the Khodjas, although there is a great similarity in their doctrines. His tomb is at Pirana (near Ahmadābād, Gujarat), where Imām Shāh lived and taught. It is greatly venerated by his followers, who are also to be found in Madhya Pradesh, near Burhanpur, where a sizeable community still exists. Their doctrines and ritual are mostly Hindu; they believe in karma (incarnation) and although they confess to faith in the Kur'ān, they hold that their Imām is the tenth incarnation of the Hindu God, Vishnū. 'Ali was the first of the Imāms and the possessor of the Divine Light. The Kur'ān was in 40 partes (parts), of which only 30 are preserved. The true interpretation (ta'wil) of the Kur'ān is called alamākār. The Imāmshāhs are generally vegetarians. Their devotional poetry, known as gnāms, of which there are several collections, is beautiful and touching, and fully deserves study and publication. The gnāms are greatly revered by the sectarians, who pay greater reverence to them than to the Kur'ān. The best account of the sect is by W. Ivanov, The Sect of Imām Shāh in Gujarāt, in JBRRAS, xii (1936), 19-70.
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(A. A. A. FYZEE)
IMĀMA, the imāmate in the meaning of "supreme leadership" of the Muslim community after the death of the Prophet. The present article will deal with the theological and judicial theory. For the institutional development see KHALIFA.
Early development. The establishment of Abū Bakr after the death of Muhammad as Khilafat Rasūl Allāh, "Vicar of the Messenger of God", affirmed the continued unity of the Muslim community under a single leader. It favoured a preferential right to the imāmate for the early Meccan, Kurayshite Companions of the Prophet and implicitly denied any right on the basis of blood relationship with him. Although these principles did not remain unchallenged from the beginning, broad theoretical discussion of the imāmate was opened by the crisis of the caliphate beginning with the rebellion against 'Uthmān. At the end of the civil war, which left Mu'awiyah as de facto ruler, the community remained divided mainly on points concerning the rightful imāmate. The upholders of 'Uthmān as a just caliph, commonly known as the 'Uthmāniyya, repudiated the revolt and the caliphate of 'Ali resulting from it. The 'Uthmāniyya comprised besides the partisans of Mu'awiyah the upholders of the principles of the early caliphate, i.e., in particular the right of the families of the non-Ḫāǧihmīte early Companions of the Prophet, now mostly living in Medina. Although criticism of 'Uthmān had been wide-spread among the latter during his caliphate, they had not looked with favour upon the succession of 'Ali, and accepted the verdict of the arbitrators appointed at Ciffin that 'Uthmān had been killed unjustly. They did not favour Mu'awiyah, since he did not belong to the early Companions, but accepted him for the sake of unity. The partisans of 'Ali, commonly called his ḥīfs, upheld the justice of the revolt against 'Uthmān, who in their view had lost his title to the caliphate by his unjust acts. As against the claim of Mu'awiyah to the caliphate as the avenger of the murdered 'Uthmān, they looked for leadership from the clan of Muhammad, especially among the sons of 'Ali, in order to re-establish the rightful imāmate. Their support of the claims of the family of 'Ali al-bayt (q.v.) to the imāmate did not imply a repudiation of the first two caliphs Abū Bakr and 'Umar. The belief that
‘Ali was the divinely appointed heir of the Prophet and was endowed with supernatural powers, commonly attributed by the sources to the largely legendary figure of ʿAbd Allāh b. Saba’ (q.v.), was at most marginal. The Khāridjīs, successors from the ranks of the partisans of ‘Ali, shared the views of the latter concerning ʿUṯmān and the rising against him and upheld the initial legitimacy of the caliphate of ‘Ali. They repudiated ‘Ali from the time of his agreeing to the arbitration of his conflict with Muʿāwiya and equally repudiated Muʿāwiya as a rebel against the initially legitimate caliphate of ‘Ali.

The second civil war beginning after the death of Muʿāwiya and resulting in the definite establishment of Umayyad rule on a dynastic basis, further sharpened the fronts between these parties. The supporters of the traditions of the early caliphate, after the failure of ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr’s attempt at restoring it, lost all hope. They came to idealize the period of the first three caliphs. Although they supported Umayyad rule and were opposed to revolt, they did not, in contrast to the Syrian supporters of the Umayyads, consider this rule as part of the genuine caliphate, which had ended with ʿUṯmān. The violent death of al-Ḥusayn, grandson of the Prophet, at the hands of the supporters of the Umayyads, considered this rule as part of the authentic caliphate. Their acts and rulings were binding without any act of recognition by the Muslim community. Ahmad b. Hanbal specifically affirmed the movement of the Murdijiyya, initiated by al-Ḥasan b. Muhammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya, attempted to close the gap between the moderate Shiʿa and the ʿUṯmāniyya. The early Murdijiyya affirmed the superiority of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar over the caliphs and the ʿUṯmāniyya restricted the caliphate of the Rāshidūn to the first three caliphs and rejecting the caliphate of ‘Ali. However, Kūfani traditionalist opinion firmly endorsing the inclusion of ‘Ali among the Rāshidūn spread rapidly. It was eventually favoured by ʿAbd b. Ḥanbal, who originally had supported the doctrine of the ʿUṯmāniyya. By the 4th/10th century the caliphate of the four Rāshidūn became indisputable Sunni dogma. Ḥanbalī and Ashʿarī doctrine strongly insisted that the four Rāshidūn ranked in excellence according to their sequence in the caliphate. This agreed with the view implied in the Ḥanbalī creeds and expressly affirmed by al-ʿAshʿarī, that only the most excellent (al-afḍal) in the Muslim community could be the rightful caliph. The imāmate of the less excellent (al-majfūḥ) in the view of al-ʿAshʿarī is worldly kingship. Though the caliphate is a matter of worldly kingship, the Rāshidūn doctrine strongly insisted that the four Rāshidūn might come close to fulfilling the ideal conditions of the caliphate, as was often affirmed for the pious Umayyad ʿUmar b. ʿAbd b. Ḥaṭir, that there was no expectation that the Vicariate of Prophecy could ever be restored after the passing of the thirty years which it was to last according to a famous ḥadith. For the later imāmate there were only minimal conditions. The imām had to be a Muslim and a Kurayshite. The imāmate could become binding without any act of recognition by the Muslim community. ʿAbd b. Ḥanbal specifically affirmed the validity of the imāmate by usurpation (qalaba). While the Muslim must not get involved in a civil war when there is no imām, absolute obedience and active support of the established imām, whether he be just or oppressive, pious or depraved, incumbent or hāṣir, except on the imāmate of the ʿAbū ʿAshir. The imāmate could be forfeited only through apostasy or by neglecting the duty of the imām to provide for the communal prayer, as affirmed by a ḥadith.

Hanafi and early Māturīdī doctrine was close to the traditionalist views. Abū ʿAbd Allāh, belonging to the Murdijiyya, did not express a preference between ʿUṯmān and ‘Ali, while ranking them below Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. This view was admitted as legitimate in some Hanafi creeds, but the majority upheld the hierarchical ranking according to Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. The obligation to obey the ruler was rather implied in the prohibition of drawing the sword against fellow Muslims.

A different doctrine developed in ʿAṣṣāfīsīm and the kalām school of the Kullābiyya associated with it and increasingly also influenced ʿAṣṣāfīsīm after al-Bāṣillī (d. 403/1013). The ʿAṣṣāfīsīm did not restrict the rightful imāmate to the most excellent in the community. It admitted the imāmate of the less excellent, especially if discord could be avoided.
by choosing him. Al-Shafi’i and some prominent early Shafi’i scholars reportedly ranked Ali in excellence above Uthman (though below Abü Bakr and Umar). Al-Shafi’i’s imamate thus was that of the “less excellent”. This less rigid approach permitted the Shafi’i’s to treat the post-Rasulid caliphate as a basically sound imamate which could be judged by standards derived from the ideal early caliphate. A comprehensive legal system, strongly influenced by Mu’tazili theory, was elaborated concerning the qualifications, investiture, and functions of the imam. This development reached its climax in al-Mawardi (d. 450/1058), whose work al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyya became widely accepted as an authoritative exposition of Sunni doctrine concerning the imamate. The book, written at the time of the Umayyad caliphate, it legitimized this development, while maintaining the full sovereignty of the caliph over these offices. Al-Mawardi’s work was immediately imitated by the Hanbali Abü Ya’la al-Farrâ’î (d. 458/1066), who accepted al-Mawardi’s exposition, modifying it only in some points in accordance with Hanbali-Madârî doctrine. Hanbali-Madârî doctrine reaffirmed the validity of the imamate by usurpation and denied the forfeiture of the imamate by immorality, injustice, or heterodoxy. Among the Maturidi Hanafists, Abu ‘l-Yusuf al-Bazdawi (d. 493/1099) discussed many of the Shafi’i doctrines, modifying them from the point of view of Hanafi tradition. The rise of Sunni valuation of the post-Rasulid caliphate in this time is reflected by the endeavour of the Hanbali Abü Ya’la and the Ahqâfî Abü Bakr al-Fürâ’î (d. 478/1085-6) to prove the legitimacy of the imamate of Mu’awiya in addition to that of the four Basrâni caliphs.

Major points in the fully developed Sunni doctrine were the following: The establishment of an imâm is permanently obligatory (udâdî’b) on the community, according to the common doctrine on the basis of his functions under the revealed law, not on rational grounds. The holder of the imamate may change at any time. The view that two countries separated by a sea preventing mutual military aid might each have an imâm was exceptional. Specifically the doctrine of the Karrâmîyya that ‘Ali and Mu’awiyâ were imâms at the same time was rejected. Qualifications for the imâm were: Kûrayshite descent, knowledge of the law as required for the judgeship, probity (ud’dî’î) as required for legal testimony, majority, physical fitness, capability of carrying out the political and military duties of the office. The imâm may be invested either through appointment (’ahd) by his predecessor or by election (’ibkhir) or by the common view held that Abû Bakr was elected to the caliphate, the opposite view, that he had been appointed by the Prophet, was upheld by such prominent Sunni scholars as al-Hasan al-Basri, Ibn Hazm, and Ibnu Taymiyya. Any Muslim of probity with knowledge concerning the nature of the imamate, and discernment in choosing a proper candidate, qualified as an elector. Views concerning the number of electors or “people of loosing and binding” (a’hl alhall wa l-’ahd [q.v.]) necessary for the election to become binding on the community varied from a single one, the common Agâhî doctrine traces this “generosity” (idâmûrî) of the electors, stipulated by Abü Ya’la, to the election was not conceived as a free choice between candidates, but as a selection of the “most excellent”. Though the election of the less excellent, if qualified, was binding, it was considered permissible only for proper cause. The imâmate was invalidated through loss of mental or physical fitness or loss of liberty. According to many Shafi’îs it was forfeited by loss of probity through immorality, injustice, or heterodoxy, but this was denied by others and by Hanbalî and Hanafî doctrine. The duties of the imâm were defined as: guarding the faith against heterodoxy, enforcing lawful justice between disputing parties, dispensing legal punishments (hadd), protection of peace in the territory of Islam and its defence against external enemies, conducting the djihâd against those resisting the supremacy of Islam, receiving the legal alms, taxes, and the fifth of the booty, distributing the revenue in accordance with the law, and the appointment of reliable and sincere men in delegating authority. Mu’tazili doctrine and the movement of the Mu’tazili scholars (d. 493/1099) discussed many of the Shafi’i doctrines, modifying them from the point of view of Hanafi tradition. The rise of Sunni valuation of the post-Rasulid caliphate in this time is reflected by the endeavour of the Hanbali Abü Ya’la and the Ahqâfî Abü Bakr al-Fürâ’î (d. 478/1085-6) to prove the legitimacy of the imamate of Mu’awiya in addition to that of the four Basrâni caliphs. Major points in the fully developed Sunni doctrine were the following: The establishment of an imâm is permanently obligatory (udâdî’b) on the community, according to the common doctrine on the basis of his functions under the revealed law, not on rational grounds. The holder of the imamate may change at any time. The view that two countries separated by a sea preventing mutual military aid might each have an imâm was exceptional. Specifically the doctrine of the Karrâmîyya that ‘Ali and Mu’awiyâ were imâms at the same time was rejected. Qualifications for the imâm were: Kûrayshite descent, knowledge of the law as required for the judgeship, probity (ud’dî’î) as required for legal testimony, majority, physical fitness, capability of carrying out the political and military duties of the office. The imâm may be invested either through appointment (’ahd) by his predecessor or by election (’ibkhir) or by the common view held that Abû Bakr was elected to the caliphate, the opposite view, that he had been appointed by the Prophet, was upheld by such prominent Sunni scholars as al-Hasan al-Basri, Ibn Hazm, and Ibnu Taymiyya. Any Muslim of probity with knowledge concerning the nature of the imamate, and discernment in choosing a proper candidate, qualified as an elector. Views concerning the number of electors or “people of loosing and binding” (a’hl alhall wa l-’ahd [q.v.]) necessary for the election to become binding on the community varied from a single one, the common Agâhî doctrine traces this “generosity” (idâmûrî) of the electors, stipulated by Abü Ya’la, to the election was not conceived as a free choice between candidates, but as a selection of the “most excellent”. Though the election of the less excellent, if qualified, was binding, it was considered permissible only for proper cause. The imâmate was invalidated through loss of mental or physical fitness or loss of liberty. According to many Shafi’îs it was forfeited by loss of probity through immorality, injustice, or heterodoxy, but this was denied by others and by Hanbalî and Hanafî doctrine. The duties of the imâm were defined as: guarding the faith against heterodoxy, enforcing lawful justice between disputing parties, dispensing legal punishments (hadd), protection of peace in the territory of Islam and its defence against external enemies, conducting the djihâd against those resisting the supremacy of Islam, receiving the legal alms, taxes, and the fifth of the booty, distributing the revenue in accordance with the law, and the appointment of reliable and sincere men in delegating authority. Mu’tazili doctrine and the movement of the Mu’tazili scholars (d. 493/1099) discussed many of the Shafi’i doctrines, modifying them from the point of view of Hanafi tradition. The rise of Sunni valuation of the post-Rasulid caliphate in this time is reflected by the endeavour of the Hanbali Abü Ya’la and the Ahqâfî Abü Bakr al-Fürâ’î (d. 478/1085-6) to prove the legitimacy of the imamate of Mu’awiya in addition to that of the four Basrâni caliphs. Major points in the fully developed Sunni doctrine were the following: The establishment of an imâm is permanently obligatory (udâdî’b) on the community, according to the common doctrine on the basis of his functions under the revealed law, not on rational grounds. The holder of the imamate may change at any time. The view that two countries separated by a sea preventing mutual military aid might each have an imâm was exceptional. Specifically the doctrine of the Karrâmîyya that ‘Ali and Mu’awiyâ were imâms at the same time was rejected. Qualifications for the imâm were: Kûrayshite descent, knowledge of the law as required for the judgeship, probity (ud’dî’î) as required for legal testimony, majority, physical fitness, capability of carrying out the political and military duties of the office. The imâm may be invested either through appointment (’ahd) by his predecessor or by election (’ibkhir) or by the common view held that Abû Bakr was elected to the caliphate, the opposite view, that he had been appointed by the Prophet, was upheld by such prominent Sunni scholars as al-Hasan al-Basri, Ibn Hazm, and Ibnu Taymiyya. Any Muslim of probity with knowledge concerning the nature of the imamate, and discernment in choosing a proper candidate, qualified as an elector. Views concerning the number of electors or “people of loosing and binding” (a’hl alhall wa l-’ahd [q.v.]) necessary for the election to become binding on the community varied from a single one, the common Agâhî doctrine traces this “generosity” (idâmûrî) of the electors, stipulated by Abü Ya’la, to the election was not conceived as a free choice between candidates, but as a selection of the “most excellent”. Though the election of the less excellent, if qualified, was binding, it was considered permissible only for proper cause. The imâmate was invalidated through loss of mental or physical fitness or loss of liberty. According to many Shafi’îs it was forfeited by loss of probity through immorality, injustice, or heterodoxy, but this was denied by others and by Hanbalî and Hanafî doctrine. The duties of the imâm were defined as: guarding the faith against heterodoxy, enforcing lawful justice between disputing parties, dispensing legal punishments (hadd), protection of peace in the territory of Islam and its defence against external enemies, conducting the djihâd against those resisting the supremacy of Islam, receiving the legal alms, taxes, and the fifth of the booty, distributing the revenue in accordance with the law, and the appointment of reliable and sincere men in delegating authority. Mu’tazili doctrine and the movement of the Mu’tazili scholars (d. 493/1099) discussed many of the Shafi’i doctrines, modifying them from the point of view of Hanafi tradition. The rise of Sunni valuation of the post-Rasulid caliphate in this time is reflected by the endeavour of the Hanbali Abü Ya’la and the Ahqâfî Abü Bakr al-Fürâ’î (d. 478/1085-6) to prove the legitimacy of the imamate of Mu’awiya in addition to that of the four Basrâni caliphs.
authorities of later Mu'tazilism, left the question of the superiority of Abu Bakr or 'Ali open and held the imamate of the less excellent to be permissible for proper cause. Abu 'Abd Allâh al-Hasan (d. 357/977) and 'Abd al-Djâbîrî in his later doctrine upheld the superiority of 'Ali.

Early Mu'tazilism, in agreement with Kârîgîlî doctrine, generally did not restrict the imâmâte to members of the Kuraysh. While the eccentric Mu'tazili Djârîr b. Amr held that of two otherwise equal candidates a non-Kurayshite should be preferred to a Kurayshite, the common opinion preferred the Kurayshite in this case. Later Mu'tazili doctrine maintained that no non-Kurayshite could become imâm if a qualified Kurayshite was available.

The establishment of an imâm was considered obligatory on the community except by a group of early Mu'tazilis inclined to asceticism, who held that the community should choose leaders for the gîhâd and officials for other necessary functions on a temporary basis so as to frustrate any ambitions for worldly power. The majority rejected the view that the establishment of an imâm was obligatory on rational grounds, which was admitted by al-Djahîz, Abu '1-Kâsim al-Balkhî, and Abu '1-Husayn al-Basîrî. The common doctrine insisted that there could be only a single imâm at any time. Only Abu Bakr al-Âsamm held that because of the wide expansion of Islam it was preferable to have many imâmîs to choose its own imâm. In all other respects the Mu'tazili doctrine agreed substantially with Sunni doctrine.

Imâmî: Zaydiyya. The Zaydiyya, supporters of the revolt of Zayd b. 'Ali in 122/740, unlike the Imâmîyya did not recognize a hereditary line of imâmîs but were prepared to support any member of the al-Husaynî dynasty who claimed the imâmâte by "rising" (âihtîd) if it was perceived as necessary. While some Zaydi authorities in the 3rd/9th century considered all descendants of 'Ali's father Abu '1-Tâlib as eligible for the imâmâte, the prevalent doctrine restricted it to the descendants of al-Hasan and al-Husayn.

During the 2nd/8th century, Zaydism was doctrinally divided into two major groups, the Bati'rîyya and the Dhârîdîyya. The Bati'rîyya, following the traditions of the moderate wing of the Imâmîyya (Shî'îs), upheld the imâmâte of Abu Bakr and 'Umar the governor of 'Uthmân during the first six years of his rule on the basis that 'Ali had pledged allegiance to them. They repudiated 'Uthmân during the last six years of his rule, just as they repudiated all opponents of 'Ali. Considering 'Ali the most excellent of men after the Prophet they permitted the imâmâte of the less excellent. The Dhârîdîyya, adopting the more radical views of the Imâmîyya, rejected the imâmâte of the first three caliphs and held that the Prophet had invested 'Ali as his executor (wââsî) by designation (nasâ'). Holding that the great majority of the Companions of the Prophet had gone astray by following Abu Bakr and 'Umar, they, unlike the Bati'rîyya, rejected the tradition of the law handed down by them and relied for religious knowledge on the descendants of al-Hasan and al-Husayn as a whole, not merely those recognized as imâmîs.

From the 3rd/9th century onwards the tendencies of the Dhârîdîyya came to prevail in Zaydism.

The major points of Zaydi doctrine, as it was fully developed during the 4th/10th century in discussions with representatives of Mu'tazill and Imâmî doctrine, were: the establishment of an imâm is obligatory on the community, according to the common view, because of his functions under the revealed law, not on rational grounds. The first three imâmîs, 'Ali, al-Hasan, and al-Husayn were invested by the Prophet through designation (nâsî). This designation was obscure (kafr, ghiyâr dâlî), so that its intended meaning could be discovered only by investigation. Through this doctrine the Zaydiyya, in contrast to the Imâmîyya, tended to alleviate the sin of the early community in disobeying the order of the Prophet. After al-Husayn the imâmâte belongs to any qualified descendant of al-Hasan or al-Husayn who calls to his allegiance and rises against the illegitimate rulers. The imâmâte becomes legally valid through the formal "call" to allegiance (dâ'wâ) and "rising" (âihtîdî), not through election (âihtîlâr) and contract (âqîd). The qualifications of the imâm were, aside from his descent, essentially the same as in Sunni and Mu'tazilli doctrine, with special emphasis on knowledge in religious matters, ability to render independent judgment (âihtîdî) in law, pietry, moral integrity, and courage. The imâmâte is forfeited by the lack of any of the qualifications, in particular by moral offences. Only the most excellent can be the rightful imâm, and if a candidate excelling the imâmâte rises and claims the imâmâte, the excelled imâm must surrender his position to him. This qualification of the imâm was rejected by some later Zaydi authorities. The prevalent doctrine admitted only a single imâm at any time. The existence of two separate Zaydi communities in the coastal areas south of the Caspian Sea and the Yaman in some instances led to a later recognition of two contemporaneous claimants as imâmîs, but the formal admission of the legitimacy of two contemporary imâmîs was exceptional. There must be someone qualified for the imâmâte at any time. Knowledge of the imâm after he has issued his call to allegiance is incumbent on every Muslim.

The list of recognized Zaydi imâmîs has never been absolutely fixed, though there was a consensus on many of them. The high requirements for the imâmâte, in particular in respect to religious learning, excluded many 'Alid pretenders and rulers. These could be recognized as restricted imâmîs (muhâsîbîn or mulkîsîadu, or "callers" (du'alî), in contrast to the full imâmîs (sibî'în). Only late Yemeni Zaydism developed a formal doctrine concerning the sîbî'îd imâmâte. The Zaydi authorities defined it as "ordering the proper and prohibiting the improper", defending the community against external aggression, and protecting the rights of the weak. He was not authorized to lead the communal prayer, to collect alms and taxes, to wage offensive war, and to carry out legal punishments.

Imâmîyya (Twelver Shi'îs). Imâmî doctrine on the imâmâte in its basic conceptions was formulated in the time of Imâm Dja'far al-Şâdîk (d. 148/776). It founded the imâmâte on the permanent need of mankind for a divinely guided, infallible leader and authoritative teacher in religion. The imâmâte was thus raised to the level of prophecy. The only difference between the messenger prophet (râsîl) and the imâm was that the imâm did not transmit a divine scripture. To ignore or disobey the divinely invested imâm was infidelity equal to ignoring or disobeying the prophet. The conception of the imâm must be fully immune (ma'sûm) from sin and error was fundamental to Imâmî thought. The imâm might, however, practice dissimulation (lâkîyâ) in case of fear for his own or his followers' safety. Although the imâm was entitled to political leadership as much as to religious authority, his imâmâte did not depend on his actual rule or any attempt to gain it. Following the traditions of the radical wing
of the early Shi'a, the Imamiyya repudiated the caliphaties of Abu Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthman and maintained that the Prophet had appointed or restricted his wasi by designation. The great majority of the Companions had apostatized by ignoring this designation. The imamate after al-Hasan and al-Husayn was to be handed down among the descend-ants of the latter by designation from father to son until the Mahdi. The succession of the seventh year old Muhammad al-Djawad in 203/818 raised the question whether minority superseded an appointed imamate, and how the imam received his perfect knowledge. The majority asserted that a minor could fulfill all the functions of the imamate, and that he was endowed by God with integral knowledge in religious matters. The crisis caused by the death of the eleventh imam without an apparent son was resolved by the affirmation of the existence of a son and the doctrine of the absence, ghuya [q.v.]. The twelfth imam, though in concealment, continued to live on earth and could fulfill the essential functions of the imamate. He was identified with the Mahdi, whose return before the end of the world is expected.

Authoritative Imami hadith embodies these beliefs concerning the imams: The world cannot exist for a moment without a hadith (proof, guarantor = imam) of God. There can be only a single imam at any time, though there may be a silent (jamit) imam (his successor) besides him. The imams are referred to in many passages of the Kur'An by such terms as the "light of God," His "witnesses" (khudadad), among mankind, His "signs" (salam), those "firm" (rastkhun) in knowledge etc. They are the "vicegerents" (khalifa) of God on earth, the "gates" (abdd) through which he is approached, the heirs of the knowledge of the Prophet. The imams are in possession of all revealed books. Only they have perfect knowledge of the Kur'An in both its exoteric (sahir) and esoteric (batin). They have been given the "greatest name of God" (ism Allah al-'a'lam). They have inherited the arms of the Prophet and the books Sahifa, Djafar, Djami'a, and the Mudaf of Fattima containing secret knowledge. The knowledge of every imam is identical with the knowledge of the Prophet. Though the imams are not endowed with a native faculty of knowing the hidden (ghayb), they have perfect knowledge of all crafts and all languages. God gives them knowledge of anything they desire to know. The imam receives the perfect knowledge of his predecessor in the last moment of the latter's life. In the night of al-kadr of every year the imam receives the judgments of God concerning every event in the following year. The imam is spoken to in the crisis caused by the death of the eleventh imam without an apparent son was resolved by the affirmation of the existence of a son and the doctrine of the absence, ghuya [q.v.]. The twelfth imam, though in concealment, continued to live on earth and could fulfill the essential functions of the imamate. He was identified with the Mahdi, whose return before the end of the world is expected.

The esoteric (basi) Isma'ili doctrine, the imam represents a grade (hadd) in the religious hierarchy between the nasih and the asas and above the hadith. The imam in his time assumes the function of the nasih in expounding and preserving the exoteric (sahir) meaning of the revealed law, while his hadith succeeds to the role of the asas in revealing the esoteric (batin) meaning of the revelation. The imam is the head of the hierarchy in his time also is the mediator between the believer and the principles of the spiritual world. The seventh imam was considered sometimes as a depository imam, since the imamate was carried on among the descendants of al-Husayn, the muslim imam. This theory served, however, rather as an explanation of the irregularities of the succession in the past than as a pattern for the future. The seventh is called Imami, because his successor (imam) after him by clear designation (nass) was appointed 'Ali as the imam after him by clear designation (nass). The seventh imam had initially been legitimate. Any Muslim who does not declare his solidarity (tawalld) with the imam is considered infidel, unless they repent. Thus both 'Uthman and 'Ali became infidels, although their imamate had initially been legitimate. Any Muslim who does not declare his solidarity (tawarrra) from them, shares their state of infidelity. Similarly, any Muslim who does not declare his solidarity (tawarrra) with the just imams, like Abu Bakr and 'Umar, is an infidel. In the esoteric Imami the Mahdi is considered the "Great Man," and the imamate was modified in Fatimid doctrine by the recognition of the Fatimid as imams of the sixth era, removing the eschatological expectations further and further into the future. The efforts to explain the continuity of the imamate between the disappearance of Muhammad b. Isma'il and the rise of the Fatimids, commonly referred to as the time of "occultation" (safir), the eschatological significance of the seventh imam, and irregularities in the succession of the Fatimid caliphs led to constant readjustments of the doctrine, which cannot be followed here in detail. Deviations from the strictly linear descendence in the succession to the fatimid imamate were often explained in terms of a "deposi-tary" (mustawada') imamate which had to be returned to the line of "permanent" (mustabarr) imams. Thus al-Hasan was sometimes considered as a depository imam, since the imamate was carried on among the descendants of al-Husayn, the muslim imam. This theory served, however, rather as an explanation of the irregularities of the succession in the past than as a pattern for the future. The seventh is called Imami, because his successor (imam) after him by clear designation (nass) was appointed 'Ali as the imam after him by clear designation (nass). The seventh imam had initially been legitimate. Any Muslim who does not declare his solidarity (tawalld) with the imam is considered infidel, unless they repent. Thus both 'Uthman and 'Ali became infidels, although their imamate had initially been legitimate. Any Muslim who does not declare his solidarity (tawarrra) from them, shares their state of infidelity. Similarly, any Muslim who does not declare his solidarity (tawarrra) with the just imams, like Abu Bakr and 'Umar, is an infidel. In the esoteric Imami the Mahdi is considered the "Great Man," and the imamate was modified in Fatimid doctrine by the recognition of the Fatimid as imams of the sixth era, removing the eschatological expectations further and further into the future. The efforts to explain the continuity of the imamate between the disappearance of Muhammad b. Isma'il and the rise of the Fatimids, commonly referred to as the time of "occultation" (safir), the eschatological significance of the seventh imam, and irregularities in the succession of the Fatimid caliphs led to constant readjustments of the doctrine, which cannot be followed here in detail. Deviations from the strictly linear descendence in the succession to the fatimid imamate were often explained in terms of a "deposi-tary" (mustawada') imamate which had to be returned to the line of "permanent" (mustabarr) imams. Thus al-Hasan was sometimes considered as a depository imam, since the imamate was carried on among the descendants of al-Husayn, the muslim imam. This theory served, however, rather as an explanation of the irregularities of the succession in the past than as a pattern for the future.
a more excellent candidate appears. The imposition of conditions on the imām was, however, considered by others. Khāridji doctrine unanimously rejected the prerogative of the Kuraysh to the imām and held any qualified Muslim, even of slave origin, to be eligible. Exceptional was the view of the followers of Shabib b. Yazid in the time of al-Hādīdādī, who considered women eligible for the imāmate. There, an only single imām at any time according to the prevalent view, though some splinter groups admitted the legitimacy of more than one imām, but they could not function together. The other qualifications and functions of the imām are substantially the same as in Sunnism. Special emphasis is placed on his moral austerity as well as his duty of “commanding the proper and prohibiting the improper” and of leading the dhīd ad against the non-Khāridji Muslims.

Of the many Khāridji sects the Ibadīyya (q.v.) is the only one whose doctrine can be studied through its own writings. A systematical investigation has not yet been undertaken. The Ibadīyya, while agreeing with the general Khāridji doctrine, recognized different types of imāms corresponding to the four states or “ways” (masdīk) in which the community of true believers could face its enemies: the state of manifestation (zuhur), when the community was strong enough to overcome the enemy; the state of defection (dī‘a), when it could merely resist a powerful enemy; the state of self-sacrifice (gharme), when a small group of believers chose to rise against the enemy seeking martyrdom; and the state of concealment (ḥīmān), when the believers were forced to live under the rule of the enemy and to practise dissimulation. Only the imām of the state of manifestation can exercise all the functions of the imām, such as the execution of legal punishments, the collection of the tithe and of the non-Muslim, and the distribution of booty. Against the doctrine of the splinter group Khālafīyya, the common doctrine affirms that there cannot be more than one imām belonging to the same “way” at any time.

Later development. Sunnī thought on the imāmate, having been closely tied to the contemporaneous ʿAbbāsid caliphate in the time of al-Māwardi, changed in response to its changing fortunes. Among Khāridji, al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), under the impression of the powerful Sālīḥī sultanate, was prepared to view the caliph as merely the representative head of Islam, established by the pledge of allegiance of the effective ruler, whose rule in turn is legitimized by his formal recognition on the part of the caliph. This recognition of the legitimacy of the actual political institutions was motivated, as al-Ghazālī noted, by the overriding necessity of preserving the legality of the acts of governors and judges throughout the empire. The preservation of this legality in the execution of the gharaṣa became a fundamental concern after the fall of the caliphate of Baghdad. In the east, which for decades fell under the rule of non-Muslims, al-Tafṣīrī (d. 791/1389) affirmed that the legality of judicial acts could not depend on the presence of a qualified Kurayshī imām at a time when it was impossible to establish such an imām because of the predominance of error and tyranny. The ʿAbbāsīd shadow caliphate established in Cairo by the Mamlūk sultanate was practically ignored even by Sunni jurists writing under the Mamlūk regime like Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) and Ibn Dījāma (d. 732/1332). Considering the actual exercise of power as essential to the imāmate, they implicitly vested its functions with the actual ruler. In contrast to al-Ghazālī, they no longer tied his legitimacy to a nominal recognition by the caliph. The ḥādīṣ restricting the caliphate to thirty years, after which worldly kingship would take its place, was commonly quoted again and dominated Sunni thought. Since kingship belonged to the holder of power irrespective of qualifications, the qualifications of the imām stipulated in the classical doctrine could be ignored or expressly waived by the doctrine of necessity (darūra). The classical doctrine made the ruler imāmate, but rather treated as being in abeyance. Following al-Djumayli and al-Ghazālī, later Sunni scholars often emphasized that the imāmate properly belonged to the derived legal matters (furūʿ), not to the fundamentals of religion (ṣul al-dīn), even though traditionally it was discussed in the ṣul works rather than the expositions of the law. This consideration, originally meant to counter the Shiʿi view placing the imāmate at the core of religion, now served to mitigate the impact of the realization that the imāmate in fact no longer existed. Later Sunnī creeds commonly did not refer to the imāmate at all or mentioned only the caliphate of the Rāshidūn.

The modernist Sunnī attitude toward the question of the imāmate has varied. The need for an imāmate defined by religion was sometimes completely denied, as by the tract on the caliphate endorsed by the Turkish Grand National Assembly in support of the abolition of the Ottoman sultanate in 1923 and by the Egyptian ʿAbd al-Rāzīq in his treatise al-İslam wa-Usul al-İmām (1923). Others have advocated the restoration of a universal imāmate modelled upon the ideal caliphate of the Rāshidūn. Most notable were the detailed proposals of the Syrian ʿAbd al-Riḍā (q.v.) set forth in his book al-Niḥafas wa-l-İmām al-İmām (1923). Basic in modernist thinking on the imāmate and Islamic government is the emphasis on government by consultation (shurā [q.v.]) and on election as the sole way of establishing the imām. These principles are viewed as the traits which distinguished the righteous caliphate of the Rāshidūn from the despoticism of the later caliphate. The modernist Sunni attitude toward the question of the imāmate has varied. The need for an imāmate defined by religion was sometimes completely denied, as by the tract on the caliphate endorsed by the Turkish Grand National Assembly in support of the abolition of the Ottoman sultanate in 1923 and by the Egyptian ʿAbd al-Rāzīq in his treatise al-İslam wa-Usul al-İmām (1923). Others have advocated the restoration of a universal imāmate modelled upon the ideal caliphate of the Rāshidūn. Most notable were the detailed proposals of the Syrian ʿAbd al-Riḍā (q.v.) set forth in his book al-Niḥafas wa-l-İmām al-İmām (1923). Basic in modernist thinking on the imāmate and Islamic government is the emphasis on government by consultation (shurā [q.v.]) and on election as the sole way of establishing the imām. These principles are viewed as the traits which distinguished the righteous caliphate of the Rāshidūn from the despoticism of the later caliphate.

Imāmism fully retained its classical concepts of the imāmate and the questions of succession and the creed. Beginning with the 7th/13th century Imāmī doctrine became greatly elaborated, partially under Sufi and Ismāʿīlī influence. The eternal reality of the imāmate, now commonly termed wakḍa (quality of a wall, “friend of God”), was defined as the esoteric aspect of prophecy. The imām thus was viewed as the initiator into mystical truths by virtue of the theophanic quality of his essential nature as well as by his teaching as expressed in the transmitted logia of the imāms. Imāmīs survived the Fātimid caliphate mainly in two branches, which developed substantially different esoteric thought. ʿAbīyīb Ismāʿīlī recognized al-Tayyib, the infant son of the Fātimid al-ʿAmīr (d. 547/1153), as imām and denied his death. ʿAbīyīb doctrine affirms that the Imām al-Tayyib, though in concealment (ḥīmān), as in touch with his community, did not specifically reject the Imāmī notion of the ḡayba of the imām. The concealed imām is not identified with the eschatological Rāʾīm. In its esoteric doctrine ʿAbīyīb Ismāʿīlī discusses in particular the cosmological nature and role of the imām. The divine nature (lāhīt) of the imām, as distinct from his human nature (nasdīl), is viewed as a temple of light (haykal nūrīn). After the passing (nāḥis) of the imām the light temple,
in which the souls of his followers are gathered, rises to the horizon of the Tenth Intellect, ...

The belief in the tombs of the imams is used to designate both the descendants of the descendant of a Shi'ite imam and the shrine of such a person (with which this article is mainly concerned). The imāmahādāgan are thus sayyids ([q.v.]), but all sayyids are not accorded the title of imāmzāda. In common usage it is given to the sons and grandsons of the imams, but excluding those who themselves became imams, and also to those of their descendants distinguished by special sanctity or by suffering martyrdom. It is not normally accorded to the female descendants of the imams. The lives of many of the imāmahādāgan are recorded in biographical and hagiographical works; the details of the lives of others are obscure, and there is sometimes doubt over the actual descent of some of those who are revered and whose tombs are visited by pilgrims.

The first movement of imāmahādāgan in any number into Persia was probably to Kumm. The Ta'āīk-i Kumm of Hasan b. Muhammad al-Kummi mentions the coming of various descendants of the imams Husayn, Husayn b. Mas'ud, b. Da'far, and others to Kumm. He also states that some of them settled in Ābā and Kāshān (ed. Sayyid Dājjāl al-Din Tahirī, Tehran 1934, 194 ff.). After Ma'mūn's declaration of the Imām Riḍā as his wali 'āsh, many of the imāmahādāgan came to Persia. On the death of the Imām Riḍā, they were dispersed. Although many of them were buried within the precincts of the shrines of the imams, notably at Mashhad and Nadjaf, the tombs of others and the tombs of their descendants, or what are believed to be their tombs, are to be found through the length and breadth of Persia. Many of these have become centres of pilgrimage. From early times it was common for both Sunnis and Shi'ites to visit the tombs of holy men, including the descendants of the imams, but all sayyids are not accorded the title of imamzadeh. This list states that the custom was sanctioned by the learned doctors of the faith although it was doubtful if traditions from the imams themselves could be cited as giving authority for pilgrimages to the tombs of their children (Tuhfāt al-ażīrin, lith. Tehran 1857, 420, quoted by D. M. Donaldson in The Shi'ite Religion, London 1928, 258). He recommends, however, that such pilgrimages should be made. "In all cities", he writes, "there are many tombs attributed to the imamzadehs and other relations of the Imams. The graves of some of them are marked, however, and in case of others there is nothing in particular that is known of their lives. It is advisable to visit all of them whose tombs have been identified. Honour shown to them is the equivalent to honouring the Imams. While no separate instructions are given for these pilgrimages, it is well that their tombs should be visited in the same manner as those of other believers. If a distinction is made in the mode of addressing them let the salutation to be the same as to the Imams, with whatever words flow to the tongue to show them honour. Any written salutations that the learned doctors have included in books are also acceptable" (ibid., 429, quoted by Donaldson).

Many of the imāmahādāgan are only of local interest
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and some of those which are popularly considered to be imāms are in fact the tomb of some holy
man, as for example the tomb of Shaykh Ahmad
Ghāzali in Kazvīn, which is known as the Imāmzāda
Abād (Sayyid Muhammad ʿAlī Gurzī, Minādār yā Bāb al-dīgnāt-i Kazvīn, Tehran, 1958, 672. Cf. Ibn
Karbalāʾ, Rauwād al-dīgnān wa-dīgnāt al-dīgnān, ed. Dīḏar Sulṭān al-ක, Tehran 1965, 175, who
mentions a tomb in Tabriz wrongly described as an
imāmsāda. Cf. also the story of how the alleged
burial place of an imāmsāda was discovered in the
andārān of one of Nāṣīr al-Dīn’s palaces in Tehran
related by Dūst “Alī Muḥammad al-Malāmī in Yād-
dashtāhā az-īndāgī-i Ḵūṣūṣi-i Nāṣīr al-Dīn Shāh,
Tehran n.d., 43).

There are special sīyārat-nāmas for many of the
imāmsādas. The place where the shrine first comes
to the pilgrim’s view is known as the saḥāmah. In some
country districts, especially in the tribal
districts of southern Persia, heaps of stones, placed
there by generations of pilgrims, mark these spots.
Pilgrimage to some of the imāmsādas is associated
with a special season of the year, as for example the
annual pilgrimage to the shrine of the imāmsāda
Sulṭān ʿĀlī, a descendant of the Imām Muḥammad
Bāḏrūr, who was killed at the village of Maḵaḥād-i
Ḵāḷī, near Ardahāl, near Ḵaḡān. According to tradi-
tion, an selectable spot was carried in a carpet to
where the shrine now stands. An annual fair is held
at the shrine on the seventeenth day of autumn when
the carpet, followed by a procession, is taken from
the shrine and washed, with much ceremony, in the
near-by stream and returned to the shrine. (ʿAbd
al-Rahīm Ḍarḏāl, Taʿrīḵ-i Ḵāḥān, Tehran 1956,
300 ff. and A. Houtum Schindler, Eastern Persian
Īrān, London 1856, 85, note). This practice is still
current. In many other shrines relics of the imāmsāda
over whose remains the shrine has been raised are
also to be preserved. For example at the shrine of the
Imām Maḥmūd, reputed to be a descendant of
the Imām Mūsā b. Ḏiḏār, near Arūn and Nāz-
maḵān, what is claimed to be the sword of Sayyid
Ḏiḏār al-Dīn is in the keeping of the mutawwāli.

Miracles and special properties are attributed
to many imāmsādas. Like mosques they became,
by custom, places in which asylum or badt [q.v.]
could be taken. Criminals and fugitives from justice
frequently had recourse to them. Nāṣīr al-Dīn Shāh
[q.v.] made abortive attempts to limit the practice.
One of the best known imāmsādas is that of Shāh
ʿAbd al-ʿĀṣīm near Tehran (see Donaldson, op. cit.,
260). Owing to its proximity to the Kāchal capital,
those who were protesting against the actions of the
government frequently took refuge there in the late
nineteenth and early twentieth century. Ḏiḏār al-
Dīn Aḥfānī [q.v.] sought asylum there in 1891, but
after some seven months his sanctuary was violated
and he was seized by government troops. During the
struggle which ended in the grant of the Constitution
the supporters of the movement took refuge at Shāh
ʿAbd al-ʿĀṣīm in the spring of 1905, while in the
summer of 1907 a number of mutawwāls supporting the
Despotism retired there.

Many of the more famous imāmsādas have aubāf for
their upkeep; some others have small aubāf, while the
more obscure often dispose of no funds at all except what pilgrims may give. There is
often a strong hereditary tendency in the office of
mutawwāli (see Mīrāḏ Ṣafīʾ, Dastūr al-Mutchāh, ed.
Muḥammad Ṭakī Dānishpāzhūh, in Recueil de la
Faculté des Lettres, University of Tehran, XVI, no. 1-2,
68-9 for the office of mutawwāli of the shrines at
Ardahāl and Shāh ʿĀbd al-ʿĀṣīm; and H. Busse,
Untersuchungen zum islamischen Kanzleiewesen, Cairo
1950, 157-75).
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kūr, Sīdāragān-i furūtān, Tehran 1969; Taʿrīḵ-i
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op. cit., 449 ff.; Muḥammad Muḥfīd, Dīḏār-i Muḥfīd,
ed. ʿĪrāfī Aḥfānī, Tehran 1967, ii, 120 ff.; Ḏiḏār
Muḥammad b. ʿHolāshī, ed. Ḏiḏār-i Yā Ṣafī, ed.
ʿĪrāfī Aḥfānī, Tehran 1960, 106 ff.; Sayyid ʿAbd al-
Ḥudūdī Ḍalalāt, Taʿrīḵ-i Nāṣīrī, 21 ff.; Ṣafī, Farsnāme-i Nāṣīrī, lith. Tehran 1894-6, 154 ff.;
Muḥammad Ḏia Ḍalīil Bihūrī, Ṣahār-i Sābā yā ḡahārisūn-i kāṣārīn, Shāhre 1967-8,
289 ff., and for a list of the imāmsādas in the
main cities of Persia see ʿAlī Ḵāber Sālīnsāzī, Taʿrīḵhā-
i Wafā dar Ḵāle, Tehran 1964. Many local histories have information on
imāmsādas situated in the regions with which they deal.

(Al. S. L. Lamont)

IMĀN (a.), faith (in God), māzdār of the 4th
form of the root *mn*. The root has the connotations of
“being secure, trusting in, turning to”; whence:
“good faith, sincerity” (amana), then “fidelity, loyal-
ty” (amdn), and finally the idea of “protection grant-
ed” (amān). The fourth form (āmnah) has the double
meaning of “to believe, to give one’s faith” and (with
by) “to protect, to place in safety”. The root *mn*
is one of those most frequently found in the vocabu-
lary of the Kūrān, where imān means sometimes
the act and sometimes the content of faith, some-
times both together. It may be said that the Kūrān
continually teaches the necessity of faith and pro-
claims its demands.

I. Elements and conditions of the act of
faith. What is “to believe”? The schools of
the Ḥanbalī and of fiṣṣīḥ very soon posed this
question and continually returned to it. Three prin-
cipal elements concur in an act of faith: the internal
conviction, the verbal expression, the performance
of the prescribed works (ʿiḥād [or taʿṣīḥ] bi ʿl-balī, ʿiḥād bi ʿl-lūsān [or kawl], `amāl). There follow
now the main solutions, which sometimes overlap,
but according to different perspectives. It should
be added that each term of the definitions proposed
must be considered in relation to the schools or
tendencies which use it, and to their ideas.

(1) The Aṣḵārī school stresses conviction or
internal judgement. We find in al-Aṣḵārī himself
two ideas of faith: (a) that of the credos of the
Hānbalī (Cairo ed. 1348, 11) and of the Māḵāli (ed. ʿAbd
al-Hamīd, Cairo n.d., i, 327), which defines faith
(in the Ḥanbalī tradition) as “words (kawl)
and works” (b) that of the Luma (ed. with Engl. tr. by
R. J. McCarthy, The Theology of al-Aṣḵārī, Beirut
1953, 75-104) which states: “faith is taʿṣīḥ in God”;
that being understood as an internal judgement
of truthfulness, which gives itself to God. The
vocabulary may vary, al-Ghazālī will speak of ʿabād,
“pact”, agreement of the heart, and al-Durjānī
(Tarīḵā, ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1845, 41) prefers ʿiḥād;
but the school as a whole considers the “pillar”,
the formal constituent of faith, to be the conviction
of the heart (or of the intellect, ʿabāl): the verbal
profession of this is, unless it is impossible, the
condition required, and the “actions of the limbs”
the accomplishment of the prescribed works) inter-
vene to perfect it. When therefore the electicism of al-Ghazali’s *Ifriyā ʿulum al-din*, Cairo ed. 1325/1933, i, 109) unites the three elements to define faith as *tasdīk* (or *ʿabād*), plus *ḥanūf* and plus *ʿamal*, it cannot be said that he is diverging from Ḡarāʾirī tradition.

(2) In the Ḥanafī-Mūtarrīdi tendencies, the stress moves from *‘.thumb to *ḥanūf*, without omitting *tasdīk* and joining to it the “knowledge of the heart (ʾmaʿrīfa)”. “‘Faith’, says article 5 of the *Wasṣiyāt Abī Ḥanīfa*, which speaks about the thorny questions of the *Ikhwan al-Safa*’s conviction (*tasdīk bi ʿl-ḥanūf* and *knowledge of the heart (wa-ʾmaʿrīfa bi ʿl-hall*)”. More briefly, the *Fīkḥ Abī ʿl-Hārīrī II* (article 18) states: “faith is *ʿīşr*ār and *ṭasḥīl*”. The profession of faith expressed in words (as it is formulated, essentially, by the “two members of the *ṣahāda*)” thus appears here as the constituent of the act of faith: and the conviction which is given to it becomes the condition of it. In some manuscripts of the *Wasṣiyāt*, sometimes *tasdīk* and more often *ʾmaʿrīfa* are missing. It remains that an appeal to the “knowledge of the heart” is characteristic of the Ḥanafī-Mūtarrīdi tendencies. In his *Makālāt al-ʿālimīyyīn*, Abū ʿl-Ḥarīrī saw in it even the first of the elements of faith according to Abū Ḥanīfa. As Wensinck points out (The Muslim creed, Cambridge 1932, 132), it is possible that there is here a new agreement with the Mūtarrīdis’ definition of faith, which considered it to consist in the knowledge of God, of the Prophet and of his teaching.

The *Makālāt* (i, 197-8) mention in this connexion Ḏāhm b. Ṣafwān and the *Dhimayyīa*. Abū ʿl-Ḥarīrī describes the Ḥanafīyya as a Mūtarrīdi sect (*ibid., 202*), while recognizing that they (unlike the *Dhimayyīa*) include in faith *ʿīşr*ār with—and after—*ʾmaʿrīfa* (*ibid., 203*). However, the brief article of the *Fīkḥ Abī ʿl-Hārīrī II*, mentioning only the verbal confession and internal conviction, was to be the main theme of the Mūtarrīdi line (e.g., Abū al-Raḥīm Ibn ʿAll, *Kitāb Naṣm al-fardʿī*), Cairo n.d., 49 ff.). We find again that Abū ʿl-Ḥurānī, in his *Ṭarīqāt* (*loc. cit.*) agreed with this opinion.

(3) As we have seen, various Ḡarāʾirī texts mention the “works of the limbs” (in contrast to the Mūtarrīdis’, for whom works are only “ways” or “means” *ṣahāda*). They do not, “in confession (of faith) by the tongue” they not consider them to be a formal constituent of it, nor even an obligatory condition. An earlier attitude, which was later challenged by Sunnism and in which Ḥārīqīs, Ṣāḥīfs, Kādāris and Muʿtazīlīs joined, saw “works” as an integral part of faith, even as faith itself. By Abū ʿl-Ḥurānī, Kādāris, Muʿtazīlīs joined, saw “works” as an integral part of faith, even as faith itself. By Abū ʿl-Ḥurānī, Kādāris, Muʿtazīlīs joined, saw “works” as an integral part of faith, even as faith itself. By Abū ʿl-Ḥurānī, Kādāris, Muʿtazīlīs joined, saw “works” as an integral part of faith, even as faith itself.

Faith must not only be expressed by words and by “the works of the limbs”, but it should arise in the heart of the believer the virtues of the faith of God (ḥanāf*), of submission to God (tausawwirl), of humility (maḥsūl), and to fulfil the pillars of Islam (cf. the last sentence of the ʿAbd al-Raḥim, “To believe with—and after— *ṭasḥīl*”). We find again the distinction between external (ʾākhir) faith and internal (bāṭin) faith. The first is verbal affirmation; the second, which is the true faith, is defined as the innermost thoughts of the heart brought to bear, with experienced certainty, upon the truths professed by the tongue; and it is thus no longer a case of *ʿīsha* of belief, or adherence, or of *ṭasḥīl*, judgement of veracity, but of the “idea” of intellectual conception (iḍmār) which “realizes” the certainty (ṣuḥūl) of the object of faith (cf. the ʿṣuḥūl preached by al-Ghazālī, who goes so far as to call “the reality of faith” an experienced taste of internal evidence). The following chapters of the *Ikhwān al-Ṣafā* combine with this “certainty” the religious sentiments of *tawakkul*, *iḥlāl*, *ṣubr*, etc. (cf. *cit., iv*).
Faith and freedom: “Let whosoever will believe, and let whosoever will disbelieve” (Kūrān, XVIII, 29). How should this verse be understood? The degree of freedom recognized in the act of faith is linked with the problem of the freedom of human action; the assessment of it thus varies according to the schools. The Mu’tazilis consider the act of faith to be “created” by man by virtue of a power created in him by God; the Ash’aris consider it to be directly created by God, without any man’s act, but the act of the heart, thanks to that of tasdiq which is itself “the creation in man of the power to obey” (al-Taftażānī, Mahāṣid, Instanbul n.d., 118). This definition, although given by al-Taftażānī, is more Ash’ari than Māturīdī. Indeed, in general, the Māturīdī Ḥanafis consider the root (qād) of every human act to be created by God, whereas its qualification arises from the judgement of man. Applied to faith, this attempt at conciliation is aimed at reconciling the ideas both of God’s creation of actions and man’s freewill as recognized by the Kūrān, XVIII, 29.

(2) Faith and salvation: All the schools state that faith ensures salvation. Their divergencies on the conditions of salvation arise from their divergencies concerning the formal constituents of the act of faith: for the Ash’aris it is centred on internal tasdiq, for the Māturīdī Ḥanafis on the expressed profession of faith and the adherence of the heart, for the Mu’tazilis on the performance of the “prescribed duties”, for the Hanbalis and the Wahhābis on the profession of faith and the performance of the basic duties. If a common denominator is sought for all these various opinions, it might be said imān, summed up in šahāda, is the witness made to God, the affirmation that He is Lord, according to the terms of the “pact”, of the miḥāk of pre-eternity: “Am I not your Lord? … Yes, we testify” (Kūrān, VII, 172). In this way agreement can be reached on the well-known hadith: “No one shall enter hell who has an atom of faith in his heart” (in the Šahih of Muslim) and again: “Hell will not welcome anyone who has in his heart an atom of faith” (second part of a hadith of al-Bukhārī, 81, 51). But the interpretations of these traditional texts diverged in their turn. For the person who regards the performance of the prescribed works as an integral part of faith, the sinner guilty of grave acts of disobedience is no longer truly a believer. For the person who regards works as merely the perfection of faith, the believing sinner remains a believer; he may be punished for a time in hell, but in the end he will be one of the “guests of paradise”: for the Ash’aris it is centred on internal tasdiq; for the Ḥanbalis and the Wahhābis, faith is that of the heart, and render

III. The value of faith. There should be mentioned three problems.
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III. The value of faith. There should be mentioned three problems.

(1) Faith and freedom: “Let whosoever will believe, and let whosoever will disbelieve” (Kūrān, XVIII, 29). How should this verse be understood? The degree of freedom recognized in the act of faith is linked with the problem of the freedom of human action; the assessment of it thus varies according to the schools. The Mu’tazilis consider the act of faith to be “created” by man by virtue of a power created in him by God; the Ash’aris consider it to be directly created by God, without any man’s act, but the act of the heart, thanks to that of tasdiq which is itself “the creation in man of the power to obey” (al-Taftażānī, Mahāṣid, Instanbul n.d., 118). This definition, although given by al-Taftażānī, is more Ash’ari than Māturīdī. Indeed, in general, the Māturīdī Ḥanafis consider the root (qād) of every human act to be created by God, whereas its qualification arises from the judgement of man. Applied to faith, this attempt at conciliation is aimed at reconciling the ideas both of God’s creation of actions and man’s freewill as recognized by the Kūrān, XVIII, 29.
Kur‘an, XX, 14. This first meaning, which is the basis of the idea of “uncreated faith”, by no means excludes the second meaning of muʿāmin, one who gives security and protection. Allāh muʿāmin means therefore: God, the source of security (and thus, of faith), the Protector. While referring to the first meaning, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (Lawāmi‘), Cairo 1323, 1435-5) seems to prefer the second one.

Nevertheless, for the majority of the Ashʿarīs, the “atom (dharra) of faith” which makes salvation, is readily considered as a created participation in the “uncreated faith” of God, placed in the heart of man at the time of the mīhāk. IV. Questions concerning faith. Very many related questions are raised by the consideration of faith. We give here a list which is not exhaustive: (1) the “status” (ḥukm) of muʿāmin in this world and the next; (2) the relation between faith and disbelief (kufr); (3) the relation between imān and īslām; (4) may a person “hide” his faith? (the problem of takḥīyya); (5) should the proviso “if it pleases God” be added to the statement “I am a believer”? (6) can faith increase and decrease? (7) the degrees of faith. (Cf. L. Gardet, Les grands problèmes de la théologie musulmane: Dieu et la destinée de l’homme, Paris 1967, 308-90.) The first five questions will be treated in the articles MU’MIN, KUFR, ĪSLĀM, TASDĪK, ĪMA, respectively. We discuss here only the last two.

(1) Can faith increase and decrease? This question appears at a very early stage in the enquiries of the schools; it is related to the definition accepted for the act of faith. The Kur‘ān mentions many times the possibility of an increase of faith (thus, III, 173; XLVIII, 4; LXXIV, 31). Certain opinions, however, present it as immutable. Two examples are: (a) The Kharījis and the Karrāmiyya consider that faith is given as a whole and is retained or lost in its entirety, according to whether obedience to the Law is maintained or lost; it cannot vary. (b) The Māturīdis and the Māturīdi–Hanafis consider faith to be immutable, but not as this is understood by the Kharījis. “Faith”, says article 2 of the Wasiyyat Abī Hanīfa, “cannot grow or decrease. In fact its weakening can be conceived only in connexion with disbelief (kufr) and its progressive weakening in connexion with kufr. This would imply the possibility of being at the same time both a believer and a non-believer: and how could this be possible?” (cf. Wensinck, op. cit., 125, 138). This thesis was to be defended, against the Āsh’arīs, by the later Māturīdi manuals (cf. ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn ʿAll, op. cit., 52-4, which appeals to Abū Hanifa and al-Māturīdi). It implies a radical distinction between “faith” and “works”. To omit an obligatory work is an act of disobedience, but it does not affect faith, either in itself or in its state of perfection.

But a very early tradition, in conformity with the Kur‘ān, admitted possible variations of faith. Al-Būghārī and Ibn Māḍā, citing the Companions, stated this thesis in their introductions to the chapter on faith. And this was to be the opinion followed by the majority of the schools. Thus: (a) the Muʿtaṭzīls consider that faith is the witness of works: hence it can vary in itself; it increases according to the accomplishing of the prescribed works and decreases according to their omission. (b) Ibn Hanbal (ʿAkhīda, i, 24) regards faith, defined by word and works, as being susceptible to growth and to decrease. Hanbal thinking is unanimous on this point. Ibn ʿAta: “Interior adherence (tasdīk) grows with the words and the works of goodness (ḥasān); it decreases with disobedience (maṣi‘ya). It has a point of departure and a beginning; then it is possible for it to progress and to increase endlessly” (op. cit., 487). The same opinion is found in Ibn Taymiyya and the Wahhhībīs. This thesis (we may note) was found also in the creeds of the Muhālīdī and of the Ibāna of al-Āsh’arī. (c) The whole of the Āsh’arī school was to uphold this theory of the growth and decrease of faith, but at the same time stressing that it was a matter of the degree of perfection brought to it (or not) by works accomplished. (Cf. Ibn ʿAfīf, al- Tabsīr, Cairo 1352/1934, 50): the “uncreated faith” of God and the faith of the angels can neither increase nor diminish; the faith of the prophets may grow according as the mission is faithfully accomplished, but it cannot decrease, because of the ‘isma, the prophetic “infallibility”; the faith of common men alone can increase or decrease. But the formal constituent of imān being defined, following the Luma‘ of al-Āsh’arī, by the interior tasdīk, the school habitually distinguished, at the root of faith, an immutable nucleus (the “atom of faith” of the hadāth) created by God in the heart: it can be lost entirely by an act of disbelief, but it cannot vary. Thus the Āsh’arīs admit both the immutability of faith in its main nucleus (cf. Māturīdi–Hanafis), and its variability in its degree of perfection (cf. Hanbalis).

(2) The degrees of faith: This question, to a certain extent connected with the last, is nevertheless different from it. It is no longer a matter of lower or upper levels of faith within the same subject, according to “obediences” or “disobediences”. It is a matter of the degrees of faith according to its intrinsic nature in different subjects.

The Āsh’arī and Shāfi’i lines, which consider takhīd to be an unreasoning imitation and a passive acceptance, were severe on “faith through takhīd” as being valid only for a person incapable of rising to anything higher. The Hanbalis, on the other hand, who defined takhīd as an intentional and conscious imitation of the Prophet, of the Companions and of their successors, regarded it as a fundamental attitude of the believer (cf. H. Laoust, Ibn Bāja, 7, n. 2, and 9, n. 11). The same opinion is found in Ibn ʿAsīl, however, was suspicious of it, fearing that recourse to takhīd would substitute imitation for the seeking of proofs (cf. G. Makdisi, Ibn ʿAsīl et la résurgence de l’Islam traditionniste au XIe siècle, Damas 1965, 524-5).

The majority of the manuals of kalām regard as much superior to “faith by takhīd” faith based on knowledge (or science), imān an ʿilm: an enlightened faith, which “proves” its object. The “proof” in question being understood as arising from the arguments and readings of the mutakallimīn, the “scientific” faith thus lauded was exposed to attacks by opponents, both Hanbalis and falāṣīfī. Al-Ghazālī (Ikhān, i, 107-8) mentioned a third degree, higher than the preceding one, the “faith of certitude” (yaḥīn). There is probably to be seen here an influence of both Shīʿah and Sufism: this higher degree based on the yaḥīn is for al-Ghazālī the only true faith, as was the “interior faith” for the Ikhwān al-Ṣafī. The same influences are very probably present in Ibn Taymiyya. After defining faith through īslām, that is through the proclamation of the yaḥīn and the performance of the basic duties (Kisāʾ al-imān, 32), and after enumerating the feelings of experience which it produces in the heart of the believer (cf. above), he distinguishes in ascending order the faith of the wāli (one “close” to God), that of the tasdīk.
(the most truthful, the just), and that of the prophet. Starting from a "conformist ritualism" (H. Laoust), faith, according to Ibn 'Atiya, ends as ifšā (virtuous conduct), ḥikāya (sincerity and unadulterated purity), and in the annihilation (fānā) of the created will in a total submission to the divine Commandment.

**Bibliography:** in the article. A complete bibliography would be immense; in it there would need to be mentioned the "professions of faith" of the various Sunni schools and of the fārāb, almost all the manuscripts of Ṣūlān al-balāmah and of usūl al-dīn, and many Sūfī spiritual works.

(L. Gardet)

**IMARA** [see AMIR].

**IMARAT AL-NUBUWWA** [see NUBUWWA].

**IMĀRET** [see KHAYR AND WAR].

**IMAZIGHEN** [see BERBERS].

(ḤĀDI)) IMMĀD AL-ḤĀDI AL-MUḤADDIR AL-ḤIMM DI AL-MĀHKĪ B. MUḤAMMAD AMīN AL-FARQĀN, the spiritual guide and preceptor of a number of leading religious personalities of India (including Muḥammad Kāsim al-Nānawtāwi, founder of the Dār al-Ulūm at Deobānd [q.v.], Rashīd Ahmad al-Angārī of Gaṅghōd (d. 1323/1905), a well-known muḥaddith, fākhlī, divine and scholar of his days and Asgāfr 'Alī Thānāwī [q.v.], was born at Nānawtā (dist. Sahārānpūr, India) in 1321/1851.

A hāfīz of the Kurān, he was moderately well educated in Persian, Arabic grammar and syntax and jurisprudence, but was never regarded as an álim in the traditional sense. He spent his youth in gaining a good knowledge of tasawwuf and soon established himself as a shaikh in a mosque in his home-town of Thānā Bhaṅwān (18 miles N.W. of Muzaffarnagar), which later came to be known as the Khankāh-i Ḥimmatīyā, the seat of his sīsilā. It was burnt down as a reprisal in 1857, following the insurrection of the local people, but was rebuilt and in course of time produced such great figures as Asgāfr 'Alī Thānāwī, one of whose disciples was Sulaymān Nadwī, the celebrated Urdu biographer of the Prophet.

He performed his first pilgrimage to Mecca in 1261/1845, thus gaining the honorific of "Ḥādī", which raises the Arabic numeral of his name. During the Indian Mutiny of 1274/1857 Imdād Allāh and his colleagues also declared ḥikāya against the British, following the execution of a certain 'Abd al-Rahīm, a leading citizen of Thānā Bhaṅwān, who was accused of being in league with the mutineers. After establishing parallel government in the town they attacked Shāmīl, a small neighbouring place, but were routed by the British. Imdād Allāh succeeded in making good his escape but the other ring-leaders of the rebellion were arrested and treated rather leniently. Apprehensive of being arrested, the Ḥāḍī succeeded in leaving the country incognito and reaching Mecca (1276/1859), where he permanently settled. As a stranger, not esteemed very highly by the local population, he passed some very difficult days in the beginning owing to poverty. Besides his other activities he delivered lectures on Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī's Ṣ素养īn the Haram al-Sharīf. Gradually his fame as a šīfi spread and he began to attract many followers. People from India, mostly scholars from Deobānd, went all the way across the seas to contract his bay'a. Asgāfr 'Alī Thānāwī being one of them. While in Mecca he married three times at a fairly advanced age, but none of the wives bore him children.

He is the author of: (4) Di'yāl al-ḥasbū (in Persian; ed. Delhi 1877) composed in 1282/1865, on the ṣarbār wa-'an-sabārī (formulas and practices) of the Qādīya, Shāftīya and Ṣ素养īn al-Dīn in Urdu, containing strange tales and parables in verse warning against the wiles of Satan; (5) Di‛kād-i akbar, a long poem in Urdu composed in 1268/1852 on the virtues and merits of kītal, in fact a translation of some anonymous treatise in Persian, which shows that even before the Mutiny of 1857 he had been cogitating on the subject of ḥikāya which led to his military setback at Shāmīl in 1857 (see above); (6) Tawḥīd al-mushtāq-i Ḥimmatīyā, a treatise composed in 1281/1864, on gnosis and divine cognition and on alḥākhā wa 'l-magāzī; (5) Dārīnāma-i ghamākh, a small poem in Urdu composed as a plaintive dirge of a forlorn lover; (6) Irshād-i mursīdī (again a poem in Urdu composed in 1293/ 1876) on spiritual and esoteric experiences, also containing his moral exhortations and aphorisms; (7) Wāḥadat al-mushtāq (in Persian) composed in 1299/1883; a brief treatise on the doctrine of the Unity of Being as propounded by Ibn al-'Arabī; (8) Faysalā-i ḍaf māsāla, a treatise on seven controversial topics of the day, such as simʾā, the visiting of graves, the celebration of the death anniversary of a saint etc., which led to a rift among his own followers; (9) Gulār-i māsirīf, a collection of his Persian and Urdu verse on spiritual and mystic matters; (10) A Ḥimmatīyā in Persian on the Maḥμaw (ed. Cawnpore 1314-1321/1898-1903), partly published posthumously; (11) Mawābūt-i Ḥimmatīyā (ed. Asgāfr 'Alī Thānāwī, Lahore 1966), a collection of 50 of his Urdu letters written from Mecca during the closing years of his life (the last letter is dated 1327/1899); (12) Marākūmāt-i Ḥimmatīyā, 61 letters in Persian published as an appendix to Imdād al-mushtāq (ed. Asgāfr 'Alī Thānāwī, Lahore 1915); (13) Kullāyāt-i Ḥimmatīyā, a collection of his poetical works, repeatedly published in India and Pakistan (ed. Cawnpore 1325/1898, Shāhkhōf, dist. Shēkhjōhpūr, n.d.). Most of these compositions are in verse but he never claimed to be a great poet. These books have been published repeatedly in India and Pakistan with the exception of the Ḥimmatīyā on the Maḥμnaw.

He died in 1371/1899 in Mecca widely acclaimed as a great spiritual teacher, at the ripe age of 84, and was buried in al-Maʾālā, the historic graveyard wherein also lie buried Khadījā, the first wife of the Prophet, and his uncle Abū Taibī. **Bibliography:** Asgāfr 'Alī Thānāwī, Imdād al-mushtāq, Thānā Bhaṅwān 1327/1909; idem, Karāmāt-i Ḥimmatīyā, Shāhkhōf (dist. Shēkhjōhpūr) n.d.; idem, Kamālāt-i Ḥimmatīyā, Shāhkhōf n.d.; idem, Mawābūt-i Ḥimmatīyā, Lahore 1966; Muhammad Irtiqla Khan and Muḥammad Ahsan Nāgrān, Shāmāmīn-ī Ḥimmatīyā (Urdu transl. of Shamsim-i Ḥimmatīyā, Lucknow 1897; Amīr Shāh Khan, Amīr al-riwāyāt, ed. Muḥammad Tāyīb under the title Awarāt-i thulātha, Deobānd n.d.; 'Ashīk Ilaḥt, Taqīkhārīr al-Rasālī, ii and iii, Meerut 1905; Muḥammad Anwār al-Hassān, Anwar al-riwāyāt, Imdād al-mushtāq, Karachi 1957; 'Ashīk Ilaḥt, Rahmān, Taqīkhārīr al-Rasālī, Deobānd, Karachi 1954, 69-90; Imdād Sābirī, Sīrat-i Hādījī Ḥimmatī Allāh. . ., Delhi 1951; Rashīd Ahmad Gaṅgōhī, Imdād-al-sulūk, Persian translation of an Ar. treatise entitled Risāla Makhkīyā, Shāhkhōf n.d.; anon., Hādījī Imdād Allāh, Thānā Bhaṅwān n.d.; Husayn Amīdī Mādānī, Naqī-i ūsēlī, Delhi 1954, ii, 42-5, 53-63; Gazetteer of the Muzaffarnagar District; Rahmān 'Alī, Taqīkhārīr-i laṣmāmī-ī Hind,
Cawnpore 1949, 28-9; 'Abd al-Hayy Lakhnawi, Mudallal al-Munshi, Hyarabad (India), viii (in MS); IMDAD 'Alam, Farangiyah 'Ali Dji, Delhi 1949, 7-12; Nadhir Ahmad Deobandi, Taqdirat al-'Abd al-Mu'umin wa-imad-al 'Arifin, Delhi 1333/1915; Muhammad Husayn b. Bakhsheh 'Ali, Mas'har al-'ilmad wa taridim al-'ilmad wa 'l-humad (composed 1371/1899), MS in the library of Madrasa Kirdiyah, Bad'uni; Muhammad Ayyub Kaki (ed.), Makkhibi Hadrat 'Aliiddi 'Imam Ab'd al-Mu'umin, Karachi (Oct.-Dec. 1957), 41-9; Sayyid Muhammad Miyad, 'Ulam-d'i Haakb aw ure Muddjiadhiana Karnaume, i, Delhi n.d.; Storey, i/2, 1055, 1345.

(A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

IMMOLATION [see DBIDIN]

IMPIETY, IMPIOUS [see KAFIR]

IMRAN, IMRA'LI [see EMRELI]

IMRAN (Ibneb) 'Amram (modified to an authentically Arabic name, cf. Horovitz, Koranischen Untersuchungen, 128), name given in “Israelite” history as related by Muslim authors to two persons: the first appears in the Bible but not in the Kur'ân; the second vice versa. The first is the father of Mûsâ, Hûrân and Maryam (q.v.), the son of Kâhiy (Kohah, the son of Lâwî (Levi) according to the Biblical genealogy (Exodus, vi, 20) followed by al-Ya'âbî, ed. Horovitz, 51 (tr. G. Smit, Bijbel en Legende, 1932), al-Mas'udi, i, 92; tr. Pellat, i, § 85; others, for example al-Tabari, i, 443, and the Kâlûb al-Bad' wa 'l-tarîkh, iii, 81/83 insert between 'Imran and Kâhiy, Yishar, who according to the Bible was the brother and not the father of 'Amram.

Rabbinal legend referred to 'Amram as an important person in Egypt. In the fabulous version of al-Mas'udi, i, 92, 93, he was again betrayed and went to the Azd in Rudh (relying on information obtained from members of the Sufriyya, 527, f); Ash'arî, Mahallî, 120, 5; 'Agâhî, vii, 152-7; Amin, Mu'tahfî, 91; 'Abdali, Mu'tafî, ii, 256; Ibn Hadjar, Aynî, i, 276; Ibn 'Abidîn, ed. M. Gauderfroy-Demobymes, Mahomet, Paris 1957, index s.n. 'Imran(‘Amran; for the Jewish legend, see L. Ginsberg, The legends of the Jews, ii, 1949, 229 = 1957 ed., p. 331).

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, viii, 113; Dâhid, Bayan, i, 132, 136; Mubarrad, Kâmîl, 530-8 (relying on information obtained from members of the Sufriyya, 527, 7); Ash'arî, Mahallî, 120, 5; 'Agâhî, vii, 152-7; Amin, Mu'tahfî, 91; 'Abdali, Mu'tafî, ii, 256; Ibn Hadjar, Aynî, i, 276; Ibn 'Abidîn, ed. M. Gauderfroy-Demobymes, Mahomet, Paris 1957, index s.n. 'Imran('Amran; for the Jewish legend, see L. Ginsberg, The legends of the Jews, ii, 1949, 229-56, v, 1925, 390-7.

(J. EISENBERG—[G. VAJDA])

‘IMRAN B. HITAN, a famous Arab sectarian and poet. He hailed from the Banu 'l-Harith b. Sadûs, a clan of the Banû Shaybân b. Dhuw. He was first a Sunni, and is mentioned by Ibn Sa'd (vii/1, 113) in the second class of the “followers” (tablûn) of Banû 'Alâ, a name given to the transmitter in the collections of the Banû 'Alâ, Abû Dâwûd, and Nasâ'i. It is said that he was converted by his wife to the doctrine of the Khawârij (q.v.) and became the leader of their moderate wing, the Sufriyya (q.v.), which rejected indiscriminate political

murder (isti'âd [q.v.]) and were lenient towards those Khawârij who sometimes abstained from fighting and stayed at home (al-ba'âd). They were interested in theological problems, and 'Imran had no equal as their muftî and the expounder of their doctrines. Of his life very little is known. When the great revolts of the Khawârij started in the reign of 'Abd al-Malik, 'Imran was persecuted by order of al-Hâjîdâlî and had to leave Basra. Under a false name he found refuge with Bedouin chiefs in the desert, but had to move on to Khawarîd (q.v.) in Basra, the Khawarîd started in the reign of 'Abd al-Malik, which did not however prevent him and his band on occasion from continuing to pursue his favourite occupation.

For a year he stayed in Syria with Rawb b. Zinbâ al-Dîjââmî, a favourite of 'Abd al-Malik, who inadvertently led the caliph to detect his guest's identity. So 'Imran fled to Zufar b. al-Hârîth al-Kilâbî, the leader of the Khayyâylân. This happened apparently before Zufar was besieged and subdued by the caliph in 71/689. 'Imran then fled to Oman, where they were living many followers of Abû Bîlîl (see MIRSAI B. UDAYWA); they received him kindly, but he was again betrayed and went to the Azd in Rûdî Maysân near Kûfâ or according to others (Yâmû, iii, 889) in Fârîth in the district of Wâsît. He died there in 84/793.

'Imran had a great reputation as a poet; according to Faraḍâk (Agâhî, vii, 232) he would have been counted the greatest poet of his time, had he not devoted all his verses to the cause of the Khawârij. His diwâns, mentioned by Yâkût, U'dâbî, vi, 133, is lost. He lamented (Kâmîl, 550, etc.) the death of Abû Bîlîl, who was killed in battle in 61/680; he eulogized (Agâhî, vii, 153, etc.—the whole poem is extant in al-Âamâsâ al-Bâsiriyâ) Ibn Muldjam (q.v.), the murder of 'Ali. In other poems he praises his hosts Zufar (Kâmîl, 532 f.; Agâhî, vii, 254), Rawb (Agâhî, vii, 253) and the Azd (Agâhî, vii, 154; see above Yâmû, i, 448). Some of his verses contain pessimistic reflections on life and death.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, vii/1, 113; Dâhid, Bayan, i, 132, 136; Mubarrad, Kâmîl, 530-8 (relying on information obtained from members of the Sufriyya, 527, 7); Ash'arî, Mahallî, 120, 5; 'Agâhî, vii, 152-7; Amin, Mu'tahfî, 91; 'Abdali, Mu'tafî, ii, 256; Ibn Hadjar, Aynî, i, 276; Ibn 'Abidîn, ed. M. Gauderfroy-Demobymes, Mahomet, Paris 1957, index s.n. 'Imran('Amran; for the Jewish legend, see L. Ginsberg, The legends of the Jews, ii, 1949, 229-56, v, 1925, 390-7.

(J. W. FÖCK)

‘IMRAN B. SHAHIN, one of the best known of the bandit-lords who, from the marshes of the Badhâ (q.v.) where they were entrenched, periodically defied and even threatened the authorities of Baghdad itself. A native of al-Dîjâmîa, a place between Wâsît and Basra, 'Imran was obliged to go into hiding following a crime which he had committed, and then on led the life of a brigand, for which the region where he dwelt was very suitable. He next entered into relations with Abu 'l-'Ismân al-Bârîdî (see al-Bârîdî), who saw in him the man he needed to defend the marshes against his enemies.

But as his banditry was threatening the security of the road to Basra, the Bûyûq Mu'izz al-Dawla was several times obliged to send troops against him; this however, because of the local conditions, produced no result, and the government soldiers were usually lured into some place from which they could not escape. Mu'izz al-Dawla was reduced to appointing 'Imran officially governor of the region, which did not however prevent him and his band on occasion from continuing to pursue his favourite occupation.
Repeated attempts by Mu'izz al-Dawla and his successor Bakhtiyar to put an end to his situation by force were no more successful than formerly; Bakhtiyar was in fact reduced to asking 'Imrān's help to fight against 'Aḍud al-Dawla, the bandit receiving the official laḥab of Mu'ān al-Dawla. He remained master of the marshes until his death in 369/979 and passed on his power to his son Husayn, with whom 'Aḍud al-Dawla had the same experience as his predecessors had had with his father; however in 372/982-3, Husayn was killed by his brother Abu 'l-Haydja, who himself suffered the same fate the following year at the hands of the bādīq al-Muzaffar b. 'All [q.v.], who had been a general under the rule of his father, and who then proclaimed as ruler a son of Husayn (a minor) named Abu 'l-Ma'ālī; but soon afterwards he established himself in his place, basing his authority on a forged title of investiture bearing the signature of the Būyid Șanşām al-Dawla. On one other occasion, in 412/1021, a son of 'Imrān, Abu 'l-Haydja b. Muḥammad, attempted to seize power, but he failed.

Bibliography: See especially Miskawayh and 'Abd al-Malik al-Ḥamadhānī, Takhmila; see also Būyids.

AL-‘IMRĀNĪ, Muʿīn al-Dīn al-Ḥindī, distinguished theologian and scholar of Delhi, whom Shaykh 'Abd al-Haqq Muḥādhdhī calls usād-i șahr, "teacher of the (whole) town". He wrote commentaries on Kanz al-’dāvīya, al-Manār, al-Muḥāfīz, al-Takhkīs, al-’Uṣūmd and Talwūth (for MS, Zuhayr, cited below). Muḥammad b. Tughlūkh (725/52-1324/51) held him in high esteem on account of his erudition and sent him to Shīrāz to persuade Kādī 'Aḍud al-Dawla to come to India. The ruler of Shīrāz received him with respect, but persuaded the Kādī to decline the invitation from Delhi. 'Imrānī was at first critical of the sūfis, but his pupil Mawlānā Khādījī gradually drew him to the mystic path, and he developed a devotion to Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Ḥaḍīḏ [q.v.]; according to the author of the Ma’ārīḍī al-walāyāt, he received khīḍāfī also from him.

Bibliography: ‘Abd al-Haqq, Abhāb al-ṣawārī, Delhi 1309, 142; Muḥammad Ghwāthi al-Saḥārī, Gāzir-i ʿabīrā, MS As. Soc. of Bengal, fols. 22-23v; Faqīr Muḥammad, Ḥaddah al-Faṣāfī, b. Rehman, Kishān, Gawār; Khālīm Muʿīn al-Dīn ‘Abd Allāh, Maʿārīḍī al-walāyāt, MS in personal collection, i, 450-1; Ṣaḥīnān ‘Alī, Taḏḥīḥa ‘ulamā‘-i Hind, Lucknow 1914, 228-9 (Urdu tr. by Ṣaḥīnān, Karachi 1961, 499-500); Elliot and Downow, vi, 486; Ghūlām ‘Alī ʿAṣād, Maʿārīḍī al-hārūm, Agra 1910, 184-5; idem, Subḥat al-mardjūn fi ʿl-hār Hindustān, Bombay 186, 37; M. G. Zuhayr Ahmad, The contribution of India to Arabic literature, Allahabad 1946, 266, 399.

( K. A. NIZAMI)

IMROZ, Ottoman name of the island of Imbro, in the Aegean Sea, some 15 km off the southern end of the Gallipoli peninsula (Thracian Chersonese), and thus of strategic importance as commanding the entrance to the Dardanelles, Șançal-Keke Boghaft [q.v.]. In 1444, when it was visited by Çyrılç, a journal, it was still Byzantine (although the neighbouring islands of Thasos and Samothrace were in the hands of the Gattilusio family). When news of the fall of Constantinople (857/1453) reached it, it was still Byzantine (although the province of Panakale, pop. (1960) 5776.

During the First Balkan War, Imroz, with the other Aegean islands, was taken by the Greek fleet (November-December 1912); Greece maintained possession of the island, which was formally ceded to her by the Treaty of Sèvres (August 1920). By the Treaty of Lausanne (July 1923) it was returned to Turkey, with the stipulations that it be demilitarized and that its predominantly Greek population be excluded from the proposed exchange of populations [see MURADE]. It is now the province of Çanakkale, pop. (1960) 5776.

Bibliography: Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Imroz; W. Miller, The Gattilusio of Lesbos (1355-1459), in Essays on the Latin Orient, Cambridge 1921 (repr. Amsterdaml 1964), 313-53; idem, The Ottoman Empire and its successors, 1801-1927*, Cambridge 1927 (repr. London 1966), index; Pir Re'is, Kitāb Bahriye, Istanbul 1935, 94-6; I. H. Qamīs, Kronologi, i and iv, index; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie, i, Paris 1909, 84-7; Kāmūs al-ʿIlām, ii, 1935. For a hākimāna of 925/1513 (showing that the islanders enjoyed several exemptions), see O. L. Barkan, Kanūnār, Istanbul 1943, 237-8. For a recent description of the island: Turkey (Naval Intelligence geographical handbook), 1943, i, 76. See further the articles on the islands whose history is closely linked with that of Imroz in: Hittit, AAME, DSEMENDEIRE, TAKMAKAL (especially LIMNI.

IMRū al-KAYs [slave of [the god] Kays], by-name of several Arab poets. Al-Āmidī mentions ten of them (al-Mu'allīf wa-l-mu'llīfāt, Cairo 1961, 5-9), while Fīrūzābdī lists eleven of them (al-šāmās al-mu'llīf, Cairo 1930, ii, 244) and the Suyūṭī fifteen (Muṣḥar, Cairo 1968, ii, 456). Taking account of all the variants in their genealogies, H. Sandūbi has drawn up a list in which their number reaches twenty-five (Abhāb al-Marāshīsa wa ashrūkum fi l-dhāhīyya wa-sādīr al-İslām, printed as a continuation of Şarh ālīsu Imro z al-Kays [Cairo 1959, 233-368]. The most famous of all these poets is Imru’ al-Kays b. Ḥudīr [see next art.]. Mention should also be made of the following two: Imru’ al-Kays [Adl b. Rabī’al-Taghībī, best known under the name of al-Muḥallī, who was the maternal uncle of the Imru’ al-Kays b. Ḥudīr, and according to some, the creator of the form of the classical kašda (Ibn Kusayyib, Șhīr 164-6; Șhīr, viii, 63; Ǧāhīma al-adāb, i, 302-4; Fu’ad Bustānī, Șu’ār 46, and references there given; Sandūbī, op. cit., 231-301); Imru’ al-Kays b. ʿAbī al-Kindī, who is included among the Companions of the Prophet (Sandūbī, op. cit., 339-47 and references there given). (S. BOUSTAVY)
IMRÎ' AL-KAYS B. HUDJR, name of a pre-Islamic Arab poet, who is generally considered to have died circa 550 A.D. Unfortunately the biographical details on the poet come mainly from Kufan writers of the second half of the 2nd/8th century, who practically never give their sources and who very often contradict one another. As little as two centuries later, authors collecting these contradictory facts had denounced them as untrustworthy. Hence the portrait of the poet, so far as it emerges from the existing information, is that of an obscure and semi-legendary personality.

His personal name is reported as ‘Adî or Mulayka or Hûndudûj. In addition to that of Imrû' al-Kays ("slave of the god Kays"), he is said to have had the by-names of Dju 'l-kurîh ("the man covered with ulcers") and al-Malik al-dillî ("the wandering king"); there are also attributed to him three kunyas: Abu 'l-Hârijh, Abû Wabb and Abû Zayd.

On his genealogy the sources disagree. The chain of ancestors given by the Baṣran al-Asma'i differs on several points from those provided by the Kufan Ibn al-A'râbî, the Baghdîdî Mûhammad b. Hâbib or other sources which the Aghdâmî cites without naming them. There is even disagreement over the name of the father of Imrû' al-Kays (Hudjr or al-Simm), that of his grandfather (al-Hârij or 'Amr or Imrû' al-Kays), and of his mother (Fâtima bint Râbi'a or Tamâlik bint '4Amr).

The most usual version of his life may be summarized as follows: as a child he had lived at the court of Hudjr, the last king of the Kinda, of whom he was the youngest son; but soon his passion for poetry, and especially erotic poetry, led to his being expelled from his father's house. Here there comes an episode which has all the characteristics of a romanticized addition: the father, in his anger, instructs his freedman Râbi'a to put the young poet to death and to bring him his eyes; Râbi'a, seized with pity, merely kills a young antelope and takes its eyes to the hasty father. Later, the father repents, learns of the substitution, summons his son and is reconciled to him. Once again however, and for the same reasons, Imrû' al-Kays was expelled from his father's house and began to lead the life of a carefree vagabond. At the head of a band of roughs, he began to wander in the desert, dividing his time between hunting, drinking and song. In order to enliven his libations he had taken with him his singing slave-girls.

It was during a drinking session that he received the news that his father had been assassinated. The Banû Asad had revolted against their ruler and had succeeded in having him killed. From then Imrû' al-Kays's only aim was to avenge his father.

Helped by the Banû Bakr and the Banû Tabîhî, he succeeded in inflicting heavy losses on his enemies and in putting them to flight. His allies, considering that he was sufficiently avenged, refused to continue the fight and abandoned him. It was then that he began to wander among the tribes, at first in Kays, and that of his, after the king of Hira had sent troops in pursuit of him, seeking a refuge. It was thus that he arrived at the court of al-Samawâlî, prince of Taymâ, who gave him refuge in his castle al-Abîl. Al-Samawâlî next recommended him to the Ghassânî al-Hârijh the Lame, who helped him to reach the court of Justinian in Constantinople.

Justinian is said to have received him well and agreed to give him the command of an army whose task was to restore his throne to him and to avenge his father's death. Imrû' al-Kays then set off on the return journey, and he was already near to Ankara when he was met by an emissary bringing him a present from the emperor: this was a shirt of Nessus which poisoned him, covering his body with ulcers and finally killing him. He was thus punished, it is related, for having, while in Constantinople, seduced Justinian's own daughter (though in fact history does not mention that Justinian had a daughter). But neither the crime nor its punishment seems to have destroyed the poet's glory, since it is said that the emperor erected a statue to him on the actual site where he was buried, a statue which was seen by al-Ma'mûn.

This is of course not the only version of the biography of Imrû' al-Kays. The available sources contain other variants, all equally romanticized and agreeing only on the most important points. Furthermore, the facts reported about the poets said to have been in direct contact with him, such as 'Alkama, 'Abîd b. al-Abraq and 'Amr b. Kama, are just as imprecise and suspicious; they throw no light at all on his life. Of the same order are the statements of Nonnosus and Procopius, in which certain modern authors have thought to find a reliable historical basis which would confirm the statements in the Arab traditions. In fact it is now established that the two historians are not referring to Imrû' al-Kays (or Imrû' al-Kais) but to Kaisos, i.e., Kays b. Salama b. al-Hârijh; by the same token, the arguments which some have thought they found in them to prove that Imrû' al-Kays was a Christian are valueless, and this remains a pure hypothesis. It should moreover be pointed out that the Kaisos of whom the two Greek authors were writing was converted by Justinian himself and that he returned home with a Senatus consultum, having been appointed Phylarch of Palestine. Neither of these two sources mentions his death on the way.

The poems which bear the name of Imrû' al-Kays were collected towards the end of the 2nd/8th century by the Kufans Abû 'Amr b. al-Shaybânî and Kâhil b. Khalîfîmî, the Baṣran al-Asma'i and, later, the Baghdîdî Mûhammad b. Hâbib. Based on these collections, two definitive recensions were established during the 9th/10th century, one by Ibn al-Sikkît and the other by al-Sukkari. Ibn al-Nadîm mentions also a partial recension made by Abû 'l-'Abbas al-'Abwâl.

On the authenticity of these poems, we have the testimony of one of these authors, al-Asma'i, who says: "All the poems which have survived under the name of Imrû' al-Kays have been transmitted by Ḥammâd al-Râwîya except for some poems communicated by Abû 'Amr Ibn b. al-'Allî."

It is known that the Baghdadî Muhammad b. Hâbib. Based on these collections, two definitive recensions were established during the 9th/10th century, one by Ibn al-Sikkît and the other by al-Sukkari. Ibn al-Nadîm mentions also a partial recension made by Abû 'l-'Abbas al-'Abwâl.

On the authenticity of these poems, we have the testimony of one of these authors, al-Asma'i, who says: "All the poems which have survived under the name of Imrû' al-Kays have been transmitted by Ḥammâd al-Râwîya except for some poems communicated by Abû 'Amr Ibn b. al-'Allî."

But it is known that the Baghdadî Muhammad b. Hâbib. Based on these collections, two definitive recensions were established during the 9th/10th century, one by Ibn al-Sikkît and the other by al-Sukkari. Ibn al-Nadîm mentions also a partial recension made by Abû 'l-'Abbas al-'Abwâl.

On the authenticity of these poems, we have the testimony of one of these authors, al-Asma'i, who says: "All the poems which have survived under the name of Imrû' al-Kays have been transmitted by Ḥammâd al-Râwîya except for some poems communicated by Abû 'Amr Ibn b. al-'Allî."

It is known that the Baghdadî Muhammad b. Hâbib. Based on these collections, two definitive recensions were established during the 9th/10th century, one by Ibn al-Sikkît and the other by al-Sukkari. Ibn al-Nadîm mentions also a partial recension made by Abû 'l-'Abbas al-'Abwâl.

On the authenticity of these poems, we have the testimony of one of these authors, al-Asma'i, who says: "All the poems which have survived under the name of Imrû' al-Kays have been transmitted by Ḥammâd al-Râwîya except for some poems communicated by Abû 'Amr Ibn b. al-'Allî."

But it is known that the Baghdadî Muhammad b. Hâbib. Based on these collections, two definitive recensions were established during the 9th/10th century, one by Ibn al-Sikkît and the other by al-Sukkari. Ibn al-Nadîm mentions also a partial recension made by Abû 'l-'Abbas al-'Abwâl.

On the authenticity of these poems, we have the testimony of one of these authors, al-Asma'i, who says: "All the poems which have survived under the name of Imrû' al-Kays have been transmitted by Ḥammâd al-Râwîya except for some poems communicated by Abû 'Amr Ibn b. al-'Allî."

But it is known that the Baghdadî Muhammad b. Hâbib. Based on these collections, two definitive recensions were established during the 9th/10th century, one by Ibn al-Sikkît and the other by al-Sukkari. Ibn al-Nadîm mentions also a partial recension made by Abû 'l-'Abbas al-'Abwâl.
form, in terms which vary according to the transmitters, expresses high regard for Imru' al-Kays, and makes him the "leader and standard-bearer" of the poets; the latter praises his ingenuity, affirms his superiority, and stresses the disinterested driving-power which lay behind his poetic production.

Those who have proclaimed his superiority have admired above all the ingenuity of his metaphors and his concise and skilful treatment of various traditional forms and poetic themes. They state also that he was the "king of the kaus" and that his poetic achievements are the work of his maternal uncle Mu'adhil, and that the Banu Bakr consider it to have been 'Amr b. Kamla, as if it had been his companion on his journey to Constantinople. It should however be noted that in spite of the two traditions just mentioned and the arguments of his admirers, the majority of the scholars of Kufa continued to prefer al-Asma'i, and that of Kufa continued to prefer al-Asha to him, those of the two traditions just mentioned and the arguments of the same scholars, sometimes hesitated to prefer him to al-Nabigha.

His *dīwān* was first published by de Slane, in Paris, in 1837. This edition consisted of the 28 poems that formed the recension of al-Ašma'ī. Next there appeared the edition of Ahlwardt (London 1870), which contained 68 poems and which reproduced the recension of al-Sukkari with some additions drawn from various literary sources. The section edited by de Slane was reprinted in various editions appearing later in Egypt, Iran and India. There have been other more scholarly oriental editions, the most important of which were that of al-Sandubi (Cairo 1930) and that of Beirut (1958). The most complete edition remains that of Muhammad Abu 'l-Faql Ibrāhīm (Cairo 1958; 2nd ed. 1964). In it there appears the recension of al-Ašma'ī, another attributed to al-Mu'afdal al-Dabbi and approved by his pupil Ibn al-Arābi (it cannot be very different from that of Abū 'Amr al-Shaybānī, another pupil of al-Mu'afdal, to which the author of the recension refers for certain corrections), as well as the recension of al-Sukkari (67 poems), and some additions which could have originated from the other collections mentioned by Ibn al-Nadim. The total number of verses in this edition is 1399, only 485 of which come from the recension of al-Ašma'ī.

Among the poems in this *dīwān*, it is the *mu'allāba* which has aroused the most interest. Appearing in the collection of the *mu'allābāt*, it was edited and translated, with all the other *mu'allābāt*, into Latin by L. Warner (Leiden 1749), into English by W. Jones (London 1782), Clouston (Glasgow 1881) and Johnson (London 1881), into Swedish by B. M. Bolme (Lund 1824), into French by S. de Sacy (Mém. de l'Acad. des Ins., 1, 411), Caussin de Perceval (Essai sur l'hist. des Arabes, ii, 326-32), and by Raux, into German by A. T. Hartmann (1802), Nödeke (1899) and Gandz (1913), and into Russian by Murkea. It appears also in the various editions of the commentary of al-Zawawi (1st ed. by Hengstenberg, Bonn 1823), that of Nābūs (Leiden 1748 and Halle 1876), that of the Badawi (Calcutta 1834) and of the Turkish commentary by Farsak (Istanbul 1316 H.).

*Imru' al-Kays b. Hudjr — Imtiyāzāt*


**Imtiyāzāt**, commercial privileges, capitulations.

i.—The earliest documentary evidence for commercial privileges emanating from Muslim chanceries in the Mediterranean world dates from the 6th/12th century. While it is unlikely that these documents represent the origin of such privileges, they are, with very few exceptions, unilateral and, from a juridical point of view, represent decrees (mardīm) or even agreements (nd*āb*). The retention of such documents to the head of the community (imām) or his representative (nda*b). The retention of the technical term amān is to be understood as an attempt at the rhetorical concealment of juridical innovation.

All of the commercial privileges included, either explicitly or implicitly, the following provisions with respect to the status of non-Muslim, non-dhimmī merchants in dār al-islām:
1. General security of person and property, including:
   A. Testamentary rights, freedom of worship, burial, and dress.
   B. Repairs to ships, emergency rations, aid against attack by corsairs, and abolition of the
      les naufragi.
   C. Permission to address complaints to the head of the Muslim community.

2. Exterritoriality, including:
   A. Consular jurisdiction.
   B. Consul's salary and other exemptions.
   C. Abolition of collective responsibility.

The oath and affixing an attestation appear to have been limited to such of these privileges as
constituted an instrumentum reciprocum, or which were negotiated in dar al-harb. The period of validity
is occasionally specified in the North African documents, seldom in the Levantine ones, though source
material external to the documents themselves would seem to indicate either indefinite duration or
renewal for two year periods coincident with the appointment of consular representatives for a particu-
lar merchant community.

The question of cross-fertilization between the
concessions to harbis, the Ottoman authorities
imposed its will by threatening to
boycott Ottoman ports. If, after the conclusion of
the English capitulations of 1086/1675. The
Ottomans maintained this terminology; but the
ahdnames, like all documents conferring a privilege, was
drawn up in the form of a berdt (a kind of
*ahd). The oath in the document (for the formula see V. L.
Ménage, in Documents from Islamic chancelleries,
Oxford 1965, 94) is the element binding the Sultan
before God and hence guaranteeing his promise to the
musta'min. The character of the *ahdname as
a unilateral and freely-made grant or concession is
well described by J. Porter (Observations, London
1777, 362). The Sultan retains authority to decide
unilaterally when the musta'min has broken the
pledge of "friendship and sincere goodwill" (biyalar) and
in consequence the *ahdname is rendered
void. It is for this reason that in firman...
precondition of “friendship and sincerity” had been broken (cf. Mas Latrie, Traites de paix, 114-5). When the Venetians were unable to guarantee secure passage by land and sea for Muslim merchants operating in Venice (for whom see A. Sagredo-F. Berchet, Il Fondaco dei Turchi in Venezia, Milan 1860; S. Turan, Venedik’ten Türk ticaret merkezi, in Belleten, xxxii/126 (1968), 247-83), the Ottoman government warned them to remember their obligations to give reciprocal protection (letter of Rustem Paşa, publ. by T. Venetoglu, in Belgeler, i/2, 161; Turan, op. cit., 276). In the capitulations of Turkey’s princes of Anatolia (see below) and in Ottoman ‘ahdnamés, the principle of reciprocity was expressly stated in such matters as compensation for damage inflicted on sea, individual (and not collective) responsibility for debt, the seizing of fugitive debtors, and the protection of the lives and goods of victims of shipwreck (cf. the Venetian capitulations of 947/1540, publ. Gökbilgin, Belgeler, i/2, 248-50). This principle of reciprocity enabled especially dhimmis, Ottoman subjects (Jeys, Armenians, Greeks and Slavs) to engage in business operations in Europe. In Eastern Europe, particularly in Poland, the Levant trade passed almost entirely into the hands of such dhimmis enjoying the Sultan’s protection. Many dhimmis, after serving Western merchants in Levant ports as dragomans, brokers and agents, became powerful rivals to West European merchants in Venice and Leghorn, so that the Venetians and the French contemplated attempting to limit their activities (Ch. Roux, 153; Porter, 433-7; H. Inalcik, Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire, in J. Econ. Hist., xxix (1969), 97-149. The Ragusans, enjoying the status of hizadr-güzar, could profit most from Ottoman protection. Reciprocity was therefore a reality, from which the whole Empire benefited.

I. The creation of musta’mim communities and their privileges. Groups of foreign merchants resident in an Ottoman city or port would choose for themselves a representative to act for them in dealings with the authorities, variously known as bailo (T. balıkoz), consul (T. konsolos) or (for the Florentines) emiss (T. eminenism); the Sultan would grant this representative a berdt setting out his duties and the extent of his authority, and an official of his nation according to his home country’s laws could leave port without his authorization, and he was immune from interference, at his residence, on the road, or at overnight halts; his personal goods were exempt from customs’ dues (for an example of a consul’s berdt see London, PRO, SP 105/334, for W. Rye, of 1039/1629). In the execution of these duties the consul could call upon the assistance of the Ottoman authorities (this power being one of the factors which made it essential for him to hold a berdt). The ambassador and the consul were each granted a tawüz and one or more Janissaries (also termed yasakç; cf. Kurat, Türk-İngiliz müneşabe, pp. 39, 45) by the Sultan, to super-

The consul was empowered by his berdt to supervise the affairs of his millet; to register incoming goods; and to collect the appropriate dues for the ambassador and the consul. No ship of his “nation” could leave port without his authorization, and he resolved disputes and settled suits between members of his nation according to his home country’s laws and customs. His person, his servants and his animals were immune from interference, at his residence, on the road, or at overnight halts; his personal goods were exempt from customs’ dues (for an example of a consul’s berdt see London, PRO, SP 105/334, for W. Rye, of 1039/1629). In the execution of these duties the consul could call upon the assistance of the Ottoman authorities (this power being one of the factors which made it essential for him to hold a berdt). The ambassador and the consul were each granted a tawüz and one or more Janissaries (also termed yasakç; cf. Kurat, Türk-İngiliz müneşabe, pp. 39, 45) by the Sultan, to super-

The consul’s judicial authority, based on the concept of “personality of law” (Venetian caps. of 927/1522, art. 16; French caps. of 977/1569, art. 12; English caps. of 988/1580, art. 16), is a principle going back to the earliest capitulations (Mas Lat. Traité..., 87-9). The French government organised this in the Ottoman Empire by detailed laws and regulations (K. Lippmann, Die Konzularjurisdiction im Orient, Leipzig 1868; A. Benoit, Étude sur les capitulations..., Nancy 1890). Criminal cases and suits between a musta’mim and a Muslim had to be heard in Ottoman courts. Many new articles were inserted into the ‘ahdnamés to ensure that the musta’mim received just treatment in the courts: proceedings could be instituted only in respect of transactions which had been entered in the kādit’s register and for which a kādit’s certificate (a maliyet) had been given (for example in the Venetian caps. of 977/1569, art. 6; English caps. of 988/1580, art. 6); a case could not be heard unless the musta’mim’s dragoman was present (Venetian caps. of 927/1522, art. 17; French caps. of 977/1569, art. 11; English caps. of 988/1580, art. 15); the testimony of a dhimmis was to be accepted in cases between a musta’mim and a dhimmis (Venetian caps. of 927/1522, art. 23); cases and appeals involving more than 4,000 akces

gesch., vii, 249-95; Fr. Ch.-Roux, Les Échelles..., 171-93; R. Paris, Histoire du commerce de Marseille, v, 199-237; comparison of the Venetian, English and Dutch systems, see N. Steensgaard, Consuls and Nations in the Levant, in Scandinavian Economic History Review, x/1-2 (1967), 13-55. In the 17th-17th century, the Western states tried to impose on the Ottoman government their own interpretation of the status of the consul by procuring the insertion into the capitulations of articles declaring him to be the deputy of the ambassador, that he could not be imprisoned, that damages inflicted at sea, individual (and not collective) responsibility for debt, the seizing of fugitive debtors, and the protection of the lives and goods of victims of shipwreck (cf. the Venetian capitulations of 947/1540, publ. Gökbilgin, Belgeler, i/2, 248-50). This principle of reciprocity enabled especially dhimmis, Ottoman subjects (Jeys, Armenians, Greeks and Slavs) to engage in business operations in Europe. In Eastern Europe, particularly in Poland, the Levant trade passed almost entirely into the hands of such dhimmis enjoying the Sultan’s protection. Many dhimmis, after serving Western merchants in Levant ports as dragomans, brokers and agents, became powerful rivals to West European merchants in Venice and Leghorn, so that the Venetians and the French contemplated attempting to limit their activities (Ch. Roux, 153; Porter, 433-7; H. Inalcik, Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire, in J. Econ. Hist., xxix (1969), 97-149. The Ragusans, enjoying the status of hizadr-güzar, could profit most from Ottoman protection. Reciprocity was therefore a reality, from which the whole Empire benefited.

I. The creation of musta’mim communities and their privileges. Groups of foreign merchants resident in an Ottoman city or port would choose for themselves a representative to act for them in dealings with the authorities, variously known as bailo (T. balıkoz), consul (T. konsolos) or (for the Florentines) emiss (T. eminenism); the Sultan would grant this representative a berdt setting out his duties and the extent of his authority, and an official of his nation according to his home country’s laws could leave port without his authorization, and he was immune from interference, at his residence, on the road, or at overnight halts; his personal goods were exempt from customs’ dues (for an example of a consul’s berdt see London, PRO, SP 105/334, for W. Rye, of 1039/1629). In the execution of these duties the consul could call upon the assistance of the Ottoman authorities (this power being one of the factors which made it essential for him to hold a berdt). The ambassador and the consul were each granted a tawüz and one or more Janissaries (also termed yasakç; cf. Kurat, Türk-İngiliz müneşabe, pp. 39, 45) by the Sultan, to super-

The consul’s judicial authority, based on the concept of “personality of law” (Venetian caps. of 927/1522, art. 16; French caps. of 977/1569, art. 12; English caps. of 988/1580, art. 16), is a principle going back to the earliest capitulations (Mas Lat. Traité..., 87-9). The French government organised this in the Ottoman Empire by detailed laws and regulations (K. Lippmann, Die Konzularjurisdiction im Orient, Leipzig 1868; A. Benoit, Étude sur les capitulations..., Nancy 1890). Criminal cases and suits between a musta’mim and a Muslim had to be heard in Ottoman courts. Many new articles were inserted into the ‘ahdnamés to ensure that the musta’mim received just treatment in the courts: proceedings could be instituted only in respect of transactions which had been entered in the kādit’s register and for which a kādit’s certificate (a maliyet) had been given (for example in the Venetian caps. of 977/1569, art. 6; English caps. of 988/1580, art. 6); a case could not be heard unless the musta’mim’s dragoman was present (Venetian caps. of 927/1522, art. 17; French caps. of 977/1569, art. 11; English caps. of 988/1580, art. 15); the testimony of a dhimmis was to be accepted in cases between a musta’mim and a dhimmis (Venetian caps. of 927/1522, art. 23); cases and appeals involving more than 4,000 akces
were to be heard only in the Diwdn-i Humdyun (English caps, of 1010/1601, art. 24); cases arising among themselves (see Belleten, xxvi/93 (1960), 71), in later years the less heavy court fees sometimes prompted Muslims to prefer the consular courts (Steengaard, 23).

By the draft capitulation (see below) of 943/1536, a musta'min who settled in Ottoman territory would have to assume the status of a djinnm, subject to djizya, after ten years residence (although by Hanafi law he was permitted to remain musta'min for only one year; Mevküfati, i, 348). In practice, the Ottomans did not enforce any rule, regarding the musta-‘mins merchants as continually coming and going. Yet from time to time attempts were made to make them liable to djizya (e.g., in 1025/1616, see Belin, Les capitulations, 85; Wood, 56, and later: Basvekâlet Arşivi, DHY, Françalı no. 26, docs. of Rabî’ II 1059 and Radjab 1061).

After Istanbul, the most numerous foreign millets were resident at Smyrna (from the end of the 16th/17th century; chiefly the English, then the French and the Dutch, a few Venetians); Sidon (French); Aleppo (French, Venetians, English, Dutch); Salonicca (after 1066/1658 the French, later other nationalities); Cairo (French, Venetians and, for a time, English). The suggestion that Mehemmed II accorded recognition to various special privileges of the Genoese of Galata and that these privileges were later extended to the Latın milleti (Magnifica Communîtā di Pera) (see M. A. Belin, Hist. de la Latinité de Constantinople, Paris 1854, 166) needs re-examination (see for the moment, Belin, op. cit., 156-65; E. Dallegio d’Ale- sio, Traité entre les Genois de Galata et Méhmet II, in Échos d’Orient, xxix, 161-75; T. C. Skeat, Two Byzantine documents, in BMQ, xviii (1953), 71-73).

In the original text of the ‘ahdnamâ (in Greek) dated 23 Djamâda I 857/1 June 1453 (text given by Skeat, loc. cit.) the Sultan promises, under oath, that he will not bring troops and destroy the walls (according to some translations: he will destroy the walls) and that the Genoese may live there according to their own laws and customs under a Khândmâ elected from among themselves. But when, before leaving for Edirne on 3 June, he visited Pera, he changed his mind (in the light of the demands of public security) and had the land walls destroyed here and there, thus cancelling one of the principal terms of the ‘ahdnamâ; Pera became an entire “Ottoman” town, under the control of a subâh and a kâdî (see ISTAN- BUL).

From the very earliest period the principle of the collective responsibility of the millet for crime (see Diva) or debt had been excluded (cf. Mas Latrie, 92); all the same, the Ottoman government, like other earlier Islamic governments, obliged the musta‘min community to pay a collective fine, a kind of indemnity for damages, when the “guest” nation imposed loss on the “host” state or its populations—through attacks by pirates, failure to pay a public debt arising from the farming of a source of revenue (siltââm, see MülZeım), or the circulation of forged currency (see, e.g., Chardin, i, 15; Abbott, Under the Turk, 237-43; Masson, i, 176): the Ottoman justification for this was that the “guest” nation had thus blatantly infringed its promise to maintain “friendship and sincerity”. These levies must be distinguished from the avanias, Fr. avanies, which paghas exacted for their own personal profit. (The word avanias, signifying collective forced levies of all sorts, derives not deriving to B. Homay, Les capitulations, 57, from A. humâna; but more probably its origin is ‘awds, “anything extorted”, from the root ‘awrd; a connection with ‘awdrîd is most improbable.) The attitude of the central government to the extortion of avanias by paghas varied according to the circumstances and the prevailing climate of relations with the “nation” involved. There are in the Ottoman state archives documents ordering the extortion of avanias (Basvekâlet Arşivi, DHY, xxxi, 177-201; Roux 53-6; R. Paris, 292-316; Svoronos, 56-66). Demands for avanias were contested by ambassadors and consuls in the name of the millet; the coltîma due, collected by consuls on the trade of goods of their millet in order to meet avanias, came to be a regular impost. The Venetians collected 1% on some imported wares, especially cloth (see Brit. Mus, Ms Or. 9053, fol. 282), the French imposed on every ship loading at an Ottoman port a fixed sum graded according to the tonnage of the ship (Masson, i, 176; Svoronos, 70-5).

II. Privileges of individuals.

The number of privileges accorded to individual merchants increased as new articles were appended to the ‘ahdnamâ. These were in practice long-standing rights recognized by custom, which, through the pressure of the musta‘mins, were progressively codified as specific articles in the capitulations (for a systematic description of these old articles, see Mas Latrie, 83-110).

The amân, which guarantees the harbî’s right to travel within the dar al-șadâm without being enslaved or having his goods looted as ghanima (q.v.), was valid for the whole Ottoman Empire (bi ‘l-djamâl memâlîk-i Othmânîyye); but for the practical implementation of this general amân by the individual, any musta‘min proposing to travel needed to obtain (through the intermediary of his ambassador) and to carry with him a special authorization from the Sultan, an idhn-i humdyn (see J. H. Mordtmann, Zwei osmanische Passbriefe, in Zwei osmanische Passbriefe, in Geschichte der osmanischen Auslandsbeziehungen in der Welt, Vol. III, Belin, 1919, 102; Ménage, loc. cit., 96-9; this document was termed mürsurenmâne; a similar authorization granted by a kâdî or another official was called yol tehdîrîesi; for an article relating to these: Venetian caps. of 928/1521, art. 21). In fact musta‘mins were normally resident only in a limited number of ports, and within these ports in specified quarters and kâhän (the merchants of Sidon were confined to their kâhän, see DHY, Françalı 26/1, a document of 1059/1649; but in other places, Smyrna, Aleppo and Galata, they enjoyed considerable freedom of movement). The kâhän registers reveal instances of foreigners being enslaved by Muslims (e.g., Bursa, Siğfillât; cf. Derschmann, Tagebuch, ed. F. Babinger, Munich 1923, 42). Separate articles permitted them, in order to avoid maltreatment, to wear Muslim dress and to carry arms.

The residences of musta‘mins could be searched by Ottoman officials only if there was a suspicion that they were harbouring fugitive criminals or slaves, or smuggled goods. The abuses to which this exception opened the way gave rise to new articles (e.g., French caps. of 1153/1740, art. 65). As to a musta‘min’s property, if he died in the Ottoman Empire leaving a will, his property went
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Guarantees for travel by sea elaborated from the
principle of amdn did not figure in the early works of
M. Khadduri, 109-17), but are found in the
earliest capitulations (Mas Latrie, 97), so that a
musta’min was entitled to invoke amdn when
threatened by a Muslim ship. But it should be noted
that the principle of reciprocity appears most clearly
in those articles concerning relations at sea. The
Ottomans seem to have regarded their suzerainty as
extending over the Aegean Sea, the Black Sea, the
Red Sea, the Straits (Bosphorus and Dardanelles) and
the Strait of Otranto (see the Venetian treaty of 928-
1521), or, in other words, they regarded these waters
as forming part of the Dār al-Islām. In 1595-1747,
during the War of the Austrian Succession, the
Ottomans attempted to forbid French and English ships
from engaging in hostilities east of a line from the
tip of the Morea to the Western extremity of Crete
and thence to Egypt. In 1109/1697, all warlike de-
monstrations were forbidden off Ottoman ports
without a formal threat of the citadel (PRO, SP 105, 33; 9109/1698). As in earlier capitulations, so in the
Ottoman ‘ahdndmes, musta’mins were granted free
navigation by sea, with security against attacks by
Muslim vessels; the right to anchor in Muslim har-
bours and to take on supplies and water at any point
on the coast; exemption for ships and crews from
being impressed for any angarya duty; help and
protection at sea or if driven ashore; security for
their persons and their goods if they were compelled
for any reason to land; joint protection against
pirates; and indemnity for losses due to piracy
(Venetian caps. of 928/1521, arts. 4, 5, 7, 13, 14, 22,
25, 26; French caps. of 977/1569, arts. 1, 2, 13, 15, 17;
English caps. of 1086/1675, arts. 1, 3, 4, 6, 17, 19).
As long as the “Barbary Pirates” were under Ottoman
suzerainty, new articles were drawn up to ensure
peace, e.g. M. Khadduri (French caps. of 1094/1684,
arts. 19, 20; English caps. of 1086/1675, art. 47). In
the 11th/17th century when mussim’sms’ ships were
permitted to engage in the carriage of passengers and
goods between Ottoman ports, new articles appeared to
cover this (e.g., English caps. of 1086/1675,
arts. 43-4).

IV. Guarantees for the free transport and
sale of goods.

These matters are usually dealt with in the first
articles, immediately following the declaration of
the grant of amdn, and to them were later added
additional articles framed to deal with abuses. They
reserved the right of local authorities and masters
of Ottoman warships to search for prohibited or
smuggled goods (articles against abuse of this right:
French caps. of 103/2604, arts. 30, 32, 44; English
caps. of 1086/1675, arts. 17, 20, 23, 33). It was con-
ceded that after ships had been inspected in Istanbul
and in the Bosphorus they need not be inspected
again at Gallipoli (Venetian caps. of 928/1521,
art. 26). Occasionally a customs officer would force
a merchant to unload goods against his will (hence
art. 17 of the French caps. of 103/1604); local mer-
chants would intrigue or exercise pressure to buy
goods at a price they determined (hence art. 33 of
these last caps., art. 5 of the English caps. of 1086/
1675), or to sell at their own price (hence docs. in
DHY, Français no. 1675). The price was the price
as it was on the market, in the port of destination.

Various obstacles were encountered by foreign
merchants when, for example, the Ottoman state
from time to time prohibited the export of various
wares (especially cereals, leather, cotton and metals)
in order to prevent the starving of internal markets,
or granted monopolies or ilfidms for the sale of
different commodities; these gave rise to new articles
in the capitulations (French: art. 14, English:
art. 53)—although the usual remedy was to resort
to widely-organized smuggling (Masson, i, 417).

In their earliest ‘ahdndmes the Ottoman authorities
were content to prescribe that customs and other
dues should be levied “according to custom and the
current regulation” (Talet ve kandn userte), without
mentioning a specific percentage. Hence Mehemmed
II had no difficulty in raising the custom’s rates
from 2% to 4% and finally, at the end of his reign,
to 5%, 5% was the general rate in the 10th/16th
century, but the Ottoman customs tariff varied ac-
cording to the status of the importer, the nature of
the commodity, and the area where it was enforced;
now or was clearly distinguished from dues levied
on goods in transit within the Empire (see Maks).
As a result of the numerous disputes provoked by
these inconsistencies, the musta’mins succeeded,
without great difficulty, in getting the minimum
customs rates fixed at 3% (for the history of this
struggle, see Wood, 27) and in obtaining exemption
from all other dues (i.e., principally bāshābıyı or
bāshā-akces, maşarıyı, rafiyı, yazakel, bâdı—
for all of which, see Maks). The traditional practice
of making payments to clerks and servants in the
custom’s department brought the customs rates
up from the official 3% to a real 4½%,. Some
commodities were also subject to additional duties:
cotton to kandn-resmi, silk to måmåh-resmi, etc.
Again, each ship had to pay to the high officials of the port at which it called a
fixed sum (at first 300 akčes, in the 11th/17th century
9000 akčes), under the name of selâmlık or selâmsiyı. Musta’min merchants also had to contribute to the
support of their ambassador and consuls, by paying
a due of 2'/4% as “consulage” (T. kösosos hahhı or
bâshā-hahhı). The usual remedy was to bring basic
customs duties, brought the total rate in practice
to at least 9%. In order to prevent disputes the
ambassador finally managed to procure the estab-
lishment of fixed tariffs and their inclusion in the
capitulations (e.g., the English capitulations of 1086/
1675, arts. 62-5).

B. Historical Survey.

(1) Period of the Italian maritime states (700-1300-
1569).

The Seljuk sultans of Anatolia had granted com-
mercial privileges to the Kingdom of Cyprus and
to the Venetians as early as 603/1207 (O. Turan,
Türkiye Selçukluları hakkında resmi vesikalari,
text to survive dates from Dhu ‘l-Ka’d 616/January
1220 (Tafel and Thomas, i, 438, ii, 143; O. Turan,
Turkia, 96, 33, 122, 124, 127). For a French merchant in Konya in 1225, see Belin, 37).

When the Ottomans first entered Rumeli in 753/
1352 [see CELİBOI] they were in friendly relations
with Genoa (then at war with Venice) and granted
her the first Ottoman capitulations. Although this
first text is lost, that of 19 Dhu ‘l-Ma’d 1789/June
1387 has survived (Latin text in Silvestre de Sacy,
Notices et extraits, xii/1, 59-61: cf. M. Belgrano,
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in *Atti della Soc. Lig.,* xiii, 146-9). The oldest commercial concession to a Latin state made by a Turkish prince of Anatolia is in the peace treaty of 1348 between the Holy League (the Papacy, Venice, the Knights of Rhodes, Cyprus) and the Aydin oglu Khider Beg (text in Tafel and Thomas, iv, 313); but as early as 711/1312 Rhodian merchants had been operating in the principality of Menteşe (Heyd, i, 36), and a commercial agreement was later concluded. Venetian consulates were established in the middle years of the 13th century, the capitulations of 915/1509 (Kalekci and Palatia (Balat) (Heyd, i, 545). When, under Bâyazed I, these places came under Ottoman suzerainty, the Sultan confirmed these privileges and extended them to "all places under his rule, by sea and by land, in Anatolia and Rumelia" (in G. M. Thomas, *Diplomatarium,* iv, no. 134). From the time when Edirne was occupied by the Ottomans (762/1361) Venice was attempting to obtain capitulations from the Sultan (J. Bratianu, *Études Byzantines,* Paris 1938, 167). In 786/1384 she was making diplomatic advances in order to procure permission to import grain from Ottoman territory and to establish a commercial settlement on Ottoman soil, preferably at Usküdar opposite Gâlata (Thomas, *Dipl.,* ii, no. 147; F. Thiriet, *Regestes,* i, 165). The peace treaty of 922/1419 mentions an agreement between Venice, the Sultan, and the Prince of Epirus, but in 936/1528 Murad I (Thomas, *Dipl.,* no. 172). Bâyazed I used his power to permit or withhold grain exports as a political weapon against Venice (M. Silberschmidt, *Das Orient, Problem ...* , Leipzig 1923). In the period of civil war after the battle of Ankara, Ottoman pretenders recognized the necessity to conciliate Venice. Süleymân Celebi actively sought Venetian support (Forja, Nosi, i, 122), and in the peace agreement of 806/1403 for the first time granted important concessions to the members of the League (Venice, Byzantium, Genoa, the Knights of Rhodes) (text in Thomas, *Dipl.,* ii, no. 159). Mûsa Celebi confirmed these at Phanar on 13 Džumâdâ I 814/3 September 1411 (Thomas, *Dipl.,* no. 164). There followed the agreements of 17 Shawwâl 822/5 November 1419 (Thomas, *Dipl.,* no. 172), 15 Dhu 'l-Hijja 833/4 September 1430 (ibid., no. 186), and 3 September 1431. The final agreement of 6 Dhu 'l-Qa'dâ 866/1 January 1458, original in Archivio di Stato, Venice, was permitted, besides the privileges formerly conceded, permission to trade with Kefe and Trabzon in the Black Sea. In 904/1498, before embarking again on war with Venice, the Ottoman Sultan granted a capitulation to the Kingdom of Naples (S. N. Fisher, *The foreign relations of Turkey ...*, Urbana 1948, 61). In the Ottoman-Venetian treaty of 24 Ramadan 909/24 March 1503, the concessions were further extended (Marino Sanuto, v, 42-7; cf. Bonelli, *Il trattato ...*, 363). These were renewed by Selim I (6 Shawbân 919/17 October 1513) and Süleymân I (27 Muharram 928/17 December 1521) (Turkish originals in Archivio di Stato). It is noteworthy that the treaty of 2 Džumâdâ II 947/2 October 1540 (L. Bonelli, *Il trattato ...*, 332-3; W. Lehmann, *Der Friedensvertrag,* and now (Turkish text) T. Gökbelgin, in Belgeler, i/2, 121-8), the commercial privileges were extended, the Arab lands and Bosnia being included,—but Trabzon and Kefe were excluded. The hostile relations between Venice and the Ottomans in the years 978/1570-980/1572 facilitated the intervention of a new competitor in the Levant-France. Until this time Venice had enjoyed commercial predominance in the Levant, in Istanbul, and in Egypt. (For the later Venetian capitulations see Murat Bâhi, *Toestra Yezâmid, Library, MS Esad Ef. 2362, 63-70; (Rabîb II 1204/ December 1595) Belin, in *JA,* VII Series, viii, 384-442; cf. Noradoungjian, i, 408-9.)

With the Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt, the value of capitulations increased enormously. Selim I renewed the capitulations granted by the Mamlûk sultans to Venice (see B. Moritz, *Ein Firman des Sultan Selim für die Venetianer,* in *Festschrift Sachau,* 429 f.) and the consul of the Catalans and the French (at Gazzara, in Rabîb II 923/May 1517; for the Italian and French texts of the terms as renewed by Süleymân I, see Charrière, i, 121-9). The suggestion that these more elaborate capitulations were the model for the capitulations later granted to the states of Western Europe (J. H. Mordtmann, *Die islamisch-fränkischen Staatstrakte,* in *Zeitschrift für Politik und Diplomatie,* xxv/3-4 (1949), 225-58) is an exaggeration: the Ottomans seem rather to have followed the practice of the Anatolian emirates.

The capitulations granted to the joint Catalan-French consuls in Egypt was not in fact an instrument between states. In 943/1536, however, the King of France, seeking the profit from the close relations he had established with the Sultan, attempted to obtain a direct capitulation for France. The *tratté* which his ambassador J. de la Forest drew up in discussions with İbrahim Paşa (see Charrière, i, 285, introduction) was not confirmed by Süleymân (cf. Charrière, i, 203, art. 17)—and soon afterwards İbrahim was executed (22 Ramadân 942/15 March 1536). This draft, as finally drawn up by de la Forest, bears the form of a treaty concluded between two equal parties: this is the sole example of such a "treaty" among the "capitulations" (all the others of which were granted as unilaterally conceded) (cf. Charrière, i, 293-4, art. 17)—and soon afterwards İbrahim was executed (22 Ramadân 942/15 March 1536). That the document remained only a draft is clear from Rûnun's letters sent from Istanbul (Charrière, i, 359, 396-7, 413-4); its text was discovered only in 1777 by the Comte de Saint-Priest in the papers of d'Aramon (see G. Zeller, *Une légende qui dure ..., in Revue d'hist. mod. et contemporaine,* ii (1955), 127-32; and (in answer), M. E., *Les capitulations de 1535 ne sont pas une légende,* in *Annales E.S.C.,* xix (1964)).

(a) Period of the predominance of the states of Western Europe (977/1569-1188/1774).

The first authentic Ottoman-French capitulations are those of 7 Džumâdâ II 1371/17 October 1569. Those attributed to the reign of Süleymân (Belin, 89) must be that the sultan's renewal of the Mamlûk capitulations, which had been extended to embrace the whole Ottoman Empire (Charrière, i, 125). A new capitulation in 977/1569 became necessary through the accession of Selim II and the imposition in Egypt of a measure which destroyed French commerce (see Safvet, in *TOEM,* iii, 993, and the introduction to the capitulations). The King sent Claude du Bourg to Istanbul to regulate this affair (Charrière, iii, 64, note 1;
Mission diplomatique de Claude du Bourg, in Revue d'Hist. Dipl., 1895), and he, without difficulty, obtained from the Ottoman government the right to trade in Constantinople (see art. 16, and the charter published by I. H. Uzuncarşı, in Belleten: xli/5i (1950), 615, doc. 2). In trade, London 1933, 21-71). Two enterprising London merchants, William Harborne and acquiring raw materials like tin and steel which were required for making arms. By a letter of 4 Ramadan 987/25 October 1579, Elizabeth had asked the Ottoman government, ignoring French protests, to sail under the protection of whichever power they wished.

As a result of the fierce competition between the European states, a “most favoured nation” clause began at this period to figure in capitulations (e.g., the English capitulation of 1580, art. 19). Other new clauses too which the Western states caused to be inserted in their capitulations are a reflection of the contemporary situation and pressures. In the new English capitulations obtained by Lello in 1610/1601 (Turkish text in Feridun, Munsha’dt, ii, 38:1) 17 new clauses appear (see Sanderson, Travels, London 1931, 282-7): the “most favoured nation” status of England is confirmed; the Dutch are put under the English flag (a defeat for the French); gold and silver currency are exempted from customs dues and permitted to circulate freely. This last clause is connected with the trade in silver currency (see art. 19), which was then an important economic question (see H. İnalcık, in Belleten, xv/60 (1951), 656-61). Another important clause was that subjecting the English to ad valorem duties on goods they brought in from Venice and other places: this encouraged other nations, subject to a 5% rate, to ship their exports under the English flag. In a later renewal, a clause was inserted to combat the misuse of bills of exchange (Noradounghian, i, 195, art. 58).
In Djumada II 1086/September 1675, during the embassy of John Finch, a new capitulation was drawn up embracing all the earlier privileges and the khat-fi sherif of the Ottoman Empire in Europe. The new clauses granted as an unveiled gesture of reciprocity for political assistance. By a khat-fi sherif of 1101/1690, the French won the reduction of customs dues in Egypt from 10% to 3%, and the return to the Catholicos of various sacred sites in Jerusalem (Paris, *Hist. de Marseille*, 89-90). When France made peace with the Habsburgs in 1109/1697, the Porte turned to England; the English were granted the monopoly of the carrying trade by sea between Egypt and Istanbul, and an English consulate was opened in Egypt (Fedden, *op. cit.*, 13-14). A rapprochement with France between 1128/1716 and 1153/1740 changed the picture again: the Marquis de Villeneuve, who acted as intermediary in the negotiations leading to the Treaty of Belgrade (1152/1739) and brought his sovereign's guarantee of it (see A. Vandal, *Une ambassade française en Orient sous Louis XIV*). At this time, Paris 1887), obtained the most extensive privileges yet conceded (1153/1740; Turkish text in Mu'âkedhat mejmû'âsî, i, 14-35; Fr. text in Testa, i, 186-210; Noradounghian, i, 277-300). The Sultan even confirmed these capitulations on behalf of his successors (cf. the Prussian capitulations of 1174/1761 in Mu'âkedhat mejmû'âsî, i, 90). The Ottoman government thus sacrificed the valuable bargaining counter that new capitulations had to be negotiated at the beginning of every new reign. The new clauses contained nothing of great substance. In the following years the French held an unchallenged position in Levant trade and in transportation between Ottoman ports (see R. Paris, 93-109). Each state of Europe which was enjoying any degree of economic development was now forming a Levant Company and attempting to obtain capitulations from the Porte. The Ottomans responded, following a policy of weakening the privileged position held by France, England and Holland (Sweden: 1149/1737, text in Noradounghian, i, 239, Turkish text in Mu'âkedhat mejmû'âsî, i, 146; the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies: 1153/1740, text in Noradounghian, i, 270; Denmark: 1170/1766, Fr. text in Noradounghian, i, 308, Turkish text in Mu'âkedhat mejmû'âsî, i, 52; Prussia: 1174/1761, Fr. text in Noradounghian, i, 315, Turkish text in Mu'âkedhat mejmû'âsî, i, 83; Spain: 1197/1783, Turkish text in Diewdet, Ta'riîkhî, ii, 338-43 and Mu'âkedhat mejmû'âsî, i, 212, Fr. text in Noradounghian, i, 344). In granting these capitulations the Porte was swayed chiefly by the political aim of acquiring friends in Europe (see especially the account of the Spanish negotiations in Diewdet, ii, 184-203).

The new stage had been fully entered when the supremacy of the Western nations in the Levant was threatened by the reluctant concession, under pressure, of capitulations to the Habsburgs and to Russia —to the Ottoman Empire's two powerful enemies.

(3) The capitulations as an instrument of European imperialism.

As early as the middle of the 13th/15th century, German merchants from Augsburg and Nuremberg had been active, under Venetian protection, in Instanbul (see H. Kellenbenz, *Handelsverbindung zwischen Mitteleuropa und Istanbul*, in Studi Veneziani, ix, 193-9). Customs documents also attest the import of cloth overland from Breslau into Ottoman Hungary (L. Fekete and Gy. Kaldy-Nagy, *Rechnungsbucher von 1570*); the Ottoman government had enjoyed since 1014/1603 (Feridun, ii, 340 and 341). At the end of the 17th century, when the Ottoman Empire in Europe was beset by dangers and the Porte needed diplomatic support from Western powers, the institution of the capitulations entered a new stage. Henceforward, new privileges were granted as an unveiled gesture of reciprocity for political assistance. By a khat-fi sherif of 1101-1090, the French won the reduction of customs dues in Egypt from 10% to 3%, and the return to the
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trade, with a customs rate of 3%; furthermore, Jesuit priests were allowed to reside in Ottoman domains and be wished for the wounded (art. 14). Russia sought to take an active part in Levant trade by founding a trading company (H. Hassinger, Die erste Wiener Handelshompanie, 1667-1683, in Viertelj. für Soz. und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, xxxv/1 (1942), 53). In the upshot, hostile between the two empires prevented these commercial privileges from being effectively exploited. Although by the Treaty of Carlowitz of 1111/1699 (art. 14) the Ottomans agreed to protect the caravan of European nations to the nations subject to the Habsburg Emperor, the latter obtained full capitulations only after the Treaty of Passarowitz (1130/1718) (Fr. text in Noradounghian, i, 220-7; Turkish text in Mu'âhêddät meğîmêtâsî, iii, 112-20). By these, ships were allowed to navigate freely on the Danube—but not to enter the Black Sea (art. 20); the Emperor could establish a consulate wherever another state had a consulate and wherever else he wished it; Austrian and Persian merchants were permitted to trade via the Danube and the Black Sea, subject to a customs rate of 5%. It is noteworthy that no oath figures in these capitulations. Trade with Germany expanded, via the Danube, but mainly via Trieste and Venice (H. Grenville, Observations, ed. A. S. Ehrenkreutz, Ann Arbor 1965, 54). These capitulations were renewed in 1160/1747 (Turkish text in Mu'âhêddät meğîmêtâsî, iii, 135-43), the Emperor obtaining the concession that merchants from the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, Hamburg and Lübeck should travel under his flag (as had Genoese merchants since 1137/1725). Rivalry with Russia prompted Austria to exact new clauses and a seneç guaranteeing that they would be honoured (1197/1784, Fr. text in Noradounghian, i, 379-85, Turkish text in Mu'âhêddät meğîmêtâsî, iii, 152-5); these clauses included the right to establish consulates in Wallachia and Moldavia, the same right of navigation by sea (including the Black Sea) and by the great rivers as Russia enjoyed, and the acknowledgement that an Austrian passport alone was a guarantee that they would be treated with the same consideration as Russian passports. Other clauses granted further privileges with regard to criminals (art. 6), diplomatic immunities of ambassador and diplomat (arts. 5 and 9), and the protection of Christians (arts. 7, 8 and 14); and finally, the Czar was granted the title Pâdishâh (art. 13). Since all these privileges were embodied in a reciprocal and bilateral "treaty" (in the modern sense), they differed both in form and in legal character from the əxânâmânes unilaterally granted by the Porte to Russia. For example, five years later the Porte attempted to restrain ships carrying to Russia provisions required for supplying Istanbul, Russia regarded this as a "violation of the treaty" (naqâd-i ışâh: Djewdet, ii, 135). The establishment of Russian consuls in such sensitive areas as Wallachia, Moldavia and Simop led to tension (Djewdet, ii, 144; iii, 125-7). The Porte indeed still evidently regarded capitulations as concessions freely granted to the subjects of friendly powers—but Russia now began to put on the pressure: in the explanatory convention of Aynall Kavak (1193/1779) Turkish text in Mu'âhêddät meğîmêtâsî, iii, 275-84; Fr. text in Noradounghian, i, 338) the construction of Article II of the Treaty of Küçük Kaynardja was reviewed, and it was repeated (art. 6) that it was a mutual engagement which could not be unilaterally denounced. Finally, on occupying the Crimea, Russia forced the Porte to recognize the annexation and to grant a full capitulation of 81 clauses "on the basis of the capitulations granted to the French and the English" (1197/1785: Turkish text in Mu'âhêddät meğîmêtâsî, iii, 285-319; French text in Noradounghian, i, 371-3). In the preamble and the conclusion it was stated that this əxânâmâne was a pact supplementary to the Treaty of Küçük Kaynardja. This instrument was to lend a new character to the Porte's capitulatory agreements with Western powers: in particular, they reacted to the opening of the Black Sea to Russian ships, and at first, hoping to expand her trade, Russia encouraged them (Wood, 180-1). Since the 10th/16th century the English (Wood, 49; Grenville, 49-54) and the French (Mason, ii, 637-55; R. Paris, 455) had repeatedly—but in vain—attempted to obtain annexation to the Black Sea. When Russia was granted this right, they asked the same concession for themselves, on the basis of the "most favoured nation" clause in their capitulations. But this was not granted immediately; the English obtained it in a "note" of 1224/1799 (text in Noradounghian, ii, 35-6) and France by art. 2 of the Treaty of Paris (1217/1802: text in Mu'âhêddät meğîmêtâsî, 36; for the negotiations, see I. Soysal, Fransiz İhtilâl ve Türk-Fransiz mânine betterleri, 1789-1802, Ankara 1964, 315-37); the same right was later granted to other powers (Sardinia, Denmark, Spain, the Two Sicilies, Tuscany; see Noradounghian, ii, 102, 137, 140, 219). (4) Abuse of the Capitulations and attempts to abolish them.

Until the end of the 17th/18th century the Ottoman state in its dealings with the mercantilist nations of Europe continued to enjoy a disproportionately large share of commercial relations with Russia and variously offered the latter privileges in commercial matters and granted generous privileges, based on the concept of əmân, without considering the dangerous results which might ensue. In about 1771 Porter considered (Observations, 357-464) that it was hardly possible to ask for more to be conceded. An expert on the Levant trade recognized (Mason, i, 473) that the Ottoman state afforded "toute la securité et toutes les facilités nécessaires";
he observed also that the Europeans abused these privileges in the most outrageous ways. The growing exploitation had, in the last years of the century, brought the Ottoman Empire to a position of political and economic subordination to Western Europe, so that the French ambassador Choiseul-Gouffier could in 1788 call the Ottoman Empire "une des plus riches colonies de la France" (Masson, ii, 279). Before the 18th century, these privileges presented no great threat to the Ottoman state and its economy, the Ottoman government still being powerful enough to prevent abuses. With the European states used pressure and threats towards the weakened Ottoman state in order to maintain and extend the concessions, and managed to obstruct the correction of abuses.

The abuse which really undermined the Empire was the extension of capitulatory rights to dhimmis subjects of the Porte. The musul'mins from a barbi land enjoyed greater privileges than an Ottoman subject; and some dhimmis hit on the method of winning these privileges for themselves, namely, to obtain from the Porte, through the bribing of foreign ambassadors and consuls, patents of appointment (be-râts) as dragomans. By the capitulations, ambassadors and consuls had the right to employ a stipulated number of dragomans, and by the berât granted to such a dragoman (for specimens, see bagiçekâlet Arşivi, DHY Ecnebi defterleri; London, Public Record Office, SP 105/334) the Sultan exempted both the bearer and his sons and servants from poll-tax (çizzya) and the other taxes to which the ra'âşû were liable. In the 11th/17th century, the Western nations obtained also various diplomatic immunities for their dragomans (see, e.g., art. 45 of the English capitulation of 1086/1675: Mu'addhadî melâmmû'ût'l, i, 252; Noradounghian, ii, 157). Ambassadors and consuls began—for a consideration—to procure such berâts for dhimmis who had no pretensions at all to be dragomans, and so to make quite large sums. These berâlîs (q.v.), or "baratâres" and their servants ("sous-baratâres"), who enjoyed the same privileges, had the same financial and juridical advantages as the musul'mins, and paid the same lower customs duties. In 1208/1793, in Aleppo alone, some 1500 dhimmis merchants held dragomans' berâts only so as to be granted patents of appointment to act as genuine interpreters (Kisbi 'arâ RKhi, âphd Djeved, vi, 130. For the check carried out in Salonica in 1178/1764, see Svoronas, 152; for further checks in 1200/1786 and 1221/1806, see Djeved, iii, 130, 270, viii, 107).

This was not the only abuse. A capitulatory power had also the right to extend the privileges arising from the capitulations to "protected persons" who were not its own nationals, so that an Ottoman subject needed only to obtain a patente from a compliant ambassador or consul to enjoy the privileges accorded by capitulation to foreigners. In about 1225/1808 the Russians had enrolled 120,000 Greeks as "protected persons" (for the "baratâres" and "protégés" see especially F. Rey, La protection diplomatique et consulaire dans l'Empire ottoman sous le sultan Muste'min (Paris 1899). During the reign of Selim III Ottoman statesmen united in a general reaction against the capitulations, and various measures were taken to rescue Ottoman subjects from the unprivileged status to which they had fallen. Thus by a berât granted in 1207/1792, a dhimmi merchant and his two assistants who traded with Europe were granted "all the privileges and exemptions enjoyed by the dragoman of a musul'min and his servants" (see O. Nûrî, Meşjet-î umîr-i beledîyesî, i, 675-8). Such merchants were called "Avrupa提速di'ârî". Shortly afterwards some Muslim merchants trading with Persia and India were, by berât, granted the same privileges (op. cit. 681-5), and called "Khahirîyîye提速di'ârî". Their affairs were regulated by a special administrative system and a special court.

The a'âyân, local despotis who at this period were rising to power in various provinces of the Empire (in Palestine, Şaykh Zâhir and later Djezzâr Ahmad Paşa; in Egypt, Meşmed 'Ali; in Rumelia, Tepeş Mehmed Përshî, Şeyh Zahir and later Dżazzâr Ahmad Paşa), sought to use the profits for their own treasuries, struggled effectively against the evil effects arising from the abuse of the capitulations by such measures as forbidding the export of certain goods, imposing monopolies and farming the sale of monopoly wares, fixing the prices of wares for export and abolishing the rights of navigation enjoyed by musul'mins. The central government too began increasingly to use the devices of monopoly (yedi-i wâhid) and ilîsizâm (q.v.) of export goods in order to increase revenue. This was an old principle, entirely the internal customs duties and other dues levied on internal commerce were matters outside the purview of the capitulations. Nevertheless, in about 1830 the Western powers, and principally England, in the new circumstances created by the Industrial Revolution, were feeling the need that the markets of the Levant should become still more accessible, secure and stable. By exploiting a political crisis England succeeded in this aim through the Convention of Balta Lîman of 1254/1838 (text: Great Britain, Parliamentary Papers, 1830, 291-95; Noradounghian, ii, 249 and note at p. 254; V. J. Puryear, International economics and diplomacy in the Near East 1800-1876, 1969, 117-26). This commercial treaty not only confirmed for ever all existing capitulary privileges (art. 1) but imposed customs duties ad valorem of 3% on imports and 9% on exports (art. 4). This 9% duty represented a rate imposed as compensation for the various duties collected on internal trade, and thus closed one of the loopholes through which the Ottoman government could exercise its freedom in customs' policy. Furthermore, the English obtained the abolition of the old limitations on their population for their own treasuries, and also sought to assure them of safe-conducts and travelling-passes, etc. and of the monopolies: in internal trade they were to enjoy the status of the "most favoured" Ottoman subjects, and could both export and also sell freely within the Empire the goods which they bought. This agreement was followed by others concluded with the other capitulatory nations (Noradounghian, ii). These changes made the Ottoman Empire an entirely open market just at the time when European mechanised industry was seeking outlets for its products. In the next ten years, local industry collapsed (O. Sarp, Ottoman industrial policy, in Ch. Issawi (ed.), The economic history of the Middle East, London and Chicago 1966, 46-60).

One of the basic causes of the Crimean War was Russia's claim, based on a distortion of an old capitulation privilege, to extend her protection over all Orthodox Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire. To counter this, 'Ali Paşa maintained at the Paris peace congress (1856) that since the Ottoman Empire had now joined the European comity of nations, it should be treated according to the rights of nations recognized among them—and hence the capitulations ('âkîl-i âlîâ) should be abolished. It was agreed that the question should be examined at a separate
conference, to be convened in Istanbul (L.-J.-D. Feraud-Giraud, *De la juridiction française dans les Échelles du Levant et de Barbarie*, Paris 1866, ii, 54-8). This news was taken very seriously in Istanbul (A. Fu’ād, *Ridājat-i mühlîmîm-i siyâsîyye*, Istanbul 1928, 70), but the powers never met: in 1861 and 1862, when the commercial treaties were renewed (Noradounghan, ii, 130-91), the capitulations were re-affirmed in their entirety, and a few modifications were made only in customs rates (see MAKS). The statesmen of the Tanzimat generation believed firmly that the first step in the recovery of the Empire was to win freedom from the capitulations. With this aim in view, while taking fundamental measures of reform in the Westernization and secularization of the administration and the legal system, they also sought methods of suppressing at least the worst abuses of the capitulations. By a firman of 1884/1867 (text in Testa, vii, 745-7; Aris-tarchi, i, 16-18; Turkish text in *Dustûr*, i, 230), while foreigners were granted the right to own property, it was also decreed that they should be subject to the same conditions as Ottoman subjects, pay the same taxes, and be answerable to Ottoman courts of law. The French ambassador commented that this new privilege "ensured to European capital the right to develop unlimited mineral, agricultural and foreign riches of the Ottoman Empire" ([*La Turquie*](https://www.persee.fr/doc/letr_0036-4518_1900_num_16_0_590675), newspaper, issue of 12 September 1868). The powers complained that the old exemptions bestowed by the capitulations were not included, but finally accepted these terms (text in Testa, vii, 730-3; for Ziya Paşa’s objections to this new privilege, see Tanzi-mât, i, Ankara 1940, 835-6). At the end of the document the Porte expressly stated that it reserved the right to alter the *şûbâd-ı fattâḥ*, *i.e.*, the capitulations. 4 Ali Paşa at one point (1867) considered adopting the French civil code in order to do away with the abuses of the capitulations (Turkish text: Testa, vii, 526-7), by enacting that a purported change of nationality was void without the approval of the Ottoman government. This provision too the powers were obliged to accept. A little later, in a memorandum circularized to the powers (Testa, vii, 548-54), 5 Ali Paşa, while recognizing that the capitulations bore the character of a "traité", drew their attention the principal points which were abused, maintaining that these abuses were contrary not only to the "law of nations" but indeed to the terms of the capitulations themselves, and that the Ottoman government was obliged to see them rectified. The principal abuses were: the status of the "protected persons"; exemption from the taxes owed by Ottoman subjects; the extraterritorial status of consular courts; the interference of foreign agents in the domestic sphere; the fact that foreigners were not answerable to Ottoman law and civil courts, which their own governments did not recognize; the interference of consular courts in the affairs of Ottoman courts; the dragoman’s claim to take part in the Ottoman judge’s decision (see J. de Testa, *Observations sur le mémoire de la Sublime Porte relatif aux capitulations*, Istanbul 1869). This memorandum had followed a Code of Regulations (*nişâmînâme*) on Consuls (1863: text in Arıstarchi, iv, 15-19) and a Protocol (*matba’a*) on the investigation of foreign criminals (1867); but the powers would not permit modifications with the points of internal taxes, the presence of dragomans in the courts, and the opening of mission schools without the permission of the Sultan, etc.

The other powers were gravely offended when, during the negotiations for the renewal of the commercial agreements in 1890, Germany agreed to the abolition of the capitulations,—but she had made this subject to the agreement of the other powers. The Ottoman capitulations were now weighing even more heavily on the Ottoman Empire because the European powers were extending their fields of activity and extending their capitulary privileges into them, so that the Empire now had no better than a semi-colonial status. Banks, railways, mines, gas and electricity, port installations, ports and telephones—indeed all the important public services—were now in the hands of privileged European companies (see N. Verney and G. Dambmann, *Les puissances étrangères dans le Levant*, Paris 1900; C. Morawitz, *Les finances de la Turquie*, Paris 1902). Behind this abuse of the capitulations and the activities of missionary societies lay the threat of the political and military pressure which an imperialist state could bring to bear. Public opinion in Turkey, at last awake to the dangers, was now violently hostile to the capitulations. From 1908 onwards, every government placed their abolition at the top of its programme (C. BibeL, *Losan*, i, İstanbul 1933, 63). In two memoranda which he delivered to the British government in May 1913, the Grand Vizier Hakki Paşa proposed some urgent modifications, such as the raising of customs’ duties to 15%, the abolition of foreign post-offices, the imposition of a profits tax on foreigners, and the setting up of a commission of lawyers to carry through the complete abolition of the capitulations. Great Britain claimed that for these the agreement of all the powers would be necessary and that the commercial and financial regulations concerned not the capitulations but the recently concluded commercial treaties (British documents on the origins of the War, x/2, docs. 64, 80, 95, 97). With the outbreak of the First World War the Ottoman government took up the abolition of the capitulations. With the British, French and Russian governments as a principal matter determining her attitude towards maintaining neutrality—but the Allies would make no clear promise (Y. H. Bayur, *Tûrîh Inkilàbî târîhi*, iii/1, Ankara 1957, 156-62). Thereupon, by a firman of 17 Şawwâl 1332/8 September 1914, the Sultan proclaimed the abolition of “all the existent foreign privileges known as financial, economic, juridical, and administrative capitulations, so that foreign nationals resident in the Ottoman Empire would be treated in the framework of the general law of nations” (Bayur, *op. cit.*, iii/1, 162; text of the note to the Powers: Bilsel, *op. cit.*, 65-7). Immediately thereafter there was promulgated the “Code of Regulations concerning the separation of şerî‘î courts and *nişâmî* courts”. The capitulary states protested, denouncing this action as unilateral and arbitrary abrogation of treaty rights. By the Treaty of Sèvres the capitulations were restored without modification and their privileges were extended to the other victorious allies; but by the Treaty of Lausanne (24 July 1923) the allies were obliged to accept their complete abolition.

**Bibliography.** I. Archive material: The most important Ottoman source is the series of 106 *Ecnebi Defterleri* in the series *Dowân-i Hümâyûn*.
Defterleri, containing copies of documents relating to the capitulations with European states for the 13th/14th centuries. In the same subject, partly alike, is the Archivio dei Stato, Venice, for which see A. Bombaci, La collezione di documenti turchi dell' Archivio di Stato di Venezia, in RSO, xxiv (1949), 95-107; for the British archives, see A. N. Kurat, Ingilis devlet arşivi ne ve Kültüphanelerinde Türkiye tarihinin bazı malzemeye dar, in AUDTCFD, vii (1949), the important series being PRO SP 105/216 and 105/334. The very extensive material in Western languages in the French archives has been used by P. Mason, A. Vandal, Ch.-Roux, E. Charrière, G. Tongas, V. Svoronos and R. Paris. Documents in English have been used by A. C. Wood, A history of the Levant Company, repr. 1964, see pp. IX-XII.


During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries European trade was carried out in Persia under the protection of farmans given by different shāhs to individuals and companies. These were sometimes of a general nature and sometimes included the grant of privileges and immunities. Those who sought the grant of such farmans and the shāhs who gave them may well have been influenced by the negotiations for the grant of extra-territorial privileges to French subjects in the Ottoman empire in the first half of the sixteenth century (see J. C. Hurewitz, Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East, a documentary record. 1535-1914, Princeton 1956). In 1566 and 1568 Shāh Tahmāsp gave the Muscovy Company farmans in which he accorded them immunity from tolls and customs, freedom of travel throughout the country, protection for their merchants "from all evil persons", legal recovery of just debts, immunity from robbery,
permission to build or buy houses for their own use, and assistance in unloading (texts in Hurewitz, op. cit., i, 40-2).

Thus, both in the case of the Netherlands and France, the judge of the locality (text in Hurewitz, op. cit., i, 18-19). New farmans were granted in 1642 and 1694. On 7 February 1651 a Dutch agent of Shah Safi obtained a grant of extra-territorial privileges for Persian merchants in the Netherlands. This instrument was on the pattern of contemporary arrangements prevailing between European nations (text in Hurewitz, op. cit., i, 20-22). In fact, it did not become operative because Persian merchants did not establish themselves in the Netherlands.

In October 1653 the English East India Company obtained a farman in general terms from Shah Abbas. Two years later, in 1656, Edward Connock obtained a farman framed in more specific terms, which was confirmed by Shah Safi in 1659. It granted freedom of trade and creed and the right to pay the same rates of customs as paid by Persian subjects. English subjects, in the event of their committing disorders, were to be punished by their own ambassador. If any difference arose between English subjects and Persian in buying and selling “if the said differences pass or exceed twenty tomanis, the Justice shall send them to the Ambassador to be decided, that he in the presence of our Justices might do whatsoever shall be conformable to honourable and noble laws” (text in Hurewitz, op. cit., i, 18-20). This farman was confirmed by Shah Sulayman and renegotiated with Shah Sultan Husayn by James Bruce in (or about) 1657 (India Office Records, E/3/51/5410. See further R. W. Ferrier, British-Persian relations in the 17th century, unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Cambridge 1970, 455 ff. See also Calendar of State Papers, colonial, Vol. IV, No. 852, E/3/12/1294, and ibid., No. 857, E/3/12/1296).

The French in February 1665 and December 1671 obtained farmanis giving French merchants trading privileges comparable to the English and the Dutch. On 7 September 1706, however, a treaty was concluded between Shah Sultan Husayn and Louis XIV. By this, French merchants were given the sole right to decide any difference arising between Persian merchants, but the investigation and decision of differences arising between Persians and members of other nations was to belong to the judge of the locality (text in Hurewitz, op. cit., i, 40-2). Thus, both in the case of the Netherlands and France
there was, at least in theory, some degree of reciprocity in the arrangements made. Article 2 the traders and merchants of England and Hindustan in the service of the English government were permitted to settle in Persia and no government duties, taxes, or requisitions were to be collected on any goods which were the property of either of the governments, the usual duties on such to be taken from purchasers (Art. 2). By an Additional Article it was laid down that the duties levied on purchasers of iron, lead, steel, broadcloth, and purperts that were exclusively the property of the English Government were not to exceed 1%. All duties, imports and customs which were at that period established in Persia and India (on other goods) were to remain fixed and not to be increased. Article 4 stated that "If any person in the empire of Persia die indebted to the English Government, the ruler of the place must exert his power to have such a demand satisfied before those of any other creditor whatever. The servants of the English Government, resident in Persia, are permitted to hire as many domestic natives of that country as are necessary for the transaction of their affairs; and they are authorised to punish such, in cases of misconduct, in the manner they judge most expedient, provided such punishment does not extend to life or limb; in such cases the punishment to be inflicted by the ruler or governor of the place". Freedom to build houses in any part of the Persian Empire (Art. 4). Both parties were allowed to have agents or consuls in such cities as they might deem fit (Art. 6). In 1736 the English received a rabam renewing most of their privileges (Selections from State Papers, Bombay 1908, 48), but neither they nor the Dutch or French merchants secured full renewals of their privileges.

On 12 April 1763 an English East India Company agent concluded an agreement with Shaykh Sa'din of Bushire, which gave the English exemption from customs duties on imports and exports and laid down that only 3% should be taken from merchants who bought and sold to the English (Art. 1). The import and sale of woolen goods was to be solely in the hands of the English (Art. 2). The English were to have ground on which they could erect a factory on which they could hoist their colours and have twenty-one guns for saluting (Art. 6). No European nation was to be permitted to settle in Bushire as long as the English had a factory there (Art. 3). The brokers, linguists, servants and others of the English were to be entirely under the protection and government of the English (Art. 4). On 2 July 1763 Karim Khan gave a grant in similar terms to the English. They were given permission to have ground for a factory in Bushire and to build factory houses in any part of the Persian kingdom and were granted the same exemptions, monopolies and privileges as granted by Shaykh Sa'din (texts in C. U. Aitchison, A collection of treaties, engagements and sanads relating to India and the neighbouring countries, Calcutta 1933, xiii, 41-4). On the death of Karim Khan confusion and disorder broke out again. His nephew Dja'far Khan gave a farman to the English for unrestricted trade throughout Persia and exemption from all customs dues (text ibid., 44-5), but this was in fact of little value since Dja'far Khan's writ did not run throughout the province of Fars, let alone the rest of Persia.

In the nineteenth century contact between Persia and Europe was once more joined in a more permanent form by the establishment of commercial relations with the English and French. These relations were the result of the treaty of 1722, which gave the English rights to trade in Persia and on the Persian Gulf. The treaty, which was concluded on the same date under Article 10 of that instrument, fixed the conditions governing the trade of the English and French in Persia without payment of duty on merchandise brought from Russia to Persia for sale or barter, and to permit Russian merchants to build houses and stores to hold their merchandise (Art. 3). The Russian empress for her part promised that the subjects of the Shāh coming to trade "in her states or passing through her states for other lands would enjoy all freedoms and advantages that may be granted according to the customs and charters of her Empire" (Art. 4). Both parties were allowed to have agents or consuls in such cities as they might deem fit (Art. 6). In 1736 the English received a rabam renewing most of their privileges (Selections from State Papers, Bombay 1908, 48), but neither they nor the Dutch or French merchants secured full renewals of their privileges.

On 12 April 1763 an English East India Company agent concluded an agreement with Shaykh Sa'din of Bushire, which gave the English exemption from customs duties on imports and exports and laid down that only 3% should be taken from merchants who bought and sold to the English (Art. 1). The import and sale of woolen goods was to be solely in the hands of the English (Art. 2). The English were to have ground on which they could erect a factory on which they could hoist their colours and have twenty-one guns for saluting (Art. 6). No European nation was to be permitted to settle in Bushire as long as the English had a factory there (Art. 3). The brokers, linguists, servants and others of the English were to be entirely under the protection and government of the English (Art. 4). On 2 July 1763 Karim Khan gave a grant in similar terms to the English. They were given permission to have ground for a factory in Bushire and to build factory houses in any part of the Persian kingdom and were granted the same exemptions, monopolies and privileges as granted by Shaykh Sa'din (texts in C. U. Aitchison, A collection of treaties, engagements and sanads relating to India and the neighbouring countries, Calcutta 1933, xiii, 41-4). On the death of Karim Khan confusion and disorder broke out again. His nephew Dja'far Khan gave a farman to the English for unrestricted trade throughout Persia and exemption from all customs dues (text ibid., 44-5), but this was in fact of little value since Dja'far Khan's writ did not run throughout the province of Fars, let alone the rest of Persia.
term "capitulations" is applied only to the régime instituted by the Treaty of Turkomancay. Strictly speaking, the term is applied to the extra-territorial rights granted by that treaty and extended to other nations under most favoured nation treatment. In practice, however, the capitulatory régime covered also, or was closely connected with, trading privileges, and became closely associated with the question of protection, which in turn became connected with asylum, both matters which gave rise to many disputes between Persia on the one side and Great Britain and Russia on the other.

By Article 1 of the separate act relative to commerce Russian subjects provided with passports were to be allowed to trade throughout Persia. Persian subjects were to be allowed to import their merchandise by the Caspian or the land frontier between Persia and Russia and to enjoy most favoured nation treatment. By Article 2 contracts, bills of exchange, securities and other engagements in connection with business transactions between Persians and Russians were to be registered before the Russian consul and the governor (hakim). Merchandise imported into Persia or exported from Persia by Russian subjects and Persian produce imported into Russia by Persians or Russian merchandise exported from Russia by Persians were to be liable to a duty of 5% levied once and for all at their entrance or exit. Russia undertook not to increase the duty of 5% should the demand arise to make new customs regulations and new tariffs (Art. 3).

Articles 5, 7, and 8 were specifically of a capitulatory nature. Article 5 stated that, "Seeing that, according to the existing usages in Persia, it is difficult for foreign subjects to find houses, ware-rooms or proper places for the storage of their merchandise to let, it is permitted to Russian subjects in Persia not only to rent, but also to acquire, by every right of ownership, houses to dwell in, as well as ware-rooms and places in which to deposit their merchandise. The servants of the Persian Government shall not be allowed to enter by force the said houses, ware-rooms or places without having recourse, in cases of necessity, to the authority of the Minister, or of the Chargé d'Affaires, or of the Consul of Russia who shall depute an officer or dragoman to be present at the inspection of the houses or the merchandise".

Article 7 read "All lawsuits and litigations between Russian subjects shall be submitted exclusively to the investigation and decision of the Mission or of the Consuls of Russia in conformity with the laws and customs of the Russian Empire. So also shall disputes and lawsuits arising between Russian subjects and those of another Power, in case the two parties shall consent to such a course. Whenever any disputes or lawsuits shall arise between Russian and Persian subjects, the said lawsuits or disputes shall be brought before the Hakim or Governor, and shall not be investigated and decided except in the presence of the Dragoman of the Mission or of the Consulate. Once judicially disposed of, such disputes shall not be allowed to be instituted a second time. If, however, circumstances should be of such a nature as to render a second trial necessary, it shall not take place without previous intimation being given to the Minister, or the Chargé d'Affaires, or the Consul of Russia; and in that case the action shall be brought and decided only in the Dufter, that is to say in the Supreme Court of the Shah at Tabriz or at Teheran, likewise in the presence of a Dragoman of the Mission or of the Russian Consulate".

Article 8 stipulated that "In case of murder or any other crime committed among Russian subjects, the investigation and decision of the case shall be within the exclusive province of the Minister, or Chargé d'Affaires, or Consul of Russia in virtue of the jurisdiction delegated to them over their own countrymen. If a Russian subject should happen to be implicated with individuals of another nation in a criminal suit, he shall not be prosecuted nor molested in any way without proofs of his participation in the crime; and even in that case, as in the one in which a Russian subject should be charged with direct culpability, the tribunals of the country shall not be competent to proceed with the trial and judgment of the crime except in the presence of a delegate of the Mission or the Russian Consulate, and if there should be none on the spot in which the crime has been committed, the local authorities shall take steps to send the delinquent to a place where there is a Consul or a constituted Russian agent. The evidence both for and against the accused shall be faithfully taken by the Hakim and by the Judge of the place, and attested by their signature; transmitted in this form to the place where the offence is to be tried; this evidence shall constitute a record or authentic summary of the proceedings, unless the accused should clearly demonstrate the falsity of the same. When the accused shall have been duly convicted and the sentence passed, he shall be handed over to the Minister or Chargé d'Affaires or Consul of His Imperial Majesty, who shall send him back to Russia, there to receive the punishment awarded by the law" (text in ibid., pp. xxii-xl). From time to time as regards the payment of customs duties and exemption from internal tolls and road taxes the subjects of other European powers were placed on a similar footing to the Russians, but this was resisted by Persia, and in 1851 the Ministry for Foreign Affairs announced that the subjects of all countries not having commercial treaties with Persia would be called upon to pay the same duties as Persian merchants. In due course, however, many European and American states acquired capitulatory privileges by either special articles included in treaties concluded between themselves and Persia or a clause giving most favoured nation treatment. The Treaty of Paris 1857 also accorded most favoured nation treatment in the matter of customs duties by Article 1 of the commercial treaty concluded with Persia in 1842 (text in ibid., xlii-xliv). Similar privileges were acquired by France (1855), the U. S. (1856), Austria-Hungary, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway and Sweden (1857), Greece (1861), Italy (1862), Germany and Switzerland (1873), Mexico and the Argentine (1902), and Chile, Uruguay, and Brazil in 1903 (see A. Matine-Daftry, La suppression des capitulations en Perse, Paris 1930, 67-81.). The capitulations were less elaborate in Persia than in the Ottoman Empire and less burdensome. They were, nevertheless, onerous, particularly because of the derogation of sovereignty which they involved, the privileged position which they gave to foreigners in matters of trade and the inviolability of their persons, domiciles, and goods, and the opportunity which they gave to Persian subjects to place themselves outside the authority of the Persian law if they succeeded in obtaining the protection of a
foreign power. Their operation depended much upon the circumstances of the moment and the temper of the diplomatic officials concerned.

Special tribunals under a department of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, known as the diwan-i mu'ahhadat-i hādiyīga and staffed by officials of the ministry, were set up in the capital for the settlement of disputes between Persians and foreigners. In the provinces, representatives of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, known as karghūdāris, presided over special councils for the same purpose. A general supervision of the activities of foreigners. Unlike the Ottoman empire, the procedure and machinery for the settlement of disputes by these courts was of the rudest kind (cf. A. C. Wratislaw, A consul in the East, London 1924, 190). Foreign consuls had, in effect, the power of veto because the decision of the court could not be put into effect unless counter-signed by the consul (Matine-Daftary, op. cit., 79-80).

Throughout the nineteenth century and in the early twentieth century there was a constant state of contention and friction between the Persian government and the agents of foreign powers arising out of the capitulary regime, but it was not until the Great War of 1914-18 and the unilateral abrogation of the capitulations by Turkey in 1914 that serious consideration was given to their abolition in Persia. In 1918 the cabinet of Šāmsān al-Dawla announced their unilateral abolition. This was followed by nothing more than a declaration of intent and was of no immediate effect. A demand for their abolition submitted by the Persian government to the Peace Conference in March 1919 was also abortive: the delegation, for reasons unconnected with this demand, was not received. On 26 June 1919, however, there was an exchange of notes with the Soviet government on the abolition of Russian consular jurisdiction. In the following year, on 1 June, a treaty was signed with China which contained no extra-territorial provisions, showing the lines along which the Persian government was thinking. On 26 February 1921 a treaty was concluded between the Soviet government and the new Persian government, which had seized power by a coup d'état early that year. This treaty was the first major step in the abolition of the capitulations. Article 7 declared that there would be no Russian consular jurisdiction in Persia. Article 16 confirmed the abolition of consular jurisdiction over Russian subjects in accordance with the note of 26 June 1919, and declared that subjects of the Soviet Union in Persia and Persian subjects in the U.S.S.R. would enjoy equal rights with the nationals of the country and be subject to the local tribunals of justice. (Texts in Alitchison, op. cit., i.xxxvii-xxxv. See also Matine-Daftary, op. cit., 151-3).

The Persian government under Rīdā Khān (who became Rīdā Shāh in 1925) now embarked on a vigorous programme of modernization. This involved, inter alia, the promulgation of civil, commercial and penal codes, the recruitment and training of judicial officials to apply the new laws, and the abolition of the capitulations. The commercial code was passed in three parts in February, April, and June 1925, and the penal code promulgated in February 1926. In 1927 after a reconstruction of the government all judicial tribunals were dissolved and the new minister of justice, Mr. Davar, authorised to prepare bills for the reorganization of the judicial system. On 26 April 1927, at the opening meeting of the commission charged with this work, Rīdā Shāh announced his wish to abolish the capitulations (Matine-Daftary, op. cit., 180, 210). Following upon this, the president of the Council of Ministers, Mustawfi al-Mamalik, announced in the National Assembly on 30 April that the government would include the abolition of the capitulations in its programme (ibid., 211). Towards the end of the year a commission was appointed to draw up a civil code. On 10 May 1928 it came into provisional operation. On the same date the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs delivered notes to the legations concerned denouncing all treaties containing capitulare provisions and stating that they would cease to be effective as from 10 May 1928 and that states which enjoyed similar provisions by virtue of most favoured nation treatment would cease to do so after 10 May 1928. Provincial tribunals presided over by the karghūdāris were dissolved by the law of 12 Shahrivar 1306/3 September 1927 (ibid., 222-5).

Bibliography: In the text.

(A. K. S. LAMBTON)

iv.—Modern Egypt

Muhammad 'All and his successors, especially Sa'id and Ismā'īl, were eager to attract foreigners and promote their economic activity in Egypt in order to modernize and Europeanize Egypt as rapidly as possible. Moreover, for political considerations they felt the continuous need of conciliating the European Powers. As a result they permitted the privileges of foreign powers to expand far beyond the limits fixed in the texts of the Capitulations. Almost all these privileges grew in Egyptian usage to much larger proportions than in other parts of the Ottoman Empire.

(a) The privileges of foreigners in Egypt

1. Taxation. The fiscal clauses of the Capitulations were primarily aimed at exempting Western European states from the heavy burdensome taxes. However, in nineteenth century Egypt they were interpreted as denying the Egyptian government the right to impose any taxes on the nationals of Capitulatory Powers without the previous consent of their governments. There was one exception to this rule: the obligation to pay a land tax was tacitly accepted by foreigners as incidental to the privilege to own land, a privilege that was granted to foreigners in 1785 and that was formally conceded by law in the Ottoman Empire in 1867. But even the payment of this tax involved many complications (cf. G. Baer, A history of landownership in modern Egypt, London 1952, 65-6). The payment of all other taxes by foreigners had to receive the explicit consent of the Powers. Customs were covered by commercial treaties (see below). The Convention of London, signed on 17 March 1885 by the six principal European Powers, accepted the house tax decree of 13 March 1884 (with certain modifications concerning the representation of foreigners on the tax commissions). In 1890 the Powers agreed that the newly established municipality of Alexandria be entitled to impose municipal taxes on foreigners. In 1930 consent was given to an additional rate on urban property for the payment of night-watchmen; similarly, during the years 1932-6 a tax on cars and some minor taxes were conceded. However, before the abolition of the Capitulations in 1937 the Powers prevented the introduction of many other taxes in Egypt, for instance an income tax.

2. Customs. There was no difference between the customs tariffs of Egypt and those of the Ottoman Empire before the Khedive of Egypt had been given the right to conclude commercial conventions
3. Individual liberty. Foreigners in nineteenth century Egypt enjoyed greater individual liberty than in other parts of the Ottoman Empire in two respects. First, the Ottoman regulation that no church could be built or repaired without the explicit permission of the authorities was not enforced in Egypt. Second, in Egyptian usage the Ottoman restrictions on the freedom of foreigners enacted in 1844 and 1869 were not applied. Thus Egyptian authorities generally did not ask foreigners disembarking in Egypt for passports nor were they required to carry a tadhkira (q.v.).

4. Inviolability of domicile. In Egypt the principle of inviolability of domicile was considerably expanded and included the premises of any business. For instance, in Turkey customs officers used to visit all vessels entering harbours and keep officers on board till the cargo was landed. In Egypt, on the other hand, they could only watch the discharge and seize contraband when it was actually on shore. The privilege of exemption from search was claimed even for fishing boats by their Maltese, Greek and Italian owners. The restrictions of this privilege which were agreed upon between the Sublime Porte and the Powers in 1868 and 1874 did not apply to Egypt, and only in the commercial agreements between Egypt and the Powers of the 1880's and the 1890's did Egypt acquire effective rights to search vessels for detecting contraband.

5. Legislative immunity. In Turkey, there had been the Tampin-decrees, which Nubar was compelled to be contented with. In Egypt, on the other hand, the powers under the Ottoman law were applied to foreigners (Scott, 198). In Egypt the foreigners' immunity from local legislation was complete. No Egyptian law was applicable to foreigners unless it had received the explicit consent of the Powers. This principle frustrated many attempts to introduce modern institutions (e.g., Sa'id's police regulations; for its detrimental influence on the development of municipalities see G. Baer, The beginnings of municipal government in Egypt, in Middle Eastern Studies, iv/2 (Jan. 1968)).

6. Jurisdiction before 1876. The principle of the personal, rather than territorial, nature of law found in Egypt its most extreme application. Gradually the maxim actor sequitur forum rei became well established, i.e., the defendant's court had jurisdiction in all cases, not only in cases involving foreigners of different nationalities but also in other parts of the Ottoman Empire. Thus the consular courts claimed jurisdiction in any criminal, commercial or civil case in which one of their nationals, or even 'protected persons', was the defendant. Moreover, in Egypt, but not in Turkey, cases concerning immovable property involving foreigners of different nationalities were also judged in the consular court of the defendant. The consuls normally applied the laws of their own countries. If an appeal was made, it had to be addressed to the defendant's home court, and for the execution of the consul's sentence in criminal cases the foreign criminal often had to be sent to his home country.

In addition to the reasons for the general expansion of foreign privileges in Egypt mentioned above, this difference between Egypt and other parts of the Ottoman Empire has been explained by the rule of most of the Capitulations that cases involving foreigners and Ottoman subjects which exceeded a specified sum should be judged by the Imperial Delaw. Since travel from Egypt to Istanbul was long and expensive, it was generally preferred to submit the case to the court of the defendant (Barakat, 173).

(b) Judicial reform and the abolition of the Capitulations

1. Mixed Courts before 1876. Attempts to establish a unified system of courts at least for cases in which persons of different nations were involved, as well as to provide for Egyptian representation on the bench in cases in which Egyptians were the plaintiffs, were made in Egypt even prior to similar attempts made in Turkey. A mixed commercial tribunal was established in the early 1820's under the presidency of Muhammad 'Ali's agent, the prominent merchant Muhammad al-Mabruki (F. Mengis, Histoire de l'Egypte sous le gouvernement de Muhammad-Aly, Paris 1923, ii, 447; for 1824-1827-8 see Amin Sânî, Talâhim al-Nil, Cairo 1928, ii, 335). After long periods of inactivity the Mixed Commercial Tribunals were reorganized in Alexandria and Cairo according to an order of 3 September 1861 which provided for the appointment of Egyptian and foreign members and of an Egyptian president. However, these tribunals never worked effectively since foreigners did not recognize their competence in cases in which they were the defendants and had recourse to them only when they were the plaintiffs (Stoddart to Aberdeen, 31 December 1845, Public Record Office, London, F. O. 78/624, and Report by Consul Green, 2 April 1856, F. O. 78/1222).

2. The reform of 1875. In a report of 1867 Nûbîr Pashâ, at that time Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs (Tieck's) proposed the establishment of mixed courts with jurisdiction in all cases in which foreigners were involved—commercial, civil, or criminal. After long negotiations, in the course of which Nûbîr was compelled to be contented with reforms more modest than his original ideas, the Réglement d'Organisation Judiciaire was enacted in 1875. The new Mixed Courts, which were established in 1876 according to the Réglement, had jurisdiction in all civil and commercial cases between foreigners of different nationalities and between foreigners and Egyptians. Their power extended also to foreign litigants of identical nationality in all cases concerning land held in Egypt, and even to cases where an Egyptian corporation was involved against Egyptian litigants if there was foreign capital invested in the corporation (so-called 'mixed interests'). In the sphere of criminal law, the Mixed Courts were only empowered to deal with police offences of foreigners for which the maximum penalties were a fine of 50 lira or one week's imprisonment, and offences committed directly against the administration of justice by the Mixed Courts themselves. All other penal offences of foreigners were dealt with by the consular courts, which also retained jurisdiction in matters of personal status of foreigners.
and civil actions, other than those involving land, between foreigners of the same nationality.

Foreign judges of the Mixed Courts were appointed by the Egyptian government after consultation with the Ministers of Justice of the countries from which they came, and the proportion of their number to that of the Egyptian judges was fixed. There were three District Tribunals and one Court of Appeal, as follows (data for 1937):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egyptian judges</th>
<th>Foreign judges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court of Appeal, Alexandria</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Tribunal, Cairo</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Tribunal, Alexandria</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Tribunal, Manṣūra</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the Mixed Courts were open to nationals of all foreign states, their establishment involved conceding new privileges to nationals of non-Capitulatory Powers.

The Mixed Courts judged according to 'Mixed Codes' based mainly on the Code Napoléon and French law. Since these codes could not be altered without the unanimous consent of fifteen governments, a Legislative Assembly was established in 1911 which was competent to approve additions and modifications (but not to endorse measures contravening the fiscal immunity of foreigners).

3. The abolition of the Capitulations and of special jurisdiction of foreigners. At the outbreak of the First World War the Turkish government declared the abolition of the Capitulations, which was subsequently recognized by the Capitularies in Article 28 of the Treaty of Lausanne 1923 (including financial legislation) and the Mixed Courts were permitted to submit themselves to the jurisdiction of the Native Courts. All vacancies up to two-thirds of the total membership of the District Courts were to be filled by Egyptian judges, who were also permitted for the first time to become presidents of these courts. Judgment was to be given in Arabic as well as in a European language.

On 15 October 1949 the Mixed Courts and the Consular Courts were closed, jurisdiction was transferred to the National Courts, and the law codes were revised and unified.
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IMUḤAGH, IMUṢHAGH. [see AHAGGAR, BERBERS, TAWĀ'RĪK].

IMZAD (Berber) or ʿimzad, ʿumzad according to the dialect, "hair, fur", denotes a musical instrument in use among the Touareg (Tawārīk q.t.), and generally compared with a violin. The sounding-box consists of a half-calabash of varying diameter (20 to 50 cm.), over which a goatskin, tanned quickly and stripped of hair, is stretched and fixed with cord or acacia thorns; often decorated with motifs painted in bright colours or with inscriptions in tifinagh [see BERBERS, vi], the goatskin is pierced with one or two sound-holes (in Ahaggar, tinjagg, tinj "eye") either to the right and left of the bridge, or between the bridge and the visible part of the wooden neck which passes under the taut goatskin and emerges on the other side. At each end of the neck the single string, formed of horse-hairs coated with resin, is fixed by means of a thin strip of leather; the tension of the string, which is held above the goatskin by a bridge composed of two small strips of wood tied together in the form of a cross, is regulated by means of a "noose" consisting of a moveable strip knotted to the neck, its distance from the end being adjustable. The bow is a curved wooden wand semi-circular in shape, between the ends of which is stretched a string also made of horse-hair coated with resin from the gum-tree instead of rosin.

The ʿimzad is held by the player on her thighs as she sits low down, just above the ground, with legs tucked back; her left hand holds the outer part of the neck, with the thumb on the noose, the right hand holding the bow at right angles to the string, pointing towards the chest. Thus the ʿimzad is "constructed partly like a percussive instrument, held like an instrument with plucked strings, and played like an instrument with a bow"; the playing of the ʿimzad is the subject of a technical study (see Bibl.) from which it appears that the music played on this instrument is of an archaic kind entirely unconnected with Islam.

In the time of Father Ch. de Foucauld, the ʿimzad was "the favourite musical instrument, noble, elegant par excellence" which in some measure symbolized the Touareg's fatherland. It was played in the courts of love known as aṭṭ, and to deprive men of music was a severe punishment, particularly after an unsuccessful raid; to play or, more accurately, "to strike" the violin (awt ʿimzad) signified "to utter charming and flattering words". While at that period half the noblewomen played it—though good players numbered only four or five—today this instrument is almost abandoned and it is even forbidden in certain encampments on account of its harmful influence on the young.
The expression **in shā Allah**—or an equivalent—reappears many times in the Kurṣān, especially, it seems, in the sāras of the Medinan period: to leave to God's will the realization of a wish, the announcement of a reward or a punishment, or the future execution of a given order (e.g., II, 70, VI, 41, IX, 28, XI, 33, XII, 99, etc.). Two similar formulas are: "if God had willed" (law; still more frequent), and "so far as God wills it" or "unless God does not will it" (ṣād ma. . .; x, 49, xi, 107-8, etc.). This "leaving to God" required by the *istiṣḥād* may be compared with a similar teaching in Christianity, *James*, iv, 19. The problem arises whether the expression is

**shā Allah** may (or must) be used in the case of a definite promise, of an oath or a giving of witness. The question is whether it is then an attestation "in the form of a circle" (yāmin dā'ira; cf. Massignon, *ibid.*), causing to intervene (by invoking God) a possibility that the attestation made (in the name of God) may be vain. The answer of the devout Muslim is that human oaths and witness "are valid only if they correspond to the divine truth" (*op. cit.*, 586) which transcends our assurances and our resolutions. It is only with God's help that we are able to keep our promises to God and to men.

The use of the *istiṣḥād* in the conclusion of contracts raised arguments among the jurists, who maintained that there was a risk that it might become a "ruse" to escape from the engagements undertaken, or even an abdication from all responsibility. Some, among them Ibn Masʿūd, suppressed the *in shā Allah* only in contracts or attestations "with immediate effect" (*fi l-hal*); others tended to suppress it from every contract or attestation, even those whose effect was in the future: such were the Muʿtazilis and the Māturidis. The Khāridjis on the other hand retained it absolutely; similarly, with some nuances, with Ibn Ḥanbal and al-Aḥṣārī (*ibid.*, 585). One of the aims of *fiḥ* was to restrain any abuse of the *istiṣḥād* by conditions "linking the contracting parties in case of the non-execution of an agreement".

Nevertheless this expression of reliance on the inscrutable will of God had a profound influence on the mentality. One of the main questions raised is that of the relations between faith (*imān* [q.v.]) and the "formula of exception". It can be seen moreover
as a particular instance of the juridical problem concerning contract or witness: inman is a pact (tahd) which is labour'd to God. Is it permitted to say: "I am a believer—if God wills" (anā mu'min—in shā' Allāh)? We give here the main answers of Sunni Islam (cf. L. Gardet, Les grands problèmes de la théologie musulmane: Dieu et la destinée de l'homme, Paris 1967, 385-90).

1. Against the istithnā': (a) Mu'tazilis: Man is "the creator of his own acts", it is a man's own will which makes the believer. Hence the formula "in shā' Allāh" (Kur'ān, XVIII, 29). The "formula of exception" may not therefore be joined to the affirmation of faith. (b) Māturidī-Hanafis: "The believer is truly a believer and the unbeliever truly an unbeliever (kāfir)", it is stated in article 3 of the Wasiyyat Abī Ħanīfah: "there cannot therefore be any doubt concerning faith, nor concerning unbelief,—according to the word of the Most High: 'Those in truth are the believers' (Kur'ān, VIII, 74), 'those in truth are the unbelievers' (IV, 153)" (cf. A. J. Wensinck, The Muslim creed, Cambridge 1932, 125, 138-40). The formula anā mu'min expresses present faith. If a man who at present has faith later dies without faith, he will have changed from happiness to unhappiness, from being saved to being damned (for the Māturidī position in detail, see in particular ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn ʿAllī, Kītab Nazm al-fard'id,* Cairo n.d., 62-4). The attestation given in the present certainly does not have any effect on the divine decree for the Hereafter; the believer must therefore affirm his faith without placing any limit on his witness. (c) Some ʿAshʿarīs, among them al-ʿIṣfārāʿīnī and al-Bākīllānī are against it "through determinism" (L. Massignon, op. cit., 585, n. 2). Acts, whatever they are, being created by God, to invoke the Divine Will has no real significance. 2. Supporters of the istithnā': (a) Ibn Hanbal in particular (ʿAbīlādī, i, 25) and the whole of the Hanball line. It should be mentioned here that the Hanball attitude is against the opposite theory of the Murdhīs; Ibn Baṭṭaṣa insists on this (cf. H. Laoust, Ibn Baṭṭaṣa, 48-97/82). After listing various doctors who desire to join in shā' Allāh to anā mu'min, and quoting a Kur'ānic text and two hadīth, Ibn Baṭṭaṣa states that it is not only "formulation of exception" but not only "formula of...
**INÁL — INAL AL-ADJRUD**

**Bibliography:** All the literary references (Ibn al-Azrak, the continuator of Ibn tfawddith, etc., Middle East; A. Gabriel, *Les sources orientales de la Turquie*, in JA, 1935; supplemented by idem, *Mouvements populaires...*, in Arabica, 1958, 244; and for archaeology and epigraphy, replacing the earlier works, A. Gabriel, *Voyage archéologique dans les provinces orientales de la Turquie*, with the epigraphical supplement by J. Sauvaget, inscriptions nos. 62-5; see also the article ARTUKIDS, and Z. Saba, *Les premiers Urtukides*, Cairo 1961. (C. Cahen, *Les premiers Urtukides*).

**INAL or INALCUK,** the governor of Utrar [q.v.] under Sultan Muhammad Kârazm-Shâh [q.v.]. A kinman of the Sultan's mother, Terken Khatun, he had been given the title of Kaylr-Khan. It was the execution by his orders of an ambassador of Çingiz-Khan [q.v.] and a caravan of Muslim merchants accompanying him that led to the Mongol invasion of Muhammad's empire. Captured at Utrar after offering desperate resistance, he was put to death at Samarkand in the spring of 617/1220.

**Bibliography:** Djuwayni-Boyle, 79-86, 367-8; Barthold, *Turkestan*, 398-9. (J. A. Boyle)

**INAL (or AYNÁL) AL-ADJRUD, AL-MALIK AL-AMIR AL-ASHRAF, SAYF AL-DIN ABU 'L-NASR ABU 'L-NUR AL-ZAHIR AL-NASIRI, Mamluk Sultan (857/1452-865/1461) of Egypt and Syria. A Circassian by birth, he had been bought in 799/1379 by the trader Aynal (or Aynalkus, the governor of Utrar) and sold to Barkuk [q.v.] (al-Malik al-Zahir, latterly Cairo and sold to Barkuk [q.v.] (al-Malik al-Zahir, whence Inal's nisba al-Zahirin). He was enrolled in Barkük's corps of al-Muhtaraat, remaining in the Kidîbiyya until the reign of the sultan (al-Nasir) Faradî [q.v.]. Transferred then (whence his nisba al-Nasirî) to the Kâdâsakhiyya, in 824/1421, under al-Mu'ayyad Shâh, son of al-Mu'ayyad Shâykh, he became a "captain of ten"; under Barsbay [q.v.] he was promoted to Amir al-islâhînÎ, then to Ras' nisbaa, and in 830/1427 to Amir arba'in, Ra's nisba al-Zahirin. Appointed 'amîd of Ghaza in 831/1428, he took part in Barsbay's campaign of 836/1433 against the Ak-Koyunlu chief Kara-Yuluk 'Uthmân Beg, when 'Amid (Diyârbakr [q.v.]) was attacked. The assault on the citadel, vigorously defended by 'Uthmân Beg, was beaten off by the Mamluk force returned to Egypt. In 843/1439, he was summoned to Cairo by the sultan 'Alâ' ad-Dîwân al-Mu'ayyad Shâh, son of al-Mu'ayyad Shâykh, and was appointed 'amîd of Ruhab (Edessa), with the rank of Amir mîta taqâda alî fi 'l-diyr al-Misrîyya. Until 839/1436 he was engaged in numerous skirmishes with the Ak-Koyunlu, and the next year was appointed 'amîd of Sa'dad. In 843/1439, he was summoned to Cairo by the sultan Çâmpak (like him an 'âlî) and was given the post of Mu'addam and then, in 846/1444, of Chief Dawdâr. In 847/1444 and 848/1444 he took part in the unsuccessful attacks on Rhodes.

On the death of Yâshbak al-Sûddîn in 850/1446, Inal succeeded him as 'Alâdîk al-tasâfi (= Al-'Amir al-habîr). When Çâmpak died in 857/1453, Inal fell out with his son and successor 'Uthmân over the donative to be paid to various groups of mamluks; in the subsequent street-fighting he occupied the Kaft al-Djaabal and was appointed sultan, by an assembly including the ('Abhcâsid) shadow-caliph and the four 'âdâdi al-Çacâdi, with the title al-Malik al-Ashraf Sayf al-Din. He was then 73 years old. His first preoccupation was to appoint 'Alâ'is to various posts, to break up the group of royal Mamluks formed by his predecessor, and to proclaim the abolition of various mazlâm-courts.

Inal's brief reign was full of incident. In 857/1453 he sent the second 'amir al-Çakâr Barsbay as envoy to the Ottoman Sultan Mesh ëmedd II in reply to an Ottoman embassy announcing the conquest of Constantinople. The following year he defeated the attempts of the Dhu 'l-Kâdîr-oghlu Fâyâyîd Beg to make himself 'amir of Albâstan, installing instead his brother Sulaymân Beg. In 859/1455 he put down a rising caused by dissension between his own mamluks and rival groups; he deposed the caliph al-Kâ'im, who had been involved, and appointed his brother al-Mustandjid in his place. Ignoring a complaint from the Kârâmân-oghlu Ibrahim II that the Ottoman Sultan had been given the title of Kaylr-Khan, he not only sent an embassy to confirm the good relations with Mehemmed, but also despatched a force under Khoqshâdam to block Kârâmânîd expansion in Câlicia; that these troops occupied four fortresses in Kârâmân and burned Lârenda provoked strong criticism of Inal's policy. The same Khoqshâdam was sent against the Ak-Koyunlu ruler Uzun Hasan [q.v.], who was besieging Malatya.

The next crisis was over Cyprus, which since 830/1427, in the reign of Barsbay, had been tributary to the Mamlûk sultan. The Lusignan king John II (1432-58) had in person attended the ceremonies in Cairo upon Inal's accession. When he died, to be succeeded by his daughter Charlotte (1458-60) (with Louis of Savoy as joint ruler), John's illegitimate brother James, Archbishop of Nicosia (in Mamlûk sources: Dahâm), feeling his life to be in danger, fled to Cairo. The dignitaries of Cyprus and the Knights of Rhodes preferred Charlotte as ruler, but the populace of Cyprus favoured James, who now found support among the Mamlûk amirs. Ambassadors for the various parties came to Cairo, where Inal upheld the claim of James and proclaimed him King of Cyprus. James was sent back with the support of an Egyptian fleet and occupied Nicosia, but was unable to take Chermes (Kal'fat Sharina), held by Charlotte. The Mamlûk troops suffered heavy losses, and the bulk of the Mamlûk force returned to Egypt.

The sources represent Inal as a just ruler and his reign as prosperous, mainly because of his monetary reforms: silver and gold coins of inferior weight were withdrawn from circulation and a new fâls (of eight to the dirham) was issued. He died on 13 Dhjumâd I 865/26 February 1461, at the age of 80 or 81, having reigned for eight years. He was described as dark, tall and thin; his scanty beard won him the nickname âdârîd. He left two sons and two daughters. As Inal had enjoined, his son Ahmad succeeded him, as al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad, but was deposed after four months, to be succeeded by Khoqshahdam [q.v.].


(M. C. Şehabeddin Tekindao) İNAİ, IBN AL-AMIN MAHMÜD KEMAL (in modern Turkish: İnbülemi Mahmûd Kemal İnal), 1870-1957, Turkish biographer and writer, a significant figure as being the last outstanding representative of traditional Ottoman scholarship and erudition. His father Mehmed Emin Paşa (1837-1908), also known as “Mühürdar,” since he held the post of private secretary to his patron and relative Yusuf Kâmil Paşa (1808-76), Grand Vizier under Abd al-Aziz and son-in-law of Muhammad ‘Ali of Egypt) served in various provinces in Anatolia and retired in 1908 as governor (muastaşar) of the Aegean Islands. His mother Hamîde Nûgîs died in 1933.

Mahmûd Kemal’s ancestors came originally from Bukhâra and were known as Seldjûq-oghûl (Selçuklu), a name which was engraved on the personal seals of the family. Later in life he wrote that he regretted having adopted the surname İnal (as a “translation” of Emino) when family names were introduced by law in 1934, and not taking instead their old name Seldjûq-oghûl, as some members of the family did (I. M. K. İnal, Pratt hillatlar, 672, n. 1). The by-name İbn al-ı Amin (İbnul Emîn) begins to appear in his earliest writings, in the 1890s. From the end of the First World War to the dissolution of the Government of Istanbul (1918-22), he served as editor of the official government newspaper Tacirvâmi-i Wehâsî, and in the last two months as head of the Government Chancery (Dîwân-i Humâyûn Bûlgîkâb), in this capacity he represented the Grand Vizier’s office on the special political committee of under-secretaries appointed to draw up the Turkish view on the forthcoming peace-treaty negotiations (Col. İsmet Bey, the future İnönü, represented the Ministry of War on the same committee).

After a temporary appointment in the Administration of the Ottoman Public Debt (Dîvân-i Umûmiye [q.v.]), where he worked in the company of many leading writers and intellectuals of the period, he was in 1924 made president of the Commission for the Classification of Historical Documents (Weţêkî-i Ta’rikhiyye tasmîf heyetsî) by the Ottoman Historical Society (Ta’rikhi-i 6‘elmîname Endûmeni), of which he had been elected a member in 1923. In three years’ concentrated work on the commission he was able to collect valuable material for his later works. In 1927, through the good offices of two of his friends and admirers, the poets Khalîl Nihâd (Bostepe) and İbrahim ‘Alî al-Dîn (Çokun), the new Ankara Government appointed him Director of the Museum for Pious Foundations (Ewâbî: İlamîyeyi Müzesi), later renamed Museum for Turkish and Islamic Arts (Türk ve İslâm Eserleri Müzesi) located in the Süleymaniye Külliyye. He kept this position until his retirement in 1935.

In 1936, with the support of the Egyptian Princess Khadjda ʻAbbâs Halim, he went to Mecca on pilgrimage, and addressed Egyptian Prince Muhammad ʻAlî, then the heir-apparent to the Egyptian throne, invited him (together with the calligrapher Kâmil Ackdik) to Egypt to help classify his collection of Islamic calligraphy. On his return to Istanbul in February 1940 he found himself appointed adviser to the Editorial Board of the Turkish edition of the Encyclopædia of Islam. This was a personal decision of Hasan Ali Yücel (1897-1961), writer and publicist and an able Minister of Education, who during his eight years in office and afterwards constantly encouraged him, urging him to publish his major works (which were mostly in the form of disjointed notes, and were edited as they actually went to the printers). Mahmûd Kemal brought himself to sort his immense quantity of material and concentrate it only when he was officially commissioned to write (A. H. Tanpinar, İbnül Emeno Mahmûd Kemal’de dair, in the introduction to İnal’s posthumous work Hoş sada, Istanbul 1958, p. LIV). From 1940 until his death on 24 May 1957, he devoted most of his time to preparing, correcting and supervising the printing of his books.

Mahmûd Kemal was probably the last surviving example of the old-style Ottoman gentleman, who anachronistically insisted on leading the life of that extinct class and on preserving in his house the nostalgic illusion of bygone days. His genuine respect
and admiration for the Ottoman past made him ignore the changes which were taking place around him; ... forward for action, was a perennial one for Islamic rulers and commanders. Unless inducements such as extra pay awards, bequeathed his to the Imam-Hatip school of Istanbul. Of many Turkish scholars, he presented to the Ho§ sada work than others. Published in the introductory part of his posthumous many people in his conversation, he was in his highly sensitive temperament, his strong likes and combined with a strong sense of humour, he often gives patrons of his family and himself (e.g., writings very conscientious, balanced and just. With the masterly use of first-hand archive material, privately obtained contribution is in the field of biography. He essentially continued but later went far beyond the traditional Ottoman biographical pattern. In his biographies he history, and often suffered at the hands of Abd al- Mudros, the Allied forces moved into Istanbul in 1919, Mahmud Kemal was given 24 hours' notice to evacuate his konak. Most of the documents, manuscripts and precious objects which had been stored in the house were found to be 'looted, destroyed, desecrated or lost' when the konak was returned to him after 18 months, as he comments bitterly in his autobiographical note (Kenende deir, in Son asur Türk sa¿leri, Istanbul 1930-1942, pp. 2201-42).

Mahmud Kemal was little more than a child when he published his first articles in the newspaper Tarik in the 1880's. Encouraged by the famous writer and publicist Ahmed Mîdhat, he contributed for years to Mîdhat's paper Tercüman-i Hafizbat. Henceforth his new surname Ibn al-Âmin appeared regularly in many Istanbul and Salonika papers and periodicals. Pamphlets of various length followed. His writings covered the fields of religion, ethics, literature and history, and often suffered at the hands of Abd al-Hamîd's censors. But Mahmud Kemal's real contribution is in the field of biography. He essentially continued but later went far beyond the traditional Ottoman biographical pattern. In his biographies he does indeed give the usual uninspiring enumeration of his subject's patron himself with advancing age, he adds is always more important. With the masterly use of first-hand archive material, privately obtained documents, illuminating authentic anecdotes, relevant analogies, unbiased analyses of contemporary conditions, and insights into human psychology combined with a strong sense of humour, he often gives the most vivid, unforgettable and convincing portrait of his subject. It is remarkable that in spite of his highly sensitive temperament, his strong likes and dislikes, his prejudices, his cutting remarks about many people in his conversation, he was in his writings very conscientious, balanced and just. Perhaps it is fair to add that the close friends and patrons of his family and himself (e.g., Yûsuf Kâmil Pa§a, Kâmil Pa§a, Kûlik Sa¿d Pa§a) are treated with perhaps a little more sympathy and attention than others.

The text of Mahmud Kemal's testament has been published in the introductory part of his posthumous work Ho§ sada (see below). Following the tradition of many Turkish scholars, he presented to the University of Istanbul his rich private library and bequeathed his Konak to the Imam-Hatip school of Istanbul.

It was hard for Mahmud Kemal to get accustomed to the new Roman alphabet (1928) with its strictly phonetic rules, and he ignored until the end the new spelling rules of modern Turkish, insisting on writing his books printed in his own peculiar spelling, which tried to reproduce the historical spelling of Ottoman Turkish. Also, like the purists of the school of Mu'allim Nâdı¿, he would prefer the "correct" forms of some Arabic loan-words and ignore phonetic adaptations in the present Turkish usage (e.g., yusalet, akraba, tehlikê, instead of yusalet, akraba, tehlikê). Apart from minor typographical corrections and many pamphlets and newspaper articles, Mahmud Kemal is the author of the following published works: (1) Ewâhî-i Hümayûn Nercetinini târîq-i teşkilâtî ve nüsurâtâr terâdiq-i ahmûdî, Istanbul 1335/1917, a history of the Ministry of Wa¿fs with biographies of the ministers. Although the book was entrusted to a team, no contribution was made by his colleagues; (2) critical edition of the Diwân of the 11th/12th century poet Shaykh al-Islâm Vâyû, with a 65-page introduction on the life and poetry of the author, Istanbul 1334/1916; (3) critical edition of the Diwân of the 19th century neo-classicist Herselîki ۰Rifî Hikmet, with a 78-page introduction, Istanbul 1334/1916; (4) critical edition of the Diwân of the 19th-century neo-classicist Lesîgofîlî Ghalîb, with a 47-page introduction, Istanbul 1335/1917; (5) critical edition of Mustafa ۰Ali's Konîlêk-i hikâyatên, with an important introduction of 133 pp. on ۰Ali's life and works, Istanbul 1926; (6) critical edition of Musta- takîmzâde Süleymân Sa¿d al-Dîn's Tuhfet-kehatîfîn, a bibliographical treatise on calligraphers, with an introduction in 85 pp., and notes, Istanbul 1928; (7) Son asur Türk sa¿leri, biographies (uncritically selected and of uneven value) of 19th and 20th century poets with short specimens of their work, published in 12 fascicules (1230 pages) Istanbul 1930-1942 (the original title Kamâl al-shu'arâ being changed by the Turkish Historical Society, which undertook the publication); (8) Osmanî devrinde son sadrasamâlar, Istanbul 1940-49, his most important work, contains much unpublished material on the lives and times of the last 37 Grand Viziers, conceived as the sixth and last supplement (dheyây) to ۰Uhmân-zâde Tabî¿s, Hadîhât i hunver-dîn, acent and of uneven value) of the 19th and 20th centuries. The first 128 pages are from his own pen, the remainder (pp. 129-314) compiled and completed, mainly from Mahmud Kemal's notes, by Avni Akta¿. The 72-page introduction includes the text of his testament, articles by Hasan-Áli Ýücel, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpinar and two of his doctors, K. I. Gürkan and M. E. Ýûşên, with important data on his life, personality and character.

Bibliography: The main sources for Mahmud Kemal Inal's life and works are his own works, as listed in the article. (FAHIR İZ)

INÅM (A.), "favour, beneficence", more specifically donatives, largesse, given to troops, etc. The problem of keeping armies in the field, once mustered and brought forward for action, was a perennial one for Islamic rulers and commanders. Unless inducements such as extra pay awards,
promises of unusually attractive plunder, etc. could be dangled in front of the troops, there was danger that an army might disband itself and melt away once the immediate battle or object of a campaign had been achieved; not infrequently, it was difficult to get an army to fight in the first place. Whilst one Muslim army faced another Muslim army, each recruited on a similar basis and facing the same problems of recruitment, supply and deployment in the field, the difficulties common to both sides tended in general to be lessened. But this problem of keeping an army in the field was a serious one for Muslim commanders during their wars with the Crusaders. The Franks had settled in their Levantine conquests and had established a feudal system on the lines familiar to them in mediaeval western Europe; their knights were accordingly kept permanently ready for war as a condition of their feudal tenure. Their Muslim opponents had to organize professional armies of mercenary soldiers, Arabs, Turkmens and Kurds, with all the attendant problems of paying the soldiers and keeping them together for lengthy periods of service (baykär = Pers. paykär), some of which dragged on for years. It says much for the heartening effect among the Muslims of the Ayyūbid Saḥḥ al-Din's leadership that he was able to lead his troops into battle year after year; here, personal influence rather than financial inducements or promises of promotion, etc. The highest commanders might receive presents of luxury items of clothing and robes of honour or ḥāsā' [see khilāf]. As the 'Abbāsid Caliphs gradually fell under the control of the Turkish generals, and lost much of their independence of action, succession crises and confs d'État increased. Rival claimants had to secure the allegiance of the guards in the capital, and this was usually only possible through financial inducements. In the 4th/10th century, these came to be expected by the army as a matter of course whenever there was a change of régime, and they acquired the technical designation of māl al-bay'a (bāb al-bay'a, rasm al-bay'a). These payments may be compared with the ḥulūl akbār later extracted by the Janissaries from the Ottoman Sultans. Thus when al-Muqtadir was restored to the throne in 317/929 after his second deposition, he had to pay the māl al-bay'a aresh: six nāṣib (monthly allotments of pay) and an extra payment, ziyyāda, of a dinār for each infantryman; and a third of a rīš (i.e., the pay for a period of 90 days, cf. Hoeran-bach in Isl., xxix (1950), 279) and a ziyyāda of three dinārs for each cavalryman (for the technical term ziyyāda, see Khummel, 225). A decade later, in C. E. Bosworth in JESHO, xii/2 (1969), 143-4). When the cash in al-Muqtadir's treasury was exhausted, the stocks of clothing and other valuables had to be sold to meet this commitment (Miskawayh, in Eclipse of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate, i, 199-200, tr. iv, 224-5). Stormy or disputed successions became common under the Buyids, and accession payments became the norm. When 'Izz ad-Dawla Bahāʾīdyār succeeded his father Muḥammad ad-Dawla in 356/967, he attempted to dispense with Daylamī support and rely on his Turkish troops. But the Daylamī leaders rebelled and demanded their normal pay plus an additional, extraordinary payment as accession money (raṣqa mansūba ili-i-bay'a ghayr mahṣūba). In the end, Bahāʾīdyār had to compromise and give them a third of a raṣqa (seil. a month's or perhaps six weeks' pay), and of the other payments, in Eclipse, ii, 226, tr. v, 250; cf. also Hilāl al-Sāḥi, ibid., iii, 159, tr. vi, 466, demands of the Daylamīs in Başra for accession money from Bahāʾī al-Dawla in 370/980).

In circumstances like these, the allegiance of the army would simply go to the highest and swiftest bidder. After the death of Ḥālam al-Dawla, his son al-Malik al-ʿAziz Abū Manṣūr was unable to find the required māl al-bay'a quickly enough, and his cousin Abū Kādishār eventually stepped in and bought over the allegiance of the Buyid troops in Iraq (Ibn al-ʿAthir, ix, 333, cf. H. Bowen, The last Buwayhids, in JRAI (1929), 232-3). Only the strongest of rulers could avoid these payments. According to Hilāl al-Sāḥi, Aṣḥāb al-Dawla refused to make any additional payments above the base allowances (ziyyāda fi l-ʾudūl) except on justifiable occasions, such as after victories or when a special policy of conciliation was required (cf. C. E. Bosworth, Military organisation under the Buyids of Persia and Iraq, in Oriens, xviii-xix (1966-67), 162). Mahmūd of Ghaznaʾs son Maṣūfī achieved the throne of the Ghuravīd empire in 431/1030, and shortly afterwards was strong enough to dispense with the māl-i bay'at payment to the army, and he even got back from the leading commanders the money from the state treasury which his brother Muhammād had paid out in a fruitless
In addition to these succession crises, soldiers were well placed for blackmailing their commanders into giving extra payments at such times as before crucial campaigns or battles. When ʿĀṣim b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Hilālī, newly-appointed governor of Khurāsān, was in 116/734 commanding the rebel al-Ḥarīb b. Suraydī (q.v.), he had to placate the Arab government troops (al-gālūnd) from Marw with the offer of a dinār per head before they would engage the Khurāsānīs, and they in the end rise to three dinārs (Tabārānī, ii, 1579-80). In 195/811 the Caliph al-Ḥātím appointed ʿAll b. ʿĪsā b. Māḥān governor of western Persia and commander of his army there; he thought it prudent to make sure his army’s loyalty by granting it a great sum of money and distributing amongst the troops 2,000 jewelled swords and 6,000 sets of robes of honour (ṣilāt, ʿubbād). The ʿAṣṣawāʾīn Amār ʿAmr b. al-Layth kept a special treasury from which rewards could be given to outstandingly brave soldiers (cf. C. E. Bosworth, *The armies of the Saffarids*, in *BSOAS*, xxxi (1968), 549). On occasion, it was politic for a commander to single out for a particular honour a section of the troops which had especially contributed to a victory. The Būyids were at times able to play off the Daylamīs against the Turkish element in their armies, and so preserve a loyal following of some kind; but often, they had simply to purchase support through financial inducements. Faced by a serious revolt in 345/956-7 of the Daylamī general Rūzbāhān b. Windād-Khurshīd, Muʿīz al-Dawla had to buy the loyalty of the Turks of Baghdād, a body of his young slaves and the minority of Daylamīs who had remained faithful to him, by increased pay allowances and promotions (Miskawayh, in *Eclíptica*, ii, 163, 166, 173-4, tr. v, 174, 178, 186-7; Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 386). Because of their outstanding rôle in the victory over his uncle Kāwūrūd in 465/1073, the new Sālṭjūqī Sultan Malik-Shāh gave the Arab and Kurdish commanders of his army an extra share in the plunder, special honours and a distribution of land grants or ṣīḥād’s (Bundārī, 49; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, x, 53).

"Mirrors for Princes" literature frequently adverted to the necessity of keeping the troops’ loyalty by means of timely donatives, especially after outstanding victories or feats of valor. Kay Kāʾūs advises the wise prince, “Pay special regard to anyone who fights valiantly, overthrows or wounds one of the enemy, seizes a horse or performs any other laudable deed. Reward such a man for his services by presentation of a robe of honour and increasing his pay; do not spare money at such a time” (*Kābūs-nāma*, ch. xii, tr. R. Levy, 220). Ṣafīqī b. Mudābir’s ʿĀdāb al-harb wa l-ṣiḥādā’ has a special chapter on the obligation of the ruler or commander to reward his soldiers for special services, bravery in the field, etc., with marks of honour (*taqāfīr*), financial awards (*silāt, ʿinnām*), gifts of horses and weapons, and pensions (*nāmāra*). He goes into considerable detail about the proportionate rewards for various deeds, such as bringing in the severed head of an enemy, capturing a horse and rider together, or a horse or rider alone, leading or withstandning a charge, going out in single combat, carrying off the enemy’s standard or ceremonial parasol (*lātir*), and so forth (*India Office Persian Ms. 647, ch. xxxvi, ff. 126b-128a; ed. Aḥmad Subayyī Khāṃsārī, Tehran 1346/1967* (based on the British Museum Ms. alone), ch. xxx, 542-7).

**Bibliography:** given in the article. There are no special studies devoted to this topic.

ʿĪNĀN, poetess who was very famous in Baghdād in the second half of the 2nd/8th century. The little that is known of her life is of doubtful authenticity. She was a *mawṣūladda*, and was born, and received a polite education, in the Yamāmā, which was to produce a little later another famous poetess, Paḍī. ʿĪnān was brought to live in the capital by her master, Abū Khālid al-Nāṭfī, then probably lived in ʿAbd Allāh Khurshīd, and died in 192/808 (Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīh, *Makānī* (Nisd*), 53). She enlivened literary society during the reign of al-ʿAbīd, who expressed great admiration for her and wished to acquire her, but she is not mentioned under any of his successors.

She was considered as the first woman to have won literary fame under the ʿAbbasīs. The *Fihris* attributes to her only a *ḥiṣb* of twenty leaves, of which a few poems have survived. The longest is a laudatory petition of fourteen verses addressed to ʿAbd Allāh Kāhīlī (Ibn al-Muʿtazz). These fragments show signs of a real talent. In bold language and a vocabulary which is simple but not without subtlety, ʿĪnān writes harminious poems in which the ideas are supported by a prudent use of the stylistic figures of *bādī*, which were fashionable at this period. Her reputation, like Paḍī’s later, rested on her skill at improvisation, an attribute which found her so much fame that it forms the subject of most of the anecdotes about her. Several of her dialogues in verse with such skilled opponents as Abū Nuwās, al-ʿAbbas b. al-ʿĀnaf and Marwān b. Abī Ḥaṣṣa show that she was capable in any situation of producing the rhyming repartee which established her reputation as a poet in the eyes of her contemporaries. Her profound knowledge of early poetry enabled her, in exercises in *idās*, for example, to improvise after a verse by Dījar a poem in the manner of that great poet (ʿAghdānī, *Idā*). This throws some light on the techniques of composition of certain writers who continually used a style inherited from their predecessors.

But it seems that it is mainly her role as the centre of a literary circle that should be noted. Her house was frequented by the most brilliant people, notably those of the famous group of "libertines." The brightest of them held discussions in her presence and submitted their works for her judgement. She was in addition regarded by a number of them as their inspiration. Abū Nuwās, Ibn al-ʿĀnaf and Abu l-ʿNaḍīr, the Basran attached to the Barmakīs, all dedicated love-poems to her, though their sincerity is doubtful. The first addressed her with much wit and discreet allusion. The main point is that she represents a type of woman who mixed freely with writers and sometimes accompanied them to some of the places of amusement in the suburbs of Baghdād. The love which poets expressed for her was an exercise of wit rather than a true emotion. The courtly exchange, racy or even erotic, became a genre which was cultivated in emulation. It can be imagined that someone like ʿĪnān had a considerable influence on its development by helping to establish the rules of courtliness and by taking part in the flowering of the new love poetry in the second century, which was so progressive of new forms.

In early life he held an office under the Moghul emperors. He seems to have died at an early age, when the family ancestral home was at Lahore. How and when his father died is not certainly known, his father's name was mentioned as Ali Nausar and his father's brother, who speaks of him in very affectionate terms and calls him his patron. In early life he held an office under the Moghul emperors. He seems to have died at an early age, when the family ancestral home was at Lahore. How and when his father died is not certainly known, his father's name was mentioned as Ali Nausar and his father's brother, who speaks of him in very affectionate terms and calls him his patron.


'INĀYA (A.), "providence". The word which etymologically evokes the idea of care, solicitude, is not part of the Kur'ānic vocabulary. Nor does it belong directly to the vocabulary of ʿīm al-ḥalām, but to the language of falsafa (and of the sīraḥ of Subhawardi)—it was to be taken up after this by the later works and manuals of ḥalām which summarize and discuss its theses (among them al-Shahrastānī, al-Dīwān, etc.). It should be mentioned however that it has no place in the Taʾrīḵ of al-Dīwānī. 'Ināya appears in the Śūṭī lexicon, but with only the more precise meaning of divine benefaction, or of a "gift granted" by God.

Certainly, if "providence" is understood as the order by which God conducts all things, this idea recurs throughout the Korān. Muslim piety insisted on this, and such divine names as al-Muḥaṣṣīn (the Vigilant), al-Razzī (the Dispenser of all good), al-Ḥafiz (the vigilant Guardian), al-Muḥīṭ (the Feeder), al-Raḥīb (the Jealous Guardian), al-Māʾīn (the tutelary Defender), could not fail to turn the mind towards the notion of a provident God. But it seems to have been the falsāfīs who more precisely adopted 'ināya to signify divine providence. And their view of it is closely linked with their theory of "necessary and willed" creation.

It suffices to give some main references taken from Ibn Sīnā. It is he in fact who provides the clearest definitions of 'ināya (cf. A. M. Goichon, Lexique de la langue philosphique d'Ibn Sīnā, Paris 1938, no. 488-9, and L. Gardet, La pensée religieuse d'Ibn Sīnā, Paris 1949, 131-5). The metaphysics of the Ṣīfaṁ refers to it twice: concerning divine knowledge (īḥāsiyyāt, Cairo ed. 1960, ii, 398) and in particular in the chapter (mainly ii, 415) which deals with the introduction of evil (ṣarār) in the predetermining divine decree (ḥaddā). This text has been repeated in the Naqāḍī (Cairo 1357/1938, 284): "He [the prime Being] knows therefore the order of good according to the best order in the line of the [the being] possible, and there flows from Him that which He knows has a certain order and a good, according to the best which He knows, in a flow (fasū) which leads perfectly to order, according to the line of [the being] possible: and such is the meaning of the word 'ināya". (Definition reproduced by al-Shahrastānī in his refutation of Ibn Sīnā, ed. Fārābī, London 1846, ii, 288).

The Ḥarārī returned to the same theme, underlining, more clearly perhaps, its double theme of knowledge and necessity: "Providence is therefore the full comprehension which the First [God] has, in his science, of all and of the necessity for all to rest on Him so as to be according to the best order. [He fully understands also] that this comes necessarily from Him and from the total grasp which He has of it" (ed. Forget, Leiden 1892, 185; Fr. tr. A. M. Goichon, Beirut-Paris 1951, 458). It is characteristic that these lines are presented as a "remark" (taʾrīḵ) in the section of "general knowledge with new words" (see another text, ibid., 150).

This conception of 'ināya cannot accommodate either God's liberty or gratuity, a fact which accords perfectly with the existential determinism of Ibn Sīnā. Certainly providence, in its obvious sense must be understood, he says, from "the thought by the First of what is good and just", and the divine thought is the principle of providence (cf. Al-Kūthī, al-Dīwān, ed. M. Badawi, in Ar-Ra ṣ ā al-ʿAraḵ, Cairo 1947, 63). It may be objected that the coming into being of existing things from the prime Being is "a simple overflow (inbīgās) which has no connection with the thought which He has of them, even although this thought accompanies it". (Ibid.; Fr. tr. G. Vajda, in Revue Thomiste, li (1951) 369). Ibn Sīnā replies by distinguishing between the necessary ṣarār also (in the order of existence) and the possible (in the order of essence). He concludes: for things, "the best becomes one of the possible things for them, after the best having been thought necessarily. This is providence, that is to say, the thought of the best possible" (Ibid., tr. 390). And again: "His [the prime being's] essence is that from which necessarily derive the things which have the possibility of deriving from it because He thinks them. It is thus that providence succeeds in becoming providence" (Ibid. 64/390-1).

The idea of providence as divine knowledge which is a realization of the good and just ordering of existing beings is thus clearly settled. But Avicennan determinism makes this ordering, whatever its "possibility" may be as regards the essence of things, into an existential necessity: which the prime Being knows and wills, but which He could not refrain from producing and which He could not modify. When the later Ashʿarī manuals debated 'ināya according to the falsāfīs, this was in order to oppose to this providence which is (and is no more than) a necessary producing knowledge, the productive gratuitous dispositions of the free will of the Most High. It is true that they do not distinguish at all between common providence and particular decree. Everything is providence, and everything is decree (ḥaddā and ṣarār). It is the chapters on ṣarār and ḥaddā which deal with the designs and the government of God.

Finally it may be added that the Śūṭī vocabulary contrasts maḥabbā (or ṣīgh) and 'ināya. According to al-Hallādī, love is "a perennial (sarmaṣṣiya) attitude" and a pre-eternal liberality (ʿināya asalāsiyya; cf. L. Massignon, Passion, 610; Massignon here translates 'ināya by "grace"), Al-Hujwīrī, in his Kaṣāf al-mahāḏib, referred to 'ināya in the sense of divine favour (Nicholson translates this sometimes by "grace", sometimes by "favour"; Eng. tr. Leiden-London 1911, 203, 268).

Bibliography: in the article. (L. Gardet)

'INĀYAT ALLĀH KANBŪ, elder brother of Muhammad Sālīh Kanbū, author of ʿelmāl-i Sālīh or Sālīh, a history of the Moghul emperor, born at Elahbād, near Lucknow, has been born at Elahbād, near Lucknow, 19 1219/31 August 1608, though his ancestral home was at Lahore. How and when his parents came to Burhānpūr is not known. His father seems to have died at an early age, when the family returned to Lahore. Himself well-educated, he attended to the education of his orphaned younger brother, who speaks of him in very affectionate terms and calls him his patron.

In early life he held an office under the Moghul
The Muslims were divided in their attitude to the Congress between two incompatible schools of thought, one stressing the common interests between Muslims and Hindus, the other emphasizing the cleavages between the two communities. The first school was exemplified by Bardar al-Din Tahiybdi, who presided over the third session of the Congress. He called upon Muslims to regard the Congress as a "truly representative national gathering," promoted co-operation between Muslims and Hindus, and urged Muslims to identify themselves with the objects of the Congress. Although these views appealed to only a small section of the Muslim community, they were advocated throughout the history of the Congress by prominent Muslims, notably Dr. M. A. Ansari, Mavian Abu 'I-Kalan Azad, and Dr. Dagar Husayn, who felt no contradiction between their Islamic beliefs and their membership in the Congress. However, most Muslims dissociated themselves from the Congress: they were convinced by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan that the Congress was a sectarian organization designed to advance the exclusive interests of the Hindus, and they shared Sir Sayyid's apprehensions that the Congress was striving to establish Hindu rule, in which the Muslims would be a deprived minority.

The Congress endeavoured to attract the Muslims to its annual conventions and resolved to drop any subject to which Muslims objected. Moreover, the Congress did not extend its official approval to the popular agitation against the partition of Bengal which was permeated with Hindu religious fervour; nor to the anti-Muslim activities of the Arya Samaj in the Punjab; nor to the militant anti-Muslim festival of Shivaji and the Cow-Protection Association in Maharastra. Nevertheless, most Muslims saw in the Congress a Hindu movement. Since Muslims lagged behind Hindus in acquiring western education, in taking advantage of the new economic opportunities and in forming a political organization, they became particularly conscious of their backwardness and were anxious to accelerate the advancement of their interests by claiming special minority rights.

Notwithstanding the foundation of the Muslim League [q.v.] in December 1906, and the provision of separate electorates for the Muslims by the India Act of 1909, the Congress continued to claim that it alone represented the people of India.

For a brief period Muslims and Hindus jointly supported the Home-Rule League in 1910 and co-operated in 1920 in the Khilafat and Civil Disobedience movements. But when the Civil Disobedience movement was stopped by Gandhi without consulting the Muslims, and when the Khilafat movement collapsed after Ataturk abolished the Caliphate, the Muslims became depressed and frustrated, and the brief reconciliation between Muslims and Hindus turned into discord and antagonism.

When the Nehru Report was published in 1928, the Muslim League regarded the refusal of the Congress to recognize special electorates and other measures as proof of its contention that the Muslims would be a deprived minority under Congress rule. The fears of the Muslim League were intensified when the Congress overwhelmingly won the 1937 elections, formed seven ministries, and stipulated that it would accept Muslim representatives into its ministry of the United Provinces only if they merged into the Congress.

While Nehru dismissed the complaints of the Muslim League of discrimination against Muslims in the Congress Ministries as side issues which weakened the struggle for Swaraj (self-rule), M. A. Dinar rallied the Muslims to the Muslim League with the warning that Swaraj meant Hindu-râj. While the Congress promised the Muslims equality of rights, the Muslim League argued that since the Hindus were better educated, more prosperous, and wealthier than the Muslims, "equality" meant the perpetual inferiority of the Muslims as well as constant economic and political oppression. While the Congress assured the Muslims of religious toleration, the Muslim League warned the Muslims that they might be absorbed into Hinduism and lose their identity, and that therefore any Muslim who was not with the Muslim League was a traitor to Islam. Nevertheless, the Congress courted Muslim members, many of
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whom attained eminence in the Congress party; this position still holds.

Until 1940 the Muslim League endeavoured to gain special rights to safeguard the interests of the Muslims as a minority; from 1940 it asserted that Hindus and Muslims were two different nations and that the Muslim League, and it alone, represented the national aspirations of the Muslims which aimed at the establishment of a national home. The Congress rejected the equation of religion with nationalism and feared that Muslim issues might lose their religious animosity for political ends. However, the 1945 communal riots widened the gulf between the Muslim League and the Congress, and the schism reached its climax in 1947 in the partition of India and the foundation of Pakistan.


Indian Ocean [see Bahr Al-Hind].

Indigo [see nil].

Indjli, Arabic transcription of the word ὑπάγεταιν, gospel, through the Ethiopian ὑπάγεταιν (Nöldeke, Neue Beiträge, 47; Grimmie, in Festsch. Goldscher, 164; Jeffery, Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān, 72-2). The variant indjll may arise from a Mesopotamian Persian influence.

The word indjli occurs twelve times in the Kur'ān (III, 2, 43, 58; V, 50, 51, 70, 72, 110; VII, 156; IX, 112; XLVIII, 29; LVII, 27) and refers to the Revelation transmitted by Jesus. The word also means the scripture possessed and read by the Christian contemporaries of Muhammad (V, 52; VII, 156), i.e., the four Gospels, often extended in current usage to mean the whole of the New Testament.

In this article there will be studied successively: I. The relations between the Kur'ān and the Gospels; II. The place of the Gospels in Indjli; III. The knowledge of the Gospels possessed by Muslim writers; IV. The place of the Gospels in Sīfsim; V. The Islamic-Christian controversy over the Gospels.

I. The Gospels and the Kur'ān. There appear in the Kur'ān a certain number of Gospel characters: Jesus, Mary, St. John the Baptist (Yahyā), Zacharias, the Apostles, and a certain number of facts (the Annunciation, the miracles of Jesus) whose resemblance to those in the Greek versions has given rise to discussions, so that the question arises of how exactly they are related to the Gospels, which preceded them.

For believing Muslims this question presents no difficulties: it is the same God Who reveals both books, and the Prophet Muhammad, having received the Revelation directly from God, had no need to consult, directly or indirectly, the Scriptures in order to be able to reproduce some of the features which are found in them.

The historian of religions however feels obliged by his discipline to seek for possible historical connexions. The first question is therefore: what knowledge could Muhammad and the first Muslims have had of the Gospels? This leads to the question of the translation of the Gospels into Arabic, since any knowledge of Greek, Syriac, or Coptic on the part of Muhammad and his Companions may be excluded.

In a memoir presented to the Reale Accademia dei Lincei in 1888 (see Bibli.), Ignazio Guidi raised the question of the question of the translation of the Gospels into Arabic before the advent of Islam. Sprenger (Das Leben und die Lehre des Moh., i, 131 ff.) thought he recognized in a passage of Muhammad b. Iṣbāk (ed. Westenfeld, 149-50) a fragment from a translation made after the time of Muhammad. The fragment contains John XV, verses 23-27, and the word which is used in them to translate παράδειγματως is al m-n-w-m-na, which is neither Arabic nor Syriac but Palestinian and probably quite early (cf. Gildemeister, De evang. in arabic., 35). According to a text of Bar Hebraeus (Chron. eccles., ed. Abbeloos and Lamy, i, 275; Assemani, Bibli. orient., ii, 335; cf. Gildemeister, op. cit., 30, note 1), a translation was made between 631 and 640 A.D. by the Mono-

physite Johannes on the instructions of an Arab ruler, 'Amr b. Sa'd. But these first translations, if they existed, amount only to isolated and disputable details.

On the other hand, extant manuscripts attest that from the 2nd/8th century, Arabic versions of the Gospels were in the hands of the Christians of Syria. The many manuscripts of the Gospels in Arabic may be divided into six classes: (A) Those which were translated directly from the Greek. They originate from the monastery of Saint Sabas or from near there; two of them (Vatic. arab., 13, of the 8th century, and manuscript Borgia, K. 11, 31 8th or 9th century) are the oldest known. (B) Texts translated from the Peshitta, or at least revised on the basis of this Syriac version. These are of different periods (Tischendorf manuscript at Leipzig, 8th-9th century; Codex Vaticanus, 13). The translation of the Diastaros of Tatian was made in the 3rd/4th century by Ibn al-Ṭayyib. (C) Texts translated from the Bohairic Coptic translation, which is neither Arabic nor Syriac. There exists a translation into Arabic before the appearance of the Codex Vaticanus, (capit. q). The passages from the Gospels mentioned in the History of the patriarchs of Egypt by Ibn al-Muṣaffa [p. v.] (4th/10th century) are based on the Coptic translation, perhaps in the form of lectionaries. The same or a similar Coptic version seems to have been used by al-Ghazali in al-Radd al-djamil (cf. R. Chidiac, Réfutation excellente de la divinité du Christ, Paris 1939). (D) Texts of ecclesiastical recensions, made in the 7th/13th century in the patriarchate of Alexandria to become the canonical versions. The first work on this was done circa 650/1250 by Ibn al-As'ad Abu 'l-Farādi Ibn al-ʿAssāl. (E) Texts which are distinguished by their more particularly literary form (Leiden MS 2348 and those in the Vatican, cod. arab., 17 and 18). The two latter, in a Coptic transcription, are based on the Gospels in Arabic, the translation of which is known to be from the end of the 4th/10th century. Other versions in the same genre were made later. (F) Arabic versions of Western origin (cf. H. Hyvernat, in Dict. de la Bible, i, col. 851-6).

We may thus conclude, with Graf (Geschichte, i, 41) that in the present state of knowledge it cannot be asserted that Muhammad and his first companions could have had a direct knowledge of the Gospels in Arabic.

In addition to the canonical Gospels, there exist
Arabic recensions of the New Testament apocrypha: the Gospel of the Childhood, the Protevangelium of James, the Gospel of Thomas, the Life of Paul, the Gospel of Peter and a sermon of Simon, a martyrdom of James and one of Simon, and a small number of others which do not appear to have been known in Muslim circles. Rubens Duval, La littérature syriaque, Paris 1899, 96, mentions an apocalypse of St. Peter as being an Arabic composition of the 7th/8th century.

The spread in Arabia of Christian ideas in addition to the narrative accounts of the Gospels and the apocryphal books, before the arrival of Islam, took place largely, if not entirely, through oral teaching and the exchanges of everyday life. There existed in the Yemen a Christian community (cf. Nallino, Ebrei e Cristiani nell'Arabia preislamica, in Raccolta di Scritti, iii, 122-9), which was in active rivalry with the Jews and had close relations with the Ethiopians.

The occupation of the Yemen by the latter certainly strengthened the position of this community. In the north-east, the influence of the Nestorian church spread from al-Hira, whence it was carried not only by the monks and perhaps by preachers, but also, although more superficially, by the poets who frequented the court of the Lakhmid princes. In addition, the Christian or Christianized poets of the Hijaz, Zayd b. 'Amr b. Nufayl and Waraka b. Nawfal of Mecca, and Umayya b. Abi 'l-Sa'it of Ta'if, are represented as having relationships with the Christians of the Yemen and of Syria, whereas the Ghasanid princes or the tribes which were under their influence had adopted Monophysism. It is even stated in the Aghānī (iii, 14) that Waraka, the cousin of Khadhija, wrote translations or copies of the Gospels.

It is thus probable that the passages in the Kurān which reflect the canonical or apocryphal Gospels derive from these Christian communities, and this possibility is confirmed to a great extent by the large proportion of Ethiopian and South Arabian terms which they contain (see, e.g., V, 112-3). The greater part of these passages describe the births of Jesus, of Mary and of John the Baptist, the mission, the miracles and the ascension of Jesus (see Ḥisā, Māryam, Yāhya). There are also references to several parables, the Apocalypse of Paul, the Parable of the Flock (XLVIII, 29), that of the wise and foolish virgins (LVII, 13), the prophecy of the announcement of another Apostle (VII, 157) and to several other passages. More surprising, but not intrinsically improbable, given the rivalry between Jews and Christians in the Yemen, are also those echoes of the arguments directed against the Jews in the Gospels and the Epistles, which, as has been pointed out by Tor Andrea and Ahrens (see Bīhī.), are sometimes used in the Kurān as much against the Christians as against the Jews.

The influence of the New Testament on tradition (hadith) is important. A number of the miracles, proverbs and ideas attributed to Muḥammad or to his followers have their source in the Gospels. For example, Muḥammad increases the amount of some water or supplies of food. Many traditions on the dignity of the poor and the difficulty for the rich to enter the Kingdom of Heaven reflect the teaching of the Gospels and are in contrast with the attitude of the pagan Arabs. Goldziher mentions an adaptation of the Paternostera which an Arab traditionist puts into the mouth of Muḥammad (Abū Dāwūd, i, 101). The parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Matthew, XX, 1-16) is applied to the Jews, the Christians and the Muslims in the Muwatta' of Mālik (Risāya al-aṣḥābī, bāb al-tasaḥsīl). Similarly in the legends on the Mahdi and in eschatology, apocalyptic precedes an immanuelism.

III. As Islam spread in the formerly Christian countries and contact between Christians and Muslims became more frequent, the Muslims gained a deeper knowledge of the Gospels. Thus several Muslim historians display a fairly extensive knowledge of them. Al-Ya'qūbī, one of the earliest Arab historians, quotes an extract from them; al-Mas'ūdī, who had an enquiring mind, makes no secret of his relations with the Christians; he mentions visiting, in Nazareth, a church much venerated by the Christians, and he learned from them a number of Gospel traditions; he knew of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, his childhood in Nazareth, God's words reported in Matthew III, 17: "This is my beloved son . . .", of which he reproduces a variant; he had also heard the story of the visit of the Magi to the infant Messiah, according to the Gospels and other versions, he gives accurately the account of the calling of the Apostles; he names the four Evangelists, and refers to the "book of the Gospels" as if he had seen it, giving an exact summary of it, though exhibiting a certain mistrust of it, as compared with the respect with which it is treated in the Kurān. Similarly al-Mas'ūdī is relatively well-informed concerning the lives of the Apostles. He twice mentions the martyrdom of St. Peter and of St. Paul, but attributing to both the type of execution which, according to tradition, was that suffered by St. Peter; St. Thomas is known as the apostle of India, he seems moreover to be the apostle who, after St. Peter, was best known to the Muslims; even St. Paul was less well known.

Even better informed than al-Mas'ūdī is al-Būrānī. This writer must have consulted Christians in order to write his Chronology. Several texts of the Gospels were known to him, as well as the commentary by Dādibūn (Jesudān, cf. Duval, Litt. syr.*, 84) and he mentions it with some criticism. He regarded the four Gospels as four recensions, which he compares to the three versions of the Bible, Jewish, Christian and Samaritan, remarking however that these four recensions differ greatly from each other. This author relies largely on the works of Joseph the Syrian, given by Matthew and Luke, and, in a very interesting passage, he mentions how the Christians explain the difference between them. After this he mentions other gospels in the possession of the Marcionites, the Bardesanes and the Manicheans, the first two, according to him, differing "in some places" from the Christian Gospels, the others being contrary to them. Given all these differing versions, he considers that the prophetic value of the Gospels is not greatly to be trusted.

The Persian version of the Chronicle of al-Ṭabarī (Fr. tr. by Zotenberg) contains some legends on New Testament subjects more developed than in the Arabic original and similar to those found in the "Stories of the prophets" (Kīsās al-anbiyā'). Certain details concerning the Passion are related in it: the denial of "Simon", the betrayal of one of the Apostles, who is not named, Mary's station at the foot of the Cross. The author admits however, following Muslim belief, that there was substituted for Jesus some other person, whom he calls Joshua. Concerning the Apostles, he reproduces the tradition that makes John travel to Edessa.

IV. In Muslim mystic literature are found many references to the Gospels and there can be detected some knowledge of the interpretation given
to certain passages by the Christian Fathers. Nevertheless the words which the Muslim mystics attribute to Jesus are far from always agreeing with the Gospels; thus those reported by al-Ghazālī and collected by Asīn Palacios (see Bibli.) are almost all inexact. On the other hand, al-Mubāsibī and al-Suhrawardī give an exact and complete transcription of the parable of the Sower. The writings of al-Hāwīn al-saḥīf contain some remarkable passages on the crucifixion of Jesus (Cairo ed., iv, 99), the reality of which they admit, and on the resurrection, the meetings of the Apostles in the Upper Room and their dispersal throughout the world. The Acts of the Apostles (ṣaḥīf al-bawārīyā) are expressly quoted in this work (Dieterici, 605). For other features, cf. L. Massignon's Hallāj: there exists a miniature showing al-Hallāj on the cross with the face of Christ; also the fine epic romance of Ḥamza (Sirāt al-amīr Ḥamza, Cairo n.d., iii, 822 f.).

V. Islamo-Christian controversies about the New Testament. The basic dogmas of Christianity, such as the Trinity, the Incarnation and the Redemption, based essentially on the New Testament, very soon gave rise to polemic between Christians and Muslims, each party trying to prove that its attitude was based on truth.

From the Muslim side, attacks were very chiefly on the authenticity of the Gospels and it was stated that they had undergone tahrīf (q.v.): the meaning or words distorted, passages suppressed, others added, etc. They said that Jesus had never stated that he was God; the Trinity and the Redemption were doctrines invented by St. Paul. Recent polemicists (19th and 20th centuries) added as sources for the Christian attitude Greek philosophy and the pagan mysteries or the religious beliefs of India.


Authors the desire to adopt in part, in particular in matters relating to the Gospels, Christian attitudes. There should especially be noted in this respect the works of Mahmūd at-Šākīk (Abbaruṣiyat al-Masih, Cairo 1932) and the Kārṣa'at al-ṣayma of Kāmil Ḥusayn, Cairo 1954, both of them largely based on the Gospels. For details of all this see Anawati, Polimiche, etc.


Authors mentioned: Ya’qubî, ed. Houtsma, i, 74-9 (cf. Klamarth, Der Auszug aus den Evan- gelien bei dem arab. Historiker Ya’qubî, in Festschr. des Wilhelm-Gymnasium, Hamburg 1885; G. Smit, Bijbel en Legende bij den Arabischen schrijver Ja’kubî, Leiden 1907); Mas’udî, Murâdî (new ed. and tr. in preparation by Ch. Pellat); Birûnî, Chronology, tr. Sachau; Tabârî, tr. H. Zohnen, 1867-74; Muhâbî, K. al-Râ’îyâ, ed. M. Smith, 1940, 2; Suhrwardî, Anâwîr al-ma’ârif, in the margins of the Ihyûdî of Ghazâlî, ed. 1312 (see the parable of the Sower, i, 78-9, probably borrowed from the earlier passage of Muhâbî); Die Ab- handlungen der Ichwân es-Safá, ed. Dieterici, Berlin 1886, 594 ff.


**INDJÎL — INDOCHINA**

This name, properly speaking the term (Turkish indjîl) applied to royal estates under the Mongols, is usually given to the dynasty which reigned ca. 703/1303-758/1358 in Fars (Shîrâz), the founder of the dynasty, Shârâf al-Dîn Muḥâbî-Shâh, having been sent thither by Šâhâb al-Dîn, to administer the royal estates. According to the Ta’rîkh-i Guzîda he was a descendant of ʿAbd Allâh Anâqî (q.v.). Under Šâhâb al-Dîn’s successor, Šâhâb al-Dîn, ʿAbd Allâh Saʿîd he not only retained his office but was able to extend his power so that by ca. 721/1325 he was practically the independent ruler of Shîrâz and almost the whole of Fars. After the death of ʿAbd Allâh Saʿîd, he was executed by the order of his successor, Arba Arba Khwân in 739/1336. According to the Shîrâz-nâmâ he had four sons: Šâhâb al-Dîn, Masʿud-Shâh, Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kay-Khwaraz, Shams al-Dîn Muḥâbî and ʿAbd ʿIshâq Djamâl al-Dîn. The first two were already ruling in Shîrâz during his father’s lifetime down to ca. 735/1335, when in his absence his brother Kay-Khwaraz took his place, refusing upon his return to restore him his authority. Hostilities then broke out between the brothers ending only in 739/1338-9 with the death of Kay- Khwaraz. Masʿud-Shâh had imprisoned the third brother Muḥâbî in Kâfaʿ-yi Saʿîd, but he managed to escape and enlist the support of the Golden Horde of Huanguyuan. The latter crossed a Mongol army and advanced on Shîrâz with Muḥâbî; Masʿud-Shâh was forced to flee, and Pir Husân entered the town. When, shortly afterwards, in 740/1340, he put Muḥâbî to death, the population adopted so threatening an attitude that he found it advisable to withdraw, but only to return the next year at the head of fresh forces. On this occasion also luck was against him; he quarrelled with the Golden Horde and, when the two sides were drawn up in line of battle, was left in the lurch by his own men and sought refuge with Ḥasan-i Kûchâ (q.v.), by whom he was put to death. Meanwhile, Masʿud-Shâh had made his way to Luristân, where he allied himself with Yaghî-bastî, a brother of Ashraf, while Ashraf himself took the part of Masʿud-Shâh’s sole remaining brother ʿAbd ʿIshâq. Masʿud-Shâh, with Yaghî-bastî’s aid, succeeded in reaching Shîrâz, where he met the same fate as his brother Muḥâbî: he was treacherously murdered by Yaghî-bastî in 743/1343. The latter then quarrelled, and was reconciled again, with Ashraf; and they were engaged in a joint attempt at the subjugation of Fars when the news of their brother Ḥasan-i Kûchâ’s death caused their troops to disperse. ʿAbd ʿIshâq, who had previously received the town of Isfâhân from Pir Husân, now became the ruler of Shîrâz and the whole of Fars. As he endeavoured to extend his rule over Yazd and Kîrmân, he came into conflict with the Muzaffarids (q.v.), with varying success. The final result was that ʿAbd ʿIshâq was not only driven from Yazd and Kîrmân but was besieged in Shîrâz itself, which surrendered to the Muzaffarids in 754/1353. Before the surrender he had escaped to Kaft-yi Saʿîd and remained there, refusing upon his return to restore him his authority. Meanwhile, Buzurg, had made his way to Isfâhân. Besieged once again, he was taken prisoner and handed over for execution to the relatives of a skhat which had been put to death by his orders. This was in 758/1357. The Persian poet ʿUbayd-ı Zâkânî has commemorated his patron in a marâqya or elegy.


**INDOCINA** (Islam in.) The union of Indochina, created by a decree of 19 October 1887, was definitively completed and organized under the governor- in-chief of Paul Doumer (February 1897-March 1902), who had previously received the town of Isfâhân from Pir Husân, now became the ruler of Shîrâz and the whole of Fars. As he endeavoured to extend his rule over Yazd and Kîrmân, he came into conflict with the Muzaffarids (q.v.), with varying success. The final result was that ʿAbd ʿIshâq was not only driven from Yazd and Kîrmân but was besieged in Shîrâz itself, which surrendered to the Muzaffarids in 754/1353. Before the surrender he had escaped to Kaft-yi Saʿîd and remained there, refusing upon his return to restore him his authority. Meanwhile, Buzurg, had made his way to Isfâhân. Besieged once again, he was taken prisoner and handed over for execution to the relatives of a skhat which had been put to death by his orders. This was in 758/1357. The Persian poet ʿUbayd-ı Zâkânî has commemorated his patron in a marâqya or elegy.
Neither historical records nor legends suggest that the religion of Muhammad was widely adopted by the Chams before their kingdom was absorbed by the Vietnamese in the 9th/15th century. It may reasonably be thought that it developed rather among the Cham refugees in Cambodia in the 15th century, and that this occurred through the intermediary of the Malays, their brothers in race, after the Malay immigrations of the 14th and 15th centuries. And these Muslim Cham of Cambodia tried, it seems, in their turn, to propagate Islam, with relatively little success, among their brothers remaining in Central Vietnam.

Muslim Cham and Malays in Cambodia, from the 17th to the 19th century, built mosques, made converts, fomented troubles and even took part in the political life of the country. It was thus that, in 1820, one of them, Tuan Saït Ahmad (= Shaykh Ahmad), became vicar before being put to death by his political adversaries. After the establishment of the French protectorate (1863), they formed in Cambodia as in south Vietnam (Châu-Dōc, Saigon, Phan-Thiêt) fairly closed communities living apart from their Cambodian and Vietnamese compatriots.

There is little original about their observance of Islam and they share the beliefs of the Cham and the Malays. All observe the five prayers, the ablutions, and circumcision, and that at the age of 15; they abstain from the flesh of pigs, dogs, tortoises, crocodiles, elephants, peacocks, vultures, eagles and crows, and also from strong or fermented drinks. If any one worships a strange idol, he is expelled from the community. Some make the pilgrimage to Mecca or pay a certain sum, for which a representative is sent on their behalf. In Cambodia the mosques are almost always built of wood and are placed on small eminences. The finest are large bare rooms with a platform at the back. The mats which are used as praying carpets are hung up in a sack from the rafters. On the left at the entrance there is usually a large drum painted red (Cham ganang = Malay gendang, Javanese kendang). Outside is a little basin of masonry for ablutions.

Within these precincts the imāms give the children instruction (in reading and writing) and in reciting the Kur'ān. The assembly or jam'a cannot take place without a quorum of 40 believers. Ramadān is strictly observed by all, and pious families are quite abstemious in this period. On Mondays they refrain from sexual intercourse.

The Chams of Cambodia also observe the bulan dh hajj (fasting month of the pilgrims) also called bulan Oslah (month of Allāh) three months after Ramadān. They also observe the molot or melut (cf. Achenese molot; Arabic mawlid), when a lock of hair is cut from the children of 3 to 13 and they are given a religious name, which for boys is always 'Abd Allāh or Muhammad, for girls Phwatimob (Fātimah). The imāms, at least four in number, are invited to pray in the house in which the ceremony is being performed. This custom of hair cutting seems to be borrowed from the Cambodians.

The tamael (Arab tamma) is a ceremony nearly always confined to the family circle, at which a boy who has learned the Kur'ān entirely by heart, which however happens very rarely, is led round the village on horseback amid the acclamations of men and women. He is dressed in his best clothes and is greeted with the greatest reverence by men and women.

The swa'al (pursuit), which is celebrated in the first Cham month, is accompanied by two days'
fasting and commemorates the migration of the Prophet (Hijrda).

By the tapat, which we also find among the Chams of Annam, who call it tubah = Ar. tasbeha, old persons are purified from their sins by means of prayers and sprinkling with holy water.

Malays and Chams have common religious officials in Cambodia, who are given the following names according to their office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malay</th>
<th>Cham</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mufis</td>
<td>mophati</td>
<td>jurist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuan kadi</td>
<td>tuh kalik</td>
<td>judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raya kadi</td>
<td>rajah kalik</td>
<td>judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuan pakh</td>
<td>tuan pakh</td>
<td>jurist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hakim</td>
<td>hakam</td>
<td>doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitip</td>
<td>katip</td>
<td>preacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilai</td>
<td>bilai</td>
<td>mu'adhdhin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lobai</td>
<td>lobbi</td>
<td>officiant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All are exempt from taxation. The four first have the following Cambodian names: 1. okhia radd kale, 2. okhia raya kale, 3. okhia tek kale, 4. ohia pakh. They are appointed by the King, belong to his council and are the official superiors of the Muslims of Cambodia. They are regarded by the faithful as representing the four caliphs of the Prophet and enjoying great spiritual authority.

The religious dignitaries are usually chosen from the most prominent families, whose sons can become imãms at the age of 15 and whose daughters are educated with special care to make them worthy wives.

The Muslims of Cambodia respect the graves of saints, which they call la-lak; they believe in witches, the werewolf, evil spirits, and in magic, and have retained certain agricultural customs which are also found among the neighbouring peoples, such as the Cambodians and Annamese; these are relics of an old animism.

The family bonds among the Muslims of Cambodia are very strong; the father has great authority. The wife is well treated but kept strictly within the house as are the daughters, who are very early initiated into household duties and, being under strict control, are rarely allowed to marry Muslims.

The Muslim Chams of Annam are to be counted among the Muslims mainly through their naive conviction that they are Muslims. They call their Hindu countrymen kafir without the slightest derogatory intention and consider themselves as basi, “the sons of religion”, or Cham Asalam (= Islam), “Chams of Islam”. They say that they worship Oblah (Allah), but also P© Devata Thwov (Çvor) (Sanskrit Devata Starga), “God, Lord of Heaven”, and they offer presents in certain agrarian rites, e.g., two eggs, a cup of rice brandy, and three leaves of betel, to P© Ovlah T©k Allah, the “mysterious king of the underworld”; in reality it is the Muslim expression Allah ta’alah, out of which they have made a god. They also worship the Brahman goddess P© Ino Nogar = “Mother of the Land” (Umã, Bhagavati), and her husband P© Yang Amô, “the Lord God, the Father [of the land]” (Sîva), whom they identify with P© Havah (= Hawawâ), i.e., Eve and P© Adam, the ancestors of mankind.

The Kaphir Cham of Annam with as broad a tolerance have taken into their Pantheon P© Ovlah = Allah, an undefined bodiless god, the creator of Po Raqullâk (= Rasal Allâh) and of P© Lãhâ, who lives in Môkah (Mecca) and who was created by P© Ovlahuk (= Alâhû) the father of nobi Mahamad (= Naâbi Muhammad); we thus see that the Kaphir have made three gods out of the misunderstood formula: Lã silãha sila ‘llahu, Muhammad rasul-il ‘llah!

The Bani of Annam have a very high but vague notion of Nobi Mahamad, i.e., the prophet Muhammad, and to them the Kur’ân is tapuk (= kitâb) nobi Mahamad = the book of the Prophet Muhammad; the call it also tapuk asalâm (= kitâb al-Islâm), the book of Islam, kitâb alamadu = kitâb al-İslâm, the book of praise, tapuk akâhârû, the talisman book. They never use its real name. The Kur’ân moreover is hardly to be found among them at all. The few copies which exist are incorrect, and written on Chinese paper with the brush and not with the reed pen. The Bani seem to esteem equally highly a mystical compendium which much resembles the Javanese primbon and is called nérbonan by them. The “priests” copy it only during ramotion (= Ramadãn) and they receive the princely remuneration of a buffalo for each copy.

The Cham of Annam pray only on Fridays and during Ramadan the five sab or vabut (= wakî) (“prayer”), the names of which they corrupt as fol-
The festival takes place on the second day at the rise of the morning star. After the modin has invoked the deities and exchange the turban for a kind of disc, which is covered with white cloth; on these occasions they bored through the middle and fastened to the fez by long gru. A white sarong, a cane, the roots of which are woven into the form of a basket only for the mimbars. The people observe Ramadan only for 3 days. These mosques or cisterns under the penthouse roof of the mosque. The others are performed using the great cisterns under the penthouse roof of the mosque. These mosques or sang mogik (samōgik, samugik; cf. Ach.: mösōgit), which are turned towards Mecca and, while they do not eat pork, the priests as well as the faithful enjoy spirits made from rice, as well as other intoxicating liquors; the religious dignitaries do not however drink in the mosque. If the number of "40" is not present on Friday in the mosque, those making offerings by sacrificing a piece of linen. The whole looks like the biretta of a judge. These "priests" are almost as ignorant as their simple followers; they can hardly read Arabic, hardly study it at all, and only roughly understand some sūras which they repeat only because their fathers also did so. They are free from taxation and forced labour and are held in fairly high esteem by the people; they are the more educated class, however slight the education may be. As they are quite indifferent and tolerant, they do not think ill of the faithful when they make offerings to the Pō Yang or various Hindu deities, endeavour to propitiate evil spirits and perform certain agrarian rites or magic ceremonies which have nothing Muslim about them. They live in perfect harmony with the Hindu bapaq, invite them to their religious and domestic festivities and are invited in turn—only the food for the imōms must be prepared by a Muslim woman—and give each other places of honour. From mutual tolerance the two communities refrain from eating both pork and beef. Only from the Hindu cremations do the Muslim priests carefully absent themselves, and this religious horror of corpses was previously, it is said, the reason why they alone could enter the royal palace to pray with women in child-bed and to watch his wives and children during the absence of the king. Either as a result of ancient customs or of the Malay-Polynesian matriarchal system, or through contact with the Hindus of Annam who have priestesses called padju, the Muslims of Annam have priestesses for a domestic cult; they are called radja or ri tenía. If a sick member of the family has to be healed, for example, or a journey or business enterprise to be undertaken auspiciously, the imōm first of all recites various prayers, then this radja—often the housewife herself—accompanied by the mōdin, who sings and beats the drum, performs certain ritual dances or falls into a state of great excitement in order to influence the 'deities' or 'spirits of the dead', to whom sacrifices are at the same time made. This ceremony is always followed by a great feast. The radjas, who must not eat the flesh of the pig or of the sand lizard, even play the principal part at the great annual festivals, which are celebrated in December-January and are probably of Malay or Indonesian origin—the name Java is repeated by the Muslim Cham as the "New Year festival of the ancestors". The festival lasts two days and three nights. A great booth is built in an enclosure, if possible of new material, and the interior is hung with white cotton cloth. The altar is a simple large tray, with dishes on which are betel, food and fruits. Wax lights are stuck on the edge of the dishes and they also are bound round with cotton threads of different colours. A swing hung from two pillars is for the radja: she is assisted by three imōms and the mōdin, who with his tom-tom conducts an orchestra consisting of a clarionet, a violin, cymbals and an oblong drum (pass). The festival, which is interrupted by numerous meals, is opened with the bismillāh, then follows the invocation of the mountain and forest spirits and of the shades of the "spirits beyond the sea, which may not be mentioned by name"; and finally the invocation of 38 deities or spirits by name; at each of them the three imōms recite prayers. The most characteristic part of the festival takes place on the second day at the rise of the morning star. After the mōdin has invoked the deities and
the radjá has performed a special dance in their honour, they take a small boat made out of a single piece of wood, which is said to have come from Java or China to collect tribute. The master of the house in which the festival is held pretends not to understand Javanese and the modin acts as interpreter. Amid joking all round, eggs, cakes and the figure of an ape with jointed limbs are put in the boat, the participants then break up the walls and roof of the booth and fight for the cakes. On the third day the radjá goes, accompanied by the officiants and the orchestra, to the river and solemnly places the boat with the ape on the water. This ends the festival.

While circumcision is only symbolic with the Bani of Annam, the tubals for the old men is practised as in Cambodia and the karôh (literally, "enclosing") marks the declaration of a girl's fitness for marriage. Not till then dare they put up their hair and marry; until then they are tabung, i.e., unapproachable, and the seducer would be severely punished. This festival takes place under the presedency of the ong gru and of two imôms for a considerable number of girls on each occasion and lasts two days. It is opened with prayers to Allâh, Muhammed, the Hindu deities and the shades of their ancestors as well as with a feast at which the priests eat apart. Two booths are erected, one for the ceremony—ong gru—and the other as a dressing room for the girls, who sleep there under the supervision of four matrons. The imôms spend the night praying; at 7 a.m. the girls appear wearing their finest clothes and ornaments, their hair loosened and covered with a triangular mitre. Before them goes an old woman and a man clothed in white, who carries a year-old child dressed exactly like the girls except for the mitre. They throw themselves down before the ong gru and the imôms. The ong gru places a grain of salt in the mouth of the child, cuts off a lock of its hair and gives it some water to drink. The same is done with the girls, who then return in procession to their booth. If a girl has been seduced the lock is cut off at her neck as a mark of shame. A second feast, at which the priests eat before the faithful, concludes the ceremony.

Birth customs in Annam among the Bani are similar to those among the Kaphir except that the Bani do not sacrifice to the gods on such occasions. The seduction of girls is also severely punished. They do not marry till they are 17 or 28. In Panrang, evidently the result of the old Malay matriarchal system—which has left other traces also, like the right of inheritance of women and the tracing of descent through them and their practising the cult of ancestors—the custom prevails that the girls seek the young men in marriage, but everywhere else in Indo-China the reverse is the custom. The wedding (Cham lihkah-Arab. nikāh), which is the occasion of long and costly festivities, is usually replaced by public cohabitation, which causes no scandal; the pair are free to celebrate it later when they can afford it, and they may already have two or three children before they take part in it. It is far more elaborate among the Bani than among the Kaphir. The imôms repeat prayers; the ong gru, who represents the "lord Muhammed", asks the bride, who is considered to be Fâtima, whether she accepts the presents of the bridegroom, the lord 'Ali. Rich feasts take place at the weddings. The dowry given to the woman remains her property in case of a divorce. Divorce is fairly easy and leaves nearly two-thirds of the joint property in the hands of the woman. Mixed marriages are rare, and in them the children follow the religion of the mother. It sometimes happens that a Muslim woman marries a Hindu, very rarely the contrary.

The burial service is as simple among the Bani as it is elaborate among the Kaphir. The corpse is wrapped in white cotton sheets and placed in a small hut, where the ong gru and the imôms repeat prayers. As soon as night falls the dead man is buried, with four imôms present, almost secretly, without a coffin and with the face turned to the north. The relatives beseech his spirit not to come and afflic the living. On the 3rd, 10th, 30th, 40th and 100th day as well as on the anniversary of his death a padhi, i.e., a service at the tomb with prayers, a meal and presents for the imôms, is observed at his grave. Those of the 7th and the 40th day are the most important. The dead person is almost always exhumed after a certain period on an anniversary of his death. His bones as well as his golden or silver ornaments are placed in a small coffin which is again buried in a particular place and considered sacred.

We thus see that Islam, while it has remained fairly pure in Cambodia, has been overlaid in Annam with a mass of elements and customs, partly anamistic and partly Hindu. The Cham nevertheless desire to be good Muslims: it is only their ignorance and long usage that are the causes of their errors. Malay kadigis who have come from the Archipelago or Cambodia on a religious mission have repeatedly succeeded in putting an end to sacrifices to heathen deities in various villages, although they have been unable to stop the enjoyment of rice brandy.

Under the influence of "modernism" and westernization, all these customs have become very much less rigid, losing all those elements which might seem archaic or incompatible with the demands of present-day life.

The French administration attempted, though not very forcefully, to preserve the Cham from complete assimilation and from the extinction as a separate community to which they seemed doomed at the beginning of the 20th century. It succeeded in saving the essential part of what remained of the monuments they had built, and managed, with less happy results, to preserve their countryside intact. Their future, which now depends on their own will to survive, is still very uncertain.

Bibliography: E. Aymonier, Les Tchams et leurs religions, Paris 1891; idem, Légendes historiques des Chams, in Excursions et reconnaissances, xiv, no. 32; idem, Grammaire de la Langue Chame, Saigon 1889; Aymonier and Cabaton, Dictionnaire châm-français, Introduction: La Langue Chame, Paris 1906; Cabaton, Notes sur l'Islam dans l'Indochine française, in RMM, i, 17-47; idem, Les Chams musulmans de l'Indo-Chine française, ibid., 129-180; idem, Nouvelles recherches sur les Chams, Paris 1910; R. P. Durand, Les Chams Banis, in Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, iii, 54-62, 447-503; v, 388-86; idem, Notes sur les Chams, in Revue Indo-Chinoise, no. 32; Aymonier and Jeanne, Les Chams d'autrefois et d'aujourd'hui, Hanoi 1915, republished under the title: Un Royaume disparu, les Chams et leur art, ed. Van Oest, 1923; Georges Maspéro, Le Royaume de Champa, ed. Van Oest, 1929; see also the article "Champa" in the Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, xxi, II, general index to vols. i to xx, and the same article in the analytical indexes to the following volumes.

(A. CABATON-[G. MEILLON])
The Republic of Indonesia comprises some four-fifths of the archipelago which, stretching eastwards from the south-eastern angle of Asia, separates the Indian from the Pacific Ocean, at the same time as it constitutes a discontinuous land link between Asia and Australasia. Extending for approximately 3,400 miles from west to east, and about 1,250 miles from north to south (in a zone bounded by longitudes 92° and 141° east and by latitudes 6° north and 11° south), it embraces some 3,000 islands of highly diverse size, character and resources. In popular topographical terminology these are perceived as constituting four groups. The Sunda Raja or Greater Sunda complex, including the four large islands of Sumatra, Java (Djawa), Celebes (Sulawesi), and the larger part of Kalimantan, constitutes the core of the country from the point of view of areal extent, size of population, wealth of natural resources, and intensity of economic activity. The Nusa Tenggara or Lesser Sundas form a chain of smaller islands extending from Bali to western Timor (the eastern half of this latter island is under Portuguese control). The third group, known as Maluku, includes the island arcs lying north of the eastern Lesser Sundas and east of the Sunda and Sahul Shelves, and the half of the island of New Guinea, which was incorporated within the Indonesian polity as recently as 1963, is by all standards the least developed part of the country.

Structurally the Indonesian archipelago comprises three main tectonic components, each with a distinctive morphological expression. Both the western and eastern sectors—known to physiographers as the Sunda and Sahul Shelves respectively—are developed on stable continental platforms of ancient indurated rocks, relatively subdued relief, and comparatively shallow seas. Between, and partially bounding, these platforms are a series of geologically recent mountain ranges that now appear on the map as fragmented but structurally continuous island arcs separated from each other by deep semi-oceanic basins. As might be expected in view of their geological history, these island arcs are zones of instability, manifested primarily in earthquakes of high frequency but moderate intensity and, more particularly, in a wide range of volcanic activity. On the continental platforms the starkness of this tectonic skeleton is peripherally mitigated by a mantle of alluvium giving rise to extensive coastal plains: elsewhere slopes tend to be steep, and level land exiguous. Finally, deriving from this structural context are substantial mineral resources: notably petroleum, tin ore, coal of various grades, and bauxite, all from the Sunda Shelf and its borders; low-grade iron ores from Borneo and Celebes; and small quantities of high-grade magnetite and hematite elsewhere. Other mineral resources which have been exploited on a small scale include nickel in Celebes, manganese, phosphate, sulphur, and iodine in Java, and gold and silver in Sumatra and West Java.

Indonesia's location determines that its climatic régime is broadly equatorial. Variations in insolation intensity and duration are minimal, so that temperatures at sea level are uniformly high and extremely constant. Annual ranges are small, usually of the order of 5°F, with diurnal ranges up to three times that amount. The season, distribution, and quantity of rainfall depend on location and aspect, as well as on relation to the seasonally reversed wind systems which the presence of continental land masses here imposes on the equatorial régime. Whereas an annual total of at least 80 inches is experienced throughout most of the archipelago, slopes athwart the warm moist air streams that prevail during the northern-hemispheric summer are much wetter. Padang, at the foot of the Barisan Range, for example, has an average annual rainfall of 177 inches. In the eastern half of Java and the Nusa Tenggara, by contrast, an extremely southerly location within the Indonesian polity combined with coastal orientation to the arid zone to produce average annual totals of less than 60 inches. This is also the only part of the country to experience a markedly drier season. Generally speaking, rain everywhere tends to fall in heavy showers of comparatively short duration.

High temperatures and abundant moisture ensure that soils, apart from those developed on recent alluvium or volcanic ash, tend to be strongly ferrallitic in character, their outstanding agronomic feature being a low natural fertility. In primeval times virtually the whole territory was covered by a mantle of equatorial rain-forest of great floristic richness, which itself subsisted a variety of plant associations ranging from true rain-forest to coastal mangrove, fresh-water swamp-forest, limestone associations, and mountain vegetation. Centuries of human occupation and the spread of new crops, such as sugar, tobacco, coffee, and subsequently rubber, and by the imposition in Java, by a paternally inclined colonial government, of an agro-industrial system which intruded the disequilibrating forces of commercial agriculture into the very heart of the village, often making the javanese farm worker occupationally conduplicate, coolie and peasant at the same time.

Indonesia is the fifth most populous nation in the world, with a current population exceeding 100 million souls. Of these, approximately two-thirds are living on the islands of Java and Madura, which together comprise only seven per cent of the land area of the country. In terms of average densities, this means something like 1,200 persons per square mile in Java, but only 62 per square mile in the Outer Islands (though this figure conceals wide variations within the region, e.g., Bali with 750 persons per square mile; Sumatra with 50; and Kalimantan with 78, and Irian Barat with 6). In large measure this imbalance in population distribution is
attributable to what Clifford Geertz has described as the concentrative and tumescent qualities of the wet-padi ecosystem as integrated with commercial farming in colonial Java. The dispersive, inelastic properties of the swidden ecologically would seem likely to make large-scale transfers of population from Java to the apparently underpopulated Outer Islands not only unpopular, but also ineffective unless accompanied by a major transformation of the ecosystem.

The population of Indonesia is disposed in a hierarchy of settlements ranging from innumerable villages to the principal cities of the colonial jayas, at the highest. Although Jakarta, with a population of three million, is more than twice the size of Surabaya, the next largest city, it appears to accord better with the graduated distribution of city sizes characteristic of economically developed countries than with the concept of the primate city as evidenced in numerous other formerly colonial territories. In fact the notion of primacy would seem to be more appropriate to the situation in the Outer Islands, where some of the higher order urban centres are nearly four times as populous as the next largest cities in their territories. Whereas urbanism reaches a higher level in Java than elsewhere in Indonesia, urbanization appears to be proceeding more rapidly in the Outer Islands. The several levels of the city hierarchy subsume a considerable variety of urban forms, ranging from traditional ceremonial and religious foci to the commercial-administrative conurbations which rose to pre-eminence during the colonial period, from largely unchanged pre-industrial market towns dominated by the expediential mores of the bazaar to modern industrially oriented port cities.


II.—ETHNOGRAPHY

The cultural diversity of the several hundred ethnic groups of Indonesia is striking; a common pattern underlying the diversity is discernible, but elusive and hard to specify. For this reason, no consensus has been reached on a classification or taxonomy of Indonesian peoples and cultures. A workable, if somewhat imprecise, classification is as follows: (A) societies (or tribes) which adhere predominantly to a territorial basis; (B) societies, politically organized on a territorial basis, but with chiefs of genealogical groups also having political and legal powers; (C) societies in which political power is exclusively vested in chiefs of genealogical groups (or of local segments of such groups).

Societies of group A constitute real states, which have played an active role in the history of South-East Asia. Examples are the principalities of Java and Bali, the Malay states of eastern Sumatra and of the Malay Peninsula, and the sultanates of the Bugis-Makassar area of southern Celebes. Without exception they have adopted a world religion: mostly Islam, but a syncretic form of Hinduism and Buddhism in the case of Bali. Political authority is (or was)—in Indonesia these States have lost the semi-independence they have preserved in Malayas in the hands of established dynasties, assisted by courtiers, administrators, and territorial chiefs who form a nobility, and in the case of Java drew their emoluments from the taxes they levied in the district granted to them by the ruler as an apanage of their office. The rulers, and their regalia, are usually considered to be the sacred centres, the spiritual depositories, of the wellbeing of their realms. Kinship organization in these societies is generally of the bilateral (cognatic) type, based on single-family households. Economic activities are centred on agriculture (rice grown on elaborately irrigated fields), stockbreeding, and trade (some of it interinsular).

Societies of type B (such as the Batak and the Minangkabau, both of Sumatra) have or had some measure of centralized political government, but the chiefs of genealogical groups (clans and lineages) have considerable authority over their kinfolk. The lineages in question may be patrilineal (Minangkabau) or matrilineal; they have a tendency to maintain regular marriage relationships with specific other lineages, in which the bride-borrowing lineage is superior to the bride-receivers. This type of social structure links up with a whole system of cosmic classifications, involving dichotomies as male/female, upperworld/underworld, and superior/inferior, and speculations on numerology and colour classification. Such a system appears most clearly among those Batak groups which are not yet converted to Islam or Christianity.

Rice cultivation (on irrigated fields as well as by the slash-and-burn method) is important, as is the growing of commercial crops (coffee, rubber). Peoples of this group are no less prominent in modern Indonesian affairs than those of group A.

Societies of type C, finally, occur on the smaller, and in the interior of the larger islands: the Dayak peoples of Borneo, the Toradja of Celebes, etc. Many still adhere to their original religion, or were only recently converted to Islam or Christianity. The archaic religion is predominantly an ancestor cult,
with elaborate, frequently potlatch-like, mortuary rites and (e.g., with the Dayak) a developed priestly theology and rich mythology, manifesting the same type of classification system as mentioned for B. Kinship forms vary around the theme of matrilineal combined with patrilineal descent or inheritance. Agriculture (“dry” rice, maize, sago) predominates, foreign trade is rudimentary. For these people in particular a general Indonesian problem is acute: how much of their traditional way of life can and should they preserve in a nation striving towards a modern and unified culture?


(E. de Josselin de Jong)

iii.—LANGUAGES

With a few exceptions which will be mentioned, the indigenous languages of Indonesia belong to the Austronesian family. Austronesian languages extend over Madagascar, southern Vietnam, Taiwan, the Philippine Islands, Malaysia, Indonesia, Papua/New Guinea, the Melanesian, Micronesian and Polynesian islands and New Zealand. Although the existence of such a family was postulated as early as 1780 by William Marsden, it was left to W. von Humboldt, in 1836, to define it more closely and to give it the title “Malayo-Polynesian” by which it was to be known for more than a century; this has now been displaced by “Austronesian”, a term coined by Wilhelm Schmidt in 1889. The Austronesian family, comprising perhaps some 500 languages in all, is currently subdivided into three subgroups, Indonesian, Polynesian and Melanesian; Micronesian is held by some to constitute a fourth subgroup. The majority of the people who have embraced Islam in this area speak Indonesian languages; therefore it is these languages that are important to the study of Islam in South East Asia, particularly Malay, Javanese, Sundanese, Achinese, Minangkabau, Buginese and Macassarese.

Owing to the lack of real evidence, the early history of the speakers of Austronesian languages is little more than conjecture. Their probable original homeland, which would of course be the homeland of the ancestors of the Indonesian languages, has been located by speculation in places ranging from Tartary, the Indo-China area and southern China to Melanesia or Taiwan.

Not all the languages of Indonesia belong to the Indonesian subgroup; communities speaking non-Indonesian languages can be found in North Malaya, Ternate, Timor and Irian Barat (formerly known as West New Guinea). Besides these should be mentioned the non-indigenous languages spoken in the country, such as Chinese (mainly Hok-kien, Khoe, Cantonese), Dutch, English and Arabic.

On the other hand languages of the Indonesian subgroup are spoken by communities beyond the borders of Indonesia: Malay in Malaysia, southern Thailand and Brunei, and other languages of the Indonesian subgroup, Sarawak, Sabah, Sarawak, the Philippines and Portuguese Timor. In addition, Malay or other Indonesian languages are spoken by communities of Indonesian origin living in Ceylon, South Africa, Surinam and the Netherlands.

There is no general agreement on the total number of languages within Indonesia. Apart from the absence of an agreed definition of language, detailed linguistic studies are lacking for most areas. A figure commonly mentioned is 250, but possibly more reliable estimates are those which put it at 200, or a little less. The number of speakers of any single language can vary from perhaps over 50 millions, as in the case of Javanese, to the 40,000 or so who speak some of the lesser tongues. Some idea of the distribution of the main languages can be obtained from the accompanying language map; for some suggested amendments to the data given in it, see I. Dyn, A lexicostatistical classification of the Austronesian Languages (Indiana University 1965, 48-49). Generally a map cannot show the minority speech communities which have grown up outside their original areas as a result of population movement.

A broad division of the Indonesian languages into Western and Eastern, suggested by the Dutch scholar J. L. A. Brandes, failed to withstand the test of time.

Epigraphic material. The decisive early external influence on Indonesian culture was unquestionably Indian, and the earliest known inscriptions are written in Sanskrit. One of these, found near Kutel in the island of Kalimantan (formerly called Borneo), is thought to date from about 400 A.D.; it commemorates the rule of Mulavarman over a Hinduized state. The earliest inscriptions from the Malay Peninsula, Buddhistic texts, and also the earliest epigraphic evidence from Western Java, are judged likewise to date from this time.

The oldest evidence of a language indigenous to the area is found in inscriptions on stone from South Sumatra, dating from 682 A.D., and associated with the state of Srivijaya; despite the occurrence here too of many Sanskrit words, the basic language has sufficient affinity with later Malay to be given the name Old Malay. Although Old Javanese inscriptions begin only about a century later (circa 780), subsequent material in this language proved to be much more abundant than that in Old Malay; copper inscriptions appeared up until about the 12th/13th century. Epigraphic evidence of the other recorded ancient Indonesian language, Old Balinese, begins in 882 A.D., and continues to appear over nearly two centuries. It may be noted that all three languages employed scripts of Indian derivation. There is of course no reference to Islam in the early inscriptions. Malay and Bahasa Indonesia, probably in Sumatra, has been disseminated widely through the Indonesian area, in which it has for centuries been the lingua franca. On account of its usefulness for commercial, political and religious purposes it has always attracted more attention from foreigners than have other Indonesian languages. It is the language of a considerable corpus of manuscript material produced in the 15th-16th/17th-18th centuries. Malay, the official language of Malaysia, and Bahasa Indonesia (see below), the official language of Indonesia, have both been developed directly from this earlier form of Malay. Linguistically speaking, Malay and Bahasa Indonesia can scarcely be held to be separate languages; the two different names reflect the political division of the Indonesian cultural area which ensued on the Anglo-Dutch Treaty of 1239/1824. The following remarks on some of the characteristics of Malay apply equally to Bahasa Indonesia.

We may mention first some features of the Indonesian languages in general which are at the same time applicable to Malay. Observers have noted conspicuous mutual resemblances between the languages of the Indonesian subgroup. The number of vowel phonemes is limited, being basically [a], [i],
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and, with sometimes a considerable range of non-phonemic variation (\[i\] to \[e\], \[u\] to \[\text{a}\] etc.); variation in the length of vowels, when it occurs, is also non-phonemic. Common diphthongs are \([\text{ai}]\), \([\text{au}]\) and \([\text{ui}]\). The consonantal system is relatively simple; the glottal stop (\text{hamsa}) is widespread; single consonants are preferred, and consonantal clusters avoided, both at the beginning and end of words; but certain two-consonant combinations, notably nasal combinations such as \(-\text{mb}-\), \(-\text{nd}-\), etc., may occur within the word. Thus the common pattern for the Indonesian "word-base", which is likely to be disyllabic, will be consonant/vowel/consonant/vowel/consonant.

Affixation, another trait of the Indonesian languages, can best be illustrated with specific reference to Malay examples; but it must be mentioned that infixation is no longer productive in Malay, if indeed it ever was a feature of this language. Very briefly, the verbal prefixes in Malay include \text{ber-}, \text{mas-}, \text{pe(r)}- and \text{ter-} and the suffixes are \(-\text{i}-\) and \(-\text{kan,-s}\); a verb may occur without any affix; in certain cases two prefixes may be used simultaneously, as may prefix and suffix. Prefixes commonly employed in conjunction with or to form substantives are \text{ke-}, \text{pe(r)}- and \text{per-}, while a common suffix (which again may be used in conjunction with a prefix) is \(-\text{an}\).

Further, it may be remarked that substantives have no grammatical gender, and they do not normally undergo morphological change for case or number; thus \text{mata} unless further qualified can be translated 'eye' or 'eyes'. Reduplication of the substantive, a very common feature of Indonesian languages, can correspond to the plural number, but does not always do so. Perhaps the one syntactical feature of Malay which ought to be mentioned is the fact that the affirmative adjective follows the noun it qualifies.

External influences on Indonesian languages. Of the languages which were introduced into the area in historical times, it was undoubtedly Sanskrit which first exerted a major influence. The occurrence of Sanskrit and partially Sanskrit inscriptions has been mentioned. Javanese and Malay proved to be particularly susceptible to Sanskrit influence, and it was via these languages that Sanskrit influence reached other languages of the area. Sanskrit has given to these languages common grammatical particles, and moreover has enriched the lexicon in the spheres of religion (for example \text{iśama}, \text{dosa}), of ideas (e.g., \text{buddhi, jiva}), court ritual (e.g., \text{uṇācara, āstāma}), of statecraft (e.g., \text{dāla, drohaka}), of relationship (e.g., \text{ṣuśmin, puṇa}), and so forth, with appropriate adaptation to the morphology of the recipient language.

Arabic is the other language which has exerted a significant influence on the Indonesian languages over a long period if time; perhaps none was more deeply influenced than Malay, and Arabic influence has permeated through to the other languages often via Malay. This influence can be seen in Malay syntax, at least in religious writings, and in the 'popular' lexicon as well as the 'learned', though understandably to a greater extent in the latter.

Examples of everyday Malay words of Arabic derivation are: \text{asad (}<\text{aqīs})}, \text{fasal (<\text{faṣīl})}, \text{hal (<\text{kāl})}, \text{ilmu (<\text{ilm})}, \text{mangkin (<\text{mumkin})}, \text{perlu (<\text{fard})}, \text{sebab (<\text{sabab})}, \text{selamat (<\text{salāma})}, \text{tawab (<\text{tauba})}. Before the coming of steam, contact between Arabia and the Indonesian Archipelago was maintained mainly via India; traces of Indian languages, and Persian, consequently appear in borrowings from Arabic. This possibly explains also, perhaps, the unexpected occurrence of words of Sanskrit origin in the vocabulary of Islamic practice in Malay; so for 'heaven' \text{shurga (<\text{Skt. svarga})} is preferred to the Arabic \text{sama}; for 'heil' \text{naraaka (<\text{Skt. naraaka})} rather than \text{jahannam or al-nār}; for 'fasting' \text{puasa (<\text{Skt. upāvāsa})} rather than \text{ṣawm}. Alternatively—and this seems more likely—the use of these words may be due to the taking over by the first Muslims of terms already current in the area of pre-Islamic Malay.

The relative position of Sanskrit and Arabic as sources of influence on Malay and other Indonesian languages can be summed up thus: Up to and including the 7th/8th century Sanskrit held the field; during that time Sanskrit appeared in inscriptions in combination with Indonesian languages, and indeed inscriptions wholly in Sanskrit occasionally appeared. However, by the beginning of the 8th/9th century Islam had secured a foothold in the Archipelago, and before the century was out Arabic influence had begun to manifest itself on the language; in that century appears the first clearly Islamic Malay inscription, known as the Trengganu Stone, written moreover in an Arabic type of script. From then on, Sanskrit was steadily to yield ground to Arabic in the field of language; some of the Sanskrit vocabulary in the inscriptions has failed to survive into modern times, while there has been no comparable loss of Arabic elements once they have been incorporated in the language. The position of Arabic has of course been strengthened by the force of religion exerted through religious instruction and the Kurān, and numbers of manuscripts in Arabic have been brought into, or produced in, Indonesia. Excepting possibly in the island of Bali, no comparable Sanskrit subculture persists; nevertheless, since 1942 Indonesian linguists have often resorted to Sanskrit when creating new terms for Bahasa Indonesia.

The remaining non-Indonesian languages which have influenced Malay and Bahasa Indonesia are relatively unimportant and can be dealt with briefly. Considering the centuries of Chinese contacts with the Archipelago, Chinese dialects have had a remarkably slight influence, excepting possibly at the colloquial level; from India has come vocabulary of Hindi, Persian, Urdu, Tamil derivation; three European languages which have exercised significant influence are Portuguese, Dutch and English, the last, being the most widely taught foreign language in Indonesia, can be expected to exert a continuing influence on Bahasa Indonesia. Through the centuries there has of course been a continuing interaction of the Indonesian languages on one another.

Scripts. Broadly speaking, the pattern of influences which emerged in the previous section will be reflected in any discussion of the scripts used in Indonesia. The earliest Sanskrit inscriptions were written in a Pallava script, and developments of this were used subsequently in the inscriptions and other writings in Indonesian languages: Old Javanese (from which modern Javanese script has been derived), and the Bugis (from Old Malay language sources from Sumatra), Balinese, Madurese, Sundanese; also in the Sumatran languages Batak, Redjang and Lampung, and others. Although superficially very different, the Bugis and Makassar scripts show definite affinities with those mentioned. In fact, there is so far no evidence to refute an opinion put forward by H. Kern and others that all the early scripts of the Archipelago are of Indian origin.
For some languages (exemplified by Malay), though not for others, the diffusion of Islam resulted in the adoption of a new Arabic type script. For Malay the adoption was virtually total, and apart from epigraphic material referred to above no writings are known in pre-Arabic script. As far as the other languages are concerned the new script met with varying degrees of acceptance; in Javanese it was used for certain kinds of literature, in Bugis and Makassarese it was rarely employed, while in Achenese and Minangkabau for example it came into general use. The principal modification to the script necessitated by Malay phonology was the addition of the following letters to represent sounds not found in Arabic: چ for ch; چ for ng; چ for r; چ for g; and چ for ny. In the Malay alphabet (which in this respect is more consistent than some other alphabets of Perso-Arabic origin) the چ precedes the چ. The vowel signs چa, چa and چa are seldom used; their Malay names (baris diatas, 'line above', baris dibawah 'line below' and baris dihadapan 'line in front', respectively) are reminiscent of the equivalent terms in Persian. The letters of this script are known in Bahasa Indonesia as huruf Arab, but in Malay as Jawi. Use of this script is declining in Malaysia, and in Indonesia it has almost disappeared, surviving only in the religious sphere. It has been superseded by romanized script, introduced from Europe as early as the 11th/12th century by Christian missionaries. Thus other languages than Bahasa Indonesia, Javanese for example, make use of a romanized script for publications at the present time. The romanized spelling of Bahasa Indonesia and of Malay, being based respectively on Dutch and English orthography, tend to emphasize the dissimilarity of the two; however, on 27 June 1967 agreement was reached on a new unified spelling to be used both in Indonesia and Malaysia. The letters which functioned identically in the two former orthographies have been retained in the new spelling: b, d, f, g, h, k, l, m, n, p, r, s, t, w, z; so have the combination ng, and the letters q, s, and x which occur in some borrowed words. Where usage in the two former orthographies differed, changes had to be made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Malay</th>
<th>Former Bahasa Indonesia</th>
<th>New Spelling</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>tj</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>dj</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>sy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The agreed new symbols for the vowels are a, e, e, i, o, and u (thus, except in material for reading practice, there will be no differentiation between the symbol for e taling ("long e", sometimes hitherto given an accent sign), and e pèhèt ("short e", sometimes written hitherto [i]). The present spellings for diphthongs (ai, au, oi), are retained. It is not yet certain that the new spelling will be generally adopted in Indonesia.

Bahasa Indonesia. It has been seen that both Old Javanese and Old Malay appeared on the early inscriptions. In the intervening centuries both languages have developed and they have played prominent roles in the cultural history of the Archipelago, Javanese as the language of the sophisticated polities of Central and Eastern Java, Malay as the language of the port-states and of mercantile intercourse in general. In view of the numerous literary works produced in Javanese, and of the cultural prestige of the Javanese in the area, it would not have been surprising to find Javanese become the language of Indonesia; however, owing in part perhaps to the complexities arising from the "stratification" of the Javanese language, in part to the geographical dissemination of Malay through the island archipelago, Javanese was not adopted as the vehicle of the independent nation. The modern Indonesian form of Malay is known officially as Bahasa Indonesia (literally "the language of Indonesia"); foreign writers generally use this term to refer to the language in preference to the less precise "Indonesian". The adoption of Bahasa Indonesia to be the official language of the country was virtually assured even before Dutch rule ended in 1949. In spite of advocacy by some that Dutch should become the primary language, and misgivings on the part of others as to the capability of Bahasa Indonesia to function as the language of a modernizing state, the determination of Indonesian nationalists to utilize the language as the vehicle of expression of their will in the end decided the issue. In 1928 the nationalist youth movement formally resolved in this sense; and the suppression of the Dutch language as a consequence of the Japanese occupation of the East Indies in 1942 removed another obstacle from the path of Bahasa Indonesia, which was declared to be the official language of the new Republic of Indonesia in the constitution adopted in 1945. The present situation therefore is that Bahasa Indonesia is in general use for radio, newspapers and books; it is spoken and understood by nearly all Indonesians, the exceptions being mostly middle-aged or elderly; since it is now taught in schools throughout Indonesia it may be assumed that within a generation or so it will be the everyday tongue of all Indonesians—and thus incidentally the everyday tongue of more Muslims than any other language. The majority of Indonesians will continue to study and speak a regional language as well (Javanese, Sundanese etc.), which will in fact be their mother tongue. The use of Dutch, still surprisingly popular with older educated Indonesians, is bound to decline rapidly; to a great extent it is being displaced by English.

Bibliography: For a survey of the Indonesian languages in their wider context see A. Capell, Oceanic linguistics today, in Current Anthropology, iii/4 (October 1962), 371-66, and comments by others; also C. F. and M. Voegelin, Languages of the world, Indo-Pacific, in Anthropological Linguistics, iii/4 (1964), "Indonesian and other Austronesian", see O. Dempwolff, Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes, 3 vol., Berlin 1934-8, and for "Proto-Indonesian" R. Brandstetter, Wurzel und Wort in den Indonesischen Sprachen, Lucerne 1910, and other monographs by Brandstetter [four of which are translated by C. O. Blagden in An introduction to Indonesian Linguistics, London 1910]. On the "Austronesian homeland" theories there is a useful survey with bibliography by J. C. Anceaux in BTLV, deel 121 (1965), 417-32. J. Gonda's Sanskrit in Indonesia (Nagpur 1952) gives much more information about Indonesian languages than is implied by the title, and numerous articles on Indonesian linguistics by this scholar are to be found in BTLV, Lingua and elsewhere.
On Arabic influence on Malay see Ph. S. van Ronkel, Over Invloed der Arabische Syntax op de Maleishe, in TBB, deel 41 (1899), 498-528, and C. Skinner, The influence of Arabic upon Modern Malay in Intisari (Singapore), ii/1 (1966 (?)), 34-47. For specimens of scripts see K. F. Holle, Tabel van Oud- en Nieuw-Indische Alphabetten, The Hague 1882, also Ararkin (below). Of the many grammars of Bahasa Indonesia which have been produced, so far none has achieved recognition as a standard work.

A general discussion of the Indonesian languages is to be found in V. D. Ararkin, Indonezyshie Yazyuki, Moscow 1965, with an extensive bibliography of works in various languages. A very useful series of critical bibliographies on Indonesian languages is being published in Leiden by the Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde; those that have appeared so far are: P. Voorhoeve, Critical survey of studies on the language of Sumatra, 1955; H. A. C. van Es, De reder en E. M. Uhlenbeck, Critical survey of studies on the languages of Borneo, 1958; A. Tceuw (assisted by H. W. Emanuels), A critical survey of studies on Malay and Bahasa Indonesia, 1961; E. M. Uhlenbeck, A critical survey of studies on the languages of Java and Madura, 1964. For a comprehensive collection of linguistic maps, see Richard Salzner, Sprachenkress des Indonezyshen Raumcs, 2 vols., Wiesbaden 1960. (Russell Jones)

iv.—History: (a) Islamic period.

The earliest known record of probable Muslim settlement in the Malay-Indonesian Archipelago is a Chinese report of the existence of an Arab settlement in east Sumatra (San-Fu-Chi = Srwidiyaja = Palembang) headed by an Arab chief in 53/674. A more definite statement on large-scale Muslim emigration into the Archipelago was given by al-Mas'udi, who reported that in 265/878 there were about 120,000 or 200,000 merchants and traders consisting mainly of Muslims (Arabs and Persians) who had settled in Kahanu (Canton) which was massacred following a troublesome peasants' rebellion in south China under the T'ang emperor Hi-Tsung (265/878-276/889). Consequently large numbers of Muslim merchants and traders fled from Canton and sought refuge in Kalab (Kedah) on the mainland or in the Malacca region. This considerable emigration of Muslim merchants and traders effected a transference of the entrepot for Muslim trade with the Chinese empire from Canton to Kedah. We may reasonably assume that since the Muslims had had quite a considerable settlement in Canton (which dated from as early as the 1st/7th century), enjoying a high degree of religious and civil autonomy, they must have perpetuated their mode of settlement and social organization in Kedah, and also in Palembang, whither they had similarly emigrated. This event seems to have marked the beginning of the coming of Islam in the Archipelago.

There is evidence of Muslim settlement in the Phanrang region in south Champa in Cambodia in 421/1029 or earlier. The Leran inscription near Gresik in east Java dated 475/1082 indicated an earlier Muslim presence in the region.

According to the Acehnese (Malay) chronicles, Islam was introduced into the northern tip of Sumatra sometime around 506/1122 by an Arab missionary whose name is given as Shaykh 'Abd Allāh 'Arif. One of his disciples, Shaykh Burbān al-Dīn, later carried on his missionary work as far as Priaman down the west coast. The date of the establishment of Islam in north Sumatra is given as 601/1204, when Djōbān Shāh became its first Sultan. The Hikayat Radja-Radja Pasai related that the Sharif of Mecca sent a certain Șayḫ Ȭ ṭūl all Īl ā at the head of a mission to spread Islam in north Sumatra in the middle of the 7th/11th century. The Pasai region of north Sumatra, consisting of the realms of Perlak and Samudra, was already Muslim by 682/1282. The Sultan, al-Malik al-Šāhīb, died in 707/1307 or 707/1307.

In Trengganu on the northeast coast of the Malay Peninsula a Teofrastos inscription dated 701/1301 was discovered at Kuala Berang indicating earlier Muslim settlement in the region. A Muslim tombstone at Bud Dato on the island of Jolo in Sulu dated 710/1310 indicates that Muslims frequented the region, perhaps in the course of their trade relationship with China.

Towards the end of the 8th/14th century, the kingdom of Malacca on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula was founded by Parameswara, a Palembang prince who had fled from Java and ruled for a brief period in Tumisik (Singapore). It is possible that the coastal regions near Malacca had already been used by Muslims for their commercial activities at an earlier date, seeing that they had settled in Kedah long before. By 812/1409, the ruler of Malacca, through Muslim proselytizing efforts, had embraced Islam and concluded a family alliance with the Sultan of Pasai by marrying the latter's daughter. Both Pasai and Malacca had by then become centres of Islamic learning and of the propagation of the faith throughout the Archipelago. Sufism was to play a dominating role in the Islamization process for the next two centuries. Scholars and missionaries from all parts of the Archipelago as well as from Arabia gathered in these two emporia to disseminate religious knowledge. Among these were found many from Java including two future saints of Java, Sunan Bonang of Tuban and Sunan Giri, who on their return to Java propagated the faith there.

Pasai during the reign of al-Malik al-Zāhīr (beginning of 8th/14th century), a grandson of al-Malik al-Šāhīb, was the earliest centre of Islamic learning in the Archipelago. When Ibn Baṭṭūṭa visited Pasai in 746/1345-747/1346, he recorded that the Sultan was fond of religious debates, and zealous in propagating Islam in the surrounding country by means of confraternities. By 830/1427 the rulers of Aru, Samudra, Pedir and Lambri, who were all included in the realm of Atjeh, had become Muslim, and Atjeh was expanding her power to the south.

According to a tarsila (silisila: genealogical record of noble families) of Sulu, Islam was introduced there in the second half of the 8th/14th century by an Arab missionary called Sharif Awliyā Karīm al-Mahkūdīm, who had come from the region later known as Malacca, where he was credited with having converted the inhabitants to Islam. He is said to have reached Sulu in 782/1380 and settled in Bwansa near Jolo. The latter was the first Sultan of Sulu at the end of the 8th/14th century.

On Java, Arab and Persian missionaries had been propagating Islam since 803/1400. One of them, a famous wālī, the sayyid Mawlānā Malik Ibrāhīm, died in Gresik in 822/1419. He had made attempts to persuade the king of Maqājahīt (Vikramar-vaddhana, 788-1386/833-1429) to embrace Islam.
However, it was during the reign of Kertawidjaya (Bhre Tumapel, 851/1447-855/1451) that Islam gained a foothold in the royal court of Madjapahit. This event was initiated by the coming of Raden Rahmat, the son of an Arab missionary of Champa, whose important and decisive role in the Islamization of Java had been foretold by another Arab missionary of Java, Shaykh Mawilain Djumád̤a al-Krubá. Raden Rahmat established his centre at Ampel (Surabaya) and later was to become venerated by the Javanese as the chel wall (master) of Java with the title Sunan Ampel. Another famous sayyid missionary of Java was Mawilain Ishák of Pasai who was entrusted by the Sultan of Pasai with the mission of converting Balambangan in the easternmost region of Java. Both Sunan Bonang, a son of Sunan Ampel, and his own son by his marriage with a daughter of the king of Madjapahit, Raden Paku (Sunan Girı), studied under him in Malacca and Pasai. Upon the death of Sunan Ampel (972/1467), Sunan Girı succeeded him and made Ampel (Java) still further as the centre of Islamic learning and the propagation of the faith in Java. Another son of Sunan Ampel also became recognized as a wali and was known as Sunan Dradjat of Sidaryu. On the island of Madura, Pangeran Sharif, also called Khalfi Husayn, held sway. The fall of Madjapahit in 883/1478 has been traditionally linked with Raden Patah, a son of the king and foster son of Arya Damar, a Madjapahit governor of Palembang, who had converted to Islam by Raden Rahmat sometime before 844/1440. Raden Patah settled in Bintara (Demak), where he built a mosque, completed in 894/1488 (and still standing). It was in Demak, which also became a centre of Islam in Java, that another celebrated wali, Sunan Kalidjaga, ingeniously made use of the wayang (theatre) for spreading Islam.

Islamization in the southern region of Sumatra began in the beginning of the 9th/15th century. By the beginning of the 15th century, the region was already Muslim. Certain areas in the Minangkabau region had by then also been Islamized. Palembang is generally held to have been Islamized initially through the influence of Raden Rahmat and Arya Damar some time after 844/1440. The Lampung region in the south was converted through the influence of Bantem, where Islam had taken root at the end of the 9th/15th century. It is reported that another famous wali, Sunan Damar, who used to sail to the Moluccas, also took part in the spread of the faith in Java. The districts were governed by their own walis, of whom the most famous was Sunan Gunung Djati, who used to sail to the Moluccas, also took part in the spread of the faith in Java. The districts were governed by their own walis, of whom the most famous was Sunan Gunung Djati, who used to sail to the Moluccas, also took part in the spread of the faith in Java. By 879/1474 through missionary efforts. From Celebes, Islam was carried by Macassar missionaries to the island of Sumbawa, and perhaps also to Lombok, between 947/1540 and 957/1550.

On the Malay Peninsula, Kedah had become Muslim by 790/1484 through missionary efforts. Nothing much is known about the penetration of Islam in the Malay Peninsula, but there are indications pointing to missionary activities centred at Malacca and Pasai.

Sukadana in southwest Borneo was Islamized by Arabs and Malays chiefly from Palembang. By 1000/1591, all the coastal regions of Borneo had become Muslim.

The Luzon islands and districts such as Manila, Cebu, Oton and others were Islamized by
missionaries from Brunei and Atjeh, as were also those of Mindanao and Sulu. Around 1009/1600, the Spanish missionaries from Brunei and Atjeh, as were also those of Mindanao and Sulu. Around 1009/1600, the Spanish missionaries from Brunei and Atjeh, as were also those of Mindanao and Sulu. Around 1009/1600, the Spanish missionaries from Brunei and Atjeh, as were also those of Mindanao and Sulu. Around 1009/1600, the Spanish missionaries from Brunei and Atjeh, as were also those of Mindanao and Sulu. Around 1009/1600, the Spanish missionaries from Brunei and Atjeh, as were also those of Mindanao and Sulu. Around 1009/1600, the Spanish missionaries from Brunei and Atjeh, as were also those of Mindanao and Sulu. Around 1009/1600, the Spanish missionaries from Brunei and Atjeh, as were also those of Mindanao and Sulu. Around 1009/1600, the Spanish missionaries from Brunei and Atjeh, as were also those of Mindanao and Sulu. Around 1009/1600, the Spanish missionaries from Brunei and Atjeh, as were also those of Mindanao and Sulu. Around 1009/1600, the Spanish missionaries from Brunei and Atjeh, as were also those of Mindanao and Sulus.

The beginning of the 10th/16th century, under the first maker of Greater Atjeh, Sultan 'Ali Mughāyat Shāh (d. 937/1530), Atjeh had conquered several territories in the south and eastern coastal regions. His son, Sultan 'Ali al-Din Ri'āyat Shāh al-Kahhar (d. 976/1568), who hired mercenaries from the Yemenis, conquered more territory and began the series of Central Sumatra (Batak region) in 944/1537. Not all the Batak people were converted to Islam, but the Muslims were to score their greatest missionary success there much later, after the arrival of Christian Protestant missionaries in 1315/1897; this was no doubt also due to the effect of the zeal of the Wadhdh-inspired hādżī who promoted a revivalist movement in 1218/1803 [see RAIK]. In the years 983/1575 and 990/1682, there arrived in Atjeh certain 'ulamā' from Mecca, Yemen and Gujerat to discuss metaphysics and ḥaṣāwewa. These discussions, which seem to have begun at the beginning of the 9th/15th century, continued with ever-increasing depth and produced prolific writings in Malay, which continued to maintain intellectual interest for over two centuries. Their significance was to indicate the inner intensification of the Islamization process in the Archipelago, chiefly affecting Sumatra and Java. Some of the most profound and best examples of such writings are those of the Malay Sūfi poet and writer on doctrine, Ḥamza Fānsārī [q.v.], who belonged to the Kādirīyya Order and flourished during the reign of Sultan 'Alā al-Din Ri'āyat Shāh (Sayyid al-Mukkāmal, 998-1013/1589-1604). During Sultan Iskandar Muda's reign (1026/1617-34), Atjeh reached its zenith in military as well as in commercial power. Atjeh continued till 1054/1644 and became chief ḥādī of the realm under Sultan Iskandar II (1047-51/1637-41). The next important event following this period was the Malay translation of the Kurān, together with al-Baydawī's commentary, made by 'Abd al-Ra'ūf al-Sinkīlī (born ca. 1030/1620 and d. after 1104/1693 [q.v.]), a member of the Ṣaṭṭārīyya Order, who flourished during the reign of Sultan 'Alā al-Din al-Sultān Shams (937/1530-990/1682), the first of four queens who ruled Atjeh from 1051/1641 to 1111/1699. The line of Sultans of Atjeh continued till 2021/1903 [see ATR]

In Celebes, the kingdom of Bolaang-Mongondow in the northern peninsula east of Minahassa was Islamized gradually by Arabs, Bugis and other indigenous Muslim missionaries. Between 1098/1686 and 1121/1709, the kingdom was ruled by its first Christian king, Jacobus Manopo. By 1260/1644, its last Christian king, Jacobus Manuel Manopo, had embraced Islam. The famous Padri, Tadj al-Alam al-Safiyyat al-Din Shah (1051/1641-1111/1699), who was a profound and best example of such writings, was to indicate the inner intensification of the Islamization process in the Archipelago—till after the arrival of Nūr al-Din al-Rānī (d. 1077/1666 [q.v.]), who was Şaykh al-Islām of Atjeh. Discussions and polemics on the teachings of the Wahhabi-inspired Ḥāshids, which continued to maintain intellectual interest for over two centuries. Their significance was to indicate the inner intensification of the Islamization process in the Archipelago, chiefly affecting Sumatra and Java. Some of the most profound and best examples of such writings are those of the Malay Sūfi poet and writer on doctrine, Ḥamza Fānsārī [q.v.], who belonged to the Kādirīyya Order and flourished during the reign of Sultan 'Alā al-Din Ri'āyat Shāh (Sayyid al-Mukkāmal, 998-1013/1589-1604). During Sultan Iskandar Muda's reign (1026/1617-34), Atjeh reached its zenith in military as well as in commercial power. Atjeh continued till 1054/1644 and became chief ḥādī of the realm under Sultan Iskandar II (1047-51/1637-41). The next important event following this period was the Malay translation of the Kurān, together with al-Baydawī's commentary, made by 'Abd al-Ra'ūf al-Sinkīlī (born ca. 1030/1620 and d. after 1104/1693 [q.v.]), a member of the Ṣaṭṭārīyya Order, who flourished during the reign of Sultan 'Alā al-Din al-Sultān Shams (937/1530-990/1682), the first of four queens who ruled Atjeh from 1051/1641 to 1111/1699. The line of Sultans of Atjeh continued till 2021/1903 [see ATR].


Bibliography: For the spread of Islam in the Malay-Indonesian Archipelago, the best narrative account based on translations from the Malay, Javanese, and other original sources, contemporary non-Muslim sources, and the research mainly of Dutch scholars, is in T. W. Arnold, The preaching of Islam, London 1935, ch. 12. There are many Muslim and other sources giving general or particular accounts of Islam in the Archipelago, among them the Ḥiḥāyat Raṣa-Raṣa Pasaī (History of the kings of Pasaī), edited by A. H. Hill, in JMBRAS, xxxii (1960); the Ḥiḥāyat Atjeh (History of Aceh), ed. T. Iskandar, The Hague 1959; the Būṣīn al-salāṭin of al-Rānī, ms Or. 1971 and Or. 5303 in the University Library, Leiden; the
Sejarah Melayu (Malay Annals), edited by T. Situmorang and A. Teeuw, Djakarta 1958; the Sedjarah Banien (Annals of Banien), edited by R. H. Djadjiningrat, Haarlem 1913; idem, Critisch overzicht ... maleisische ... gegevens over de geschiedenis v. h. Soelanaat van Alijt in BTLV, lxv (1911), 135-265; the Babad Tanah Djawi (History of Java), tr. from Javanese and ed. W. L. Othoff, The Hague 1941; T. Fires, Suma Oriental, tr. from Portuguese by A. Cortesão, London 1944, ii; C. Snouck Hurgronje, De Atjehers ... (Koninklijk) Balansch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen. (S. M. N. al-Attas)

**b) Colonial period.**

When the first Dutch merchants arrived in Java in 1596, they heard news of a major kingdom in the interior of the island. There, the Islamic state of Mataram was emerging after a century of confusion following the fall late in the fifteenth century of Madjapahit, the last major Hindu-Buddhist kingdom on Java [q.v.]. The Mataram hegemony was expanding over the Islamic port-principalities of the northcoast, as well as over other interior states. The greatest of the Mataram monarchs, Sultan Agung (1613-1645), completed the subjugation of Java with the conquest of Surabaja in 1625.


**Abbreviations:** JMBRAS = Journal of the Malay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society; JSBRAS = Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society; JSEAH = Journal of Southeast Asian History; MMBRAS = Monographs of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society; RSEA = Revue du sud-est asiatique (Institut de Sociologie, Université Libre de Bruxelles); VBKW = Verhandelingen van het Nederlandsch Indie.
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strative system. This activity had already been apparent
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the areas in which the Dutch claimed paramountcy, and took the form of the imposition of treaties by which local Indonesian rulers acknowledged their states to be part of Netherlands India. Sometimes, as in Bali in 1846 and 1849, this involved a military expedition and a Dutch Resident. In other cases, as in the tin-island of Billiton in 1851, full-scale occupation and direct administration was necessary. In most cases however only a paper claim to Dutch supremacy was involved.

After the beginning of the so-called 'Liberal' period, however, this governmental activity in the outer islands was reinforced and intensified by private Dutch and foreign enterprise and capital seeking to exploit the agricultural and mineral resources of economically favoured areas. From many examples one may mention the large-scale development of estate cultivation, beginning with tobacco, in the East Coast residency of Sumatra. This is partly because the Siak tobacco concessions of 1863 were amongst the largest and earliest of these private enterprises, partly because they provoked an important political and military confrontation between the Dutch and the Acehnese, who claimed to exercise suzerainty over the leased tobacco lands.

The Atjeh War [q.v.] (1873-1904) was long, arduous and financially ruinous for the Dutch. More important, since many of these who sought to resist the imposition of Dutch control and the extinction of their independence were by long tradition a fiercely Islamic society, maintaining close links with the centres of their faith in the Middle East, the war raised the whole issue of the colonial government's Islamic policy. It also brought to the fore two men of influence and note—Snouck Hurgronje, a scholar and the government's adviser on Islam from 1890, and Van Heutsz, a soldier and administrator. Snouck Hurgronje advocated as a general principle ruthless suppression of all Muslim leaders who opposed Dutch political control combined with complete freedom for the day to day practice of the religion and customs of Islam under Dutch administration. The execution of the first part of this policy was entrusted to Van Heutsz, who not only brought the war in Atjeh to an end but as Governor General (1904-1909) brought virtually the whole of the remainder of the outer islands under effective Dutch administration.

The beginning of the twentieth century thus saw the whole of what is now Indonesia linked by Dutch administrative control, consolidated by the operations of the inter-island shipping company the KPM (Koninklijke Paketvaart Maatschappij), founded with government support in 1888. It witnessed also the emergence of a new school of thought, embodied in the so-called 'Ethical' policy, which took as its objectives not only administrative efficiency and economic development but also the enhancement of the welfare of Indonesians, and the repayment of the "debt of honour" which had been incurred by the acceptance of the financial profits which Holland had drawn from Indonesia since the inception of the "wilj" or "private" enterprise. The so-called 'transformation of Javanese culture for the purpose of modern political party. Very quickly, Sarekat Islam developed into the organizational expression of massive popular unrest, part traditional messianic movement and part modern political party.

The decade between 1912 and 1922 marked the high point of political Islam in Indonesia. Sarekat Islam was by the far the largest and most influential Indonesian organization; it reflected a developing popular consciousness of an identity that transcended regional cultural boundaries, and this broader unity was seen in terms of Indonesian adherence to Islam. In Malaya, the process of pan-regional awakening was to lead to a lasting identification of Islam with Malay-ness; but in Indonesia the connection proved ephemeral. Sarekat Islam was not organizationally and politically capable of bringing the desired concrete reforms and amelioration of people's living conditions, so that its following was fluid, dissolving in one area only to expand where it had not yet been tried and found wanting; this was a process which could not continue many years without general disillusionment. Moreover, in the early 1920s mounting government pressure caused the Sarekat Islam leaders to become increasingly outspoken opponents of foreign rule. This was followed by their expulsion of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI), which had hitherto flourished as a bloc within the larger movement. The Communists took with them the bulk of the now much reduced membership of Sarekat Islam, and thus control over Indonesia's largest mass following passed into secularist hands.

To some extent the PKI-Sarekat Islam schism seems to have rested on the "santri-abangan" cultural contrast. But there were important Islamic Communist movements in Central Java and West Sumatra in the 1920s and the principal areas of Communist rebellion in 1926-27 (Banten and West Sumatra) were strongly Muslim. Moreover, a high proportion of Communist cadres arrested in the wake of the 1930s "crisis of the Acehese" were identified with Islam. In fact the main basis of choice between PKI and Sarekat Islam seems to have been the demand for action against foreign rule. The most disaffected Sarekat Islam members—including a considerable portion of petty entrepreneurs, merchants, and wealthy farmers—turned to the Communists in desperation, and their eventual revolt exhibited many traditional millenarian features. Of those Sarekat Islam followers who did not seek action at
all costs, the great part turned apathetically from politics; the remainder—more economically and socially secure and more willing to organise for limited and largely non-political objectives—constituted the subsequent clientele of the Sarekat Islam and its successors.

The Netherlands Indies government had not been insensitive to the emergence of a modern-educated elite and the transformation of Indonesian society by advanced forms of economic exploitation. It was, however, only after some time to decide whether to concentrate on shoring up traditional social structures and muffling the impact of economic modernization on the Indonesian populace, in the interest of maintaining the status quo, or whether to stress opportunities for Indonesian participation in the modern sphere, in particular providing a place for the emerging modern elite as the future source of native leadership and as an instrument for the peaceful modernization of the society. The latter approach was favoured by the advocates of the so-called Ethical Policy, the principal political accomplishments of which were the establishment of parties and the foundation in 1916 of the Volksraad, an advisory assembly involving some Indonesian representatives and a restricted Indonesian electorate. However, it very soon appeared to both the Indonesians and the Dutch that the ideas concerning the scope and pace of native participation were very different, and it seemed increasingly questionable if their ultimate interests were compatible at all. Ethical assumptions were dealt a severe blow by Sarekat Islam involvement in popular disturbances in 1919, and the coup de grace was provided by the abortive Communist rebellion of 1926-27. Thereafter, Netherlands policy stressed measures that favoured the restoration of traditional authority; strongly repressive action was taken against efforts by Indonesian politicians to acquire a mass following.

Politics thus once again became restricted to the small circle of the modern-educated elite, located for the most part in the great cities of Java. This group still represented a tiny and privileged minority. It was, however, radical and its members were sufficiently separated from the world of their fathers to reject reforms for some time to come, their primary focus of identity. Tradition was to them a dead weight which must be sloughed off if the Indonesian people were to unite in effective struggle against colonial rule. Their goal was the realization of a modern Indonesian nation-state, unqualified by such internationalist ideological aims as had been represented by the Sarekat Islam and the PKI.

Some of these nationalists involved themselves in religiously-orientated organizations, but most joined or founded movements of explicitly secular bent. One reason for this was the increasing Westernization—and therefore secularization—of the modern Indonesian elite, to whom Islam seemed part of the outmoded traditional world. Moreover, they were mostly of prijaji origin. This placed them on the abangan side of the sandhi-abangan cultural contrast and aligned them with the alternative focus for popular loyalty and hence as a potential source of social unrest.

Indonesian politics was henceforth marked by a deep split between religious and secular movements. On the Islamic side when Sarekat Islam abandoned its radical opposition to colonial rule it identified itself more closely with the Javanese merchant and entrepreneur elements from which it had originally sprung. These were strongly modernist in their orientation and had already found non-political expression in the Muhammadijah, a social and educational welfare organization founded in Jogjakarta in 1912. Muhammadijah modernists dominated Sarekat Islam of the 1920s and involved it in Pan-Islamic endeavours; in reaction to this, more traditionalist Javanese Muslims formed a new Islamic organization, Nahdlatul Ulama, in 1926. This was orientated more towards the opinion of the countryside, where it drew its leadership from religious notables and the more prosperous peasantry. Neither of these two religious orientations or their social bases were attractive to nationalists derived from the traditional bureaucratic elite; and in turn the Muslim groups viewed the prospect of the secularists gaining power with justified apprehension.

Within the secular nationalist camp there was an even greater schismatic tendency, but during the colonial period it reflected quarrels over personalities and strategy rather than any fundamental ideological division. The most serious disagreement was between those who considered it appropriate to take advantage of what representational possibilities the Indies government granted and those who considered this to be collaboration with the enemy. The most prominent of the non-cooperative groups was the Indonesian Nationalist Party (PNI), founded in 1927 and led by the future Indonesian president, Sukarno. It dissolved in 1930 following its leader's imprisonment, to be succeeded by two organizations reflecting another difference of nationalistic opinion—the Indonesian Party (Partindo), which called for an emphasis on unity and the acquisition of as much of a mass following as was then possible, and the 'new' PNI, led by Hatta and Sjahbir, which urged the development of an ideological and organizationally disciplined cadre.

Conscious of sectarian feehness and the general futility of non-cooperation, the nationalists of the mid-1930s sought fusion, first in the Greater Islands Party (Parindra) in 1935 and then in the more radical Indonesian People's Movement (Gerindo) of 1937. The urge toward unity also affected the Islamic organizations, bringing modernists and traditionalists together in the All-Indonesian Islamic Council (M.I.A.I.) of 1937. Finally, both religious and secular groupings combined in the Indonesian Political Coalition (G.A.P.I.) in 1939.

Neither this strenuous effort at unity nor the abandonment of non-cooperation by the radicals achieved any significant modification of colonial rule. The repressive post-Ethical policy seemed to the Dutch to have worked well; even the united Indonesian political organizations were weak, and their most troublesome leaders were in jail or exile. It consequently seemed better not to tempt fate by opening the Pandora's box of politics again. The last years of Dutch rule therefore gave little hope to even the most moderate of Indonesian nationalists for the reform of the colonial regime. There was very little to make them feel a stake in the Dutch presence and a good deal, once the Japanese seized the colony in 1942, to make them fear a Dutch return.

(R. B. McC.)

(c) Post 1942 [see DUSTUR p. 662; HIZB p. 534].
immediately visible and dominating imprint on the Indonesian's thought and action. Even so, this imprint is not uniform throughout the vast area of the Indonesian archipelago. There are notable regional differences. On the other hand, Indonesia clearly constitutes one of the outer fringes of the world of Islam. There is relatively much adaptation of Islam to local customs and traditions; conversely there is relatively little positive contribution to Islam, whether as doctrine or as practice, even so far as Indonesia proper is concerned, let alone the more central parts of the Islamic world.

Neither the chronology nor the nature of the spread of Islam in the Indonesian archipelago is satisfactorily established, especially for the earlier period.

The nature of the spread is often described as a combination of two kinds of process. At times it operates like an oil stain, with people (on an individual or on a familial basis) gradually deciding to embrace Islam. At other times it goes by leaps and bounds, with entire communities opting for Islam, often as the only available means to hold their own, for example in the face of Western expansionism or other critical events. Under the latter kind of circumstances, prompting or pressure by Muslims may occasionally play a role. On rare occasions the use of force has been recorded, but this appears as untypical. Whatever the nature of its spread, Islam reached Indonesia as a fully-grown way of life: there was no necessity for an Indonesian contribution to its tenets and practices.

During historic times, the cultural, religious, economic and political history of the area has been marked to a large extent by three successive waves of influence from outside. One originates from the Indian subcontinent and is expressed in terms of the naturalist religions and philosophies of that area, especially Hinduism and Buddhism. The second is Islamic; at first it originated from the Indian subcontinent as well, but later on its source of inspiration shifted to the Middle East. The third is European, especially Dutch; it has a Christian component, but this has not been preponderant at all times. A fourth outside influence, not comparable to a wave but this has not been preponderant at all times. A fourth outside influence, not comparable to a wave but this has not been preponderant at all times.

A common characteristic of all three waves is that when each of these waves first arrived, the territory of the present-day state of Indonesia was not distinct as such. To discuss these forces as impinging on "Indonesia" is therefore an anachronism. Yet as a descriptive device it is not too objectionable, for four reasons: (1) Irian (New Guinea) does not really count for present purposes, (2) the Philippines, where Islam arrived through Indonesia, have always had a separate status, (3) Malaya cannot be overlooked entirely but needs no more than casual reference, and (4) the Moluccas in the Moluccan archipelago, not belonging to the Indonesian Republic, like Northern Kalimantan (Borneo) or half of Timor, play no significant part in Indonesian Islam.

A common characteristic of all three waves is that their first approach was prompted by trade activity; the third differs from the other two in that it has gradually taken shape as political-economic conquest by foreigners, followed by colonization. The three are alike once more in that none has resulted in a full disruption of Indonesian continuity, but they differ again in that the bearers of both the Hindu-Buddhist and the Islamic waves have gradually identified with, and become virtually indistinguishable from, their new Indonesian setting, whereas the carriers of Western impact have assiduously and to an increasing extent maintained a separate identity. Moreover, of the first and the second, the second is now predominant and the first greatly reduced both in visibility and in importance.

As regards the chronology of the spread of Islam, it is generally agreed that Islam gained a foothold on Indonesian soil, in the ports of the Northern tip of Sumatra, towards the end of the 7th/8th century. Although the history of Muslim trade with China is rich in vicissitudes, it has existed, more or less successfully, ever since the 8th century AD. There is no reason to assume that it did not occasionally involve parts of the Indonesian archipelago. In this connection one thinks in particular of the spice trade, involving especially the Moluccas area. But it is only in 1292 that the Venetian traveller Marco Polo, visiting the North Sumatran ports of Perlak, Samudra and Lambri, refers to the former two as more or less Muslim port towns in fully pagan surroundings. A stone dated 696/1297, made in Cambay (Gujarat), marks the tomb of a ruler Malik al-Sālib of Samudra-Pase, who must have been a Muslim. The strong links between this area and India are also emphasized by another traveller, the Moroccan Muslim Ibn Battūta, 748/1345-6. The slow spread that would have been likely, given such a foothold, gained a dramatic impetus by the Islamization of the coastal state of Malacca, originally the creation (around 1400 AD) of an expatriate Javanese. A highly successful maritime empire, Malacca became a centre for the diffusion of Islam in all directions. Another Cambay tomb stone covers the remains of one Malik Ibrāhīm, who died in Gresik, East Java, in 822/1419. Malaya and the various parts of Northeast Sumatra were islamized in the coastal areas; and in the early 15th/16th century some small Muslim principalities existed on the North coast of Java. What introduced the decisive element of competition was the Portuguese crusader spirit, established in India in 1498 and immediately carried Eastward in the capture of Malacca—the centre of all commercial and religious traffic in the area—by a Moslemמסלח. Malay was not yet a language, when reaching Indonesia, was engaged in a race against the second. Thus, the further spread of Islam acquired a disproportionately important element of religious-commercial-political strategy.

As regards Sumatra, the second half of the 10th/11th century saw the Islamization of the Lampung and Bengkelen areas; but it was only in 1170 that the last group of people in the inland parts of South Sumatra became Muslims. Menangkabau was Islamized soon after the fall of Malacca by people from North Sumatra, the realm of Atjeh, who engaged in the spice trade. Indeed, during the 14th/15th and 16th/17th centuries the ever continuing spice trade served as the token under which virtually every major commercial-political-religious event in the archipelagic state unfolded. As regards the interior of South Sumatra, Kalimantan (Borneo) has kept its pagan interior up to the present. Its coastal areas have been settled, and largely islamized, by people from various other
parts of the archipelago, and particularly in the North and West of Indonesia, and also by Chinese and Islamic Arabs. The various emerging realms had invariably a Muslim, sometimes Hadrami, imprint. Notable amongst these were the realms of Banjarmasin, Kutai and Pontianak. The former lasted from the middle of the 10th/16th to the middle of the 19th century, and it included the Hulu Sungai area.

Celebes (Sulawesi), in its turn, remained mostly pagan in its central area where only the Toraja embraced Christianity. Its Northern tip became Christianized. But its two Southern tips, containing important maritime areas—again in the spice trade—, were islamized, mainly from Java, early in the 17th/18th century. This spread was not without violence.

The Moluccas succumbed partly to Portuguese efforts at christianization and then saw Catholicism replaced by Protestantism under Dutch pressure. But as from the second half of the 16th century the realm of Ternate was a centre of diffusion of Islam, both Westward and Eastward.

The Lesser Sunda Islands, another clear demonstration is how the spread of Islam was related to political vicissitudes. The phenomenon of emergent realms imposing themselves by means of religious identification is visible even in these relatively remote parts. Thus, the Western tip of Bali and also the islands of Lombok and Sumbawa have been vaguely islamized at some time, while the remaining islands have hardly been touched by Islam until recently.

In Java, the political overtones of Islamization have been even more noticeable. The Muslim coastal principalities already mentioned began as vassals of the Hindu-Buddhist kingdom of the interior. Gradually, there was a shift in supremacy. Once united under the realm of Demak, Muslim power could tip the scales. As from the second half of the 10th/16th century, all of Java and also Madura have become formally islamized: by leaps and bounds in the political centres and much more slowly in remote mountain areas.

A shift, gradual but important, in the overtones of Indonesian Islam has occurred with the onset of modernity. The dominance of the commercial and religious (that is, cultural) roles as powers behind the throne—for example in Java the nine holy men (walis) credited with bringing the religion that has won out in the long run, even protected status, they are not necessarily inclined to embrace it.

As to the nature of the reception of Islam in Indonesia, the earliest more or less detailed data refer to northern Sumatra in the early 17th century. There are Islamic manuscripts and there are (Dutch) eye-witness reports. The area was clearly still a major centre of diffusion of Islam. The data suggest a relative predominance of mysticism of the philosophical-speculative kind, represented by various brotherhoods; but it soon comes under the emergent attack of a more orthodox theology.

There are Islamic manuscripts, often arguing against the spread of Islam. It thus might have been during an apparently critical period of Muslim expansion Islamic scholars, and especially mystical philosophers, have played decisive roles as powers behind the throne—for example in Java the nine holy men (walis) credited with bringing Islam, and in Sumatra at least one mystic who also served as prime minister.

The third, the Western wave of influence, has injected itself into the archipelago as competitive, both commercially and religiously (that is, culturally), against the spread of Islam. It thus might have offered the Indonesians an option as regards the creed that could most suitably be adopted for purposes of survival. But the options that might have never appeared so attractive as Islam, in consequence of the continued non-integration of the Western element. In remaining alien, it did not really lend itself to adoption with modification. Church authorities have usually scorned attempts at a more or less sectarian, and mostly local, adoption of Christian ideas. Besides, inasmuch as Christianity is to Muslims a superseded religion, and one of protected status, they are not naturally inclined to embrace it.

In consequence, the religious map of Indonesia shows Christianity in a few areas converted from paganism before the advent of Islam (for example, part of the Moluccas, Northern Celebes, part of the Batak area of Sumatra) and amongst mixed urban populations. It shows Hinduism-Buddhism entrenched in one area (central Java and eastern Bali). It shows survivals of paganism in some remote parts, mostly in the interior of islands. And it shows Islam as the religion that has won out in the long run, even though the political stress of the 1950's and 1960's has somewhat undermined its predominance. It is often said that the Muslims constitute 90% of the Indonesian population. Statistically unverifiable, this figure is generally accepted as a rough estimate. Given a total population of about 130 millions, this
makes the Indonesians one of the largest sections of the world Muslim community.

The specific characteristics of Islam thus spread and still spreading throughout Indonesia are so difficult to sum up that time and again disputes have arisen, mostly between non-Muslim observers, as to the question whether Indonesians are or are not true Muslims. Those trying to argue a negative answer have tended to assert that Islam is merely a veneer under which the solid base of Indonesian paganism, with its many highly differentiated and typically Buddhist elements, remains fully distinct. If there is truth in this, yet it does not detract from the efficacy and tenacity of the Islamic identification of the Indonesian Muslims. The rationalization and legitimation even of things possibly pre-Islamic in origin or conception yet currently effective will invariably occur in terms of Islam and be generally deemed adequate as such.

In matters of law, the Shāfi‘ī school reigns supreme, and seems never to have suffered from real competition. Even so, the Indonesian situation may well have been more markedly complex than situations elsewhere, especially because colonial administration has tended to emphasize rather than to obscure such matters as the discrepancy between formal Islamic law on the one hand and customary law on the other. Indeed Islamic law has figured for long years as the least important of three competing sources: customary law, as represented by quite numerous and very different systems in the several parts of the archipelago, Dutch code law (constitutional and penal, not civil) as more and more emphatically imposed for purposes of uniform administration, and Islamic law itself, adopted by Indonesians for quite limited purposes only, and to an extent varying with time and place. The tendency has been to have such legal systems represented by their own jurisdictional arrangements. In the case of Islam this has tended to bring to the fore the category of the scholars of Islam, the ‘ulama or kyahi. Not only was this one way in which these scholars of Islam managed to maintain part of their importance dating back to the pre-colonial days of the early Muslim expansion; it also pitted them, unintentionally perhaps yet quite effectively, against the traditional education, the pesantren, and the Hindu-Javanese Islamic dervish conventicle. But the preponderant feature of the pesantren, in turn perhaps reminiscent of the Indian ashram, is to be a centre of learning and of education for pupils from nearby and—if it is well-known—also from far away. The leader, kyahi, is primarily the scholar who retains his authority over his pupils even after having granted the iǧāza [q.f.] or licence to teach. He will be the spiritual leader and mentor at all times. In the notion of his teacher, the Indian idea of the guru has come to emphasize the Islamic respect for the šālim. There has traditionally been unorganized, yet more or less regular, intercourse between the best of these schools and the centres of learning at Mecca and Cairo: the former reflecting, with a time-lag, what went on in the latter. It has proved extremely difficult, both in colonial days and later, to forge a link between this type of schooling and so-called modern education. This has by and large worked to the detriment of traditional Muslim education. Gradually, the name madrasa has been adopted for religious schools conforming to a more “modern” pattern of education. By 1954, there were three levels of these, namely elementary (13,057 schools), intermediate (776), and secondary (16).

Another peculiar aspect of Indonesian Islam is architecture. With a few rare exceptions, of imitation of Arab style (e.g., Medan, Kebajoran), mosques in Indonesia show a style that illustrates nothing better than the continuity from pre-Islamic into Islamic periods. Mosques like the one of Kudus recall Hindu-Javanese building styles, even though they are now unequivocally recognized as Islamic buildings. A common feature is the roof in three or four layers or tiers, almost pagoda-like, that contributes significantly to the circulation of fresh air. An entirely Indonesian feature is the use of the bedug, a huge drum, to announce the times of prayer even to those who might fail to hear the adhan. On the other hand, the various grades of mosque personnel are hardly exceptional.

As regards the fulfilment of religious obligations, Indonesians are again not very special or exceptional. The salāt is variably performed, as everywhere; the payment of zakāt is haphazard. In matters of ritual purity Indonesians are relatively strict, perhaps on account of traditions older than Islam. Also the pilgrimage has always tended to be an attraction and a challenge to Indonesians. Relatively many, including women, will perform it when circumstances allow. Indeed the pilgrim may achieve a kind of special status in his community. The ḥajjī is a potential leader of opinion if he returns to a relatively recent and contemporary political organizations of Muslims.
small and remote community. The pilgrim will not enjoy great prestige unless he is at the same time well learned in Islamic doctrine. This applies the more since the pilgrimage has become safer and more within the means of relatively many: all this thanks to means of transport made available by non-Muslim Westerners. The attraction of the pilgrimage is demonstrated by the tendency for Indonesians to borrow money for the journey, in contravention of the explicit injunctions of Islam.

Mysticism remained influential for quite some time. In Northern Sumatra, its sway must have stretched at least into the first decades of the 20th century. In Southern Celebes, it seems to have lasted almost until the Japanese occupation. In these areas there are indications of the existence of local chapters of various mystic orders, including the more famous ones from the heartlands of Islam. The list of brotherhoods is impressive and includes such famous names as Shādiliyya, Radārīyya, Nakhshbandiyya, Khalwatiyya, Samariyya, Ṣafī-ʿīyya, Tijānīyya. There is however no effective record of their organization, let alone of their functioning. Nor is it clear what role they have played in the spreading of Islam or, for that matter, in society at large.

The two areas referred to differ from the third area influenced by mysticism, Java, in one major respect. In Javanese Islamic mystical writings a clear and decisive adaptation of mystical ideas is manifest. At the point where Sumatran took over from Indian mystics, not much of a break occurred; but here, one sees a complete change in the spiritual climate. On the other hand, this specifically Javanese mysticism does not seem to have spread to other islands.

 Everywhere, orthodox teachings have gradually gained the upper hand. Unfortunately, this process and its causes have hitherto eluded historical research. Accordingly, it comes as something of a surprise to see that in the middle of the twentieth century numerous organizations of a more or less esoteric (kebatinan) nature flourish, several of them adorned by names of famous mystical brotherhoods, that seem to attract quite a few urban intellectuals. At a later stage this phenomenon will be discussed in more detail below. These were inadequately studied at the time. A sectarian movements and organizations appeared. They tend to congregate in the neighbourhood of a mosque.

The turning-point was, in a sense, the period of enlightenment in colonial policy, which was at the same time the period of more or less forcible introduction of effective Netherlands-Indies administration in parts of the archipelago hitherto not really controlled. Most notable for its expressly Muslim resistance was the so-called Atjeh war of 1873-1904. This is also the period during which the Netherlands Indies authorities, guided by the famous orientalist and islamologist C. Snouck Hurgronje, adopted a new policy. Its aim was, in the last resort, to promote effective Dutch rule by removing Islamic motives for resistance; or, to express it more crudely, to rule effectively notwithstanding the potential or actual adverse implications, for such rule, of the fact that so many Indonesians identify as Muslims.

During roughly the same period, Indonesian Islam shows a variety of tendencies, as is to be expected in times of turbulence.

To begin with, Indonesia has seen the reflexion of the so-called reformist or modernist tendencies in the heartlands of Islam, even though no Indonesian thinkers have arisen who could be compared with modernistic Muslim leaders in an area like the Indian subcontinent. It has even seen its own variant of the breach between the two components of this tendency: one ending up in the rationalism of a Muslim assertion of a predominantly political nature, the other in a more typically Indonesian variant of fundamentalism such as Wahhabism, the next section will be discussed in more detail below. The latter, somewhat belated in its effective manifestation, appeared after the end of the Japanese occupation, first in the remote mountains near the South coast between Central and Western Java in the form of a small, entrenched state, the Negara Dūr al-Islām founded by Kartosuwiryo in 1948 (suppressed in 1962), and then also as a militant movement in areas like Southern Celebes and Kalimantan (1949). It was subdued, but not necessarily eliminated so far as its true inspiration goes, by the Indonesian state.

In the second place, a range of more or less sectarian movements and organizations appeared. These were inadequately studied at the time. A common trait seems to be that if they strive for the reassertion of the Islamic identity, this does not so much aim at determining the full round of life but rather at providing adequate shelter under adverse circumstances. Some of this sectarianism is imported from elsewhere in the world of Islam. Wahhābīsm (see Wahhābīyya), a forerunner here as everywhere else, had made its influence felt in Sumatra and also in Java already by the end of the 12th/18th century. The Indian sect of the Ahmadīyya (q.v.) maintained missionaries in Indonesia for a number of years before and after the Japanese occupation; but it
does not appear to have reached more than a handful of more or less marginal individuals, mostly in towns. Not unlike the Ahmadiyya in their basic inspiration, various sects have emerged on Indonesian soil in the course of time, each representing some syncretistic attempt to harmonize elements from various sources (old-Indonesian pagan, Hindu-Buddhist, Christian, Muslim) into religious-philosophical teachings, not without mystical or even magical (invulnerability!) elements, to satisfy thirsty souls. The combination of elements has, however, never been formally mentioned. Some parts of Indonesia are clearly more fertile in this respect than others; at all times the appeal of sects of this kind is mostly local. It is not unusual to find the leaders of such sects described as *kyahi*, the word that, as stated, also serves as the Indonesian translation of *ulim* scholar in the sciences of Islam.

In the third place, there is the phenomenon, already alluded to, of Islam serving as an ideological support for political action. This places Islam in a somewhat odd context, namely as one out of three main competing bases for the political self-assertion that nationalism purports to achieve. Another is Marxism, whether in the strict (Russian or Chinese) communist form or in more diluted, socialist-revisionist presentations. The third is nationalism purporting to which assumes the goals of national self-assertion as against Western domination to be a sufficient ideology in its own right: in the last resort, a kind of anti-ideology, as represented, for example, in Sukarno's ideal of the ongoing revolution. In this connection, a source of confusion exists in the circumstance that Islam as an ideology is not necessarily restricted to one of the three basic positions, but will in fact tend to permeate each of the others as well, if only to an unclear yet limited extent. The point is that whilst the three formulae are mutually exclusive, and thus fiercely competitive, they are at the same time necessarily comprehensive, in the sense that each must make a point of embracing any of the specific features of the others, lest it forfeit public appeal. After all, each is, by its own standards, the movement that embodies the entire nation in its effort to reassert itself. Indeed, before long they worked for all practical purposes one and undistinguishable.

The actual manifestation, during the four decades prior to World War II, of the three tendencies just described, has been greatly influenced by the adoption of Western organizational patterns and communication devices. This is the period of emerging Muslim organizations of many different kinds. Sometimes (as in the case of most sects) they are regionally confined; but not seldom they aim at, and achieve, a nation-wide scope.

The first properly Indonesian association, a Javanese one with mainly educational purposes, was founded in 1908. It was followed in 1911 by the first typically Muslim organization, *Sarekat Dagang Islam*, later *Sarekat Islam*. Conceived as an organization of (small) traders, it was initially economic rather than political, and anti-Chinese rather than anti-Dutch. Within five years it was perhaps still to some extent religiously determined and *kyahi*-influenced: but to all intents and purposes it had become a political party of a clearly nationalist character.

The year 1912 saw the establishment of a somewhat different organization, the Muhammadiyya. Guided by such men as K. H. Dahlan, it represented an attempt to spread amongst Indonesian Muslims the modernism then fashionable in Egypt and India. Given the Indonesian setting, this movement was perhaps somewhat more orthodox-puritanical than similar organizations elsewhere, and also somewhat more concerned with education. Significantly, these and other organizations tended to operate a number of subsidiaries, through which to reach special categories of people, such as women and youth.

A third Islamic organization emerged in 1926, under the name of *Nahdatul Ulama*; it was meant to serve as a stronghold of more traditionalist or *ulim* orthodox ideals that had been ignored by the *ulim* established scholars. But whilst competing for public support with the other two and whilst unable to avoid acquiring political significance, it was prevented from becoming fundamentalist in the same way as, much later, the *Dar ul-Islam* movement did.

Among the three organizations, as also in connexion with other political organizations, a pattern of unsteady and not always easy relationships developed; the mounting significance of nationalism tended to make for a special kind of unity, effective specifically as against the impact of Dutch colonial rule. Together, these organizations have succeeded in galvanizing the highly varied Indonesian population into an emergent nation, and one that in asserting itself in response to colonialism, however developmentally oriented that might be, acted in certain respects as a nationalist Muslim. On the other hand, the simultaneous existence of important non-Muslim parties and organizations proves that there were limits to political unity in the name of Islam.

A shift in organizational alignment occurred in 1937, with the Muhammadiyya and the Nahdatul Ulama jointly creating the *Majlis ul-Islam ul-A'la Indonesia* (MIAI), the Supreme Islamic Council of Indonesia. This competed with the third organization, then called *Partai Sarekat Islami Indonesia*, until their merger in 1939. But in 1938 a new *Partai Islam Indonesia* had been created, formed to some extent from the earlier *Jong Islamieten Bond* (Young Muslims' Association).

The *Japanese* interlude, 1942-5, had a double significance for Indonesian Islam. Envisaged in the long run, it hastened decolonization in a manner entirely unconnected with Japanese intentions. Seen in the short run, it brought a unique understanding of Islamic policy on the part of the ruling authorities; and the change was not quite the same in Java as it was in the other parts of the country.

The Islamic policy of the Japanese forces was a relatively well-prepared two-pronged attempt to solve two problems at once: to nip any Muslim opposition in the bud, and to obtain if possible public allegiance through making Muslim leaders of public opinion rally to the Japanese cause. A specially trained Japanese staff was in charge. On the one hand the existing organizations were abolished and a series of efforts made to replace them by one comprehensive organization that would abide by Japanese instructions. On the other hand, the *kyahi* category were made into special targets of opinion-control. This went to the extent of making them attend special courses. In order to support the activities concerned, a network of offices was maintained throughout the area, as a kind of perverted development from the one Office for Indigenous Affairs that the Dutch had maintained previously. Notwithstanding all this, there was an element of wavering on basic issues in the Japanese Islamic policy that only strengthened the urge of Indonesian Muslims to assert themselves regardless of outward appearance, and that did nothing to help them articulate this urge.
The end of the Japanese occupation, in August 1945, ushered in Indonesian independence, in two stages. The emergency declaration of independence of 17 August [see DUSTUR, p. 665] resulted in an Indonesian Republic, really effective in part of Java only, vying with Dutch attempts to set Indonesia on its feet again according to a new formula. Sovereignty was officially transferred in 1949, to the Indonesian state. During the intermediary stage, the two claimants for authority were equally preoccupied with soliciting the allegiance of Muslims; and in this process Muslims were largely left to their own devices in their attempts to overcome the disruptive effects of Japanese-imposed organization and ideas.

Since independence, Indonesian Islam has played mainly two roles in public life. On the one hand, it is one of the main tributaries to the national identity and indeed to national ideology. The Panitia Sila, the five-point national doctrine, has been carefully phrased so as to allow Muslims to recognize it as theirs, without alienating non-Muslims. One of the five points is the recognition of the overlordship of the Almighty. Yet as an ideological creed it stands for a nationalist ideology, which is in the last resort competitive with Islamic ideology and which as such is a rallying point for Christian and other groups. All this is reflected at the more institutional plane. Insofar as independent Indonesia has come to have its own Islamic policy, it stands on a necessity different from both the Dutch and the Japanese policies, it manifested itself as part of the activities of the newly installed Ministry of Religion. Intended to cater for the needs of any religious community, this ministry has inevitably acquired a strong Muslim imprint, and this with a kyahi shading.

On the other hand, Islam has become one of the three major political forces in the country, in the sense that it has proved possible to use people's identification as Muslims as a means to rally them around certain political causes, not necessarily of a clearly or exclusively Islamic nature. This is sometimes explained as an after-effect of denomination- alism in the Dutch political party system; but the true explanation may well lie in the traditional role of Islam in the social fabric of the country, its identification. A significant occurrence in this connexion is the Piagam Djakarta of June 1945, a kind of preliminary document to the constitution, in which mention is made of Islamic law as having to be applied to all Indonesian Muslims. As a political force Islam finds itself competing with two other forces already mentioned, namely Communism and ideological nationalism. Under these conditions there does not appear to exist an immediate urge for Muslim leaders to elaborate and expound relatively novel ideas of an explicitly and consistently Islamic nature. In effect, the pre-war pattern of more or less exclusively political organizations of Muslims has returned, with names somewhat modified—this also being the inevitable result.


vi.—Literatures

In the vast area of the Indonesian archipelago, where more than two hundred languages are spoken, we find as is only natural various literatures. Insofar as these languages are spoken by Muslims (some parts of the archipelago were not Islamized) the literatures of these languages underwent, some to a greater, others to a lesser extent, the influences of Islam. This influence is two-fold: on the one hand Islam caused much of the older literature, in particular religious works, to disappear; on the other hand it enriched these literatures by substituting new genres and new works for those that fell into oblivion, and by adding to the literature that already existed.

In this article we confine ourselves to those aspects of Indonesian literature that bear on Islam. The influence of Islam on the literatures of Indonesia is predominantly an influence of Islam as a religion. Its main features are translations, reworkings and adaptations from Arabic and Persian works written with a view to educating and for purposes of edification: textbooks of Arabic, grammars, translations
of the Kur'an, commentaries, sacred history, philosophical treatises and religious tracts, works dealing with theology, law and mysticism, in short with any aspect of Islamic spiritual life. The adab-literature, an important element in the civilization of Islam, poetry and belles-lettres in general, is rather poorly represented compared to the mass of purely religious works; works dealing with Islamic sciences, technical works and works on geography and Islamic history are virtually non-existent or found in a very few instances only.

Notwithstanding the great and visible impact of Islam on Southeast Asia, the influence of Islam was a limited one and remained confined mainly to the sphere of religion. This can easily be explained from the fact that the Indonesian archipelago was situated on, or even outside, the periphery of the civilization of Islam. Moreover, seen in a historical perspective, Islam came late to Southeast Asia and the process of Islamization stretched over several centuries; it is, in fact, still continuing at the present day.

For a long time, from the 7th/8th century until well into the 11th/12th century, contacts between Indonesia and Arabia were difficult and few. The majority of those who undertook the long and dangerous voyage to the great centres of Islamic spiritual and political life did so in order to perform the Hajj, Pilgrimage, often combining it with a visit to other holy places. Quite a few, however, stayed on in Arabia for a longer period, sometimes for several years, in order to deepen their knowledge of religion. The works which they studied, copied and later brought with them to their country of origin, were almost exclusively textbooks of religion.

Another factor of great importance was the trade within Asia. This trade made it necessary for many foreign merchants—Arabs, Persians and in particular traders from the mercantile ports of the Indian subcontinent—to settle in the archipelago, and it may be assumed that besides bringing their commodities, they also brought cultural goods, among them literary works such as stories and romances which were adapted or translated into Malay and so found their way all over the archipelago. The harbour cities were centres of radiation of this international culture. They had had from of old an international character with a very mixed population. The majority of those participating in the inter-Asianic trade were bilingual or even spoke more than two languages, and this considerably facilitated the adaptation, translation and diffusion of products of Islamic literature in the archipelago.

The medium which was made use of by Islam for the spread of the faith was the Malay language. Although data about the history of Malay are rather scant, it may be assumed that already before the coming of Islam to the archipelago this language was the common vehicle for interinsular intercourse. The new task assigned to it has left many traces in the Malay language. Not only did the vocabulary, and it may be assumed that besides bringing their commodities, they also brought cultural goods, among them literary works such as stories and romances which were adapted or translated into Malay and so found their way all over the archipelago. The harbour cities were centres of radiation of this international culture. They had had from of old an international character with a very mixed population. The majority of those participating in the inter-Asianic trade were bilingual or even spoke more than two languages, and this considerably facilitated the adaptation, translation and diffusion of products of Islamic literature in the archipelago.
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manuscripts of the Hikajat Nabi mi’raj, about Mu-
hammad’s ascension to heaven, a tale found in vari-
ous versions. Of a different kind again are tales like the Hikajat Nabi mengadjar Ali (Teachings of the Prophet to his daughter Fatima), which is of a mystical character on the four stages of the mystical path, shari’a, tarbi’a, ma’rifa, and ma’rifat. Of a different kind again are tales like the Hikajat bulan berbelah, which contains the well-known story of Muhammad splitting the moon. Edifying and exhorting the reader to a life of piety are among other texts the Hikajat Iblis dan Nabi Muhammad, containing a discourse between the Prophet and Iblis; Hikajat tatkala Rasul Allah memberi sedekah kepada seorang dermawan (the tale of how the Prophet of God gave alms to a dervish), and Hikajat Nabi dan orang miskin (the Prophet and the poor man), the last two containing an appeal for generosity towards the poor.

In an enumeration of tales about the Prophet mention must be made of the Hikajat waqaf Nabi (The Prophet’s death), reworked from Persian, and the Hikajat Mulud (maulud, maulid), commemorating the Prophet’s birth. Widely known both in the past and in modern times is the Mulud berdjandji (a popular etymology of Bareslangi, the name of the original author, an Indian), a liturgical text recited on the occasion of the birthday of Muhammad. In addition, mention must be made in this connexion of the well-known and very popular Burda [q.v.] of al-Bûsîrî, sometimes with interlinear Malay transla-
tion.

(3) The third group of tales consists of those devoted to persons who lived at the time of Mu-
hammad, both šâhiba and others, opponents of the Proph-
et. In the first place we must mention the Hikajat Radja Khandak (Hindik, Unduk, from Arabic khandaq, moat), containing a very romanticized story of the War of the Ditch, the contents of which considerably deviate from the facts of history. The Arabic word for moat (khandaq) has become a personal name in this tale. The same is the case with the place-name Bareslangi, the name of the original author, an Indian), a liturgical text recited on the occasion of the birthday of Muhammad. In addition, mention must be made in this connexion of the well-known and very popular Burda [q.v.] of al-Bûsîrî, sometimes with interlinear Malay transla-
tion.

The last group of tales to be considered in the frame-work of tales about persons around the Prophet are those of which ʿAli, Fâtima, their children Hasan and Husayn and their stepbrother Muhammad b. al-Hanafîyya are the main characters. About the last mentioned there exists a famous romance, or perhaps better “epic tale”, the Hikajat Muhammad Hanafijjah, also known under the title of Hikajat Ali Hanafijjah. The majority of manuscripts of this text commence with the tale of the Nûr al-nubuwâwâ, and then pass on to a description of what happened to the main character, who here in this tale contrary to historical fact is victorious over Yazid, but at the end withdraws into seclusion and lives on as a kind of hidden imâm who will reappear to his follow-
ers in due time. This hikajat goes without a doubt back to a Persian original. Reminiscent of the martyrdom of Husayn is the Hikajat Tabûh (The Coffin), so named after the coffin which used to be carried round in procession at Padang and Bencoolen in former days. In this tale Shî’i influence is obvious, but is probably due to Indian troops stationed there during the British interregnum.

(4) An important and interesting group of tales are those dealing with the heroes of Islam. Without going into details we mention here a few titles only: the Hikajat Iskandar Dhu ‘l-Karnas, the tale of Alexander the Great, also found in Arabic and a number of other languages outside Indonesia. The Malay tale is probably a translation of a harmonized Arabic-Persian version; the Hikajat Amîr Hamasî, in Malay reworked after a Persian original, too, but with Malay extensions; the Hikajat Saiﬁ Dhu ‘l-Jazan, on the half-legendary, half-historical pre-Islamic ruler of South Arabia, translated from Arabic; and finally, the various versions of the Hikajat Sultan Ibrahim ibn Adham, the renowned saint so highly regarded in Islamic tradition.

(5) A very copious group consists of the theolog-
ical works in the stricter sense of the word. This literature can perhaps best be characterized with the name “kitab-literature”, religious and juridical works and treatises bearing on the three-fold Islamic “knowledge”, namely ‘ilm al-kalâm, ‘ilm al-fîkh and ‘ilm al-ta’lîwî, together with the disciplines per-
taining to it. As a transition between the groups already mentioned above and this kitab-literature may perhaps be considered the Hikajat (or kitab) Seribu Masa’ilah (The Book of the Thousand Questions), well-known in world-literature and (together with the Kur’ân) among the first works in Arabic which already at an early stage were translated into various European languages. In the Indonesian archipelago, too, this work found many readers. Besides the reedition in prose, at least one versified version is known to exist. It contains the tale of the Jewish scholar ʿAbd Allâh ibn Salâm of Khaybar who put a number of questions to Muhammad (cosmological and eschatological questions, questions about heaven and hell, and questions pertaining to secular, i.e., non-
revealed, knowledge) and who embraced Islam when the Prophet was able to answer his questions in a satisfactory way. This kitab-literature is very extensive. In fact, it is a technical literature, written for and studied by a certain group, the religiously minded and in particular the theologians and the teachers of re-
ligion. The language is Malay, but a Malay which is characterized by a multitude of technical terms and shows the influence of Arabic both in syntax and in vocabulary. It is this genre of literature that has exercised a considerable influence on the Malay
language. The greater part of this literature was reworked and translated from Arabic, in several cases in Mecca and Medina, by people from Indonesia for the benefit of those of their compatriots at home who had no knowledge of Arabic. The author's and translators' names of a number of works of this kind are known, and it is here that Malay literature somewhat loses its characteristic anonymity. In accordance with Arabic custom these authors used to add to their names a word indicating their place of origin, so that the names are followed by such words as al-Palimbâni, al-Bandjâri, al-Samâtrâ'î, al-Fânsârî, al-Bâni, al-Mahasâri, al-Kalanâtâni, al-Fâlânî, and so on. The subject-matter treated in this kitâb-literature shows a great variety, comprising in effect all aspects of Islam as a religion: the Kurâân, tafsîr, taqâyâd, hadîth, ar-khân al-Islâm, fiqh and wasil al-fîkh in the widest sense of the word. Some of them are voluminous compilations, others are small and deal with one special subject only, such as prayer, marriage or certain aspects of the law of inheritance. Numerous, too, are works dealing with mystical knowledge (simu sufî, simu tasawwuf), sufi orders, treatises on djihâr, collections of litanies (rawâûth) and primbons, books of notes on various subjects. Then there are collections of prayers (duâ'ûth). A special group is formed by collections of djîmâms (from Arabic 'âjâm), small booklets containing prayers and charms, often written in a very corrupt Arabic, which serve as measures of protection from the machinations of enemies and as a cure for illnesses.

During the 12th/13th century, in the flourishing period of the Sultanate of Atjêh in the North of Sumatra, we meet with four outstanding religious leaders whose influence was felt all over the Indonesian archipelago for a long time afterwards, namely Ha'mza Fansûrî, Shams al-Din al-Masâ'dî, Nûr al-Dîn al-Ranîrî and 'Abd al-Ra'ûf al-Sûngkîlî. The Achinese court played a prominent role in the development of the Malay religious literature of the 12th/13th century. At that time there flourished in Aceh a heterodox mysticism based on the doctrine of the seven grades of being (Ibn al-'Arabi, 'Abd al-Kâdîr al-Djîlânî, known under the name of Wudjûdîyya. Ha'mza Fansûrî [cf.], famous on account of his skill in composition, introduced into Malay poetry by means of the rhyming scheme a-a-a-b/b-b-b-b) of great lyrical power and outstanding literary value in Malay literature, such as the Sajîr dajîfî (the Poem of the Wanderer), Sajîr bunung pînggi (the Poem of the King) and Sajîr fêrâhu (the Poem of the Ship). In addition, he has a number of prose works to his name, e.g., the Sharab al-Sâkhînî, consisting of seven chapters, the first four dealing with the four stages of the mystical path (sharâ'î, tarîba, khâtîba and ma'rûfîa), the second two following the Chapters on the Being (wudjûd) and Attributes (isfâd) of God, and the last chapter on berahi dan sjukur, i.e., mystical enthusiasm; another prose work ascribed to him is entitled Arsrâr al-'ârifân fi bayd 'ûm al-suluk wa l-wajûd, which also is a mystical work. Commentaries on a number of his works were written by Shaykh Shams al-Din al-Samâtrâ'î, known also under the name of Shams al-Din of Pasâî, Shams al-Din, who died in 1039/1629, also wrote several works, but there is some doubt whether all the works ascribed to him are really his. Some of his works are in Arabic, e.g., Djuhâr al-khattabî, some in Arabic and Malay, e.g., Nûr al-dâkhîlî, others in Malay, e.g., Mi'ra' al-mu'mînîn, an Arabic treatise quoted in a Malay translation.

Nûr al-Dîn al-Ranîrî (d. 1068/1658 in India) was (as is indicated by his nisba) born in Rânrî (modern Ranar) in India and therefore was not a Malay. He was a prolific writer, who during his comparatively brief stay at Atjêh (1047/1637-1054/1644) wrote a great number of works, some of them voluminous, both in Arabic and in Malay. Some of his works were written outside the Indonesian archipelago. He was an orthodox shaykh, who took great pains in his works to attack the mystical school of 'Abd al-Rahmân and Shâms al-Dîn and their followers. Among his exegetical works directed against the wudjûdîyya is the Tûbyân fi ma'rûfîat ad-djân, consisting of two bûhs, one dealing with the various religions from Nabi 'Isâ until Muhammân, the other about the variant tenets adhered to by the religious schools; and in particular his Hudjûdî al-djâdî dik lâ dajîfî l-sînîdî, further Hâli al-sîlî and Shufî al-kulbî. Widely known and still read today is his Shirâr al-mustashîm (sic; the first article is dropped according to Indonesian usage), a translation from Arabic, and his voluminous Abûbâr al-alhîmra fi ahwâl al-hiyyâm, a treatise on eschatology and after-life, compiled from various Arabic sources. The last book begun by al-Ranîrî but left unfinished owing to his departure from Atjêh was Djuhâr al-lûlâm fi khân al-mâ'tâmîn. It was completed by one of his students. It is an important work, in which al-Ranîrî gives a detailed and systematic account of his theological views. For his large encyclopaedic work, Bustûn al-saalânîn, see below.

'Abd al-Ra'ûf al-Sûngkîlî, after his death known in Atjêh under the name of Teungku Ki Kuala (he presumably died about the beginning of the 13th/14th century) studied in Arabia for 19 years, amongst others with Ahmad al-Kushashi and Mawla Ibrâhim. After obtaining the idjâma from the latter, he returned to Atjêh, where he introduced the Shâttariyya tarîba, which was very popular in Indonesia for a long time. (The Shâttariyya tarîba, also reached the Indonesian archipelago through other channels independently of 'Abd al-Ra'ûf.) His best-known work, Umdat al-muhtâdîn il-sâlûk mas-lah al-mufradin, is a textbook of practical mysticism giving detailed information about the methods of djihâr and containing litanies (rawâûth), formulas to be recited; it was illustrated with figures, daers, to explain certain mystical truths. 'Abd al-Ra'ûf, too, was a prolific writer. Mention should be made here of his translation of parts of the Kurâân commentary of al-Baydâwî, which, in editions printed in Egypt, is still used in Sumatra and Malayâ today. For further titles we refer to Voorhoeve's article listed in the Bibliography.

Besides works on mysticism as mentioned above, there exists a great mass of orthodox literature which can only be mentioned here. Widely read was, e.g., Biddâyû al-hiyyâm, a work of al-Ghaßâlî translated into Malay with additions of his own by 'Abd al-Samad al-Palimbânî, who also edited the fourth book of al-Ghaßâlî's Tûbyân in Malay under the title of Sâyûr al-sâkhînî il-sâbîd Rabb al-sâlim, both works were written by 'Abd al-Samad while he was in Arabia. Of the numerous catechisms, mention may be made of the popular Masalî al-muhtâdi il-tuhûd al-mufradî, of which there are a great many manuscripts and which, moreover, was printed several times.

Closely related to religious literature are the so-called risâlats and wawâds (from Arabic wahâd), which appear at times in the wake of disturbances or catastrophic events like floods and
earthquakes. The purpose of these writings was to admonish people to atone for their sins and to return to a pious life. The form as a rule is traditional, the author relating how the prophet appeared to him in a dream and ordered him to convey such and such a message to his, i.e., Muhammad's community.

Finally, mention must be made of two genres which are a good illustration of certain aspects of Indonesian popular Islam and popular beliefs, namely the hadith and the hikajat. The latter, with the "Maulid" and founders of tarikahs. The hikajat (or biographical works) do indeed contain medical prescriptions, but on the other hand they have a markedly magic character because recitation of prayers (du'a) or incantations and formulas, among them verses of the Qur'an, for a certain number of times are considered an important expedient for curing illnesses. Another means of healing is, e.g., by making various calculations based upon the numerical value of the Arabic letters of the name of the patient. The tales about prominent religious teachers and saintly persons of bygone times and of founders of tarikahs are not strictly biographies but rather stories in which all kinds of miraculous deeds performed by the main characters are related. The miracles stand as proofs of the sanctity of their performers. These tales, legends of the saints, are composed for edifying purposes. Examples are Hikajat Sjaint Awal al-Djadir al-Djilal (Ar. Shaykh Abd al-Kadir al-Djilali) and Hikajat Sjaint Muhammad Samman.

As for belles-lettres, in the first place mention must be made of two important texts, both written for Achehnese Sultans in the first half of the 11th/12th century. The first is Tadj al-qaliluj, about whose author, named Buquljar Djobhori (or Djawhiari), nothing is known. This text, a Mirror for Princes, was written in 1012/1603, without a doubt after Persian originals. The second is the Bustan al-qaliluj of al-Ranirl, dated 1047/1638, an encyclopaedic work and a compendium of Islamic knowledge with a special chapter on the history of the Achehnese Sultanate and the genealogy of its Sultans. Besides these, there are a great number of romances, both in prose and in poetry. These works, mostly dating from the 9th/16th and 12th/19th centuries, are very loosely connected with Islam, only the motifs and the subject matter being derived from international Islamic literature, their surroundings being set in the central lands of Islam. A few titles may suffice: (poetry) Sjaar Tadj al-muluk, Sjaar Siti Zubaiddah, Sjaar hijajat Radja Damsjik, and (prose) Hikajat Komala Bahrain, Hijajat Shahi Mardan (= Hijajat Bitbrana Ditja Djaja), Hijajat Ahmad Muhammad, Hijajat Djauhar Manikam, Hijajat Abd al-Rahman and Abd al-Rahim, Hijajat Radja Damsjik, Hijajat Tawaddud, and many others.

Of the literatures of Achehnese, Macassarese and Buginese (Macassarese and Buginese have, like Javanese, been able to maintain their original scripts), the same can be said as has been said of Malay literature, although the Islamic literature in these languages is more restricted so far as numbers of titles is concerned; but on the other hand, in addition to the works in these languages, there was a wide circulation of works in Malay. For details the reader is referred to the catalogues listed in the Bibliography.

As regards Javanese literature, here too we find essentially the same pattern as in Malay literature: textbooks of Arabic, translations and commentaries of the Qur'an, works dealing with the sacred history of Islam, tales of Muhammad and the prophets before him, of the heroes of Islam, and so on. The majority of these works consist of translations from Malay, and are, like their Malay originals, anonymous. One characteristic of the Javanese translations and reworkings is that they have been expanded and as a rule, in accordance with Javanese literary taste, have been versified. The story of Hamza has here grown into a voluminous and very popular cycle, the "Maulid" and other tales are likely to have developed round the tale of Yusuf, which has become extremely popular in Java and Madura. In almost all cases it is written in Javanese script on palm-leaves (lontar). A well-known orthodox theologian in Java and author of several works which were widely studied was Ahmad Rijang (= Rifai) of Kali Salak, Pekalongan.

According to Javanese historical tradition, Islam was introduced in Java in the 8th/9th century by the seels, saintly persons of great spiritual power, usually nine in number. They may be considered as culture heroes; it is believed that they also invented the wayang, the Javanese shadow-play, and the gamelan, the well-known Javanese musical instrument. These seels preached a heterodox mystical doctrine of the relation between the Creator and the creature and of the unity of being. This doctrine is expressed in anonymous mystical songs, called suluhis. A very few are in Javanese, but they were written by seels, the majority are of a later date. Some of them are brief songs explaining mystical concepts, sometimes in the form of questions of a student to his teacher, of a son to his father or of a wife to her husband, together with the answers. The language is often cryptic. Some of them are very literary—which is exceptional in Javanese literature. Their wide circulation all over Java is apparently due to wandering students travelling from one kiai (spiritual leader) to another. The voluminous romanticized cycles of tales like Tjabolang, Tjentjini and Djatiswara are likely to have developed around suluhis of the same name. They are conceived as travel stories in which the main characters travel about in search of each other; in places of rest, often the homes of famous spiritual teachers (kiahis), discussions are held on sacred history. A very few of these suluhis are too trivial to the loftiest, among which figure very profound religious and philosophical speculations.

The Arabic script failed to supersede the Javanese script, although specifically religious works were written in Javanese in an (adapted) Arabic script, the so-called pegon. Besides the indigenous literatures, there existed a vast literature in Arabic imported from abroad. This Arabic literature is represented in a great number of manuscripts. The Museum Pusat (formerly the Museum of the Batavia Society of Arts and Sciences) in Jakarta is one of the libraries which possess a large collection of these texts. Other manuscripts of this kind are preserved in the Leiden University Library, mainly derived from the collection of Professor Snouck Hurgronje. The following categories can be distinguished: theology, law, sacred history of Islam and biographies, philology, and (although very few in number only) poetry and tales. For details the reader is referred to the catalogues.

Modern developments in Islam have left practically no visible traces in Indonesian and Malay literature. It is a secular literature although there are, of course, such authors as Hamka (Hadj Abdul Malik Karim Amruhlah), who bear a markedly Islamic stamp.


Articles: Ph. S. van Ronkel, Het verhaal van de held Samd'un en van Mariah de Kopitsche (Tibyan Sam'un), in TILV, xii (1901), 441-81; D. A. Rinkez, De Heiligen van Java, in TILV, lii (1910), 556-86; liii (1911), 17-57, 269-93, 435-57; liv (1912), 135-207; lv (1913), 1-207; Th. G. Th. Pigeaud, De Serat Tjabolang en de Serat Tjentini, in Verhandelingen Bataviansche Genootschap, lxxii (1933); C. A. O. van Nieuwenhuijze, 'Nur al-Din ar-Raniri als bestrijder der Waqfisbayah, in BTLV, civ (1948), 327-44; Th. G. Th. Pigeaud, The Romance of Amir Hamza in Java, in Bihagisan Budi (Festschrift Ph. S. van Ronkel), Leiden 1950, 235-40; P. Voorhoeve, Van en over 'Nuruddin ar-Raniri, in BTLV, civ (1951), 357-68; idem, Bajari Tadjallil. Gegevens voor een nadere studie over Abdurraof van Singkel, in TILV, lxv (1952), 87-117; idem, Lijst der geschriften van Raniiri en Apparatuur Cricicus bij de tekst van twee verhandel- lingen, in BTLV, civ (1955), 152-61; G. W. J. Drewes, De herkomst van Nuruddin ar-Raniri, in BTLV, civ (1955), 137-51; idem, Een 16e eeuws Maleise vertaling van de Burda van al-Buatri, in BTLV, xvii (1955); idem, The struggle between Javanism and Islam as illustrated by the Serat Dermagandul, in BTLV, cxxii (1966), 309-65; idem, Javanese poems dealing with or attributed to the Saint of Tanah Lot, in BTLV, cxxii (1966), 209-299; Syed Nagub al-Atass, New light on the life of Hamzah Fanruiri, JMBRAS, xii (1967), 42-51.

R. Roolvink

INDUS [see MIHRAN, PANJAB, SINDE].

INDUSTRY [see SINJA'U].

INEBAKHTI [see 'AYNABAKHTI].

INFIL [see FILL].

INFIDEL [see KAIFAR].

INFISAKH [see FASEEK].

INFISAL [see WASI].

INGUSH, a Muslim people belonging to the central group (wujukh) of the Ibero-caucasian linguistic family of the northern Caucasus. Chechen, Batshi and Kist are languages belonging to the same group. The name Ingush comes from the Aul Angush, founded in the foothills of the Caucasus in the 17th century. The term was first used by the Kabards [q.v.], then by the Russians. The indigenous name is Galgy, which is the name of one of the most important Ingush tribes, or Lamur (= "Mountainers").

The Ingush live in the western districts of the present-day Checno-Ingush Autonomous Republic, mainly in the upper and intermediate valleys of the Terek and the Sunja and their tributaries, between the Checens [q.v.] to the east and the Kabards to the west. Very little is known of the history of the Ingush tribes before the 18th century. They had been subdued in the 11th century by the rulers of Georgia, from whom they received Christianity. At the beginning of the 15th century the Ingush were paying tribute to the Kabards. Sunni Islam only penetrated the country in the second half of the 18th century as a result of the activities of the Chechen Naksabandis and did not triumph until the beginning of the 19th. Christian Ingush were still to be found in 1865 (3,405 as compared with 11,960 Muslims according to Semenov, Geograficheskiy i Statistichesskiy Sjovar Rossishchoy Imperii, St. Petersburg 1865, ii). It was also at the beginning of the 19th century that the Ingush began their slow migration from the high lands to the more fertile plains of the Terek and the Sunja. This movement continued during the first half of the 19th century.
Unlike their Čečen neighbours, the Ingush offered little resistance to the advance of the Russians whose first detachments entered their country about 1790. On the contrary, they even helped them against the Kabards and took no part in the revolt of the Čečen shaykh, Manṣūr Ughurma [q.v.], nor in the great movement of the Imām Šamil [q.v.].

After 1850, the Russian presence in the lands of the Ingush was not characterized by indigenous revolts, as it was in Dāğhīstān and the lands of the Čečens; and it was only in the second half of the 19th century that relations between the Ingush and the Russians became noticeably worse. The conflict began about 1860 when the Ingush settlements around Nazran on the Sunja were pushed back by the Cossacks towards the infertile lands of the high mountain. At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th the political climate deteriorated rapidly when the lands of the Ingush were again disturbed by severe troubles between the Ingush and the Terek Cossacks.

Until the Revolution, the Ingush, like their neighbours, the Čečens, maintained a pre-feudal social structure. All the Ingush clans considered themselves as free and equal and were grouped in “free societies” (the most important were the Galgaj, Djerak Kistin and Galash). The large, undivided family was preserved, and patriarchal customs (levirate, polygamy etc.) were faithfully observed. Ingush society was not divided into classes; there was no aristocracy, although an élite, made up especially of officers and public officials, had begun to form at the beginning of the 20th century.

During the October Revolution the Ingush played a part in the confused struggles which involved the northern Caucasus in great bloodshed between 1918 and 1921. Because of their enmity towards the Terek Cossacks who had driven them out of the rich lands of the Caucasian foot-hills, the Ingush supported the Bolshevik forces.

On 7 July 1924 the Autonomous Region of the Ingush was founded with an area of 3,200 sq. km. and a total population of 81,900. (At this time the Ingush numbered 75,200). On 15th January 1934 the Region was united with that of the Čečens to form the Čečeno-Ingush Soviet Socialist Republic on 5 December 1936.

In 1943 the advance guard of the German armies reached the western districts of the Ingush lands. In 1944 when the region was recaptured by the Soviet Army, the entire Ingush population was accused of “treason against the Soviet fatherland” and “collaboration with the Germans” and was deported to Central Asia (at the same time as the Čečens, the Balkars, the Karaçay, the Kalmucks and the Crimean Tatars), their national republic being suppressed. In 1957 this measure was recognized as an error arising from the “cult of personality” and the Ingush were officially rehabilitated and allowed to return to their re-established republic. In 1959 they numbered 106,000 (as against 92,000 in 1939), but their birth rate is one of the highest in the Soviet Union.

In 1959 the Čečeno-Ingush Autonomous Republic had a total population of 710,000, of whom 292,000, i.e., 41%, were Muslims. Of this number only some 48,000 were Ingush.

The Ingush language was given a Latin alphabet in 1923; in the same year there appeared the first periodical in Ingush, Serdalo (“The Lamp”). In 1938 the Latin script was replaced by the Cyrillic script.

Bibliography: All the works dealing with the Ingush are in Russian. Among the chief ones are: B. Dolgot, Material po obolonamu pravu Ingushey, Vladikavkaz 1930; N. F. Grabovskiy, Ingushskii ’Ikhkit’ i obloqay, in Sbornik Svedenii o Kavkaskih Gor’ladh, ix, Tiflis 1876; Narodi Kavkaza, i, (Narodi Mira series), Moscow, Ac. of Sciences, Inst. of Ethnography, 1960, 375-91; I. I. Pantukov, Ingush, Tiflis, Kavkaskoe Otdelenie Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva, xii/3, 1900; G. V. Tertov, Ingushi Istoriyo-Sotsiologicheskoy ocherk, in Tershy i Inkhar, 1930, 1, Vladikavkaz. See also the bibliography of Čečen.

(A. Benningsem)

INKHĀR [see REGÈ].

INK [see MIDĀD].

INKĀR, “denial”, the opposit of ʾathrār [q.v.]; it is said that there is inkhār when a person who is summoned by law to acknowledge a debt denies that he owes it; this inkhār should not be confused with the refusal (nadd or tāhāb) of the beneficiary of an ʾathrā to agree to the said acknowledgement [see INKRĀ].

Faced with a debtor who refuses to recognize his debt or his obligation, the petitioner has the right to use any of the methods of proof which the law allows him and, in particular, can make him swear an oath, yamin al-munkir, which many Muslims in former times preferred to avoid pronouncing, even though they did not admit to being debtors. There could then take place a transaction which put an end to the legal conflict, usually irrevocably, and this was called sulh ʾalā inkhār.


(Y. Linant de Bellefonds)

INKILĀR [see THAWRA].

INNĀYIR [see INGUSH].

INNOVATION [see BIDĀ].

INŌNŪ [see SULṬĀN DĪWĀN].

INŚAF, equity. According to the L.A., this maṣdar of the fourth form has as synonym nasaf, nasafah, and implies the idea of “to grant rights” (ʾīṣā al-khabb); it is stated there that anṣāfa is to “assure to others the same right that one claims for oneself” that, thus presented, therefore corresponds strictly to equity, but it is not clear at what date this notion began to be rendered by inśaf. Although nasaf is attested in early poetry, inśaf does not seem to appear in the so-called pre-Islamic diwāns; nevertheless there is to be found, in the anthologists of the 3rd/9th century, the expression asfār munsifa (or asfār al-nasaf, al-inśaf), to indicate, if not a poetic genre, at least a theme which first appears among a certain number of poets of the end of the Djāhilīyya and of the very early years of Islam; in the verses thus described (which are most frequently in the ṣafir metre and contain often-repeated clichés), the poets praise the fervour and the valour in war of the rival clan and acknowledge that victory has been hard-won; these poems are thus a means of glorifying oneself without humiliating one’s adversaries. It is this contrast with the themes of the traditional ḥijād [q.v.] which attracted the attention of the anthropologists (Ibn Sallām, Albū Tammām, al-Blūṭuri and others) and led them to adopt the epithet of munsifa (see Ch. Pellat, Sur l’expression arabë asfār m.n.s.fāfāt, MéI, Marcel Cohen, 1970, 212-9).

The term inśaf does not appear in the Kur’ān, where the root ṣf is used in referring to equity, but it enlivened by its frequent and lavish use of roots which are conceptually either
close to it or opposed to it, such as *dw, ?ulm,* *adl, slfa, fan. The principle of *adl, slfa, fan, in particular by the Hananis, may be considered as a continuation of the Kur'ānic idea and terminology: it expresses, in fact, a more flexible and more circumstantial conception and practice of the over-rigid justice produced by the formal strictness of *biyās. In introducing concrete considerations, of time, of practice and of persons, *isti McN allows the adoption of solutions which tend towards equity. *isti McN*" (Ch. Checheta, *Études de philosophie musulmane du droit*, in *St. Isl.,* xxv, 138), "may be considered as the form which the idea of equity has taken in the mind of the Muslim jurists. *Benignitas* (*isti McN*) is a very human aspect of the principle *jus est aequi et boni. It belongs on the borderline between law and morals*. It is difficult to state precisely what this aspect of juridical thought owes to indirect influence (e.g., to *hilm* as indulgence, i.e., a higher form of justice, to Byzantine practice, to Medinan and *Trakî* *urf* etc.) and to direct influence. What is certain is that the *Nichomachean ethics* contain a penetrating discussion of equity (*épreuves*) at the end of book V on justice (*diké*). Aristotle’s thought stems from a very early tradition which opposed the unwritten law to the written law, which is too general to solve with equity all the individual cases. It is thus one finds here a very clear defence of equity as being the source of a higher law.

The *falāsifa* naturally took up this idea in order to praise its moral beauty. “The virtue of justice (‘adāla’), writes, for example, Miskawayh (*Tahdhib al-Akhlaq*, ed. Zurayk, 26), “confers on man a disposition (hay’a) which causes him to choose always to treat first himself with equity, then to treat others with the same equity (insdnintisdn) which he expects from them”.

The rationalization of this idea is pursued in the writings of the scholars, and *insdn* finally came to mean impartiality, objectivity, integrity, in short a complete ethical code for the activity of the man of learning (*’ilm* ‘i-s’im), which al-Mawardi, for example, describes at length under the name of “independence” (sīyās) (in *Adayat al-dīn wa-dīn yilıs tālī*, ed. Saqqa, 30 f. and passim). The importance of this ethical code explains the attraction for stories of figures like *Ktāb al-Insdn* or *Ktāb al-Insdn wa-l-insdn* (16 of them are to be found in Brockelmann).

Finally it may be mentioned that *insdn* is a method of argument in which, instead of immediately asserting the inferiority or error of that which is being attacked in comparison with that being defended, both are placed on a fictitious equal footing although it is granted that one or the other is inferior or wrong. In this way impartiality is displayed while one of the alternative propositions is implicitly considered as impossible or absurd. The model for this figure is provided by Kur’ān XXXIV, 23/4: "Either you or I are on the right path or in manifest error" (M. Canard, *Abhār Ar-Rādī fil-biḥār..., Algiers 1946, i, 67, n. 3; see also the commentaries on this verse where two lines of Hassan b. Thābit (wāfīr metre, ... al-rasul rhyme) are cited on this subject, lines 24-5 of the first piece of the *Dīwān* with the explanations of the editors).

*Bibliography:* In addition to the works mentioned in the article: R. A. Gauthier and J. V. Joll, *Aristote, Éthique à Nicomaque*, ii, 1, 431 ff. (M. Akrour) *INSĀN* (*A*), man (homo). The Kur’ān states that God created man weak (IV, 28). Several verses describe his holoclean trouble: he is trying to do evil, and when the trouble has passed, he forgets (X, 12; XXXIX, 8 and 49); he is very unjust (*falsām*, XIV, 34; XXXIII, 72); much inclined to be precipitate (*ṣaghil*, XVII, 11); versatile (*hāṣla*, LXX, 19); rebellious (XLVI, 6); a subtle reasoner and given to argument (XVIII, 54, XXXVI, 77).

The LR echoes this Kur’ānic teaching: all beings which are made with intelligence, a being whom any are given to argument, but man is more so than the others; on the other hand, it quotes a fantastic etymology, from Ibn ‘Abbās: “man is called *insdn* because he receives the alliance of God and then forgets (*ja nassaya*)”; the ajd of this word is said to be *insdn*, the *yfīlān* form of *nissān*.

On the physical reality of man, there are many verses in the Kur’ān. God created him “of a clay of mould moulded” (XXV, 6). In particular in XXIII, 12 ff. there is a detailed account of the development of the foetus: the primary source of the human body is clay; then there is successively the *nūjf* which fixes itself in the uterus, the *uṣla*, the *mudgha*; then the differentiation of the tissues: bone and flesh; and finally there occurs a “second creation”, which corresponds, according to the commentators, to the various phases of development from birth to death.

*Naṣir al-Dīn al-Rāzī* gives an Aristotelian interpretation to these passages: “Man is engendered from a flow of sperm; the sperm is engendered by an excess of the fourth type of coction (*min fādil al-hadīm al-rābi*), cf. the *μέρις*, that is the digestion, *Meteorologica*, book iv, 379152; *De Gen. Animal*. 724a 9 f.). But all this is engendered only by foods, which are animal or vegetable substances. But the animal substances are engendered from juices which themselves are engendered from the clarified juices of the earth and of water. Thus man is in reality engendered from a pure extract of clay (*min salālā miš fin*, cf. XXXII, 12). Next this pure extract, after passing successively through various stages (*aṭūr*, cf. LXXI, 14) of formation and through the circuits of elaboration, becomes semen*. "The explanation of “We have made him to grow in a second creation" (*insdn* in *Tahdhib al-Akhlaq*). The original *mulik* of this word is said to be *nāsī’a*, perhaps equivalent to *nassā’a*, because he receives the alliance of God and then forgets (*ja nassaya*). The ajd of this word is said to be *insdn*, the *yfīlān* form of *nissān*. The Kur’ān describes man by contradictions: grandeur and wretchedness (cf. *XCV*, 4-5): “We indeed created Man in the fairest stature/then we restored him the lowest of the low”. Al-Rāzī states that the word *lakwīn* may refer to the exterior form, to its balanced assembly of parts (some point out that man is the only animal which does not have its face turned towards the ground, *mikabb *ald wadj[h]], but which has an upright stance, *ardhal al-*umr*”.

The Kur’ān says: “We gave Adam the knowledge of the tree of life, the knowledge of good and evil; and we made a living being for Adam and which takes its food with its hand; cf. St. Gre-
gence begin to fail; strength diminishes and man becomes incapable of performing good works” (al-Rāzī). This is one aspect of man appears clearly in sūra II, where the angels comment on God’s plan to establish Adam as deputy on earth. This has given rise in the commentary of the Manār to an interesting anthropological view which has a certain analogy with some western ideas going back to Herder and developed in Germany during the 19th century. Unlike animals who know by instinct (iḥāmaṭ) what is useful to them and what is harmful, man acquires knowledge of his surroundings only by very slow degrees. But his progress has no limits, and on this point he is superior even to the angels, whose knowledge and actions are limited (mahbūd). This recalls al-Rāzī’s idea that man, unlike the angels and the beings which are inferior to him, has no determined function (waṣfā maʿlaṭyana). Thus man has been able to acquire a knowledge which gives him a considerable power over nature and which continually increases.

“He has invented, discovered, innovated, so as to change the shape of the earth (ḥattā gḥayyara shardh al-ārḍ)”, we read in the Manār. He has cultivated the uncultivated lands; he has grown, through hybridization, species which did not formerly exist, for example the mandarin (yāṣuf endendi) which “God has created through the hand of man (khālakah bi-yad al-ʾinsān)”. It is in this sense that man, without offending the angels, may truly be the khulṣa of God, in spite of all his deficiencies.

It is also from verses of the Kurʾān that the Iḥšān al-Ṣafā’ have many further ideas about man, all of them curious and interesting. To take one instance: in the same way that man is a microcosm, he shares all the particular characteristics of the animals (cf. Ep., iii, 19 f.). In this system, the stars serve as instruments, not of the Creator, but of the Universal Soul which obeys him. Thus man takes his place in the hierarchy of the universe.

The Iḥšān al-Ṣafā’ studied man mainly in the perspective of the Greek thinking concerning the nature of the soul, its relation with the body and the union of the agent Intellecit with the material intellect. “The rational faculty by which man is man is not in its substance an intellect in action ... it is the agent intellect which makes it become an intellect in action ...” (al-Fārābī, al-SAyiṣa al-madāniyya, Beirut 1964, 35).

Finally, al-Tahānawi, in his dictionary, gives in his article ʾInsān a long quotation from the commentary of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī on sūra XVII, 85: “Say: ‘The Spirit is of the bidding of my Lord’”. Intuition alone tells us that the spirit is what man means when he says “I”. But can this “I” be the organic body when it is well-known that its parts are always changing and being replaced? If man is not this body, is he a body in which the earthly element predominates, since this would be made of bone, flesh, fat and sinews, and nobody identifies man with these “thick, heavy and dark” tissues. It cannot be a body in which the aqueous element predominates, since this would be one of the four humours, and none of these is man, except that some consider that an exception should be made for the blood, since the loss of it brings death. Bodies in which there predominate the elements of air and fire are the spirits, bodies composed of air mingled with natural heat (al-harāra al-gharīsiyya) and engendered in the heart and in the brain. Spirits cannot dissolve or decline. They are noble, celestial and divine bodies, which penetrate into the organism as soon as it is formed and completely prepared to receive them. They remain there so long as the body is in good health, but when there arise thick humours which prevent their circulation (ṣarayda), they leave it, and this is death.

This doctrine, says al-Rāzī, “is powerful and sublime, and should be pondered since it corresponds exactly to the statements in the divine books on the states of life and death”. In fact God said to the angels: “I am creating a mortal of a clay. When I have shaped him, and breathed My Spirit in him, fall you down, bowing before him” (XXXVIII, 72, cf. XV, 29).
The doctrine of most of the physicians and of those who deny the soul, is based on the observation that each animal species is characterized by its own balanced arrangement of humour. The word "human" is applied to bodies having particular qualities resulting from the mixture of the elements according to an equally particular proportion. The metaphysicists on the other hand say that man is not a body. They teach the doctrine of a "return" (ma'dd) to God whereas the body dies, and they believe in spiritual sanctions in the after-life. Several sects of Islam have supported these ideas: the author cites Râghib and al-Ghazâlî (?), certain early Mu'tazilis, a group of Karramîyya, among the Shî'îs al-Shaykh al-Mufîd, and in particular the ascetics and the mystics. After this long citation, al-Tahânawi embarks upon the question of al-Insân al-kâmîl.

Bibliography: in addition to the references in the article, see al-Insân al-kâmîl.

(R. Arnaldez)

AL-INSÂN AL-KÂMIL The Perfect Man.

1. General observations on this concept. The idea of the Perfect Man, which occurs in Muslim esoteric mysticism, is not derived directly from the Kur'ân. It may be compared with gnostic conceptions which have assumed various forms: that of the prîwos ânivîrios linked with Hermeticism (cf. Positanean) and the mandaic gnostics, may be the purest original source; another origin may be found in the Mazdaean myth of Gayomart, the primordial Man. These two currents come together in Manichaicism with the doctrine of the first Man (al-Insân al-kadîm) who, with the Mother of Life and the five elements, her sons and auxiliaries, constitutes the first Creation which the Father of Greatness raises up by his Word. For the disciples of Zoroaster and for Mani, however, this prototypal man has as his function the combatting of evil and darkness, in conformity with a dualist doctrine which developed in Iranian thinking and which Islam rejected with all its might. Nevertheless the idea of a role, if not of salvation, at least of conservation, assumed by the Perfect Man in regard to the inferior world, remains an essential one for the Muslim mystics who make use of this idea. A parallelism with the Jewish Cabala would be even more instructive: for which they found elsewhere various expressions of the mystical theory of the Merkabah there has been developed, in the Sepher ha-Zohar, the doctrine of the ten sephirût, among them being Wisdom (hokhmâh), Intelligence (binâh), Love (hesed), Mercy (rahamîn), Royalty (malkhût), and so on, which constitute the World of Union or transcendent Man. It is through these that divine life is diffused into the entire creation. Thus Jewish mysticism also finally reaches this conception, that the Infinite (En sêf), by the emanation of its light, forms the Âdâm Qadmon, from whom the light of the sephirût produces the total emanation. This kind of refraction of light through light calls to mind the kur'ânic expression "Light upon light" (mîrâ'în 'alî mîrâ'în), in XXIV, 35. Similarly one sees, in al-Dhill, for example, that God created the muhammadan forms (cf. infra) from the light of his Name of Creator (Bâdî) and Powerful (Kâdîr); then he irradiated (tâqîllâh) on these forms with His Name of Benevolent (Lâîfî) and Grantor of Absolution (Ghâfir). Here too, there is an irradiation of light in light. From these similarities must it be concluded that a real influence existed? Might there be a "unity of initiatory origin among all the religious mysticism of ancient Asia"? L. Massignon thinks not. In this matter he sees "coincidental terms, without any real relationship existing between their respective processes of formation" (Essai, 57 and n. 5). It seems indeed that there may be reason to observe some parallel developments, in particular between the Jewish Cabala and the Muslim (irfân). But it is not excluded that independent reflection upon the Kur'ân may have led certain mystics to conceptions for which they found elsewhere various expressions and symbols that they could adopt.

2. The kur'ânic contributions. The idea of al-Insân al-kâmîl appears in the Qur'ân that, in the whole of creation, man occupies a leading position, entirely apart. Now the Kur'ân adds many revelations to this effect. First of all there is the affirmation that the universe, the heavens and the earth with all that they contain, are placed in the service of man by the tâshîr. The expression sâkkhâra labûm (He has caused to labour for you) or lâma (for us) occurs about ten times in the Kur'ân. Next, there is the choice of man as God's vicegerent (khâli'fah) on earth (II, 30), a choice which was to surprise the Angels; then, the proposal put to man to assume responsibility for the amânâ (trusting of faith): he accepts, when the heavens and the earth had refused, through fear (XXXIII, 72). In the commentary of Fâghr al-Dîn al-Râzî there occurs an observation which gives us an indication of what constituted the Perfect Man for the interpreters of these mystics: according to one of them, there are those who perceive both the universal and the particular; these are men. Some others who perceive only the particular are the animals; while those others who perceive only the universal are the Angels. Man has therefore an intermediate position which endows him with a value unique in creation; thus, despite his weakness, he will bear the amânâ.

But it is the verses referring to the light which are above all important. In two passages (IX, 32 and LXI, 8) it is written that, in transmitting it to men, God gives His light a complete perfection (yustimm nîrâhu; mulîm nîrûn). Al-Râzî comments: "God promises Muhammad an increase (mâstâl) in aid and power, as well as a raising in degree (iîkal al-darajât) and the perfection of the hierarchical rank (hamâmîl al-rutbât)". In II, 257, we read—"God is the wall of the ones who believe; for example, God makes a covenant with the darkness to the light", i.e. to all His creatures; or finally because He loves the Believers because to all His creatures, He is said to be in a very particular sense the wall of the Believers (sakhkhara lakûn). Now the light is in one sense faith or Direction (hudd); it is also revelation; it is a Book (Torah, Gospel, Kur'ân); but it is also that through which the Prophet causes men to pass from darkness into light (XI, 1).

It is then among Believers, the Friends of God (auûtîyâ; cf. the singular wall), the prophets and especially Muhammad, that one must seek the Perfect Man. The celebrated verse 35 of the Surah of Light (XXIV) has been given an important interpretation. A distinction has been made between the opening section which speaks of God as light, and the continuation introduced by mînâhîrî nîrûn, apparently referring to the light which descends on certain of His creatures. For some, the niche (mîghâfîh) is the
heart of the Believer, and the lamp which is found there is the light of the heart. For others, such as al-Kharraz, the reference is to the heart of Muhammdd and to a light which shines there, lit by a sacred tree which, for al-Kharraz is Abraham, for some Şûfis the inspirations (îlâmîyat) of the Angels, for Muqâtîl prophecy and mission. These ideas were finally to lead to the doctrine of the Muhammadan light (nûr muhammadi [q.v.]).

3. Transposition of an alchemical idea. The symbol of the Perfect Man is connected also with the alchemical conception of man as a microcosm and of the macrocosm as "meganthropos" (însân kabir). According to al-Djârî, in his Definitions, the perfect man unites the totality both of the divine (îlâmîyya) worlds and of the engendered (kawnîyya) worlds, universal and particular; he is the Writing which combines the divine Writings and the engendered Writings; indeed, in respect of his mind and intellect, he is an intelligible Book, named Umm al-Klâb; in respect of his heart, he is the Book of the Lawh Mahfûz; in respect of his soul, he is the Book of the Abolition (mahû) and Establishment (îlâmîl) of being. The relation of the Prime Intellect to the macrocosm is that of the human Spirit to the body and its faculties: the universal Soul is the heart of the macrocosm, just as the rational soul is the heart of man. Thus the universe is called al-Insdn al-kâmîl, his perfect creature, the perfect man in Ibn ʿArabi (e.g., Fusûs al-Ifîkâm, ch. 14, De la Sagesse divine dans le Verbe adanime trans. Burckhardt, La Sagesse des Prophètes, 231 and in al-Djîlî, al-Insdn al-kâmîl, ch. 53, On the Prime Intellect: "The Science of the prime Intellect and that of the sublime Calamus are one single Light whose relation to man is called the prime Intellect, while its relation to God is called the sublime Calamus. This being the Intellect ascribed to Muhammdd, it is from him that God created the Angel Gabriel in pre-ernity. Thus Muhammdd is a father to Gabriel and a principle for the totality of the World").

4. Ibn ʿArabi. The idea of the Perfect Man is found in Ibn ʿArabi, in the Fusûs al-Ifîkâm, as a development of the kurrânîc revelation, according to which man is the "mirror" (masâbîh): "One ephemeral and eternal, it is through his existence that the world was completed. "He is to the world what the stone is to the ring: the stone bears the seal which the king affixes to his treasure-chests". To man is entrusted the divine safeguarding of the World, and the world will not cease to be safeguarded so long as this Perfect Man shall remain there. God first created the whole world like a mirror which has not yet been polished. In order that He might be perfectly manifested in it, it was necessary that by means of divine Order (amr) this mirror should be made clear, "and Adam became the very clarity of this mirror and the spirit of this image". Therefore the Prophet says that God created Man in His image, that is to say that Adam is the prototype [the universal soul] which synthesize all the categories of the divine Presence, Essential (îlâmî, or attributes (îlâmîy) and actions (îlamîl) (cf. La Sagesse des Prophètes, 20, 22, 154 and 54, n. 1). The image of God is no other than His Presence, "so that, in this noble epitome which is the Perfect Man, God manifested ... all the divine Names and the essential Realities (habâ'îb) of all that exists outside Himself, in the macrocosm, in detailed fashion. ... From the Perfect Man He made the spirit of the world, and subjected the high and the low to him. Just as there is nothing in the world which does not exalt God by praise of Him (XVII, 44), so there is nothing in the world which does not serve this man...”. Here Ibn ʿArabi recalls the tashqîr, and he concludes: “Everything the world contains is subject to man. This is known to him who knows, that is to say the Perfect Man, and is not known by him who does not know, that is to say man the animal” (p. 154).

5. The Muhammadan Reality (Habîba muhammadiyya). Ibn ʿArabi writes in his Fusûs al-Ifîkâm, ch. 6, "One can never consider and wishes to express them publicly (ibd.) And so, among other denominations, beings are "sublime letters", as Ibn
Arabi says: “We were sublime letters which were not read.” In order to read them, just as to speak, there must be a will which sets in motion and a breath (nafaqā) which animates. God has willed that letters should be made to pass, from the invisible world of the ghayb to the visible world of the ghaibāda. But He has especially spelled out Man by a breath from His own Spirit (XXIII, 9). The same observation occurs in Ibn Ka‘īb al-Bārī in his Maṣāḥīf al-Īlāhīyya. From this starting-point, al-Bārī works with the idea of the human man being a copy of Himself (mushhada); if you looked into yourself, you would find for each of His attributes a copy in yourself” (i, ch. 20).

“The Perfect Man is the pole (kubṭ) around which the spheres of existence turn, from the first to the last”. Ibn Ka‘īb al-Bārī says that man is the point of the sphere which serves as a pivot (madār) for existence. The Perfect Man is unique in all eternity. But he appears in different guises (malābīya) and receives various names. His name in principle is Muḥammad, his kunya Abū ʿl-Ḳasim, his attribute ʿAbd Allāh, his ṭ HASHAMS al-Dīn. His other names vary with each epoch, in harmony with the “guise” of that epoch. But all are united in Muḥammad. Spiritual men are in the image of Muḥammad (al-ṣūra al-Muḥāmmadiyya), which refers to the muḥāmmadan XXIII, 72). All the epiphanies of the essence (dākhla) there, but merely the irradiation (tadžalli) of the Muḥāmmadan Reality in each era upon the most perfect of men, who thus become the representatives (khulūfā’) of the Prophet on the plane of manifestation (zāhir), while the Muḥāmmadan Reality is the hidden side (ḥārin) of their own reality.

The Perfect Man, in himself, is that which corresponds (mukābīl) to the totality of the Real. Al-Dīlī enumerates all these correspondences (ch. 60). As in God all opposites co-exist, so in the correspondences one discovers the same antitheses. In the Perfect Man the aspects of the ḫabb and the ḫahl are combined; he is the mirror of the Name of God (Allāh) and he corresponds to all the Names and Attributes; to Iṣṣeity (ḥusayya), to Egoity (miyāyya). Thus, God has entrusted the whole of such images to him (XXXIII, 2, a). All the epiphanies of the essence (dākhla) of the God of Truth (Ḥabb), from the ʿUkhlīyya (the being-Allah) and the Ḥaddīyya (absolute Unicity) to the ʿUkhlīyya (the Unity of the multiple), the Ṭahmāsīyya (virtue of mercy, which extends to all individuals and supports them in their being) and the Ḥuḥūbīyya (the Lordship which directs them), recur in the “copy”, that is to say the Ḫānān kāmil. This recalls the theory of the divine Powers, of the Man of God, and of the Logos in Philo of Alexandria, and is also close to the theory of the Sephirōt in the Zohar.

As for the Perfect Man, regarded not as the prototype but as the believer, the “saint” or individual prophet who is to be “clad” in the Muḥāmmadan Reality, he passes through three intermediate zones (barzakh): the first, in the initial stage of the actual knowledge of the Names and Attributes; the second, the middle stage, is that of the touch-stone (muhakk), which proves the spiritual relations of man with God (rabāʾik insaniyya) by the divine Realities; the third is the knowledge of the diversification of Wisdom in the creation of that which is the subject of the divine Decree. After that, there is the Seal (ḥulām, XXIII, 26), then the final term, the Majesty of Greatness (kibrisya, XLIV, 37), which is infinite. 7). Conclusion. There are more concise defini-

tions of the Perfect Man, for example in al-Ḳānuwān: “The forty-fourth degree of existence is the Perfect Man. It is with him that the degrees reach their completion, that the world is perfected and the God of Truth manifests Himself to the world by the most perfect manifestation”. In his Isḥākāb, al-Ṭahānawī records that the Kitāb al-Fuṣūs contains this passage: “The Perfect Man is the isthmus (baraṣih) between necessity (enḏūd) and possibility (ismān), the mirror which combines the attributes of eternity and its laws with the attributes of generation and death (ḥidūkām). He is the central point between the ḫabb and the ḫahl. Through him and through his hierarchical rank (marṭaba), the emanation(ʿayyid) of the Ḫabb and the presence (madād), the source of subsistence(ʿabād) of that which is not God, make their way to the entire world, the upper and the lower. Without him and without his quality of barṣih (baraṣihīyya) which does not cut itself off in either of the two extremes, nothing in the world would receive the divine presence of the Unique, for lack of relationship and link”. Al-Ṭahānawī notes that the same things are found in the Sharḥ al-Fuṣūs of ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Dānī. Finally, he makes an observation which well emphasises the exceptional situation of the man neither within nor outside the world, neither united with it or separated from it. “His coming into existence, the only one in the world, is a begulement (tadbir) and of a free disposition (lasarrūf)”. Bibliography: In the article.

R. Arnaud

INSRIPTIONS [see KITĀBĀT].

INŚHĀ (INŚHĀ), strictly “construction”, “style” or “composition”, i.e., of letters, documents or state papers; then used elliptically for ‘ism al-inśhā (as, e.g., in mahālāt al-inśhā)’ or even for a synonym for “mumākāt”, “documents composed according to the rules of inśhā”; finally also to designate a form of literature, popular and widespread in the area of the Islamic cultural languages (i.e., Arabic, Persian and Turkish), in which were included what in the West would be counted under the heading of style-bks for chancery scribes, copy-books and letter manuals. Thus inšhā literature offers important material not only for epistolography and diplomatic, but also for the literary history of the Islamic world, especially since it often includes models from the pens of prominent letter-writers, poets or statesmen. This literature comprises works of various types. Some are limited to the collection of precepts for writers of letters and documents, i.e., for the chancery scribes (ḥātib [al-ṣūr], mūnāḥ), whilst others contain collections of model letters of every type, private and public, and especially materials originating from the chancery, i.e., documents, diplomas and state papers. Some works include only one or the other—either precepts for scribes, including stylistic directions, or simply models of style—but those in which both elements are represented are numerous.

The themes of private correspondence to be found in inšhā works are those of eulogy, congratulation, condolence, gratitude, remembrance, etc. They are addressed to members of the family, friends or acquaintances. The various kinds of documents and State papers are dealt with in the article DIPLOMATIC.

Copies of documents actually drawn up and issued are often offered as examples of style; but fabricated texts, to which however a certain relative value may be assigned, are also occasionally used. Since both authentic and fabricated examples of style are produced at random and without any distinguishing
indication, careful verification is needed in each case as to whether a given text is authentic or not. Special care is required if the compiler of an inshā2 work wishes to show the documents of bygone times, for example documents or state papers of an earlier ruler or some other prominent personality. In this case fabricated texts could be inserted all too easily, when, though authentic examples were lacking, the compiler wished to show how documents of such a kind might have appeared. This need not imply an intent to mislead, since the compiler was guided by subjective or in any case literary motives, not usually by historical and much less juristic purposes. Fabricated texts, however, cannot be ruled out, even if the author of an inshā2 work cites, as often happens, documents which he himself has composed, possibly in his capacity as an important chancery official. These may only be drafts which were no doubt submitted but were not ratified; yet they seemed to the author worthy of inclusion on stylistic grounds. Care is also called for with regard to formularies, since it is not always possible to establish whether they have been taken from genuine documents drawn up according to the rules but omitting specific details such as the address, date, place of issue, etc., or whether they have been freely invented.

The lack or scarcity of historically relevant original documents from certain periods of Islamic history has attracted the interest of historical research to inshā2 literature, in the search for substitutes for lost or destroyed originals, and with good reason, since, given the non-historical motives of their compilers, most of the inshā2 works—apart from the special cases just mentioned—are not a limine suspect of spuriousness or intent to mislead. For this reason our knowledge of inshā2 literature has improved considerably over the last decades with regard both to the content and to the form of individual works or whole groups of works. On account of the almost exclusively historical interest of the researchers, little or nothing has been said from the point of view of style, aesthetics or literary criticism. Too many questions about the origin and early development of inshā2, questions important in several cases, however, have been left unsolved. It is of the greatest importance that what we are offered on these topics still consists largely of guesswork.

It seems probable that already in the time of Muhammad the people of Mecca made use of Arabic written documents in their diplomatic and commercial transactions. That specific rules were already in use and held good for such purposes may be seen also in the conduct of the Meccan delegation to Hudaybiya for the bay'at al-risāla: against Muhammad's desire to use the basmala, they insisted on the customary formulary already in use. We do not know, however, whether there were already tabulations of those rules or even collections of formulae which might be regarded as the precursors of the later inshā2 literature. For the time being literature of this type can be traced back only as far as the end of the Umayyad period. Although this literature is without doubt Arabic in origin, yet the influence of Persian and Byzantine models is to be taken into account, as can be seen in the character of the letters and documents themselves. In any case it must always be remembered that, after the Arab conquests in Persia and Mesopotamia, the Pārsā or Persian chancery and its personnel was taken over by the new rulers, as was the Byzantine chancery and its personnel in Egypt. Furthermore, in each case many years elapsed before the process of Arabization was complete, bringing with it the exclusive use of the Arabic language and Arab personnel in the chancellories.

As yet we do not know when the term inshā2 came into use. It appears already in Kudāma, hence around 288/900, in his Kitāb al-Khaḍārā fi 'sa'ādat al-kitāb, passim. It was used officially by the Fātimids in Egypt, under whom the institution known elsewhere as the dīwān al-risāla or dīwān al-muḥātha-bāḍ was called the dīwān al-inshā2. The practice commonly known as inshā2 goes back at least to the Abd al-Hamid b. al-Malik, who died ca. 133/415. It left a large collection of model letters, part of which has survived, as well as his Risāla ila l-ḥudūd (Italian trans. ayyūd F. Gabrieli). Even the reputation which 'Abd al-Hamid enjoyed as a kāthib illustrates the effect of Persian influence: up to this time the secretaries of the Umayyads had occupied only a humble position, while under the Sāsānids their position had been far superior. Persian influence appears even more clearly in the style of his letters. His Risāla ila l-ḥudūd, it is true, is still composed in simple prose, but in his other writings the use of artificial stylistic methods, for example sādī2 [q.v.], in accordance with Iranian models, is unmistakable. Sādī2 was to be the basis of the stylus ornatus, a characteristic feature of the later inshā2 literature, but also of various other genres. The presumption of Persian influence is confirmed by Ibn al-Muqaffa's [q.v.] advice to secretaries.

Under the 'Abbāsids, there took place an unprecedented rise in the position of the chancery secretary in the official hierarchy of the state, a process not unconnected, presumably, with other Persian influences. The elaboration of a body of literature relating to the secretary and his office went hand in hand with this process. Abu 'l-Yūsuf ʻAbd al-Muḥammad al-Mudabbir, appointed vizier ca. 264/876, appears as the author of the first handbook for secretaries, entitled al-Risāla al-ṣādīqā fi ma waṣāfa al-balāgha. The literature of the secretaries (inshā2) cannot at this period be clearly distinguished from the adab al-kāthib literature [see KATN], which is dealt with in the histories of literature and summarized by the writers. It is embodied in the highest points under the Būyids with Ibn al-ʿĀmid (d. 350/960), but especially in Egypt and particularly under the Fātimids, with Ibn al-Ṣayrafi (d. 463/1071), and finally under the Mamluks with Ahmad Fadl Allāh al-ʻUmari's work, al-Taʿrīf bi 'l-mustalah al-ṣarif, composed after 745/1340-1, and with al-Kalqashandi, whose work ʻṢāḥib al-aʿlaī2 fi kitābat al-inshā2, completed in 815/1412, an encyclopedia of all the information useful to the scribe, became in practice a handbook for the administration as a whole.

Arabic inshā2 literature continued to be productive for centuries longer, without, however, attaining any particularly high points. In the nineteenth century it even survived under European influence, as may be seen in works written in French by Arab authors. Before it reached this stage, however, it had had further secondary developments, which were to mark the decline of the power of the Caliph, local dynasties arose, and, as a result, other languages came into official use in the Islamic world alongside Arabic or in its stead. At that time, and especially after the collapse of the Caliphate, inshā2 literature developed in languages other than Arabic, first in Persian, then in Ottoman Turkish, in Čagatay, and in Urdu.

Persian was, it is true, used officially in place...
of Arabic in the chancery of the Seljuks of Rum as early as 657/1259. But this seems to have been simply the culmination of a development which had begun very much earlier. We know in fact that from the second half of the 6th/12th century at the latest Persian models were used in Khazar chancery purposes. They developed under Arabic influence, as is clear from the fact that the oldest collections contain both Arabic and Persian models (cf. Horst), e.g., the collection of Rashid al-Din Wa'iz, d. 578/1280, Mashhad, Bagdad, minister of the Khazar chancery, it is outstanding among contemporary or later masters of the art of inscribed. His work, Al-Tawassul ila 'l-tarassuli (ed. A. Bahmanyar, Teheran 1315/1935), was well known that, even in the 16th/16th century, the famous Feridun Beg Ahammad Beg [q.v.] could make use of it to "complete" his Munsha'di al-salatin. Similarly at the end of the 8th/14th century with the Dastur al-kabir fi 'l-farisiyya, and further the Dastur-i dbiri. From then on there is no end to the series of Persian inscribed works. They reached a peak in the second half of the 8th/14th century with the Dastur al-kabir fi 'l-maradith of Muhammad b. Hindushah Nakhchivani, who, moreover, also stated at that time his intention of compiling a Persian inscribed work as a sequel to his Persian one. More detailed information about Persian inscribed is to be found in Bjorkman, and Matuz, where a composed about 974/1264-5, two vtrtumes each), and in Ethe, Roemer and Herrmann (see bibl.).

Similarly at the end of the 13th century: From then on there is no end to the series of Persian inscribed works. They reached a peak in the second half of the 8th/14th century with the Dastur al-kabir fi 'l-maradith of Muhammad b. Hindushah Nakhchivani, who, moreover, also stated at that time his intention of compiling an Arabic inscribed work as a sequel to his Persian one. More detailed information about Persian inscribed is to be found in Bjorkman, and Matuz, where a composed about 974/1264-5, two vtrtumes each), and in Ethe, Roemer and Herrmann (see bibl.).

The Ottoman inscribed literature is directly linked with the Persian, and thus also with the Arabic. For various reasons it seems likely that the Ottomans drew exclusively on Persian traditions, but in the present state of research direct Arabic influences, e.g., from the Mamluks, cannot be excluded. In any case there are Turkish inscribed works containing Arabo-Persian and Turkish inscribed literary models. The origin of the Turkish inscribed literature is to be found in the 13th century, e.g., in the 13th century, e.g., in the 13th century,

...
INSHA: *makbās* of the famous Urdu poet, one of the most remarkable figures in Urdu literature, Insha Allāh Khān. The eldest son of Mīr Māgha Allāh Khān “Maṣdar” al-Di āfari al-Najjāfī, he was born between 1756 and 1758 at Murshidābād, though, having an income of Rs. 10,000 on his father, was far ahead of his times. Leaning towards the unconventional, his verse is both amusing and burlesque, constituting a landmark in the development of Urdu poetry. His style is laboured and artificial rhetoric. The rest is by Insha Allāh Khān, it shows the author’s vast vocabulary and poetic skill.

His *Kaliṣyāt* (ed. Lucknow 1321/1864), which comprises his Urdu, *rekhāt* and Persian *dīwāns*, *hasūds* and five or six *mathnawīs*, contains between 8,000 and 9,000 verses marked chiefly by virtuosity but little poetic feeling. He indulged in verbal gymnastics using most intractable rhymes, sometimes writing a series of *ghazals* in the same metre and rhyme merely to display his vast vocabulary and poetic skill.

He was equally at home in Arabic, Persian, Turki, Pūghti, Hindi, Bengālī, Pandjābi, Kāshmirī and Pūrī. His prose works comprise: (1) *Doryā-i iʿtāfāt* in Persian (ed. Murshidābād 1266/1850; Awrangābād 1916; Urdu tr. by Brījmohān Khatā Kaifī, Delhi 1935), the first work by an Indian author on Urdu linguistics and grammar, composed at the instance of Yamin al-Dawlā in 1222/1807 in collaboration with Mirzā Kāṭīl, a well-known poet of Persian, who contributed the chapters on logic, prosody and rhetoric. The rest is by Insha Allāh Khān. It shows the author’s wide range of study and his grasp of Urdu linguistics and morphology. (2) *Rānī Kheṭā Kihānī*, a romance tale with love, magic and adventure as its theme, written in pure Hindi, without a single word of Arabic or Persian origin. In spite of such limitations, the narrative is neither dry nor artificial although it is interspersed with archaic wordings and expressions (ed. Delhi 1937, Karachi 1953). (3) *Sīk-i Qawwar*, also a love story in Urdu prose, without any dotted letter, in clear imitation of the *Awadh* and *Pāvīnān*. He appears to have started composing poetry at a very early age, as he had compiled his *dīwān* of Urdu verses when he was still a boy, “in a new style and without the help of a teacher” (cf. Ahmad Āli, *Maḏżān al-qurdu*b, fol. 60b). He had also tried his hand at composing Arabic and Persian verses (ed. Murshidābād 1274/1858). Ahmad Āli styled himself a physician and became one of the courtiers of the last independent Muslim ruler of Bengal, Nawāw Bīrīmād al-Dawlā (g.v.); on the decline of his fortunes, he migrated to Farrūghābād (g.v.). Insha Allāh received his early education in various sciences including grammar and syntax, logic and philosophy at home, and at the age of sixteen left for Lucknow in search of a poet, he joined the court of Nawāw Bīrīmād al-Dawlā (g.v.); on the death of Bīrīmād al-Dawlā he left Lucknow in 1276 and served several nobles in turn in Bundelkhand, Delhi and Dīyānagar. Unable to find an appreciative patron, he returned to Lucknow, where he joined the retinue of Mirzā Sulaymān Shukkā (d. 1857), the third son of the Mughal emperor Shāh ʿAlām II, as a court-poet. Some time later Tafrīdī Husayn Khān ‘Allāmā, a Shīʿī nobleman and patron of art and literature, introduced him to Saʿādat Āli Khān, the ruler of Lucknow, who assigned him a monthly salary of Rs. 200. Soon they became close friends, but a chance remark on a delicate occasion offended the Nawāw, and led to his expulsion from Lucknow; though allowed to return later he spent the rest of his life in rather reduced circumstances. His sharp and sometimes caustic wit made him more enemies than friends. By his superior talents he outshone his rival Ghūlām Hamādānī Muṣṭafī, Tadhkira-i Hindī, Awrangābād n.d., 23; *Allāh Khān Khān ‘Allāh Khān* (incorporating Mirzā Allūt’s *Gulghān-i Hind*, ed. Lahore 1906, 35-7), Allagār 1934, 42-2; Kundrat Allāh “Kāsim”, *Madīmās-i Naqaḥ*, Lahore 1933, 80-1; Abād ʿAllāy Yartā, *Dastār al-fasāḥāt*, Rampur 1943, 103-8 (where several other references are given); Saʿādat Khān “Nāsīr”, Tadhkira-i Khān maʿrīkā-i ‘ibād, (MS in Urdu in Andijūmān Tarakī-kī Urdu Library, Karachi), fols. 192-9; Abād ʿAllāy Dīdār “Nāsīḥāb, *Sāḥib-i ‘ibārāt*, Lucknow 1293/1874, 52-5; Abād al-Karim, *Tafshīl al-’sāḥār*, Delhi

INSHA — INSTITUT D'ÉGYPTE

1848; 'Abd al-Hayy Lakhnawi, Gul-i ra'ānī, Lahore 1859, 213; Râmi, Bakr, Sokaroud, A history of Urdu literature, Allahabad 1940, 151-82; T. Grahame Bailey, A history of Urdu literature, Calcutta 1932, 54-5; Muhammad Sadiq, A history of Urdu literature, London 1964, 11-2, 120, 124-30, 178, 167, 314; Sri Râm, Khâmshâm-i gîhadî, Delhi 1968, 467-75; Amina Khâtûn, Taḥkîm nâsîrûd-dîn, Bangalore 1930, 8-66, 107-27, 133-53; 'Abd al-Sâlih 'Abînâ, 'Addâr al-Hind, in Inshâ, Delhi 1968; Garcin de Tacy, Histoire des lettres et des arts en Egypte, in BIE, 1907, 133-57 (deals only with the expedition of Bonaparte); R. G. Canivet, L'imprimerie en Egypte, in Bulletin de l'Institut d'Egypte, whose aim was to continue the traditions of the Institut founded by Bonaparte. European and Egyptian scholars met there on an equal footing. This "scientific and literary" society was transferred to Cairo in 1880. It adopted again the old name of Institut d'Egypte on 1 November 1918 and is still continuing its activities more than a hundred years later. Its Arabic name is al-Madîma 'alî al-miṣrî. According to its statutes, revised in 1918, there were envisaged fifty titular members, resident in Egypt; in addition there are appointed honorary members, the number of which must not exceed one hundred, and an unlimited number of corresponding members. The Institut publishes regularly a Bulletin (magazîn) which, from 1859 to 1918, was called Bulletin de l'Institut d'Egypte; then, from 1918, Bulletin de l'Institut d'Egypte; it also publishes Mémoires which appear at irregular intervals. It publishes in Arabic, French and English, but up to now the publications have been mainly in French and English. The best outline of the activities of the Institut d'Egypte is in the bibliographical work by Jean Ellul, Index des Communications et Mémoires publiés par l'Institut en dehors de la presidence de Monge, on 20 August 1798 (3 Fructidor). Its creation had been made possible by the existence in Bonaparte's expedition of a "Commission of the Sciences and the Arts", in effect an intellectual general staff which Bonaparte had decided should accompany him when he left France. The Institut d'Egypte held its meetings in the palace of Hasan Kâshîf, in a sort of academy which included scholars, artists, the high-ranking officers and the heads of the various services. It contained four sections (mathematics; physical and natural sciences; political economy; part of a standing collection of geographical maps and plates on a wide variety of subjects.

(b) On 6 May 1859, during a preliminary meeting, there was founded in Alexandria under "the illustrious protection of His Highness the Viceroy of Egypt" (Muhammad Sa'd Pasha), the Institut Égyptien, INSTITUT D'ÉGYPTE, one of the centres of intellectual and scientific life in present-day Cairo. Its history is in fact of that of two separate institutes.

[The text continues with a detailed account of the activities of the Institut d'Egypte and its role in the development of Egypt's cultural and scientific landscape.]
INTIHAR, "suicide", expressed more technically in Arabic by hāl nafs with pronominal suffix (as against kall nafs or al-nafs "homicide"). Intihar is designated originally, and does so in its occurrence in the hadith, suicide by piercing or cutting one's throat. At an undetermined but possibly quite early date, the word was singled out to mean suicide in general. It is thus used in modern Arabic and in Turkish, also in Persian.

The Kur'an contains several passages (II, 54/51, IV, 66/69, XVIII, 6/5) that might possibly be interpreted (but, in fact, are not) as indicating a factual, even condoning attitude toward suicide. No clear prohibition of suicide appears in it. The most relevant passage in this respect, IV, 29/33: "and do not kill yourself (anfusakum)", is interpreted by leading exegetes as referring to mutual killing, with anfus- to be understood as reciprocal in meaning, as in II, 85/79 and elsewhere. The context supports this interpretation. However, the verse is often cited as evidence for the divine prohibition of suicide.

The Prophet himself certainly disapproved of suicide. A number of hadith leave no doubt that Islam forbid it. The person who commits suicide, regardless of the circumstances (unless it happens accidentally), forfeits Paradise. His punishment in Hell will be the repetition of the very act by which he killed himself, and this is considered a metaphor for saying the customary prayers for a suicide. Suicide was thus generally considered a grave sin (for instance, al-Dhahabi, Kalâbîr, Cairo 1385/1965, 119 ff., ch. 29; Ibn Hadjar al-Haythami, Zaeddîj, Cairo 1370/1951, ii, 89 f.). At times, it was pronounced a more distressing act than murder (Ibn Kutayba, Úyûn, Cairo 1343-49, iii, 217; Ibn `Arabi, Fadîkalâ, Cairo 1329, ii, 234; ch. 147, iv, 463 f., ch. 960; cf. also the case posed by Kâdidîghân, Fadîkalâ, Cutcuta 1835, iv, 298 f.).

The legal literature has comparatively little to say about successful suicide, and no good evidence appears to be available as to the medieval legal attitude toward abortive suicide attempts. The most debated question, and no doubt the one of the greatest practical importance, was, and still is, whether the funeral prayers may or may not be pronounced. On this question, things are accordingly from school to school. The different legal schools have held divergent views on this point and the practice appears to have varied. The more charitable view may have widely prevailed. For instance, when Ḥâfiz b. Yûsuf al-`Irâkî, a blind professor at the Al-muniyya in Damascus, committed suicide under tragic circumstances in 602/1206, people refused to pray for him, but another prominent Shâfîitic scholar did (Ibn Kâfir, Bidâya, Cairo 1350-51, xlii, 44, from Abû Shâmâ). Details occasionally discussed by jurists were such points as the inapplicability of the ṣubûl [q.v.] in cases of suicide (Ibn Abî Zayd, Risâla, ed. trans. L. Berchet, Algiers 1949, 246); the disposition of the mahr [q.v.] of a woman who commits suicide before the marriage is consummated (al-Shâyâbhînî, al-Dhâmî al-ṣâgîrî, Bûlûk 1302, margin of Abû Yûsuf, Khurâbî, 37; Kâdidîkân, i, 436); the legal responsibility of the person who, by digging a well or the like inadvertently makes it a suicide. A number of hadith refer to the practice (for instance, Ḥâfiz b. Yûsuf al-`Irâkî, a blind professor at the Al-muniyya in Damascus, committed suicide under tragic circumstances in 602/1206, people refused to pray for him, but another prominent Shâfîitic scholar did (Ibn Kâfir, Bidâya, Cairo 1350-51, xlii, 44, from Abû Shâmâ). Details occasionally discussed by jurists were such points as the inapplicability of the ṣubûl [q.v.] in cases of suicide (Ibn Abî Zayd, Risâla, ed. trans. L. Berchet, Algiers 1949, 246); the disposition of the mahr [q.v.] of a woman who commits suicide before the marriage is consummated (al-Shâyâbhînî, al-Dhâmî al-ṣâgîrî, Bûlûk 1302, margin of Abû Yûsuf, Khurâbî, 37; Kâdidîkân, i, 436); the legal responsibility of the person who, by digging a well or the like inadvertently makes it possible for someone to commit suicide (Kâdidîkân, iv, 134, 454; for the Mu'taazzili view on the moral problems caused by knowingly enabling a person to kill himself, cf. Abu al-Djâbirr, Muqnis, xi, Cairo 1385/1965, 232 f.; cf. also Ibn Kâyîm al-Djâwwîzî, Makhîr al-su'râ, Cairo, n.d., i, 23) or, according to modern Shîa law, the validity of a suicide's will depending on the time it was made (A. A. A. Fyzee, Outlines of Muhammadan law, Cutcuta 1949, 300).
Lay views and attitudes with respect to suicide present a rather different picture. The threat of committing suicide was not infrequently used as a psychological weapon, in one instance even by the famous Sāfi ʿAbī ʿl-Ḥusayn al-Nūrī for the purpose of forcing the deity to confirm his sainthood for the sake of some minor miracle, provoking the strong disapproval of al-Dhaylāy (al-Sarrāqī, Lumaʾ), ed. R. A. Nicholson, Leiden-London 1974, 327; Taʾrikh Bagdādī, v, 132 f., omitting al-Dhaylāy's disapproval. A woman might threaten suicide in order to force her husband to give her a divorce (Ibn Taymiyya, Fadāwī, Cairo n.d. [1965-6], iv, 148). "Suicide is widely used figuratively to indicate voluntary exposure to serious danger in war or through such activities as excessive praying and fasting (which, however, is also literally branded as suicide, cf. al-Muhāshībi, Khālia, ed. I. A. KHALĪF, Damascus 1955, 33; al-Sarākhī, Usāī, Cairo 1372-73, i, 120; B. REINERT, Die Lehre vom tawakhlū, Berlin 1968, 267 f.) or, as the case mentioned by W. IVANOW, Satpanth, Leiden-Cairo 1948, Collectanea, 1, 18. Religious scholars would not accept. A philosophical instance, al-Daylāmi, ed. F. Schwarz, no. 127 (Agāhīnī, i, 158); Tamīm b. al-Muʿīn, Dīnān, Cairo 1377/1957, 50, 251; al-Thawālibī, Yatīma, i, 322 (cf. also Yākūṭ, Udabdī, ii, 188; am-Dīn al-Isfahānī, Khurāda, Syr. poets, Damascus 1752/1955, i, 556; al-Ībšīhī, Mustafā, Bālāk 1268, i, 220; al-Rāshī, Muhādārāt, Cairo 1287, i, 152; al-Safādī, Ghayth, Cairo 1305, ii, 262 f. Even religious scholars might make incidental reference to suicide to prove some particular point (ʿAbd al-Ǧīdābār, Muḥgīnī, vi, 16, 188, xi, 232 f., 393, 395 f., 422 ff.; al-Qazāzī, Iḥyāʾ, Cairo 1354/1933, ii, 212, iv, 219 f.).

Famous cases of suicide from pre-Islamic times are occasionally mentioned, as, for instance, King Saul (al-Yaʿqūbī, Taʾrikh, i, 533; Judas Iscariot (al-Mubārak, Balaqhq, ed. R. ʿAbd al-Tawwāb, Cairo 1965, 62); Ceopatra (Masʿūdī, Murādī, ii, 285 f., etc.); or the Jews fighting the Romans (Ibn Khaldūn, Ḥiṣb, ii, 120). The Indian custom of the self-sacrifice of widows and an assumed general Indian propensity for suicide cannot be proved. (Tabārī, Din, ed. A. Mīngana, Manchester 1923, 31; al-Muḥtājar, Bad, ed. C. Huart, iv, 16 ff., trans., 14 ff.; Ibn Bāṭtātīa, iii, 136 ff.). Cases of suicide of non-Muslims and heretics, wishing to retain their human dignity and to remain faithful to their beliefs, are reported with a mixture of disgust and admiration. Suicide because of unrequited or illicit love was celebrated by famous stories in many cultures. In works, in particular, the large literature on love (for instance, al-Daylāmī ʿAffī, ed. J. Vadej, Cairo 1962, 77, 122-125; Ibn al-Dawlī, Dīmām al-ḥawā, Cairo 1381/1962, 356, 358, 455, 570-581); for the heroine of a romance, it was only natural to think of suicide (Gurgānī, Wis rāmīn, Teheran 1373/1959, 76, trans. H. Māssê, Paris 1959, 93). The literary topic was often mentioned in connection with cowardice and frailty. It is likely that pre-Islamic roots seem to lie largely in the Hellenistic world.

Popular Hellenistic philosophy helped to strengthen the idea that death was preferable to a life of dishonour or otherwise unbearable. It probably also contributed to the discussion of whether wishing to be dead, without actually laying hands on oneself, was a legitimate desire—something that Muslim religious scholars would not accept. A philosophical view of the meaning of suicide was probably widespread among intellectuals of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries (cf. al-Dījjībīsī, Ḥayyānī, Cairo 1325-26, ii, 99, 114, or the poems addressed to a suicide cited by Ibn Ṭabīʿī Ṭayfūr, Manṭūḡrā, Ms. Cairo 1320, fol. 88b). Some of the discussion is preserved for us from the circle of Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawbīdī, Human existence, it was argued there, possesses value only if it is accompanied by virtue; otherwise, it is equivalent to non-existence, and consequently, it would seem to make no difference if a base and imperfect life is ended by suicide. Compelling circumstances for committing suicide are destitution, disappointments, situations a person is unable to cope with, and love affairs that go beyond one's ability to handle. The occasional and temporary prevalence of the non-rational powers, which is unavoidable since human nature is the result of the simultaneous presence of all the three powers of the soul, explains the occurrence of suicide. Suicide is to be condemned, not simply on the strength of religious tradition but as an irrational act that human beings should not commit but are at times unable to avoid (Muḥābatādī, Cairo 1347, 215 ff.; JAOS, lxv (1946), 248 ff.; al-Tawbīdī and Miskawayh, Haʾawātī, ed. A. Amin and A. ʿAshīrī, Cairo 1370/1951, 150 ff., cf. also 72 ff., and 187 ff. on the fear of or desire for death). al-Dīrānī, however, quoted Greek sources in order to condemn suicide (India, ed. E. Sachau, 284, trans., ii, 173).

Many types of suicide are mentioned widely dispersed in the sources. Even such incidents as the suicide note are reported (Yākūṭ, Udabdī, ii, 146; Ibn Ṭabīʿī, Bidāya, xii, 41 f.; Ibn Ḥadīrār, Durur, Hyderabad 1348-50, iii, 392). Since our principal sources of information are historical and political, it is not surprising to find as the most common motives the wish to anticipate certain capture or death at the hands of an enemy and, for both men and women, the desire to escape dishonour and humiliation in turbulent times. Use was made on occasion of the religious abhorrence of suicide in order to camouflage political murder as suicide. We also hear of unsubstantiated rumours of suicide upon the death of high-ranking officials, and suspicions of a person's orthodoxy gave rise to gratuitous accusations. Human existence, it was argued there, possesses value only if it is accompanied by virtue; otherwise, it would seem to make no difference if a base and imperfect life is ended by suicide. (ʿAbd al-ʿAzīzī, al-Maʿṣīrī, ed. A. Amin and A. ʿAshīrī, Cairo 1350/1930, ii, 672; Ch. Pellat, Ibn Śhuqaydī, Ammān [1966], 67-8). Insanity, guilt feelings, and the desire for revenge are attested as causes of suicide.

In the absence of meaningful statistics, it would be rash to draw any sociological conclusions. The common motive of conjugal problems, for instance, seems to play only a relatively minor role according to the medieval literature, but whether this is due to lack of information or to the social climate created by Islam cannot be decided. Suicides of religious scholars are rarely reported. Possible instances of such cases in which a scholar's political or administrative activities can be ruled out as the cause are the above mentioned al-Ṭrāṣī in 620; the eccentric Ibn Saʾbīn [q.v.] in 669; ʿAbd al-ʿRāḥīm b. Abī Bakr al-Dījarī al-Nāḥwī in 698; Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-ʿAṣkārī in 731 (Ibn Ḥadīrār, Durur, iii, 392); Abūnā b. Muḥammad b. al-Zarkašī in 782; ʿAbd al-Ḥādhīr al-Ḥanbālī in 801 (al-Sāḥibī, ʿAdī, iv, 300); or, in a very different environment, the case mentioned by W. IVANOV, Satparvā, Leiden-Cairo 1948, Collectanea, 12-18.
The total number of all cases that can be collected from the literature remains small. However, the case for metonymy of "suicide", the urgency of the discussion of the question of funeral rites, and similar matters, among them the constant presence of the thought of suicide in popular works such as the Arabian Nights and modern fairy tales and plays (for instance, W. Eberhard and P. N. Boratav, Typen türkischer Volksmärchen, Wiesbaden 1953; O. Spies, Türkische Puppenspiele, Emsdetten/Westf. 1959, 77, 104 f.; E. Littmann, Arabische Märchen und Schilderungen aus der Gegenwart, 2nd ed. 1962). Had it not been for the general consensus that suicide was a part of daily life in the medieval Muslim world, even if we take into account the likelihood that suicides were hushed up wherever possible because of religious scruples, and the fact that the bulk of available biographical information concerns scholars who were most sensitive to the religious injunction against suicide and pays hardly any attention to other, numerically much stronger, classes of the population, the impression prevails that, everything considered, suicide was of comparatively rare occurrence. The assumption that the teachings of Islam were an effective deterrent may very well be true.

Bibliography: T. F. Hughes, A dictionary of Islam, London 1885, s.v. suicide; O. Roscher, in Isl., ix (1919), 55 f. (Arabian Nights); W. M. Patton, in Encyclopaedia of religion and ethics, New York 1921, x, 38; Müftü Dağdau, al-Manbubahān fi 'l-Dīnḥiyyā wa-l-Islām, in al-Hilāl, xlii (1934), 473-9; L. Nemoy, A tenth century disquisition on suicide (from Yaḥqūb al-Qiqisānī), in Journal of Biblical Literature, lvi (1938), 411-20; F. Rosenthal, On suicide in Islam, in JAOS, lxvi (1946), 239-259, where much of the earlier literature is listed; H. Ritter, Das Meer der Seele, Wiesbaden 1955, 147, 239, 339, 430, 457, 517, 533. [The very dubious tradition that the Ottoman sultan Bayazid I (q.v.) committed suicide is discussed by M. F. Körprülü in Bell., ii/2 (1937) and by Mükrim Han Yulunç in IA, ii, 388-9.] (F. ROSENTHAL)
Nevertheless in translating thus, one comes up against the way in which the Arab grammarians envisaged this "inflexion".

It should be pointed out, first of all, that these grammarians had no proper term for "declension" and "conjugation", and no general term for "case" and "mood". They proceed in a purely formal manner. Taking sounds into consideration, they make the following division: (a) ra'f = nominative (as al-ra'dul-ai and indicative (as yawb-ul-ai), because both -a and -m are thus masculine (as mubr-ul-ai and subjunctive (as yawb-ul-ai), because both -a and -m are thus masculine, because the transformations are thus different, they act as a verb and the 'ad) and "although" (as yad-ul-i to the Kufans) = genitive (as al-ra'dul-ai), because it takes -i and is thus madjar (al-madjr).

This last has no counterpart in the imperative of the verb, the other, instead of adding a vowel, suppresses a vowel: they say: dijam "cutting" and this imperative is madjam "apocopeated" (as yahdul); it forms the jussive.

In this formal distribution of the three short vowels of the Arabic language the Arab grammarians mingle noun and verb. In addition, for the noun, they consider only the singular, adding merely the qualification munsarif to nouns of three cases (as al-ra'dul-above and gayr munsarif to those of only two cases, such as Ahmad: ahmad-ai (nom.), ahmad-a (gen. and acc.). In the imperative of the verb they impress this difference on the pronouns of the first and second persons only when these are formed by the addition of a short vowel (-u, -a) or by its suppression (madjamum). Arab grammarians, then, do not think of "declension" and "conjugation" as an organic whole, or as a system. Hence the lack of denomination in their terminology and also the difficulty of giving complete precision to "inflexion", when translating srab thus.

On the other hand, and this is most important, they always consider the occurrence of the short vowels in terms of a cause: a: tamil, a: "governing", Things are regarded from a syntactical point of view. This is true to such an extent that if srab is known all the *swaml are known, and the major part of Arabic syntax is also known; thus srab (Dict. of T ech. Terms, 17).

As for de Sacy, he considered that the verb srab could not be rendered more exactly than by "Syntax of terminations" or "terminational syntax" (Antho-

logy grammaticale, i, 186, end n. 2). The srab thus understood is outside morphology, as we understand it.

The conclusion from all this is that we have no adequate term directly to translate srab. A periphrasis is necessary; it is best to adopt the definition that Arab grammarians have themselves given of srab, for example that of the Tafsir of al-Djurdjiani (Cairo 1321), 20: huwa 'liltali 'alilhi bi-'liltali 'aw tadarrs, "it is the difference that occurs, in fact or virtually, at the end of a word, because of the various antecedents that govern it"; bi-haraka aw harf, "by haraka or harf", adds the Mu'assal of al-Zamakhshari (§ 26).

This definition is bound up with a whole system. By srab Arab grammarians denote, first of all, basically the use of the three harakat: damma (-u), kasra (-i) and fatha (-a), at the end of the singular noun, which is thus mubrab (the gayr munsarif is included). This is srab lufs, "actual srab". Words like 'asa-n "stick", muna-n "sense, meaning", which are, in fact, invariable in the singular, are nonetheless called mubrab, but tabarish, "virtually", because of the asl (base): ra'f, *asasun-un, munaun, etc., which is supposed "virtually" to exist behind these words. They contrast srab with its opposite: bi'nab be'tabda', which denotes the state of a word that is fixed to one final haraka or to none at all, independently of any *samil, or whatever the *samil may be. It is thus called mabini: mabini 'ala 'l-damma (as mubnul "since"), 'ala 'l-kasra (as hawula'these"), 'ala 'l-fatha (as ayna "where"?), or mabini 'ala suktan "fixed to quiescence" (as kam "how much?").

The energetic, on the other hand, is seen only as *yafrtula-n, taktul-na, which is thought of as constituting the harf (Sibawayhi, i, 4, line 8), for it can be suppressed without making the forms unrecognizable, like the d in Yazd. There is, strictly speaking, no srab, but the following n is a kind of *yafrtul, a "compensation" for the haraka and the tanin (n-, n-, n-) of the indefinite singular noun, which have disappeared in the formation (Sibawayhi, i, 3, 12-3, 17-8); this noun, in their view, precedes the noun defined by al-. In the imperative, on the other hand, the num, the sign of the ra'f in the masc. pl. yak tul-n, tabulul-n, of the duals yahdul-ai, yahdul-ul, yahdulul-ul, and of the fem. sing. tahdul-l-na, is thought of as constituting the srab (Sibawayhi, i, 4, line 8), for it can be suppressed without making the forms unrecognizable. As for the fem. pl. yak tul-ul, tabulul-ai, (tabilul-ai, Akili, i, 36, lines 14-5), it falls under bind, mubnul "sukin before -na, a damir (personal pronoun), from their point of view. The energetic, on the other hand, is seen only as comprising a particle, the num, before which the verb is mabni 'ala 'l-fatha (Sibawayhi, i, 5, 6): yahdul-n or yahdul-ul-na, etc.

The verbal forms are thus considered in isolation, not being included in a whole, a conjugation, and this confirms that which we have seen above. The interest of Arab grammarians lies elsewhere. That which they study is the organization of the srab, and of the srab, and of the duals, etc., or yadul, or yahdul-ai, or yahdul-ul in the feminine, etc., of the harf. The srab is a "compensation" for the harf and the tanin (n-, n-, n-) of the indefinite singular noun, which have disappeared in the formation (Sibawayhi, i, 3, 12-3, 17-8); this noun, in their view, precedes the noun defined by al-. In the imperative, on the other hand, the num, the sign of the ra'f in the masc.
talists. Like him, we think that "in this, too, it is
the simplest that is the most likely", that is, to
take 'arba'a in the sense of: "to Arabize, pronounce
a word in the manner of the pure Arabs" (cf. the
remark of Ibn Djinni, ibid., 36, lines 7-8). We would
wish to bring this out in the light of the linguistic
situation in which at least the first three generations
of grammarians, from 'Abd Allâh b. Abî Isbâk
(born about 30/651, d. 117/735) to Sibawayhi (d. 177/
793), found themselves: Arabic without 'arba'a learnt
and spoken by the Arabized, Arabic without 'arba'
spoke in the towns themselves that the Arab had
created (Basra, Kûfa; see H. Fleisch, Arabe classique
et arabe dialectal, in Travaux et Jours, no. 12 (1964),
43-5) and the contrast provided by contact with the
Beduin Arabs whose speech was still equipped with
'arba'a. The Arab grammarians wished to "Arabize"
the language of their society, to make it conform to
the speech of these Beduins, the carriers of the
"true" Arabic; this is most probable and quite
sufficient to explain 'arba'a, 'arba'a as we have taken it.
By doing this, we are maintaining that 'arba'a was
retained by the tribes at least until the end of the
2nd/8th century (without deciding for later times;
see H. Fleisch, Traité de philologie arabe, i, § 58).
Bibliography: Apart from the references in the
text: Sibawayhi, i, ch. 2 (Paris ed.), the basis of the
Basrans' teaching, stated here; Ibn al-
Anbârî, 'Asâr al-Adab, ed. C. F. Seybold,
ch. 2-6, 40-1, a good introduction to the subject
and to the controversies between the Basrans and
Kûfâns; Zâdîqâlî, Al-Idâf fi 'l-i'tâm al-nâhu, Cairo
1378/1959, and Ibn al-Anbârî, Kitâb l-Insâf, ed.
G. Weil, Question 3, on the dual and the pi.; Abu
'l-Bâkî al-'Ukbarî, Al-Masâ'il al-Idâfiyya fi
'l-i'tâm (ms. Cairo, ii, 158), ed. in preparation
by C. Petraitis. Grammarical treatises: Ibn
al-Sarrâjî, Al-Masâ'id fi 'l-i'tâm, Beirut 1385/1965,
28; Zâdîqâlî, Dijumal, Paris 1957, 18-27; fuller
treatments: Ibn Mâlik, Al-Fiya, verses 15-51 and
Shahr of Ibn 'Aqlî, i, 26-76 (ed. Mubîy al-Dîn 'Abd
al-Hamîd, Cairo 1370/1951); Zamakhshari, Mufâsa'al,
§§ 15-8, 159 (2nd ed. J. P. Broch) and Shahr of Ibn
Yâ'qîb, 578-405 (ed. G. Jahn); Râdî al-Dîn
al-Ashtarâbâdî, Shahr al-Khâfiyya, i, 14-80, ii, 1-2,
292-324; Shahr of Ibn Idrîs, Paris 1879).
IRÂDE, literally "will", a term adopted in
Official Ottoman usage from 1832 to designate decrees
and orders issued in the name of the Sultan. The
formal procedure was for draft decrees prepared
by ministers and officials to be addressed to the
Sultan's chief secretary (Serhâb-i shâhriyâr), who
read them to the Sultan and received and noted his
comments. If he approved, the chief secretary then
communicated the text to the Grand Vizier, as the
Sultan's will. Under the constitution, the Sultan's
function was limited to giving his assent to the
decisions of the government. The term Irâde
remained in use for this assent.
(Ed.)
IRÂFA [see 'Arâf, Kîhâna].
IRÂK, a sovereign State, of the Muslim religion,
for the most part Arabic-speaking, situated at the
eastern end of the Fertile Crescent.
I.— Geographical

The structure of 'Irâk paradoxically derives its
originality from the fact that it forms part of a large
geographical block of territory. From the Arabo-
Syrian desert tableland which it faces along its
south-western flank, it takes its general aspect and
its climate. All along its frontiers on the North-East,
on the other hand, it shares the orientation and
relief of the folded mountain-chains of western Asia,
which give it its two great rivers. But these two
rivers, and the vast plain they irrigate, endow it,
under its classical name Mesopotamia, with an in-
dividuality which is undeniable.

This division, into two areas facing respectively
South-West and North-East, is also that which
roughly speaking distinguishes 'Irâk 'arâbi and 'Irâk
şâhîmi. But there is a further and no less essential
division between Upper Mesopotamia and the other
area, and, in general, the Dijâlî, hemmed in between
the Tigris and the Euphrates, and 'Irâk
properly speaking or Mesopotamia, where the two
rivers follow a much more indefinite course.

The climate also reflects this difference; the mean annual
rainfall varies from 50 mm. in the South to 300 mm.
in the North. These two zones are linked together at
the level of the Baghdad region where the Tigris and
the Euphrates, approaching each other very closely for
the first time, make it possible for a whole system
of navigable routes to be established, providing the
necessary crossings and connections.

Symbolised by this intermediate region between
steppe and mountains in one direction, between
Upper Mesopotamia and Lower Mesopotamia in the
other, the situation of the country is indeed that of
a cross-roads, and not merely on a local scale. The
geography of 'Irâk evokes world history, at the meeting-place of
great routes, that from the Mediterranean to Upper Asia, and that from Western
Europe to the Indian Ocean.

Northern 'Irâk. It is in the Dijâlî that the
distinction between the steppe lands in the
South-West and the mountains in the North-East is
most clearly perceptible. There the steppe undergoes
a more or less regular transformation, from West to
East, to lower and less broken country: so regards
climate and ecology, this is a classical Bedouin zone,
and what is more, a zone of transitions and contrasts.

The Euphrates, which within the territory of 'Irâk
is not joined by any tributary strictly speaking, is
above all a river providing irrigation. Its valley,
excavated from a shallow layer of alluvial deposit which
contains the limestones and marls of the Arabo-Syrian
bed-rock, is the traditional home of a sedentary and
fixed agriculture. The river can be and has been
tap water is drawn from the river by means of
wheels with buckets or by systems of ropes and other
methods operated by animals. The agricultural
possibilities are however greater than these antiquated
practices would lead one to suppose: for since the
Middle Ages, when the Arab geographers spoke of
the fertility of the country (cf. Ibn Hawkal, trans.
Wiet, 214f.), the situation has deteriorated, to
allow a greater degree of bedouinization (see Ibn
Hawkal, 221, 223), the effects of which were finally
confirmed during the 18th century. Today, the State
of 'Irâk is proposing to undertake and develop a
policy of constructing large dams (the al-Ramâdî-
al-Habbânîyya complex), in order to facilitate and
develop irrigation while neutralising the considerable
divergences in flow (annual average, 838 cubic
metres/second; maximum discharge of 5,000 cubic
metres/second). In the North-East, the highest mountains
(2588 m), near al-Sulaymâniyya) are associated with the
temporary Zagros folds in Iran, while the Dijâb
Singâr which, to the West of Mosul, is an extension
of the more faulted part of the Palmyra region, is more
closely related to the geological formation of eastern
Syria. This mountain mass encroaches on a broad
front on the basin of the Tigris which, at the defile
of al-Fâbâ, has to cut through the sandstone folds
of the Diabāl Ḩamrān. The higher lands, being very abundantly supplied with water, derive almost no advantage from their damp margins, where the springs also occur, that both cultivation and human beings are concentrated, from the plain of Assyria which is more steppe-like and, around Mosul, is enclosed between the mountains of Sīnjār to the West, of Makūl to the East-North-East and of Makūl to the South, to the sub-alpine area of Arīb, Kīrkūk and Ḩamlūk, watered by the Sīrāf, the Tigris, the Little Zāb and the Diyalā. This region of traditional agriculture is also rich in oil (oil-fields of Mosul and Kīrkūk), and moreover possesses a highly developed system of communications. The Tigris, which between the Assyrian plain and Baghdād falls by 310 m., flows through a valley about 4 km. wide, under several tiers of terraces. At the end, the fall of the river is sufficiently slight, and its current sufficiently powerful (average of 1400 cubic m. per second), to allow navigation on quite a considerable scale, for which purpose rafts on inflated goat-skins are still often employed. But here again, the need to regularize the river and its affluents on account of the extension of irrigated cultivation has given rise to the planning and completion of various dams—the complexes of Samarra—Wādī Tharthār and Balastik (which has been constructed for the Little Zāb, and Derbendī-Ḵān for the Diyalā).

Southern 'Irāk. The geography of southern 'Irāk with its markedly different character, is wholly dominated by the dynamics of the great rivers. It is here that the powerful rivers flowing down from Iranian Luristān, the Kārūn and the Kergā, make their appearance and, at the point where they debouch into the plain, they build up a delta which extends across the basin of the Tigris; having already lost much of its force through the warping of the plain that is being practised farther to the North, the Tigris itself then allows its waters to linger in the marshes, mingling in a confused way with part of the waters of the Euphrates. The latter river has in the meanwhile become indubitably the feeblest of the rivers of Mesopotamia. Forced back from their course by the pressure of the hill, the great plain of yellow clay, caked by drought, the river has in the meantime become indisputably the river of the plain that is being practised farther to the North, the Tigris itself then allows its waters to linger in the marshes, mingling in a confused way with part of the waters of the Euphrates. The latter river has in the meanwhile become indubitably the feeblest of the rivers of Mesopotamia. Forced back from their course by the pressure of the hill, the great plain of yellow clay, caked by drought, the river has in the meantime become indisputably the river of the plain that is being practised farther to the North, the Tigris itself then allows its waters to linger in the marshes, mingling in a confused way with part of the waters of the Euphrates. The latter river has in the meanwhile become indubitably the feeblest of the rivers of Mesopotamia. Forced back from their course by the pressure of the hill, the great plain of yellow clay, caked by drought, the rivers, particularly at the time of the annual spring floods: in proportion, the Euphrates brings down as much silt as the Nile, the Tigris four times as much, the Kārūn perhaps even more. Thus a clear indication is given of the dynamics involved, the primary function of the mountains, since the rivers progressively lose their momentum as one goes from North-East to South-West; in contrast to the spent force of the Tigris and especially the Euphrates, it is the alluvial deposits of the Kārūn, amounting to about half a million tons annually, which alone create the bar of the Shāṭṭ al-ʿArab.

The constitution of the soil and its relations with water are directly linked with this hydrographic system, a synonym of both power and confusion. The sediments of the Tigris and Euphrates, in their lower courses where they are under pressure from the Kārūn, now consist solely of very fine mud or clay. As for the depositing of the heavier sediments, which can only take place farther up-stream, it is there compromised by the marshes, the dominant feature of the landscape: at their head is the vast sheet of water and reeds, covering an area 80 km. wide, between al-Hammār, al-Kurna and al-Ṣāliḥ. This shows that, here more than elsewhere, hydraulics is a vital necessity; in addition to the need for keeping the rivers in their regular channels and for normalizing their flow, it is also necessary to establish considerable reserves, in a country where the low water level of the Tigris is an annual and seasonal period, from the month of May onwards. The whole history of southern 'Irāk is dominated by the memory of the shifting of rivers from their courses or of devastation, in answer to which man is making efforts to maintain control over the rivers, with for instance the dams at Kūtt on the Tigris, and at al-Hindiyya on the Euphrates, and plans for improving the marches.

It is moreover by means of these rivers that one can distinguish two regions in Lower Mesopotamia. In the North, the great plain of yellow clay, caked with salt left by the flood-waters, is in essence pasture-land for camels, with typical steppe vegetation. But sedentary agriculture springs up again in the neighbourhood of the arms of the two rivers, or near canals, even temporary ones, and also, in the event of rain, upon cultivable land of a very precarious sort which for a time has been reclaimed from the steppe. Further to the South, on the other hand, when the rivers have become slower and before the marches have invaded the country, there is a somewhat humid region where, thanks to the presence of water at no great depth, cultivation can be practised regularly; the palm tree dominates the region, for a great distance. Beyond that, the reeds and the buffaloes are the chief features of the marshes, a zone whose subsistence and habitat are hazardous.

The Shāṭṭ al-ʿArab and the Persian Gulf. Land and sea here together form one single countrieside: while the tide can force back the fresh water of the great rivers for a distance of about 200 km. inland, and while the land, thanks to alluvial deposits, continues to expand into the Gulf (an average rate of 25 m. annually), the Gulf itself is merely a scarcely submerged estuary, the silt introduced by the rivers being 25 m. Taken as a whole, the natural conditions prevailing in the Gulf are severe—violent winds from Iran and Mesopotamia, a torrid climate, insecure harbours which face the threat of becoming silted up, navigable channels scarce and dangerous. Nevertheless, the balance is not entirely negative: the Gulf abounds in fish, coral, pearls (favoured by the shallow waters of the river) and above all in oil deposits, with the narrow strip of 'Irāk territory being enclosed between the oil-fields of Kuwayt and those of Khūzistān. Finally, it should not be forgotten that the situation of the Gulf, in terms of modern geography, far outweighs the shortcomings of its position: a main channel of important long-distance maritime trade with India and the Far East, the Gulf is in fact an extension of Lower Mesopotamia, with the maritime traffic forming a connection, at al-Baṣra and in the direction of Baghdād, with the railway traffic alongside the Euphrates and also with the river traffic carried on the Tigris.

'Irāk in the works of the Arab geographers. The physiognomy of the water-courses and canals of 'Irāk in the Muslim Middle Ages has already been examined in the articles Bāṯīma, Diyaʿa, Diyaʿāl and Fūrāt. Here, only the best reclaimed and properly speaking will be described.
of the Arab domain, is regarded as the centre of the fourth region, that of Babylon, renowned for its temperate character and the moral or intellectual qualities of its inhabitants. The description is arranged round two main themes, water (the rivers and canals) and the evocation of the capital, whose decline is however emphasised. From the literary point of view, the Irâk theme is thus developed on the two levels of panegyric and elegy.

By the term Irâk, the Arab geographers in fact meant merely Lower Mesopotamia. The northern part of the present Irâk, with some regions belonging to the modern Syria and Turkey, formed part of the Diáatra [q.v.]. Being thus delimited, Irâk ended in the North in the region of Takrit on the Tigris, and a little above Hit on the Euphrates. From there and in a south-easterly direction, the boundary followed the approaches to the steppe, towards ʿAyn al-Tamr, al-Kudisiyya, al-Hira and the region of the South of al- Başra. Along the mountainous side it mainly followed the present frontier between Irâk and Iran, but it extended further to the South, on the left bank of the Shatt al-ʿArab.

The general features of the country emerge fairly clearly. The climate is given as temperate along the mountain border in the North-East, and often torrid but changeable in the rest of the country, especially in al- Başra, caught between the borders of the Persian Gulf and the winds from the North which temper the effects. In general, however, the worst is the humid hot climate of the Marshes (thaṭâḥ), where mosquitoes abound.

Distances are on the whole measured quite correctly: al-Muкалâddasì (134) gives 125 parasangs as the distance from the Gulf to al-Sinn, north of Takrit, or a little less than 750 km., a distance hardly less, in fact, than that between the mouth of the Tigris and the Shatt al-ʿArab and the confluence of the Tigris and the little Zâb. For the greatest width, from Hul- wân, east of Sâmarrâ, to the steppe, al-Muкалâddasì gives 80 parasangs, that is about 450 km., a figure covering exactly the distance between the Iranian frontier in the region of al-Sulâymaniyya on the one side and, on a line drawn from al-Sulâymaniyya at right angles to the basin of the Tigris and Euphrates, a point situated on the right bank of the Euphrates, 60 km. inside the Syrian steppe, on the other side.

Great attention is given to the problems concerning water: in al- Başra, where water is scarce, it was for some time brought by boat from the nearby town of al-UBYlla. Elsewhere it is provided by the two rivers, their tributaries and the canals, of which the most important are the Nahr al-Islâkî, the Dujdaylî, the Nahrawân, the Khâlîs, the Nahr Ṭîsa, the Nahr Ṣargâr, the Nahr al-Malik, the Nahr Kûthâ and the Nîl.

The most precise account of the territorial divisions is given by al-Muкалâddasì (114-5). According to his system, Irâk constitutes a geographical entity, a province (iklim), of which Baghdât is the metropolis (miyâr). The whole country is split into six regions (kwâar, sing. kâra) of which the chief towns (musulûm, sing. madina) are respectively al-Kûfâ, al- Başra, Wasît, Baghdât, Hulwân and Sâmarrâ. This division of the country does not however entirely blur the lines of another division, deriving from the fact that the country was rich enough for uninterrupted cultivation, at least in its central zone, to have earned the name Sawâd, the dark land. The units of land for taxation purposes (fasâšâdî, sing. fasâšâdî), most necessary by the limit between the land tax (kharâdî), generally bear Iranian denominations, evidently earlier than Islam: in al-Mukâddasì, they are given as Hulwân, Shâdhabbâd, Barmâšiyân, Bâk-bâkân, al-Awârât, Ardashîr-Bâkân, Shadbâbâr, Shadbâhmân, Astân, Shâdhaburmuz and al-Nahrwânât. The magnitude of the transactions may be gauged incidentally from the openly criticized number of indirect taxes—tolls, dues and taxes on animals, sales and pilgrimages.

Religious geography takes an important place, at least in certain writers: they note the existence of large colonies of Jews or Christians and of survivors of fire worship. The strength of Irâk Shiʿism is emphasised, but, reading between the lines (cf. al-Mukâddasì, 126), one has the impression of the vigour and vigour of the Sunnis. In a more general way, the partisan passions and their political background are a characteristic feature, noted in every town of Irâk.

There are records of certain wonders (sagâdâb) and of the sanctuaries; among the most notable might be included the arch of Ctesiphon (Iwân Īskrâ), the ruins of Babylon (Bâbûl), the burial-places of ʿAll and Ḥusayn, the remains of al-Ḫira, of the Sâsûnī Dastāджîrã and of Sâmarrâ, the “ashes” of Abraham’s fire at Kûthâ, and lastly the tombs of saintly personages in al-Kûfû, al- Başra and Baghdât.

Under the heading of manners and customs, one invariably has to be noted is the commerce, urbanity and charm of the inhabitants and the undeniable piety of large elements of the population. The chief topic, however, is always commerce, based upon the needs of the towns, and carried on by Baghdât in essential goods. Agriculture concentrated upon the three basic products, cereals, date-palms and fruit, especially grapes; the cultivation of forage-plants, rice and sesame appear less frequently. In the realm of craftsmanship, al- Başra dealt in fine fabrics, luxury articles (pearls and jewels), antiquity and libthage, which were exported, as were rose-water, essence of violets and henna, although the most important article of trade remained dates. Baghdât too dealt in luxury products and clothing, but also in dye-stuffs. The Marshes produced matting, Takrit was known for wool, Wasît (which also relied on fishing) for hangings, the marshes for reed-bracelets, violet and turbans, and al-Ubulla for cloth and bricks.

Taken as a whole, the geography of Irâk as seen by the writers of the Muslim Middle Ages, far more in human than in physical terms, connected the physiognomy, the life and the destiny of the country with water, the source of its wealth and trade. No author discerned or evoked this phenomenon more successfully than al-Mukâddasì, the master of this genre in the 4th/10th century. Referring to the Tigris, he wrote (124): “It is a source of profit, thanks to the laden boats which travel up and down the river ceaselessly; upon these vessels, in Baghdât, men arrive, depart, or cross the river, in a deaening tumult. Two-thirds of the charm of Baghdât resides on its river-banks”.

For classical antiquity, see M. Besneri, Lexique de géographie ancienne, Paris 1914; for the Muslim Middle Ages, cf. bbl. of the articles already mentioned; G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, 2nd. ed., Cambridge 1930; A. Süsa, al-'Irāk fi 'l-baḥrāt al-badīma, Bagdad 1939. The principal references to the works of the Arab geographers are as follows: Khārizmi, Kishāb surūt al-ard, ed. von Mālik, Leipzig 1926 (colour photo reproduction); Ibn Dhuhiyil, 5:15; Ya‘qūbi-Wiet, 4 ff., 44 ff., 159 ff., 162 ff.; Ibn al-Fakht, 6, 161 ff.; Ibn Rusta-Wiet, 104-8, 120-1, 189-91, 202, 208, 210, 212-6; Kudāma, Kishāb al-Sharāji wa-sinā‘at al-khāda, ed. de Goeje, Leiden 1889, 185, 216-7, 225, 227, 235 ff.; Suhrāb, Kishāb ‘adā‘ib al-πā‘alim al-sab‘a, ed. von Mālik, Leipzig 1930, 28, 30, 96, 118 ff.; Mas‘ūdi, trans. Petiet, § 189, 225-9, 231, 240-9, 270, 278, 286; Idrisī-Khāki, ed. M. Di ‘Abd al-A‘l al-Hal, Cairo 1961, 56-61; Ibn Hawqal-Kramers-Wiet, 225-40; Mukaddasī, 32, 113-35; al-Khatīb al-Baghdadi, intro. to the Ta‘rih Bagdadī, ed. Salmon, Paris 1904, passim; Idrisi-Jaubert, (ii), 142-5, 155-62; Zuhrī (from Fazārī), Kishāb al-Di‘ā‘ifya, ed. M. Hadi-Sadok, B.Et.Or., xxii, Damascus 1968, 168-9, 249, 254-5; 297; Yāhūt, Mu‘jam al-buldān, ed. Beirut 1368/ 1950, 62, 151, 184, 250 ff.; von Luschan, Der Alluvialboden in Mesopotamien, Paris 1949-55, 240-68; Kāzvīnī, Abān al-bidā‘, ed. W. Stücker, Kosmographie, (ii), Göttingen 1848, 188-91, 202-3, 205-20, 235-41, 245-6, 257-61, 268-70, 279-85, 289, 298-9, 301, 303-5, 308-9, 310-11, 314-5, 316, 320-2; Abu ‘l-Fidā‘, Tābhūm, 291-309; Ibn Bāṭtūta, ed. Déterminé-Sanguinetti-Monteil, Paris 1968, ii, 81, 93-6, 100-32 and passim. (A. Miquel) ii.—DEMOGRAPHY AND ETHNOGRAPHY The alluvial plain of the Tigris and Euphrates in ‘Irāk, like that of the Nile in Egypt, could only be extensively cultivated and colonized when techniques of drainage and irrigation were sufficiently advanced in late Neolithic times. Since then, the ethnic history of ‘Irāk has been much more troubled and eventful than that of Egypt, partly because the rivers of ‘Irāk are less easy to control than the Nile, and partly because the lowlands of ‘Irāk are not removed from invasion, as are those of Egypt, by barren deserts on either side. On the contrary, there is no natural barrier between the irrigated plains of ‘Irāk and the steppes of the Hamad on one side, and the foothills of the Zagros ranges on the other. In summer, the beduin are attracted from the parched scrubland of the Hamad and Dzair to the valley-pastures irrigated by the floods of early summer, while in the winter the tribes of the Zagros come down from their high alps to warmer quarters in the riverine plains. The two main ethnic elements in the lowland population of ‘Irāk can be traced to the above two adjacent regions. From the steppe comes the long-headed, in general lightly built ‘Mediterranean’ stock; from the hills, the broad-headed and taller elements of ‘Alpine’ ancestry, such as the early Sumerians. A third constituent is the somewhat taller and more aquiline-featured ‘Eurafrican’ variety of the ‘Mediterranean’ race, and a fourth would be a ‘Negroid’ or ‘Veddoid’ substratum, which Keith confirmed in his brilliant analysis included in Field’s classic and anthropometric study of 1925 of ‘Irāk army recruits. According to the measurements of Baxton, Field and Penniman of the earliest skeletons from Kish and other archaeological sites, the ethnic constitution of the valley population has altered little since the earliest times, except for a possible slight increase in the ‘Alpine’ element. In the hill country of the north-east of present-day ‘Irāk, the Kurds and allied tribes incorporate two strains, both of tall stature: the long-headed and fair ‘Nordic’, which doubtless brought in the main features of the language and culture of the people in the second millennium B.C.; and the very broad- headed ‘Alpine’ or ‘Armenoid’, with dark hair, brown eyes and prominent, often aquiline, nose, which is doubtless ‘aboriginal’ in these mountains. Von Luschan showed that this ‘Armenoid’ stock is extremely persistent and tends to crystallize into a very homogeneous type in conditions of marked topographic and social isolation, as for example among the Yazidis [q.v.] of the Sindjar mountains of northern ‘Irāk or the Assyrian Christian communities of the Zakho district. It may be that there is a topographic limit to the successful spread of the ‘Eurafrican-Mediterranean’ desert stock, for it is remarkable that the Arabic language, the beduin tribal system, and even the characteristic architecture of the steppes cease abruptly at the rise of elevation marked by the Kurdish escarpment of Northern ‘Irāk and by the Zagros foothills to the south. The presence of this barrier to movement contributed, to this problem, that the ‘Eurafrican-Mediterranean’ stock of the deserts may, on movement to high altitudes, be prone to chest troubles which the indigenous mountain folk are better equipped, through natural selection, to resist. Throughout recorded history, it is clear that the economic prosperity and, as a corollary, the density of population of the river plains of ‘Irāk have fluctuated markedly according as the rivers were controlled and irrigation extended, or alternatively as the dams and canals fell into disrepair and cultivated land reverted to swamp, or at best to seasonal pasture. The Mongol invasions of the 7th/13th century initiated a long period of such decline, during which the plains were largely owned by or held in fealty to the great beduin tribes of the Hamad and Dzair, notably the ‘Amār and the ‘Harda’īn [q.v.]. The present settled population still widely recognizes its tribal constitution and its allegiances and blood-ties with the beduin communities, and it has been a hard task for successive governments to overcome a long aversion to settled agriculture amongst substantial and influential elements in the population. Nevertheless, it is clear from demographic statistics that during the present century, and notably since the Second World War, ‘Irāk has entered firmly on a new period of prosperity based on a renovated system of irrigation and a thriving industrial economy. In 1930, the population was calculated at 2.8 millions; in 1943 the figure had reached very nearly 4 millions; in 1950, 4.8; in 1957, 6.3; and in 1965, 8.2 millions. Even allowing for improved techniques of taking the census during this time, there has clearly been a quite remarkable rise in numbers, which can only be accounted for by natural increase. In the latest census, it is notable that the urban section of the population has become almost as numerous as the rural, doubtless owing in large measure to the increasing importance of the oil business and its ancillary industries. The recent remarkable expansion of the capital city is a phenomenon which is observable in other countries of South-West Asia. While for long the censuses showed females outnumbering males in the country as a whole, this
situation was reversed in 1965. At present there is a marked concentration of population in the prosperous canal districts around the capital city, and less pronounced clusters in the districts of Basra and Mosul. The rivers generally exert an attraction to settlement, though their banks are still by no means uniformly reclaimed to cultivation. The marshes of the lower Euphrates in the district of Samawa, for example, are occupied only by a thin population of Marsh Arabs, distinct in custom and economy. The quite high density of settlement in the mountains of the north-east of the country should be noted, especially around Sulaymaniyya. This is the only part of Iraq where the rainfall is adequate for agriculture without the aid of irrigation, and here live the bulk of the Kurdish tribes, estimated to number about one quarter of a million. Less numerous minority groups are the Yazidis of Sinjar, calculated at nearly 56,000, and the Mandaeans or Christians of St. John, who inhabit a few villages along the banks of the Shatt al-'Arab.


III.—HISTORY: (a) ANCIENT HISTORY [see Bakr b. Wā'il, al-Hira, Iwān, Lakhmis, al-Madīna, Nabat, al-Ubada, etc.]

(b) FROM THE ARAB CONQUEST TO 1258

'Irāk, a fertile rich region from very early times, had attracted some Arab groups before the appearance of Islam. The Christian Lakhmis [g.v.] had settled around al-Hira [g.v.] as early as the 3rd century, and had been entrusted by the Sassanids with the task of defending the territory of Mesopotamia from any possible incursions by the Byzantines or their allies. In the 6th century, moreover, certain tribes from central Arabia, the Taghilib and the Bakr b. Wā'il [g.v.], as a result of economic difficulties not fully known to us, left their original home-land for the steppes of the Lower Euphrates, to be followed by some members of the Tamīl [g.v.]; they even began to move upstream, establishing themselves between the territories controlled by the Lakhmids in Mesopotamia and those ruled by the Kinda [g.v.] in northern Arabia; some of them appear at that time to have been converted to Christianity.

The conquest of Iraq, which the caliph may or may not have already had in mind when he started to enter into relations with the Arab tribes who were established in that country, was begun during the caliphate of 'Umar [g.v.].

When Arabia had been entirely pacified through the efforts of Abū Bakr, Khālid b. al-Walīd [g.v.], after putting an end to the Ridda [g.v.], is said to have been invited by a leader of the Bakr, al-Muḥāammad b. Haritha, a recent convert to Islam, to come and join him in invading the fertile lands of 'Irāk. It was in the spring or summer of 12/633 that Khālid appeared with a small force outside al-Ḫira, which he surrendered rapidly. But operations became slower when, in 13/634, Khālid was sent to the Syrian front, leaving the Muslims under the command of al-Muḥāammad. A war of skirmishes, with various incidents, then followed for some months between the Muslims and the Persians; defeated at the "battle of the Bridge", al-Muḥāammad won a victory in the following year at Badawiy, but he died soon afterwards. And it was a new leader, Sa'd b. Abī Waḳṣa [g.v.], a former Companion, who in the spring of 16/637 had to face the attack launched by the Sāṣānid general Rustam: the decisive battle, which lasted three days and three nights and in the course of which the Muslims encountered forces two or three times as numerous as their own, took place at al-Kādisiyah [g.v.], 30 km south-east of al-Ḫira. The victory finally won by the Muslims opened 'Irāk to them. Now, the whole province from 50/670 until his death in 153/672, Khālid, who, after being responsible for the death of al-Husayn at Karbala, had entered the service of the Abbasids, occupied the whole of the country whose inhabitants, being of Aramaic origin, seem to have welcomed the conquerors, semi-otic-speaking like themselves, without displeasure. The fortified camp of al-Ḵabra [g.v.], on the Shatt al-'Arab, was established in 17/638, subsequently being gradually improved and strengthened, while the camp of al-Kūfa [g.v.], to the south of the modern Baghda which also on the right bank of the Euphrates, was established in 17 or 18/639, and was destined to constitute the new capital of 'Irāk, replacing Ctesiphon, the site of which was abandoned and which gradually lost its inhabitants. The final conquest of 'Irāk was assured by the victory at Nihawand (21/642) which opened the Iranian territories to the Muslim troops. Al-Ḵabra and al-Kūfa, now entrusted to separate governors, became the twin capitals. It was in the next year, 22/643, that Ali b. Abī Talib was appointed governor of al-Ḫira and al-Kufa that 'Ali held his court during the conflict in which he opposed, on the one hand, Muṣṭafā, and on the other, the Khālid, whom he crushed at al-Nahrawān [g.v.] in 35/658; it was there also that 'Ali was assassinated by Ibn Muljam [g.v.] in 40/661.

The triumph of Muṣṭafā, the governor of Syria, and the appearance of the Umayyad dynasty together resulted in Syria being given pre-eminence over 'Irāk, although 'Irāk at that time was a richer and more populous region whose inhabitants were perhaps more experienced than the Syrians in the problems of administration and government that confronted a great empire.

In the time of Muṣṭafā, 'Irāk had a single governor in the person of Ziyād [g.v.] who, after being first appointed governor of al-Ḫira in 45/665, ruled the whole province from 50/670 until his death in 53/673. In 53/675, his son 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād [g.v.] continued his work. It was he who was in part responsible for the death of al-Husayn [g.v.] at Karbala [g.v.] in 61/680, at the beginning of the reign of the caliph Yazid [g.v.].

The years that followed were marked by the revolt of the anti-caliph ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [g.v.] who...
had the support of the majority of the inhabitants of al-Kufa and al-Basra (the Tamim in particular). 'Irak was then entrusted to Mu'āshib b. al-Zubayr [q.v.]. His primary task was to oppose the revolt of al-Muhallab [q.v.] which began in 66/686 and which was repressed some months later in 67/687 [see HARûK], and he himself died shortly afterwards in a battle against the armies of 'Abd al-Malik [q.v.]. In 72/691, the Umayyads re-established their authority over 'Irak. However, in view of the hostility of the Khâridjîs who did not disarm, the caliph in 75/694 entrusted the governorship of al-Kufa. It was at this period that al-Hâdîdîdîjî, after restoring discipline in the 'Irakî forces commanded by al-Muhallab [q.v.], and then crushing the revolt of Ibn al-Ash'âb [q.v.] who had occupied al-Basra and al-Kufa, founded the new town of Wāṣît [q.v.] in 83/702. During the same period, the administrative and monetary reforms of 'Abd al-Malik came into force, as a result of which new coins were minted at Wāṣît; the period also brought to light a grave problem, the abandonment of holdings of land by agricultural workers converted to Islam, who refused to continue to pay the same taxes as they had done before their conversion [see KHâRâDî]. Rivalries between tribes manifested themselves in 'Irak, as in Syria; while al-Hâdîdîjî supported Rays [q.v.], one of his successors, Yazid b. al-Muhallab [q.v.], persecuted them until he was imprisoned by order of the caliph 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz [q.v.]; escaping from prison, Yazid stirred up a rebellion which was crushed in 102/721 by the Umayyad prince Mâsîlamâ [q.v.], to whom incidentally credit is due for the reclamation of new marsh lands close to the Shatt al-'Arab [see al-Bâṭîn]. Order in 'Irak was restored in the time of the caliph Hîshâm [q.v.], under the governorship of Khâlid b. 'Abd Allâh al-Kâṣîrî [q.v.], later executed in the time of al-Walîd II [q.v.]. The end of the Umayyad epoch was marked by increasing troubles, due to the turbulence both of the 'Abbâsîd faction and also of the Khâridjîs who for some time occupied al-Kufa. The governor Ibn Hûbyâr [q.v.] was unable to oppose the invasion by 'Abbâsîd troops; besieged in Wâṣît, he finally surrendered after the defeat of the Umayyad armies, in return for a promised safe-conduct which was not respected. On the other hand, the Abbasid caliph al-Mahdî, incidentally, the collection of these taxes from the financiers who were expert in fiscal matters and who had already had occasion, before their accession to the vizierate, to resolve the delicate problems generally raised by the calculation of taxes in this region. From the time of the caliphate of al-Mahdî, incidentally, the collection of these taxes was made on the principle of a proportional advance payment in kind.

The nomination by the caliph al-Râdî [q.v.] of an amîr al-umârâ in the person of Ibn Râhîk [q.v.] opened a new era which extended from 336/945 until 44/1055, in the course of which 'Irak, still disturbed by dissensions and military campaigns which impaired its agricultural prosperity, ceased to be the centre of the empire and became merely a single region in the political complex controlled by the Buwayhidîs [q.v.]. The Shi'î, probably Ima'mi, convictions of these amîrî led them to favour the celebration of Shi'î festivals [see MUSHâRAM] and to have mausolea erected or reconstructed on the tombs of imâms then existing in 'Irak [see MAṢ'Â]. But this policy met with opposition from the Sunni elements in the population and soon also from the caliph himself [see AL-RâD], Moreover, the tax concessions granted to the amîrs on the so-called khârîdî [q.v.] lands did not improve the situation of the agricultural workers, upon whom the wealth of the region partly depended.

In 'Irak, which for a time was disturbed by the episode of the pro-Fatimid revolt of al-Bešârî [q.v.], the arrival of the Saljûqîs [q.v.] established until the Mongol invasion a new régime essentially characterized by its efforts to restore Sunnism. But this tendency did not pass without disagreements, on the one hand without new dissensions between Shâfi'îs and IJa'âfâris [see AL-SHAFI], on the other hand between the caliphs and the sultans, who had incidentally made Isha'ân their capital, or on the other hand without new dissensions between Shi'îs who won over to Aṣ'ârîs and Hanbalîs [see al-ṢÎJÂ'I, AL-ÂSH'ÂRIYYA, AL-MAṢ'Â]. The Saldjuks continued to dominate 'Irak in the 6th/12th century, but their empire was then rapidly disintegrating. The branch which established an autonomous principality in 'Irak went back to Mûmhîd b. Mûhâmâd [q.v.], nephew of Santîlîr, who came to power in 511/1115. This branch remained there until the coming of the Khâwarîzmshâhs [q.v.] in 590/1194; but already by this time the authority of the Saljûq amîrs of 'Irak had been attacked by the 'Abbâsîd caliphs who were attempting to shake off their tutelage. As a consequence, there were struggles for influence, the most serious taking place in the reign of the sultan Mas'ûd [q.v.], and they brought about the execution of the caliph al-Mustâdshîd [q.v.] in 529/1135 and of the caliph al-Râhîd [q.v.] in 530/1136, and the accession of al-Mu'taṣâfî [q.v.], chosen by the sultan. However, the sultans'
power declined continuously, and the caliph al-Nasir [q.v.], who reigned from 575/1180 to 622/1225, even distinguished himself by trying in vain to keep the principal Sunni States in the East the organization of the futuwwa [q.v.], which seemed to him the best method of re-establishing, under his own direction, the moral and political unity of the old 'Abbasid empire. The undertaking did not however have the expected success, and the 'Abbasid caliphs ceased to dominate 'Irak when the Mongols conquered the country in 656/1258 [see Al-Musta'in]. Bibliography: No history of 'Irak for the period under consideration exists. See the articles indicated in the text, particularly with reference to the dynasties, caliphs, sultans, governors and also the towns. For the episodes of the conquest, see F. Gabrieli, Muhammad and the conquests of Islam, London 1968, 128-26 and bibl., 245.


(c) 1258-1534

The period extending from the Mongol conquest to the Ottoman conquest does not reveal any unity, unless it be in emphasising, by the rapid succession of dynasties, that, with the disappearance of the Caliphate, 'Irak entered a period of political decline which was to last until after the 16th century, and witnessed the intensification of an economic decline which reached one of its lowest points in the 15th century, the process of this decline being still insufficiently understood. The period of about three centuries covering the Mongol (Ilkhanids, Jalayirids, Timurids) and Turcoman rulers (Kara-Koyunlu, Ak-Koyunlu, Safawids) has not been the subject of any comprehensive study; detailed works on historical geography, the administrative system, and social and economic structures are inadequate, and the political history has been only relatively better reconstructed. Extracts from the most important sources are grouped chronologically in 'Abbâs al-'Azrâwî, Ta'rikh al-'Irak bayn iltisâlîyân, iili (and iv), Baghdad 1935 sqq. The principal sources are, for the Ilkhanid period, the works of Ibn al-Fuwâî [q.v.]; for the Kara- and Ak-Koyunlu period the Ta'rikh al-Qâhîyâ (unpublished) and Abû Bakr Tîrnârî, Tîrikh-i Diyârbakriyya, ed. Faruk Sûmer, 2 vol., Ankara 1962-4.

Under the Ilkâns [q.v.], although it had fallen into the status of a provincial capital, Bagdad still retained a certain intellectual and religious lustre, but was the seat of a government which ruled only Lower Mesopotamia, while Upper Mesopotamia was governed by the Mawâli [q.v.]. The division of 'Irak into two large, distinct and frequently rival administrative units was to be maintained until the Ottoman occupation. Like the other regions of the Ilkhanid empire, the 'Iraki provinces had at their head a Mongol governor (disparate and incomplete lists in Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, 348-52), assisted by a non-Mongol nâib, a senior Muslim, Christian or Jewish official, generally a member of one of the viceroyies who struggled for influence in the Ordo. Bagdad and southern 'Irak were held in this manner for twenty years by the group of Khûrâsanî administrators whom the Djûwaynîs controlled. After the disgrace of the latter, the social tensions which became apparent throughout the whole Ilkhanid State were complicated in 'Irak by the presence of numerous Christian and Jewish communities and when the Mongol sovereigns, converted to Islam, vaunted their religious opinions because of the aspirations of Shî'î circles.

At the time of the dismemberment which followed the death of the Ilkhan Aba Sa'dî (715/1315), the provinces of 'Irak at first remained within the Mongol orbit, but 'Hasan Jalayyrî, though faithful to the legitimate succession of the Djengikhanids until the end of his life (1356), nevertheless is known as the founder of a dynasty. Having established themselves in Bagdad, the Djâlayîrids [q.v.] succeeded in ousting their Cubânîd rivals and in extending their authority over Upper Mesopotamia. However, with its two capitals, Bagdadh and Tabriz, their State was more Persian than Arab. After Timur's first campaign in 'Irak (795/1393), a route march punctuated by various halts at places where there was urban resistance, there followed periods of shortlived Timurid domination (796/1393-4, 804/1401-2, 806/1403-5) and Djâlayîrid restorations in which the equivocal support of the Kara-Koyunlu Turcomans played the essential part and foreshadowed their domination in the 15th century. The sack of Bagdad by Timur in 803/1401 (cf. Arabica, ix/2 (1962), 303-9), dealt the already declining capital a blow from which it was never to recover. In fact, the tribalism (Bedouins in the South, Turcomans and Kurds in the North) from then onwards completed the disorganization of the economy and drove away the routes through Persia and Anatolia the caravan traffic between the Persian Gulf, the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. It was a lifeless region that, after the Djâlayîrid dynasty were dispossessed (1410-11), the Kara-Koyunlu were to dispute for two decades (1411-31) with the successors who had been driven back into the southern districts (Khûzîstân, Basra, al-Hilla). The political fragmentation became more pronounced, not only on account of rivalries between Turcoman federations but also as a result of the fact (illustrating the lack of historical unity of a country traditionally divided into distinct zones) that rulers of Bagdad and rulers of Mawâlî were in armed competition, and that the politico-religious movement of the Mîsha'îs [q.v.] who had emerged from the last Djâlayîrids in Lower 'Irak, and, while it there blocked attempts at expansion by the Timurids of Fârs, also safeguarded the country from Turkmen tutelage. The only native movement of sufficient vigour to challenge the authority of the Turcomans, the Mîsha'îs [q.v.] revolt remained limited and, despite the difficulties of its opponents, it did not succeed in capturing Bagdad; even al-Hilla was occupied for only a short time (1466-8). Under the Ak-Koyunlu
who supplanted (1468-9) the Kara-Koyunlu, the condition of 'Irāk was less turbulent. They maintained themselves there for some years after their eviction from Iran by the Şafawid Kızılbaşşah.

The Şafawid domination of 'Irāk (1508-34) was characterized, there as elsewhere, by economic stagnation and by feeble central government. Upper Mesopotamia remained within the orbit of the Mawzili amirs, who had already been powerful there in the time of the Ak-Koyunlu; by securing for themselves authority to govern Baghdad, the Şafawids assured themselves in fact of control of the whole of 'Irāk. At the beginning of the reign of the young Şah Tahmāsp I, one of them, Dhu 'l-Fi'kār, even attempted to secede (1528-9).

Bibliography: in article. (J. Aubin)

(d) The Ottoman Period

The 'Irākī territories from the early 10th/16th to the early 19th century were primarily a bastion of Ottoman power against not only the rulers of Persia, but also the refractory Kurds in the northeast and the Arab tribesmen to the west and southwest of the Tigris-Euphrates plain. In contrast to the western Fertile Crescent, which was conquered in a single campaign in 922/1516 and was never until the late 18th century seriously threatened by an external enemy, the 'Irākī territories were acquired piecemeal, lost and retaken, and held over a long period only by an extensive concession of autonomy to the governors of Baghdad. The 19th century witnessed here, as elsewhere in the Ottoman Empire, a phase of administrative reorganization.

The first Ottoman acquisitions (Mosul, Diyār Bakr [q.v.] and the Kurdish regions east of the Tigris) were obtained in 921-3/1515-7 in the sequel of the Çıldırân [q.v.] campaign. The renewal of hostilities between Sultan Süleyman and Şah Tahmāsp resulted in the Ottoman capture of Baghdad [q.v.] in 941/1534. The Arap dynast of al-Basra [q.v.], Rüşşād b. Mughālim, became a vassal of the sultan, and his territory was later (after 953/1546) fully incorporated in the Ottoman Empire. 'Irāk comprised the three central eyalets of Mosul, Baghdad and al-Basra, and the Kurdish eyalet of Shahrizor to the east, and the eyalet of al-Hasa [q.v.] on the Persian Gulf coast of the Persian Gulf [see Baḥr Fāris]. The eyalet of Diyār Bakr, although lying outside modern 'Irāk, was closely associated with its history in the Ottoman period.

As elsewhere in the Empire, the weakening of central control in the 11th/17th and 12th/18th centuries was reflected in the 'Irākī provinces in the rise of local despotisms and the domination of the garrison-troops in the towns. The governorship of al-Basra, purchased (c. 1021/1612) by a certain Afrāsīāb [q.v.], became hereditary in his family. Another gubernatorial family ruled in al-Hasa from the late 10th/16th century until c. 1074/1663-4. The garrison-troops of Baghdad, by this time a privileged and powerful section of the urban community, produced a faction-leader, Bakr Şu Bāšā [q.v.], who, in order to consolidate his position, negotiated with Şah Abbas [q.v.] of Persia. Baghdad and central 'Irāk thus passed under Persian rule (1033/1623), but the Şafawids failed to hold Mosul and Shahrizor. The Persians were finally ejected from Baghdad by Sultan Murād IV in 1048/1638. The ensuing Ottoman-Şafawid settlement (the Treaty of Zuhab) indicated the border between the two powers (14 Muḥarram 1049/17 May 1639). It was to be reaffirmed after subsequent hostilities until the 19th century.

The Ottoman reconquest brought no lasting stability. The garrison-troops of Baghdad continued to be turbulent and insubordinate. Although the autonomy of the house of Afrāsīāb in al-Hasa was finally suppressed in 1078/1668, the rise of the Mūntāfik confederacy of the marsh and desert Arabs of the south threatened Ottoman control. This was restored by two governors of Baghdad, Hasan Paşa [q.v.], who ruled from 1116/1704 to 1126/1714, and his son and successor, Ahmad Paşa [q.v.], who ruled (with西部) in the interval including the massacre of the Şafawids in 1120/1707. Their authority, like that of other powerful Ottoman governors of the period, rested on a new military and administrative basis. Georgian by origin, Hasan and Ahmad established in Baghdad a Georgian mamlūk household, through which they controlled and administered their province. In consequence of the threat from the Mūntāfik, al-Hasa became in effect a dependency of Baghdad. A more serious danger appeared in the years following 1135/1722, when first the Afghans, then Nādir Şah, succeeded the Şafawids as masters of Persia, and hostilities with the Ottomans were reopened. The key importance of Baghdad in the ensuing campaigns partly explains the acquiescence of the sultanate in the prolonged tenure of power and autonomous position of Ahmad Paşa. It was at this time also that members of the Şafawid 'ulama, who had established themselves as quasi-hereditary governors of Mosul, Baghdad was besieged by Nādir in 1146/1733, and Mosul in 1156/1743, but the long struggle as a whole was indecisive, and the settlement of 1159/1746 merely confirmed the Treaty of Zuhab.

On Ahmad Paşa's death, shortly after that of Nādir Şah (1160/1747), his Mamlūk household was firmly entrenched in power, and formed a self-perpetuating military and administrative elite. The Mamlūks were able to thwart the attempts of the sultan's government to displace them, but failed to develop a regular system of succession to the governorship. The period of the Mamlūk Pāshalīk (1160-1247/1747-1831) witnessed a clash with the Persian ruler, Karim Khan-i Zand, and the temporary loss of al-Hasa (1190-3/1776-9), but the danger passed with Karim Khan's death. The long rule of Ahmad Pāsha, who governed Baghdad together with al-Hasa and Shahrizor, marked the apogee of the Mamlūk Pāshalīk, but his later years were preoccupied with unsuccessful attempts to curb the expansion of the Wahhābis into al-Hasa and the fringes of 'Irāk, where they were resisted by the Mūntāfik confederacy. The great Wahhābi raid of 1216/1802 and the sack of Karbala showed the importance of the Mamlūk Pāshalīk in this respect. It survived, however, until Sultan Muḥammad II succeeded by force of arms in ousting Dawūd Paşa [q.v.] and ending the autonomous governorship (1831).

Ottoman administrative reform and increasing European penetration are the principal themes in the history of 'Irāk from 1831 to 1928. Dawūd's immediate successor, Hayreddin undick, undertook reforms, partly for the benefit of the Mamlūk pashas in enforcing their authority upon the tribes. The real turning-point came with the governorship of Midhat Pāsha (1869-72), who saw the application to Baghdad of the Law of Wiḥyets (1864) and the Ottoman Law Land Law (1858). Both of these were westernizing reforms, one creating the framework of a provincial administration of European type, the other establishing individual freehold ownership in tribal lands. Sultan Mehdī Pāsha (1908-12) brought extensive estates in 'Irāk under his private
The emergence of Arab nationalism in the Young Turk period was less evident in the 19th century. The British had superseded the Dutch (as earlier had the Dutch the Portuguese) as the dominant European power in the Gulf. From 1763 Al-Basra was the centre of British trade and the seat of an agency of the East India Company. Baghdad itself was of secondary importance to the British until Bonaparte’s expedition to Egypt, but in 1798 a permanent British resident was appointed there. Interest in the development of communications with India led to surveys of the Euphrates route in the 1820s, and to the beginning of modern river-transport in ‘Iraq. Telegraphic communications followed after 1861, when Istanbul was linked with Baghdad. The German-sponsored project of a railway from Anatolia to the Persian Gulf was resisted by the British government, and only the line from Baghdad to Sannarré was constructed under Ottoman rule.

At the outbreak of the First World War, European political and economic penetration of ‘Iraq was still very limited. In November 1914 an expeditionary force from India occupied the head of the Gulf and al-Basra. A first attempt to capture Baghdad ended with the surrender of the British at Kut al-Amara in April 1916, but a second advance succeeded in taking the city in March 1917. Mosul, however, held out until after the armistice of Mudros ended Ottoman participation in the war. Meanwhile an administration, mainly composed of British and Indian officials, had been established in the occupied ‘Iraqi territory, and formed a transition to the formal assumption of British responsibility for the country under the Mandate of 1920.

**Bibliography**: For detailed bibliographies, see the articles referred to above, especially Bagdad, and also the principal modern works: Abbás al-Azāwā, Ta’rīkh al-‘Irāq bayn ṣilmāy, iv–viii, Baghād 1949–58; S. H. Longrigg, Baghdad, London 1928. (P. M. Holt)

---

By 1918 the British occupation of present-day ‘Iraq was completed, when British forces entered Mosul in November, seven days after the signing of the Mudros Armistice between Turkey and the Allies. However, the contradictory attitudes of British official opinion regarding the political future of the conquered territory caused administrative confusion and led to the rise of anti-British nationalist agitation for the establishment of a Muslim Arab state in the country. When the Mandate over ‘Iraq was awarded to Great Britain in 1920, it sparked off an insurrection led by the Traditionalists of the Alas and fomented by the Ṣāliḥ ‘Awdāl of Nadjaf and Karbalā, the first demand of which required considerable force and was completed early in 1921. The suppression of the insurrection was preceded by the appointment of Sir Percy Cox as British High Commissioner, who set up an Arab Council of State to perform the functions of government, thus ending military rule in October 1920. In March 1921 the Cairo conference was held under the presidency of Winston Churchill, the Colonial Secretary. In dealing with the situation in ‘Iraq the conference resolved to offer the rulership of the country to Faysal, the second son of Sharīf Ḥusayn of Mecca, who had been ousted from Syria in July 1920 by the French. The choice of Faysal as King of ‘Iraq was approved by the Council of State and confirmed in a referendum, and he was crowned in August 1921 as a constitutional monarch with a representative and democratic government (see DUSTūs, 659). ‘Iraq remained with the mandatory power was regulated by a series of agreements, the last of which was signed in 1930 and gave ‘Iraq formal independence and provided for a close Anglo-Iraqi alliance to last 25 years. Thus in 1932 ‘Iraq was admitted to the League of Nations as an independent sovereign state.

When ‘Iraq became independent, the country had not attained the social cohesion among its various religious and ethnic groups necessary to make a modern nation. There were too many disruptive local forces representing the various conflicting interests. To control and harness these interests for the good of the state required wise leadership and the ability to strike a balance between the British and the nationalists on the one hand, and the different nationalist groupings on the other. Faysal succeeded in maintaining such an equilibrium, and his sudden death in 1933 was an irreparable loss.

It came at a very troubled period in ‘Iraq’s modern history, when the Assyrian massacre, tribal uprisings and strong anti-British agitation threatened the very foundations of the new state. Ghazi, Faysal’s successor, was inexperienced and lacked the authority of his father to maintain political stability. He was drawn to take sides in the turbulent and faction-ridden politics of ‘Iraq. While certain groups were inclining tribal rebellions to displace their rivals from power, others sought the cooperation of army officers to obtain political power. Thus in 1936 a military coup was carried out by General Bakr ‘Aṣālim in collusion with Iḥkāmat Sulaymān and supported by the reformist political group known as al-Ahdāl. The movement ended within ten months as it began, in another coup. The military intervention in politics set a dangerous precedent that was to follow the republic of 1958. In November 1937 al-Ahdāl came to power, and in April 1938 they were replaced by the Gaylānī regime, which seized power in April 1941 and proceeded to disregard ‘Iraq’s obligation under the Anglo-Iraqi treaty of 1930. This led to the occupation of Bagdad by the British-led Arab Legion of Jordan in May 1941. Following the suppression of the Gaylānī régime and the restoration of constitutional rule, the Iraqi political leader Nūr al-Sa‘īd emerged as the strong man of subsequent cabinets. In 1943 ‘Iraq declared war on the Axis powers and thus became qualified as a charter member of the United Nations Organization, and in 1945 ‘Iraq was admitted to the United Nations.

The end of the war saw a revival of political activities in the country, when political parties were allowed to operate freely. Several parties came into being, all representing the politically aspiring groups of the intelligentsia. All these political organizations demanded the abolition of the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty and called on workers and students to support their demands. Student demonstrations and industrial troubles led to the suppression of these parties.
The early 1950s saw an increase in Iraq's oil revenues, which were channelled towards the building of irrigation dams. The failure of these projects to yield rapid economic advancement caused wide-spread discontent and reinforced the ranks of the opposition. The emergence of a new and radical leadership in Egypt enhanced the opposition groups in Iraq, who continued their campaign against the treaty with Great Britain. Instead they advocated neutralism and an alliance with Egypt. Iraq, however, in the face of strong opposition at home and in the Arab world, joined the Baghdad Pact, the Western-inspired defence system, in 1955, and expressed lukewarm support for Egypt during the Suez crisis of 1956. Egypt's diplomatic triumph and the rise of Abd al-Nasir as an Arab national figure marked a turning-point in the history of royalist Iraq. When Syria and Egypt merged to form the United Arab Republic in 1958, Iraq and Jordan were federated under a Hashimite Crown. In July the monarchy was overthrown by a group of army officers under the leadership of Brigadier Abd al-Karim Kâsim, who declared a republic. Kâsim enjoyed the support of a wide coalition of political and other interests representing the fragmented social structure of Iraqi society. The coalition lacked cohesion and it disintegrated a few months later. For almost five years Kâsim attempted to hold a balance between the contending factions of military and civilian groupings. Under his regime Iraq withdrew from the Baghdad Pact and the Sterling area, and established diplomatic relations with all the communist countries. Kâsim was overthrown in February 1963. His legacy was the complete factionalization of Iraq's internal politics, the alienation of Iraq in the Arab world, and a Kurdish rebellion. He was succeeded by a regime representing the pan-Arab Ba'ath party, which was ousted by President Abd al-Salâm Arîf only seven months after it had assumed power. Arîf was killed in an air crash in 1966 and was succeeded by his brother Abd al-Rahêm, who was in turn overthrown by a group of army officers, a coup that led to the return of the Ba'ath Party to power in 1968.


### IV.—LANGUAGES

The official language of Iraq is Arabic (see *‘Arabiyâ*). But on the one hand the Arabic-speaking area is not at all homogeneous, and on the other hand some Iranian dialects are still much alive, in particular Kurdish, to which recent agreements have accorded an official status in Kurdistan.

#### (a) ARABIC DIALECTS

Two distinct dialect types, representing a variant of the Pan-Arabic division into *gâl* dialects and *gâl* dialects, coexist in the Mesopotamian area. They may be called *qiltu* dialects and *gilit* dialects, using the 1st pers. sing. of the perfect of the verb 'to say' to highlight three of its distinctive features: the reflexes of Old Arabic *q*, the shape of the suffix, and the degree of segholation. The division is partly regional, partly social: *qiltu* dialects are spoken by

the sedentary populations North of a line Sâmarrâ–Fallûjâ, and by non-Muslim sedentaries South of that line; *gilit* dialects are spoken by nomadic, semi-nomadic and Beduinized populations everywhere, and by Muslim sedentaries South of the aforesaid line. The *qiltu* dialects are closely akin to the Arabic spoken in Eastern Anatolia (provs. of Mardin, Diyarbakir, Sîrît and Urfa), whereas the *gilit* dialects extend into Kuwait, the Persian Gulf and Khoristân; they also bear some resemblance to the dialects of Nadîd and to those of Uzbekistan. The kindred *gilit* dialects spoken by relatively recent immigrants from Nadîd, such as the Şammar and *Anaza* tribes, are here left out of account.

A good deal of reliable material has, in the past decade, become available on the dialect of the Baghdad Muslims (hereafter, MB) but of the other *gilit* dialects, only that of Kwêrîs, prov. of al-Hilla, (hereafter Kw.) has received detailed treatment (see the bibliography), though material on al-Gilla, al-‘Afasî and al-Basra has recently become available. Of the *qiltu* dialects, Jewish Baghdamdi (JB) and Christian Baghdamdi (CB) have been described in some detail, while the dialect of Mosul (MO.) is less well-known, and there are only a few scattered notes on *‘Ana, Tikrit and Hîl.*

**Phonology.** The *qiltu* dialects are characterized by *q* for OA *q* (*qâl* 'he said', *gâm* 'he rose', *bâq* 'he stole') and by *k* for OA k (*kân 'he was', *kalb* 'a dog', * şeka* 'he spoke') though *‘Ana* has *î* in these and some other items. The *gilit* dialects have *g* for OA *g* (*gâl, gâm, bâq* though MB has *q* in a good many instances (*qira 'he read', *buqa 'he remained', *qabil* 'he accepted') and *ê* in a few cases (*rîfîj* 'companion', *sargâlraq* 'Eastern'); and *ê* for OA k in many cases (*êbîr 'big', but *kâd* 'big, pt.', *êdân 'he was', but *yên* 'he will be', *šalûb* 'your (m.s.) dog', *talbî* 'your (f.s.) dog'); MB contrasts with the rural *gîlit* dialects as to the amount of affrication: MB *êkîh* 'food', *gêlîd* 'sitting', vs. Kw. *aêl, aêlîd. The Southernmost *gîlit* dialects have *y* for OA *g*. Most of the *qiltu* dialects (MO., CB, JB, Tikrit) have *ê* for OA *r* in many instances (*êsî* 'head'). They also have, again with the exception of *‘Ana, a strong *imâla* (MO. and CB *bîsîd* 'cold', JB *bîsîd*) whereas the *gîlit* dialects, especially MB, tend toward a low, central and even back â in all positional environments (*ba’d*). *Gîlîd* dialects of both types preserve older *ay* and *aw*, but these are more generally represented by *ê* and *ërâ* rather than high, with, for *ê*, a characteristic positional variant [ê] in Baghdad and other Southern dialects. Older *ê* and *ê* are represented by a single *ê* phone, usually heard as a mid central rounded [ê], in the *gîlit* dialects (*êkil* 'all', *kimâma we were', *kêlit* 'writing', *wêqîf* 'standing') whereas MB has both *ê* and *ë*, though they have been redistributed (*bûl, çêma, kêlit, wêqîf*). The fate of short *ê* is extremely complex; it does not, on the whole, follow the *qiltu-gîlit* split, except in the case illustrated by MB *kêma* 'camel', *gêmar* 'moon' vs. MO. *kâmâl, qâmâq. The *gîlit* dialects show practically universal segholation, the quality of the epenthetic vowel varying with environment: *tîb* 'dog', *darwâsh* 'way', *sûtûba* 'breast', *bâd* 'still', the *gîlit* dialects vary in degree of segholation, the most conservative, such as JB, having practically none: *kabûl, dabûţ, xîbâ, bâd*. Common to all dialects, except CB, is the retention of the interdentals *ê, û* and *êê*, the frequent occurrence (esp. in the *gîlit* group) of the emphatic *l*, and the new phonemes *ê* and *êê*, even in the *qiltu* group; a new phoneme *êê* is well established at least in the urban dialects of both types.

**Morphology.** The pronominal suffixes character-
istic of the qiltu group are illustrated below by the Mosul paradigm, those of the gišû group by MB, using the words for 'brother' and 'house':

Mosul  MB
1s. abûyî bêti abûya bêti
2ms. abûl bétak abûl bétak
2fs. abûû bêtî abûû bêtî
3ms. ašûnu bêtu ašû bêta
3fs. ašûna bêta ašûna bêthâ
1p. ašûna bêta ašûna bêna
2p. ašûkîm bêtîkîm ašûkîm bêthum
3p. ašûhim bêtîm ašûhim bêthum

The nominal fem. suff. varies between i (or e) and a in the qiltu group, but is a stable a in the gišû group: Mo. kalbi 'bitch' (for some speakers, kalbeh), bêda 'egg' (JB kalba, bêdî), MB kalba, bêda. In annexation and with suffixes, this suffix has different allomorphs in the two groups: Mo. kalbi abûyî, kalbî, kalbinâ, vs. MB kalbi ašûya, kalbi, kalbatina. Common to the area are plural patterns of the type kâlka (MB), kâlî (Mo.) 'lazy', for adjectives in -ăn, and ḫûyî (MB), ḫayyî (Mo.) 'tailors' for qattîl nouns. Feminines of adjectives of colours and infirmities end in a long, stressed vowel in the gišû group, a short vowel in the qiltu group: Mo. šûda 'black', šumya 'blind', vs. MB šûda, šumya. In the verb, the usual ten form class occurs, with form i rather spacedly represented. Form I has a single pattern qitâlqitâl (the alternation depending on the environment) in the gišû group, e.g., kitab 'he wrote' vs. swbah 'he cooked', a single qatal pattern in some gišû dialects, whereas others have the common twofold qatal vs. qisil, e.g., Mo. katal 'he wrote' vs. šisib 'he drank'. Conjugation of the form I perfect and imperfect is illustrated by the Mosul paradigm (qatal only) and the MB paradigm respectively:

Mosul  MB
1s. katâbu aktîb kitâbat aktîb
2ms. katâtîb aktîb kitâbat aktîb
2fs. katâtîbi aktîb kitâbat aktîb
3ms. katâtib aktîb kitâbat aktîb
3fs. katâtîb aktîb kitâbat aktîb
1p. katâbna nikîb kitâbna nikîb
2p. katâtîm nikîb kitâbta nikîb
3p. katâtîb nikîb kitâbtîn nikîb

The -ăn forms of the imperfect are characteristic of the whole area, as well as Eastern Anatolia, Northern Arabia and Uzbekistan. The rural gišû dialects (and some speakers of MB) maintain a gender distinction in the 2nd and 3rd pers. pl. both in the verb and in the object pron. suff.; the distinction is absent in the qiltu group. A present indicative marker (e.g., Mo. qa, MB da) occurs in most dialects.

Syntax. Indeterminate nouns are, over much of the area, often marked by a morpheme derived from OA *fard (MB qadd, farâd). Determine direct objects are, with varying regularity in the different dialects, marked by an anticipatory pron. suff. plus *i, e.g., MB šîma lâhîh 'I saw your brother'. Also of frequent occurrence in the area are constructions of the type waçaâ lâzîm 'the good boy', i.e., a sort of construct phrase replacing the determinative noun plus adjectival phrase. Peculiar to CB, though it occurs also in Eastern Anatolia, is the use of a postposed copula, e.g., hâda šîlah yânu 'that's your business'. Negation is marked by ma- without postposed *i, by la- in negative imperative.

Vocabulary. Many items are characteristic of the area as a whole; they include a large number of Turkish and Persian loans. The following sampling is in MB unless otherwise indicated: âdîm 'person, individual', âtlâ, 'light', bâzûnâ (a) 'club, bâz, to steal', bûbû 'grandmother', tufqa 'rifle', timman 'rice', fôdi 'rat', cârak 'one-fourth', âtal 'fork', hâlîg 'mouth', hûnîa 'wheat', hâsim 'nose', hûsûga 'spoon', hîtâl 'to hide (intri.),' hû 'good', daaz 'to send', âbâ 'to throw', âbûm 'to hide (trans.),' 'agurruga 'frog', hâlmân 'to trick', giôbba 'room', gadda 'to beg for alms,' lûb, lûb 'another' (marrt ilûb 'again)', maz 'table, mewa 'fruit', niqa (Mo. âa) 'to give', hâdam (Mo. hâm) 'clothes', hâmû 'cow'. Among particles, note âku 'there is', neg. mûhû, the possessive marker mâl, and such adverbs as kam 'also', kudû 'much, many' (Mo. kõtîg, Southern wâgûd), nâmû (ya) 'here' (Mo. nõmi, nâmû 'there' (Mo. nõhîn, nâmîka), hîti 'thus' (Mo. kâhî, bâeb hûtû)'yesterday' (Mo. mbêhêa, bâeb 'tomorrow' (Mo. mûdâ), the interrogatives minus 'who', sî, 'what' (Mo. âa), lôn 'how' (Mo. akûn), wên 'where' (Mo. âa). Among characteristic interjections are i, bâi 'yes', ââ (observation of accomplishment fact: ââ sô 'so here you are'), sô (implying hope or concern: bô ma Paâdet 'you didn't get hurt, I hope?'), yêzî 'that's enough'.


(H. Blanc)

(irâk) (b) Iranian dialects

Although Persian is spoken by large communities in the holy cities of the Şîa, Karbala, Kâtiyman and Nadjaf, the main Iranian language of 'Irâk is Kurdish. Almost the entire population of the iwa'id of Sulaymânîyâ and Arbil and half that of Kirkûk is Kurdish, speaking Central Kurdish dialects. In Mosul iwa'id the Bahdînî dialect of Northern Kurdish is spoken. In the wâsâ'id of Aqâ and Amâdîyâ, Duhûk and Zûhû, and a related dialect is
used by the Yazidis of Sindjar. Southern Kurdish dialects are represented in the Khânakla and Mandall areas of Diyarl.; [see kurdu, Language].

Two other Iranian languages, often erroneously classed as Kurdish, are Gûrânî and Luri. The former is represented in 'Irâk by the Bûdânî dialects [see bûdânî] and the Hâwrânî spoken in a few villages near the Persian border north of the R. Sirwân [see haùraman; gûrân, Language]. Luri, the most closely related to Modern Persian of all Iranian languages, is spoken by the Fâyiyyâla, best known as porters in Baghêdâd.


### v.—Arabic Literature

The history of literary activity in 'Irâk is closely connected with the history of the caliphate, in the sense that Arabic literature, which had been almost exclusively 'Irâki both under the Umayyads (although Damascus was their capital) and also under the 'Abbâsid caliphs during the period when they were the real rulers of the empire, began to be dispersed as soon as more or less independent dynasties became established in various provinces. Since a distinction is drawn in the strict sense, a distinction dependent on the one hand on patronage, in respect of poetry, and on the other on the existence of administrative departments which employed kut llam as far as prose is concerned, the pre-eminence of 'Irâk suffered as soon as poets of talent began to look for patrons at the provincial courts and when the most talented scribes placed themselves at the service of the local rulers. A further point to be noted is the emigration to the West, and to Muslim Spain in particular, of writers and scholars of all disciplines as soon as the politico-religious situation appeared to be dangerous. Thus it can be said that from the 4th/10th century onwards 'Irâk, although still at the head, was increasingly rivalled by the other provinces of the empire; the decline which had already started was accentuated still more under the Seljuqs, and so, at the beginning of the 6th/11th century the Mongols dealt a mortal blow to Arab culture in 'Irâk.

There then began a long period of obscurity, which was to end in the 15th century; incidentally, 'Irâk merely followed, somewhat tardily, the Nâhda of the countries on the shores of the eastern Mediterranean, but after the second world war it embarked upon a deliberately revolutionary course.

Even in the pre-Islamic period Arabic poetry was practised in 'Irâk, especially in al-Hira [q.v.], where an Arab dynasty, the Lakhmis [q.v.], attracted poets who were natives of Arabia, for example al-Nâbiyya al-Dhûbûrî, who encouraged the flowering of local talents, particularly among the Christians, of whom 'Adî b. Zayd al-'îbâdî was outstanding. To judge by fragments considered to be authentic, the poetry which flowed there at Hîra was one of town life, with the inevitable panegyrics but also with bacchic themes which seem to have been characteristic. The end of the Lakhmîd dynasty (A. D. 602), soon followed by the preaching of Islam, seriously checked this poetic activity, but the founding of Başra [q.v.] and Kûfa [q.v.] made Lower Mesopotamia into an Arab colony, with the establishment of tribal elements coming principally from central and eastern Arabia; the Arabization took place rapidly, although the Persian captives composed no poems at that time. They were at least the newly sedentarized Bedouins who are now almost no non-Arabs to be found among the Muslims and gave rise to bloody conflicts, which are echoed in the writings of poets who were supporters of the 'Alids (al-'A'shâ of Hamdân; al-Kumâyit; Khuwayyîr 'Azza, etc.) or the Khârîjîs ('I'mrân b. Hîştân; al-Tîrîmînawî, etc.); their common hostility to the Umayyads has, as its corollary, the praising of the chiefs followed by these men, for whom poetry retained something of its magic character; and it is not uncommon, in such poetry as has survived, to detect an epic quality which makes us regret the loss of the greater part of this literary output which was, for once, inspired by sincere sentiments. There are still almost no non-Arabs to be found among the poets of talent, but perhaps it is as such, although his true character has not been established, that Ibn Mufarrîgh should be regarded; the implacable enemy of the sons of Ziyâd, he was already a member of the band of masâfî who were soon to challenge the Arabs successfully in a field in which the latter claimed to be unrivalled.

The bacchic tradition of al-Hira was maintained, particularly by Êî$hîl b. Badr al-Ghuddânî, but although erotic subjects were in no way neglected, there was still nothing in 'Irâk comparable with the love poetry which flourished during the same period in
in the towns of the Ḥijāz; and it was only with al-ʿAbābī b. al-ʿAbnāʾ (d. in about 190/805) that the Ḥijāz tradition penetrated into ʿIrāk. On the other hand, al-ʿAqlī b. Ḥudūlī of Kūfā is credited with the invention of the ṣurdiṣa [q.v.], which was practised with some success by his compatriot Abu ʿl-Nādīma, and by al-ʿAṣaṭīdī and his son Ruʿba, of Baṣra. For the town-dwelling poets of ʿIrāk, works in ṣurdiṣa subsequently offered a means of proving that they were acquainted with the life and vocabulary of the Beduins, before the ṣurdiṣa became the favourite form of didactic poetry.

In comparison with the pre-Islamic poetic tradition (at least, as one may imagine it to have been), the changes are thus not very spectacular. However, panegyric writing was henceforth addressed to personages who were no longer necessarily tribal chiefs; political and religious themes—though outside the bounds of orthodoxy—assumed a new importance, ṣurdiṣa began to take the form of short epigrams and, although the traditional forms were for the most part respected, some shorter works characterized a transition to a poetry less closely linked with the classical baṣīda.

In a more general way, this first period of intellectual life in ʿIrāk, the end of which coincided with the disappearance of the great Umayyad poets and the close of the true ʿarabiyā as defined by the lexicographers, was a period of adaptation to the new conditions of life for the Arabs settled in ʿIrāk, and of cultural adaptation for the foreign elements absorbed by Islam. In fact, it was this period which saw the beginnings of the development, in both Baṣra and Kūfā, of that Arabo-Islamic culture which was later to embrace the whole of the Muslim world and the assertion of ʿIrāk in all fields of intellectual activity, even though the political centre of the empire was still in Syria.

It is not possible here to describe the part played by ʿIrāk in the elaboration of the religious sciences; in a related sphere, however, it should be noted that grammar, in which the pioneer was probably ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Ṣaḥāk (d. 1177/776), was an ʿIrākī field of study and remained so. Moreover, it was in ʿIrāk that the main lexicographical and philological investigations were undertaken, work which, together with the systematic collection of ancient verse, proverbs and traditions of a more or less historical character, was to inspire a crowd of scholars or of ruwsī [see ṣawī], among whom Abī ʿAmr b. al-ʿAlī (d. about 154/771), al-ʿĀṣima (d. 213/828) and Abū ʿUbayda (d. 209/824) became well-known a little later, as did many others. The documents thus collected together were to constitute the principal foundation of literary culture, adab [q.v.], the origin of which must likewise be placed in ʿIrāk.

The coming to power of the ʿAbābīs merely accentuated the lead already taken by ʿIrāk in the intellectual sphere, by providing the poets and men of letters of that country and of the other regions of the empire with an opportunity to display their talent before these enlightened patrons. After the found-ering of Baghdad, the two metropolitan cities of Baṣra and Kūfā, whose literary activity was greater and more diversified than in the Ḥijāz, Syria or Egypt, for a time retained the position they had succeeded in attaining, but they soon came to play a less prominent part, merely supplying the new capital with an élite who were assured of finding fame and fortune there. From the second half of the 2nd/8th century there were indeed very few Kūfians or Baṣrans who, through modesty, fear or lack of ambition, did not at least try their luck in Baghdād. In this way a rivalry came into being which produced the most fortunate results for the development of literature.

Another phenomenon also accompanied the transfer of the centre of the empire to ʿIrāk—the introduction of the maḍāḥī [q.v.] not only to Arab culture but also to belles-lettres. A number of ʿIrākī Muslims of non-Arab origin had indeed already held a controlling part in the offices in the administration which, from the earliest time, had been a forcing-ground for men of letters; but a sort of democratization of culture, together with a more or less openly avowed desire to supplant the Arabs, considerably increased the numbers of these maḍāḥī who, having been brought up to use the Arabic language and possessing no other means of expression, adopted their conquerors' idiom and composed poetry and prose with felicity.

Imbued with the Arab poetic tradition, these maḍāḥī willingly sacrificed to custom and, when occasion required, wrote panegyrics which the Bedouin poets would not have rejected; but they tended to impose a "modernistic" poetry, characterized by the abandonment of classical forms and the adoption of themes consonant with the new way of life of the Muslims. The Kūṭāb al-Aḍāhāni, which devotes a very large part to ʿIrākī writing, contains instructive notices on poets of Baṣra or Kūfā who are regarded as modern authors by literary criticism, perhaps because they failed to respect the traditional rules, but who nevertheless deserve lasting attention, since they expressed sincere sentiments, in language of great simplicity, and at times did not scruple to hurl biting invective, the originality of which is unfortunately too often exceeded by its obscenity. All this work, which would, since it is true poetry, repay serious study, has in general been neglected for the most part, merely supplying the new capital with an élite who were assured of finding fame and fortune there. From the second half of the 2nd/8th century there were indeed very few Kūfians or Baṣrans who, through modesty, fear or lack of ambition, did not at least try their luck in Baghdād. In this way a rivalry came into being which produced the most fortunate results for the development of literature.

Another phenomenon also accompanied the transfer of the centre of the empire to ʿIrāk—the introduction of the maḍāḥī [q.v.] not only to Arab culture but also to belles-lettres. A number of ʿIrākī Muslims of non-Arab origin had indeed already held a controlling part in the offices in the administration which, from the earliest time, had been a forcing-ground for men of letters; but a sort of democratization of culture, together with a more or less openly avowed desire to supplant the Arabs, considerably increased the numbers of these maḍāḥī who, having been brought up to use the Arabic language and possessing no other means of expression, adopted their conquerors' idiom and composed poetry and prose with felicity.

Imbued with the Arab poetic tradition, these maḍāḥī willingly sacrificed to custom and, when occasion required, wrote panegyrics which the Bedouin poets would not have rejected; but they tended to impose a "modernistic" poetry, characterized by the abandonment of classical forms and the adoption of themes consonant with the new way of life of the Muslims. The Kūṭāb al-Aḍāhāni, which devotes a very large part to ʿIrākī writing, contains instructive notices on poets of Baṣra or Kūfā who are regarded as modern authors by literary criticism, perhaps because they failed to respect the traditional rules, but who nevertheless deserve lasting attention, since they expressed sincere sentiments, in language of great simplicity, and at times did not scruple to hurl biting invective, the originality of which is unfortunately too often exceeded by its obscenity. All this work, which would, since it is true poetry, repay serious study, has in general been neglected for the most part, merely supplying the new capital with an élite who were assured of finding fame and fortune there. From the second half of the 2nd/8th century there were indeed very few Kūfians or Baṣrans who, through modesty, fear or lack of ambition, did not at least try their luck in Baghdād. In this way a rivalry came into being which produced the most fortunate results for the development of literature.

Another phenomenon also accompanied the transfer of the centre of the empire to ʿIrāk—the introduction of the maḍāḥī [q.v.] not only to Arab culture but also to belles-lettres. A number of ʿIrākī Muslims of non-Arab origin had indeed already held a controlling part in the offices in the administration which, from the earliest time, had been a forcing-ground for men of letters; but a sort of democratization of culture, together with a more or less openly avowed desire to supplant the Arabs, considerably increased the numbers of these maḍāḥī who, having been brought up to use the Arabic language and possessing no other means of expression, adopted their conquerors' idiom and composed poetry and prose with felicity.

Imbued with the Arab poetic tradition, these maḍāḥī willingly sacrificed to custom and, when occasion required, wrote panegyrics which the Bedouin poets would not have rejected; but they tended to impose a "modernistic" poetry, characterized by the abandonment of classical forms and the adoption of themes consonant with the new way of life of the Muslims. The Kūṭāb al-Aḍāhāni, which devotes a very large part to ʿIrākī writing, contains instructive notices on poets of Baṣra or Kūfā who are regarded as modern authors by literary criticism, perhaps because they failed to respect the traditional rules, but who nevertheless deserve lasting attention, since they expressed sincere sentiments, in language of great simplicity, and at times did not scruple to hurl biting invective, the originality of which is unfortunately too often exceeded by its obscenity. All this work, which would, since it is true poetry, repay serious study, has in general been neglected for the most part, merely supplying the new capital with an élite who were assured of finding fame and fortune there. From the second half of the 2nd/8th century there were indeed very few Kūfians or Baṣrans who, through modesty, fear or lack of ambition, did not at least try their luck in Baghdād. In this way a rivalry came into being which produced the most fortunate results for the development of literature.

Another phenomenon also accompanied the transfer of the centre of the empire to ʿIrāk—the introduction of the maḍāḥī [q.v.] not only to Arab culture but also to belles-lettres. A number of ʿIrākī Muslims of non-Arab origin had indeed already held a controlling part in the offices in the administration which, from the earliest time, had been a forcing-ground for men of letters; but a sort of democratization of culture, together with a more or less openly avowed desire to supplant the Arabs, considerably increased the numbers of these maḍāḥī who, having been brought up to use the Arabic language and possessing no other means of expression, adopted their conquerors' idiom and composed poetry and prose with felicity.
complete and needs to be supplemented, despite the diffi- ulties of the task arising from the disappearance of a large proportion of this oral poetry and from the numerous interpolations made during later periods.

Although the evolution of poetry during the period in question is of undeniable importance, the fact which must be equally emphasized is the establish- ment of Arabo-Islamic culture and the accompanying development of Arabic prose; it is no exaggeration to say that Arabic literature, which hitherto has consisted almost exclusively of poetry, entered a new phase as soon as it was felt that prose lent itself better than verse to the expression of thought, however rudimentary, and that this new instrument deserved being taken into consideration; from that time, one has the impression that an equilibrium was reached and that the balance inclined towards prose.

In this field also the influence of Persia was de- cisive; and if the credit of the epitostyle genre, at the end of the Umayyad period, is to be attributed to ‘Abd al-Hamid b. Yahya, it was naturally enough in ‘Irak that this genre was to attain some measure of perfection, so long as the ‘Abbásids of Baghdád held power and employed kutáb (who incidentally were mainly non-Arab); thanks to the risála [q.v.], derived from the official letter, the genre was even to find a characteristic feature of erudite literature.

It was a kātib of the caliphate, Ibn al-Mukaffā’ (d. about 139/757), who with his translation of Kāliya wa-Dimmá and his own writings in fact created Arabic prose, both didactic and entertaining, by introducing into literature adab of the Sásanid type, whose purpose was the moral and so to speak “professional” instruction of the rulers and the people. The apologies of Kāliya wa-Dimmá inspired only one imitation by another Persian kātib, Sahl b. Hārūn (d. 244/858), but the adab of Ibn al-Mukaffā’, supplemented by elements of Persian origin, introduced to the ‘Iráks by translations from the Pahlavi, for a long time was to feed adab works of edification and popular encyclopaedias, first in ‘Irak and then in the other countries of the Arab world. Shortly after Ibn al-

Mukaffā’, translations from the Greek reached Baghdád or made their way into the Bayt al-‘ilmá (q.v.) of the capital, and the adab became limitumin [q.v.], later the fālāsfa [q.v.], while also providing adab with certain new maxims.

One activity which cannot be dismissed too strongly is that of the rauwt, who, coming after the generation which had devoted itself to collecting the elements of the Arab “humanities”, started to classify this vast documentation in a series of monographs, a surprisingly rich inventory of which is provided by the Fihrist; after al-Asma’i, Abu ‘Ubayda and their colleagues, Abu I-Hasan al-Madá’in (d. after 275/889), whose true influence it would be interesting to be able to assess, made available to later generations (though in a still obscure form despite the evident care he gave to classification) an enormous mass of information, traditions, verse, etc., derived from material collected among the Arab tribes.

It fell to al-Dījahž (d. 255/868) to apply critical study to this documentary material, in order to draw from it the necessary elements to constitute a large- scale, clear literary culture, to reject the legendary features and to indicate the methods by which it could be developed by reflection, research and experi- 

ment. Al-Dījahž described himself as a rauwt, but nevertheless was more than that, for although in the Bayt al-‘ilm the adab had limited itself to quoting traditions, he treated ethical adab in a more personal manner, which already amounted to a psychological analysis of qualities of character and a portrayal of society. His work, which should have marked a transition or stage, was in fact regarded as an end in itself by his admirers, or as a kind of betrayal of the Muslim ideal by his detractors, who endeavoured to lead culture and prose literature back to something more utilitarian and more com- patible with the requirements of the average Muslim. Although al-Dījahž had a remote successor in the person of ‘Alí ‘Abd al-Hayván (d. 312/923), he was supplanted, shortly after the collapse of the Mut‘azít movement, by a fāhib, Ibn Kütayba (d. 276/889), who brought a methodical and disci- plined intellect to the service of a more restricted and a less dangerous culture, one in which the religion and inheritance of the Arabs formed a coherent whole, open to the greatest numbers but preventing any kind of access into the outside world. Ibn Kütayba’s adab, represented by the ‘Uyun al-‘akhbár, the Kīdāb al-M arteries and the Kīdāb al-Shīr wa ‘l-‘ubwara, is composed mainly of quotations and traditional material, the greater part of which was to pass into later literature and to contribute largely to the popular encyclopaedias. The literary adab, made fashionable by al-Dījahž and systematized by Ibn Kütayba, was still represented by works such as the Fāmil al-Hawāwiyin (d. 285/898), before descending into the anthologies of verse, of which the Muwashsháth of al-Washshágl, which concentrates on the traditions relating to the dandies of Baghdad, is a typical and relatively original example.

While the works here referred to have survived, for they conformed with the tastes of a clientele which enjoyed short traditional accounts that were easy to memorize and to introduce into conversation, only a few very inadequate fragments are left from what was no doubt a more original literature, although still a subsidiary branch of riwdya, of erudition; to judge by the Fihrist, which records a considerable number of titles, it included true romances of love and adventure, burlesques (mostly obscene), and collections of amusing anecdotes, and in short was a purely literary genre in which imagination played a certain part. But no doubt as a result of a reaction among pietist circles, these works very soon ceased to be copied and merely made their way, in the form of extracts, into later collections where the lack of references makes identification impossible. However, the dual aspect of adab, as both diversion and instruction, can be seen also in a number or works of an intentionally serious character, such as al-Faraj b. ‘abd al-‘ghdá of al-

Tanákh (d. 384/994), which combines proverb, anecdote, and collections and narrative accounts mainly related by kātibs, on the theme of “relaxation after tension”. It is probably significant that it was in ‘Irak that the first stories of the “Thousand and one nights” [see ALF LAYLA WA-LAYLA] were collected together.

The Fihrist (written in 375/987-8) makes it possible to evaluate the richness of Arabic literature in Baghdad towards the end of the 4th/10th century, even allowing for the fact that the book-sellers of the capital may also have sold works written in other countries; in order to estimate the number of works, it would be necessary to reproduce a summary of this invaluable catalogue, a reading of which inspires the greatest admiration for the work of the scholars, writers and poets of ‘Irak.

The Fihrist also shows that the rich legacy of the philologists and rauwts of the early centuries deserves the merit
of collecting and transmitting the greater part of what we know of the Arab heritage, it was also the irdak who set themselves the task of reconstituting the divans of the ancient, the classical and the modernistic poets, and it is quite certain that this erudite work had the most far-reaching consequences on the development of Arabic poetry in irdak and elsewhere; perhaps even it immediately favoured the neo-classicism which followed the modernism. In fact, the modernist movement was only short-lived, and the triumph of Persian influence was far from conclusive since, as early as the end of the 2nd/8th century, the first manifestations of a reaction made their appearance, a reaction characterized by the return to classical forms and the use of more carefully chosen language than that of the modernists, and of more complex rhetorical figures of speech; the mausil themselves did not hesitate to plunge into neo-classicism, since the earliest representative of the movement, Muslim b. al-Walid (d. 287/899), was a mausil and his successors, Abu Tammam (d. 232/845), Ibn al-Rumi (d. 283/896), al-Buhturi (d. 284/897) and Ibn al-Muttazz (d. 294/907), were not all pure Arabs. These poets were finally to incorporate the thematic contributions of modernism in the traditional forms.

Neo-classicism, which originated in irdak, was soon to spread elsewhere, and the best known successor in regions of the Muslim world from the time when Baghdad was no longer its sole, undisputed capital and when the provincial courts attracted the greatest talents; the most celebrated representative of this type of poetry, al-Mutanabbi (d. 354/965), became famous principally in Aleppo, and many others stayed only very briefly in Baghdad. The decay of the Caliphate consequently brought with it a decline of irdak poetry, but the impression remains that the poets of irdak, among whom there was no longer any outstandingly great name, tended to fall back on themselves and to produce a more personal, more lyrical and perhaps more sincere poetry. One of them, Ibn al-Hamadhani (d. 351/961), represents this tendency very clearly, although his work is marred by its intolerable obscenity.

In the field of prose, it was probably towards the end of the 8th/10th century that Muhammad b. Ahmad Abu 'l-Mutahhar al-Azdi, inspired by al-Djahiz, created a new genre by delineating in his Ilkhya a satirical picture of life and manners in Baghdad, but his innovation, though very successful, produced no sequel. During the same period the scribes of the Bâyid chancellery customarily used rhymed prose in the epistolary style and made fashionable an original literary genre, the makâma [g.v.]; but al-Hamadhani was not an irdak, and although one of his most illustrious successors, al-Hariri (d. 516/1122), was a Bâyid, his "Sessions", through the very mass of their lexicographical erudition, bear the stamp of a period when philology had reached its highest point. It is still too early to judge the irdaki literature which has developed particularly since the second world war, but it should be noted that although in comparison with other Arabic-speaking countries irdak seems to show a slight backwardness, it nevertheless remains true that irdak is in general manifesting original and specific tendencies, which will perhaps enable the country to play again such a part as it held in the early days of Islam, at a time when attention was directed first towards Başra and Kifâ, and then towards Baghdad.
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At a very early date, immediately after the conquest of the country which was embarked upon during the caliphate of Abü Bakr (11/632-13/634) and completed during that of 'Umar (13/634-23/656), 'Irak became the scene of violent clashes among the various parties which were contending for power. From the reign of the caliph 'Uthman (23/644-33/655), a party in opposition to the caliph and the Umayyads came into being in 'Irak, and particularly in Kufa, one of their most energetic military leaders being al-Naṣir b. Jud, who had come from Egypt; he himself ranks as one of the "besiegers of the House" (muṣṭafā) and sometimes even as one of the caliph's murderers.

Under the caliphate of 'Ali b. Abü Ṭālib (33/656-60/680), 'Irak was for a time the stake of a new secession, between the Ḥijāz which for the most part favoured 'Ali, and Syria where Muṣ'awwiya had succeeded in gaining recognition. ʿAṭṭāṣa, Taḥfa and al-Zubayr, who had succeeded in winning over Baṣra to their cause, came into conflict with 'Ali near that town, in the famous battle of the Camel (al-Qāmīl [q.v.]) on 15 Djiumdād II 1369 December 656. Taḥfa and al-Zubayr perished in this confused battle, while the former wife of the Prophet had to return to Medina under a strong escort.

After the inconclusive encounter at ʿSiffin [q.v.], the acceptance by 'Ali of the arbitration (ṣaḥīṣ) proposed by Muṣ'awwiya in 37/657 was the starting point for the establishment of a new Muslim sect, that of the Ḥanafīya [q.v.], one of whose origins, like that of its history, are still extremely obscure. The secession extended to Ḥarḍara; the speech which 'Ali delivered in Kufa in justification of himself led to further desertions among his supporters. The insurrection soon possessed its own territory, its leaders and an embryonic political organization. 'Ali's inability to win back his former supporters, despite a few successes, made a clash inevitable; it took place in the battle of al-Nahrawan [q.v.], on 9 Safar 137/1 July 658. Khwaṭīridj, as a politically-religious movement, was not however destroyed.

The assassination of 'Ali, in 40/661, in the mosque of Kufa, by the Khwaṭīridj Ibn Muḥajjim [q.v.], left Šīʿism weakened and divided. It is to about this time that Muslim heresiography dates the appearance of the "Penitents" (al-Ḥaḍā'īr), a sect of the Sabiʿiyawā, whose founder 'Abd Allāh b. Saba [q.v.] seems to have been a Jew of Kufa, converted to Islam (H. Laoust, Schīʿism, 15-6).

During the reign of Muṣ'awwiya (40/661-60/670), the province of 'Irak was incorporated in the new caliphate of which Damascus became the capital, but it was the centre of opposition from two elements, the Šīʿīs and the Khwaṭīridjīs.

The leader of the Šīʿī resistance, in Kufa, was Nuḥja b. ʿAdi [q.v.], who first clashed with the governor of the town, al-Muṣḥira b. Shuʿba [q.v.], and soon came into open conflict with Ziyād b. Abīth [q.v.]. Charged with rebellion, Nuḥja was arrested and executed in Mardj ʿArbaʿa, near Damascus.

Khwaṭīridj agitation still remained active. Several revolts caused anxiety to the Umayyad caliphate—

- one led by Farwa b. Nafīl in 41/661, another under al-Mustawrid in the following year, and in particular the revolt by two of the men who had fought at Nahrawan, towards the end of the caliphate of Muṣ'awwiya.

The death of Muṣ'awwiya in 60/680, the disputed succession of his son Yāzid and the succession of 'Abd Allāh b. Zubayr [q.v.] favoured the revival of the Šīʿī and Khwaṭīridj opposition parties. The drama at Karbalā [q.v.], where the imām al-Husayn [q.v.] met a martyr's death on 10 Muharram 61/10 October 680, finally confirmed the rupture between the supporters of the Umayyads and those of the Family of the Prophet, although Husayn had met with only reluctant and uncertain support from the inhabitants of Kufa.

The revolt of the Penitents (taṣawwūbihā [q.v.]), an improvised and poorly-led affair, ended with the disaster of ʿAya Waarda, on 22 Djiumdād I 165/1 January 685, but it delayed the Umayyad reconquest of 'Irak.

The revolt of Muṣ'awwiya b. Abī Ubayd [q.v.], which was accompanied by an extremist ideology which was soon to be rejected by Sunni heresiography, was an improvised and poorly-led affair, ended with the disaster of ʿAya Waarda, on 22 Djiumdād I 165/1 January 685, but it delayed the Umayyad reconquest of 'Irak.

The first appearances in public life of the sect of the Kaysāniyya [q.v.] date roughly from this period, when that sect, as well as the 'Abbāsid claimant, Muṣ'awwiya b. 'Ali, on the occasion of his journey to Ḥumayma, the residence of the 'Abbāsids in Jordan. This thesis, of which the 'Abbāsids made use in their anti-Umayyad campaign, was still admitted in the 8th/14th century by such historians as Ibn Kaḥṣir, but it was not revived by the great theoretiors of the caliphate, such as al-Mawardi or Abu ʿI-Maṣfāl al-Ḍiwāyuni.

At the end of the Umayyad period, Šīʿī agitation reappeared with the revolt of Zayd b. 'Ali [q.v.] who rebelled in Kufa in 122/740 and met a tragic death in the town mosque where he had taken refuge with his last supporters. The revolt, though crushed in 'Irak, broke out as a little later in 'Umarāsā; during the caliphate of al-Walid II, under the leadership of Yabāy b. Zayd, whose mausoleum in Dīμāzajdān soon became a place of pilgrimage. With Zayd b. 'Ali there appeared a militant form of Šīʿism, known as Zaydism [q.v.]; according to its theory, authority passed lawfully to every qualified descendant of Fāṭima who called for insurrection and armed struggle (daʿwa and qiyād).

Another rebellion broke out a little later, once
again at Kufa, under 'Abd Allâh b. Mu'tawiya [q.v.], who was descended from neither Fâtimâ nor 'Abî, but from a brother of the latter, Dia'far al-Jayyâr [q.v.], whose death had occurred in 8/629 at the time of the expedition of Mu'ta. The revolt began in Kufa in 127/744, shortly after the accession of Marwân al-Himâr [q.v.]. Finally, crushed, the movement ended in circumstances not fully known. Several of its adherents are placed in the category of ghulât (Dianibiyya, Hârîniyya).

The problem of the Abbasids did not bring calm or religious unity to 'Irâk. Indeed, 'Irâk was pre-eminent the centre of the Mu'tazila [q.v.] movement, which had already made its appearance with the ending of the Umayyads, but which developed more particularly under the caliphate of al-Mâ'mûn and those of his two successors, in the two great schools of Basra and Baghdad. In the school of Basra, it is customary to include among its adherents such men as Abu '1-Hughayl al-'Allâd (d. 227/841 or 235/850 [q.v.]), al-Nazââm and Hîgîmân al-Fuwâštî (d. in about 200/816). In the school of Baghdad, of which Bishr b. al-Mû'tamîr is often considered to be the founder, there were found men of such different personalities as Abû Mûsâ al-Mûrdarî and Thumâmâ b. Ashras.

The two Dia'fars—Dia'far b. Mubashhîr and Dia'far b. Hârîb—are sometimes counted by certain hieographers, such as al-Mâla'tî [q.v.], not as Mu'tazila but rather among the Zaydiyya of Baghdad.

The Mu'tazili faction was to meet vigorous opposition, in the course of various confrontations among which the misna [q.v.] was doubtless the most dramatic episode, from the party of traditionalists, whose most militant representatives may be said to have included, among others, Abûn b. Hanbal [q.v.] and his first disciples [see HâNAsîLA].

The third major characteristic feature of the history of the firaq in mediaeval 'Irâk is found in the considerable importance acquired by imâmî Shi'ism, which sprang to life during the long crisis of the caliphate starting with the death of al-Muta-wakkil, and which was defended by theologians of the very first order, such as the Banû Nawbakht, or al-Kulaynî (d. 359/970), the author of the Kitâb al-Kâfi which deals with both wi'îl and fuvûs. Of the various attempts at construction, it is essential to remember the names of Ibn Bâbîyûsh (d. 381/991), known as al-Shaykh al-Sadûk, al-Mu'îdî (d. 413/1023) and the two brothers al-Ra'dî (d. 406/1016) and al-Murtâdî (d. 436/1045), equally famous as men of letters and as theorists of Imamism. The Shaykh al-Tâ'îla Abû Dia'far al-Tûsî (d. 460/ 1060) is the last great representative of this school.

The arrival of the Sabûkks in Baghdad in 447/1055 marked the start of a revival of Sunnism, punctuated at times by violent crises, such as that of al-Bâsâlî, or by a renewal of Shi'i agitation. Even within Sunnism itself, opposition between the A'Shî'îs and Han-balîs led to fairly frequent clashes, one of the most notorious of these, in 469/1077, being known as the fitna of Ibn al-KuShâyri. In the last two centuries of the caliphate, Mu'tazilism although in its decline still kept its place in Baghdad in the Bu'ayd period, it is easy to remember the names of Ibn Bâbîyûsh (d. 381/991), who is known as al-Shaykh al-Sadûk, al-Mu'îdî (d. 413/1023) and the two brothers al-Ra'dî (d. 406/1016) and al-Murtâdî (d. 436/1045), equally famous as men of letters and as theorists of Imamism. The Shaykh al-Tâ'îla Abû Dia'far al-Tûsî (d. 460/ 1060) is the last great representative of this school.

The geographical conditions peculiar to 'Irâk were long enjoyed and which in fact it began to acquire at the end of the Umayyad period certainly makes it difficult to speak of it as if it were a typically local art which had developed throughout the centuries with a well defined personality springing from the constant factors, aesthetic or technical, imposed on it by the physical character of the country. It should nevertheless not be forgotten that the very character of 'Irâk—as a route between other countries and an irrigable alluvial plain enriched by agriculture and by the traffic of its great rivers, but too frequently devastated by invasions and floods—was suited to particular methods of building, of architectural decoration and of other crafts, methods conditioned by the use of the economical and abundant but not very durable material—clay. This clay, packed together in the form of unbaked or baked bricks for the construction of the buildings themselves, applied for their decoration in facings (which might also be in plaster or stucco), and also worked into coarse pottery or rich enamelled porcelain, permitted the rapid completion, by typically Mesopotamian methods, of works satisfying the demands of a large urban population and of rulers seeking ostentation. But its use at the same time prevented such constructions from being sufficiently solid and durable to survive to the present day except as shapeless ruins. One may therefore distinguish as a characteristic of 'Irâk that its products were simultaneously magnificent and insubstantial—a characteristic appearing in all foundations of the 'Abbâsid period and later imitated in the princely constructions of various provinces of the empire, even when these provinces offered builders better and more durable materials. The two factors combined to make it impossible to 'Irâk (but also varying within its present frontiers according to the different zones of climate and living conditions) must be considered responsible also for the parallel development, throughout its history, of several local schools of art, basically represented by those schools of Baghdad-Samarra on the one hand and those of the Lower Delta on the other, together with that of al-Mawâsil [q.v.] or Upper Mesopotamia, which came more under the influence of the neighbouring
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II.—Art and Archaeology

The importance of the role played by 'Irâk in the evolution of Islamic art is directly related to the historical role which 'Irâk assumed from the time that it was the central province of a flourishing 'Abbâsid empire, between the end of the Umayyad period and a period of dissolution, which is generally considered to begin in the 4th/10th century. A methodical description of this role of 'Irâk would involve tracing, through its architecture and also through its minor arts, the various stages of the development of an imperial 'Abbâsid art which began in the capitals of the caliphs as a result of various causes and influences both political and commercial, and which spread to the outer regions of the empire—from which in fact some of its characteristic features had originally stemmed. The progress of this arts is the main title to fame of the craftsmen who worked at that time within the geographical limits of 'Irâk but at the same time made use, in this melting-pot, of all the earlier or contemporary efforts pursued in other Islamic countries.

This "imperial" character which the art of 'Irâk long enjoyed and which in fact it began to acquire at the end of the Umayyad period certainly makes it difficult to speak of it as if it were a typically local art which had developed throughout the centuries with a well defined personality springing from the constant factors, aesthetic or technical, imposed on it by the physical character of the country. It should nevertheless not be forgotten that the very character of 'Irâk—as a route between other countries and an irrigable alluvial plain enriched by agriculture and by the traffic of its great rivers, but too frequently devastated by invasions and floods—was suited to particular methods of building, of architectural decoration and of other crafts, methods conditioned by the use of the economical and abundant but not very durable material—clay. This clay, packed together in the form of unbaked or baked bricks for the construction of the buildings themselves, applied for their decoration in facings (which might also be in plaster or stucco), and also worked into coarse pottery or rich enamelled porcelain, permitted the rapid completion, by typically Mesopotamian methods, of works satisfying the demands of a large urban population and of rulers seeking ostentation. But its use at the same time prevented such constructions from being sufficiently solid and durable to survive to the present day except as shapeless ruins. One may therefore distinguish as a characteristic of 'Irâk that its products were simultaneously magnificent and insubstantial—a characteristic appearing in all foundations of the 'Abbâsid period and later imitated in the princely constructions of various provinces of the empire, even when these provinces offered builders better and more durable materials. The two factors combined to make it impossible to 'Irâk (but also varying within its present frontiers according to the different zones of climate and living conditions) must be considered responsible also for the parallel development, throughout its history, of several local schools of art, basically represented by those schools of Baghdad-Samarra on the one hand and those of the Lower Delta on the other, together with that of al-Mawâsil [q.v.] or Upper Mesopotamia, which came more under the influence of the neighbouring
Anatolia and Adharbayādn. But such distinctions should not lead to too strict a topographical classification of an artistic development which, as always in Islamic countries, also underwent the influence of political events leading to the temporary triumph of minor dynasties. Thus Islamic art in 'Irāk, both architecture and industrial art, should rather be considered in a chronological perspective, particular regard being paid to the fact that probably in no Islamic country has there been a more complete change in its landscape between the Middle Ages and today.

The few archaeological data which may be gleaned from sites which too often have reverted to desert are not in fact enough to provide any certain information on the various phases of population which the region passed through when the progressive decay of the irrigation network after the Abbāsids golden age led to the abandonment of villages and small towns, the exact sites and dimensions of which it is today sometimes difficult to determine (for an attempt at this, which applied extensive research to a limited area and which might well be extended to cover the whole of the ancient cultivated basin of the Tigris and the Euphrates, see R. Mc. C. Adams, Land Behind Baghdad, Chicago-London, 1965). Similarly it is at present impossible, in most cases, to provide an accurate history of 'Irākī Muslim towns, which were exceptionally important both in their population and in their economic activity, but which had grown up on an unstable soil, where usually there cannot now be found such remains of monuments as would enable us to reconstruct their topography at different periods (on the present state of such researches, too often based only on literary sources, see Baghdād, Al-Basra, Al-Kūfā, etc.).

There has nevertheless been some progress recently in the study of early Islamic architecture in 'Irāk, based on hitherto neglected evidence. This progress justifies our referring, in order to complete it in some points, to the table in the article Architecture showing its development during the first centuries of Islam, a period when its development was one with that of the whole of Islamic art.

The most positive if not the most spectacular contribution has probably been in the field of utilitarian objects, such as little attraction to the art historian, but providing material for the historian of civilization. Recent investigations on the systems of canal building and the division of irrigation-water which permitted the exploitation of the land during the Umayyad and Abbāsids periods, have produced a new documentation on this subject, based on aerial photography as well as on stratigraphical soundings and sections. At the same time there was revealed the existence of a type of great mosque on the one hand and a type of royal residence on the other, dating from the very early Islamic occupation of the country and differing from the Syrian specimens of the same period, which until then had been regarded as the only examples of the art of the period. The primitive mosque discovered at Uskāf Bānī Dīnunayd, on the west bank of the Nahrawān canal, and also the mosque at Wāsīt excavated on the site of the capital built in a single operation between 83/973 and 86/976 by the famous governor of 'Irāk for 'Abd al-Malik, al-Hadījjādī [q.v.], now provide plans more reliable than those based on debateable interpretations of the famous great mosques of al-Data and al-Kūfā. In addition, the interesting palaces which have been identified in these same localities of Wāsīt and Uskāf Bānī Dīnunayd and also in the neighbourhood of the great mosque at al-Kūfā, although excavations are so far incomplete and the results not fully published, provide as many examples of those dār al-imāra or bāšr al-imāra which were built at that time within the new Islamic cities. These palaces were already distinct, in the arrangement of their interior appartments or bāšr (similar to those found later in the Abbāsids houses and palaces), from the models current for the bāšrs in Syrian territory. The conclusions which may be drawn from these facts have so far been merely hinted at, but they should lead to a greater recognition of the part played in the development of early Islamic civilization by this Mesopotamian province, in which the Abbāsids revolution merely consolidated an economic and intellectual supremacy which had for long been acknowledged.

It is sufficient here to re-state only the main features of the Abbāsids architectural flowering in 'Irāk. The classic details on the subject, mainly derived from the study of the exceptional site provided by the ruined capital of the caliphs, Sāmarrā [q.v.], are to be found in every analysis of traditional Islamic art (see Architecture, Fann), so far as regards both the structure of the main buildings and also the various styles of decorative facing in painted or moulded stucco drawing on a repertoire of floral arabesques, interlaced geometrical patterns and even of representations of figures; these were to continue to appear throughout the later changes of early imperial art. Useful indications on various particular points may result from the research and restoration in progress at Uḫḫayādī [q.v.] an isolated castle of uncertain date which today stands in the desert steppe to the west of al-Kūfā, or from the continuation of investigations which up to now have been limited to a few selected new sections within the enormous area of Sāmarrā. They will not however greatly alter the present view of the width of the conception and the amazing richness characteristic of the religious and civil architecture of the period, which also saw the high points of such industrial crafts as glass-making and ceramics (the latter competing with Chinese porcelain, then imported in great quantity for the use of the caliphs), or carving on valuable woods, of which a few rare specimens have survived. Pottery continued to be usually made to an original Abbāsids school of Mesopotamia which flourished in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries before the craftsmen emigrated, probably to Fatimid Egypt, and which owed its fame mainly to its productions in cream porcelain with a painted decoration in cobalt blue or lustre.

Separate reference cannot be made here to the art of Dūwayhid and Saldāiates 'Irāk, the architectural features of which have completely disappeared and the productions of whose craftsmen are not sufficiently distant from those found at that period in the Iranian provinces, as a result of the revival of various earlier local traditions. The following period however was marked by a new advance in Islamic art in 'Irāk; this was, it is true, in a "provincial" form and had little influence outside the country, but it possessed a vitality comparable with that of the neighboring countries. It is from this post-Saldāiates period, covering the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries, that date the majority of the monuments which today form the architectural heritage of towns such as Baghdād and al-Mawsīl. In Bagdad, they are the results of the efforts made by the Caliphs al-Nāṣir [q.v.] and al-Mustanṣir [q.v.] to regain a temporal power, admittedly limited, but based on their territorial indepen-
dence and on a partial recovery of the former prestige of the caliphs. In the region of al-Mawsil, they are proof of the existence, at the small court of Zangi and his successors the Atabegs [q.v.] including the famous Lu'tu' [q.v.], of an artistic centre which was certainly neither negligible nor without an original vigour, in spite of the variety of influences which had produced it.

We shall refer here to the main features of this period of architectural development in Baghdad as shown by a rapid survey of the most important remains: fortifications (e.g., monumental gates such as al-Bāb al-Wastānī and Bāb al-Talism, of which the latter disappeared at the beginning of this century); fragments of civil buildings such as the Ḥarba bridge, the ruined remains of the former palace of the caliphs (incorporated in what later became the Ottoman citadel); or religious buildings in various stages of ruin, like the Mustansiryya madrasa, the mosque of the Sūk al-Ġhaţal (of which only the minaret has survived), or the mausoleum of al-Zubayda; we may also note such remains, outside the boundaries of Baghdad proper, as the sanctuary of Bāb al-Ḡaybā at Sāmarrā or the tomb of al-Ḥasan al-Ṭaṣri at al-Ṭāṣara. All these buildings display an extreme technical perfection in the use of baked bricks, according to the tradition already in use during the Ṣalṭjukid period, but in addition a new taste for the picturesque and a sumptuous treatment (of exteriors only), manifesting itself in the replacement of free forms by complicated compositions, either structural (honeycomb corbals used even to support domes of characteristic profile) or decorative (reduced motifs of arabesques and interlaced polygons moulded in baked clay and indecipherable now that they are seen out of scale).

This homogeneous architecture of Baghdad may be contrasted with the inequality to be found among the monuments of Upper Mesopotamia of the same period, such as the important but insufficiently studied group existing at al-Mawsil (ruins of the palace of Lu'tu' or Kara Saray on the banks of the Tigris, many small sanctuaries or tombs of saints, and a great mosque with one solitary and imposing cyp- drical minaret of brick) or the archaeological remains still at al-Rakka, outside the boundaries of present-day Iraq), but at least for the non-glazed pottery of this date (the immediate result of this disaster should, perhaps, not be exaggerated), a fate which was inevitable in a province which was now subordinate and no longer a conquering power. It is true that this more restricted life was still accompanied by activity in architecture and crafts. Throughout several centuries various noteworthy buildings were erected, in particular around the great Shi'ī shrines to which embellishments were continually added, in Baghdad as in Sāmarrā, Nadjar or Kārbala, and whose domes, covered with square porcelain tiles in glowing colours, may still be seen. But these various monuments which stylistically either from the art of Ilkhanid Persia (e.g., the Mirdānīyya madrasa or the Khan Mirdān of Baghdad) or Ṣafawid Persia or from Ottoman art (represented mainly by mosques, and by utilitarian buildings such as markets or hammams) have not been the object of studies or investigations enabling them to be assigned to their correct places in the line of a tradition which is both local and yet marked by many foreign influences, and thus conforms to one of the constant features of the history of Trāk.

**Bibliography:** All the general works on Islamic architecture and minor arts contain material on the various artistic developments of Trāk's from the time of the Islamic conquest but which did not survive the slow economic and political decline setting in after this date (the immediate result of this disaster should, perhaps, not be exaggerated), and thus in a province which was now subordinate and no longer a conquering power.

The capture of Baghdad by the Mongols in 1258 appears to have marked the end of the artistic supremacy which had been Trāk's from the time of the Islamic conquest but which did not survive the slow economic and political decline setting in after this date (the immediate result of this disaster should, perhaps, not be exaggerated), and thus con- trasts to one of the constant features of the history of Trāk.
'Iraki, Fakhr al-Din Ibrahim 'Iraki Hamadan, eminent Iranian poet and mystic. In spite of its lack of precision, the best source of information on this author, who gives very few autobiographical details in his own works, is an anonymous *muḥaddidima* (introduction), composed in the manner and style of 'Iraki's own period (the end of the 7th/13th century) or the beginning of the following period. *Djamī* (Nafāsāt al-uns) and Mir Ḭamān (Ibrāḥīm al-siyyār) have quoted their information on 'Iraki from this introduction. According to Ḥamīd Allī Mustawfī (Nafāsāt al-uns), Kazwīnī, who wrote his *Ṭārīkh-i guzīda* forty years after the death of 'Iraki (and there is no reason to suspect his witness), 'Iraki's father's name was Buzurgmīr b. 'Abd al-Ḥaẓūfī Dīwālīkhī Hamadānī, and his son was born in the village of Kūmjān, near Hamadān. In his introduction (dībājche), he reproduces the errors of Dowlātshāh, and states that there is no foundation for what the latter says about 'Iraki's attachment to a young boy and the punishment imposed by Shahrāzūrī, who is said to have sent him to Bahā al-Dīn Zakariyāyī in India, to mend his ways. In short, the later writers add many debatable details to 'Iraki's biography.

According to the *muḥaddidima*, he was a precocious youth. One day while he was uttering a commentary on the *Kur*7 in some *balandars* (wandering dervishes) came to listen to him; they persuaded him (in 627/1230) to give up teaching and to follow them to 'Iraki's 'Ādamī, and then to India; at Mūltān, they visited the scholar Bahā al-Dīn Zakariyā (q.v.), who, recognizing 'Iraki's ability, wished him to remain with him, but when 'Iraki realized this, he departed with three companions. On his return to Shīmānāt, where they were separated by a storm; after wandering for some time, 'Iraki and one of the *balandars* met again by chance in Delhi; then 'Iraki, having decided to join Bahā al-Dīn Zakariyāyī, returned alone to Mūltān and sat at the feet of the master, later becoming his son-in-law; soon afterwards, he had a son named Kabīr al-Dīn, and he remained for twenty-five years with his master, about whom he wrote several *diwāns* and *matnawāt*. On his return to Delhi, but, driven out by the jealousy of some of his colleagues, he departed for the Hijāz, whither some of them followed him. He was welcomed by the sultan of 'Umnān, who attempted in vain to detain him, and the travellers completed the Pilgrimage. Next, 'Iraki travelled in Asia Minor and put himself under the authority of Ṣadr al-Dīn of Kūnyā; after hearing his commentaries on the *Faṣūṣ* and the *Futuḥāt al-Makbiyā* of Ibn al-ʿArabī (q.v.), he gained the master's confidence. It was at this time that he wrote his *Lamāsī*; he submitted them to Ṣadr al-Dīn, who praised them highly (they must therefore have been completed before 673/1274, when the latter died). Many pupils attached themselves to 'Iraki; he gained the favour of the amīr Muʿin al-Dīn Sulaymān Parvānā (q.v.), who offered him a monastry at Dūkt (Tokāt). A series of anecdotes in the *muḥaddidima* concern 'Iraki's stay in this town, and in particular with his meeting with the master (Shams al-Dīn Dīwāynī [q.v.] (Mub. 14-6), who is said to have come there in the company of a brother of the Hīghānī Abākāt, in order to check on the actions of Muʿin al-Dīn (before 676/1277), when the latter was probably secretly in contact with Baybars, the sultan of Egypt. One day when he was uttering his last words (in the same year). Soon after this meeting, it seems that the enemies of Muʿin al-Dīn and of his protégé 'Iraki turned Shams al-Dīn against them, though the latter, recognizing 'Iraki's worth, assisted his hasty departure to Sinōp. Thence 'Iraki went to Egypt—which led to his being executed, at least in part, under the influence of the works of Ibn al-ʿArabī; however, at the beginning of the book (*Kulliyāt*, 328, l. 1) we read; "Now therefore these few words, setting out the degrees of love, have been dictated according to the mood of the moment, in the manner of the Šāmānī [of al-Ghazzīlī (q.v. Ahmad)], so that for whoever loves God they may be the mirror showing him the One Whom he loves, although the rank of love is too sublime for one to be able to approach by means of reason, understanding and eloquence, the royal Court of His Majesty . . . ." E. G. Browne (iii, 132-3) has translated the introduction giving the content of the work (cf. text: *Kulliyāt*, 327-9); he summarizes as follows (p. 124) his judgement on 'Iraki's character (of which S. Nafīsī gives some typical illustrations in his introduction to the *Kulliyāt*, p. xviii ff.): "He is the typical qalandar, heedless of his reputation, and seeing in every beautiful face or object a reflection, as in a mirror, of the Eternal Beauty" (cf. the end of the dialogue of Socrates and Dioumis: Plato, Symposium, Greek text, 209-12).

**Bibliography:** *Kulliyāt*, complete works, ed. Saʿd al-Nafīsī, with important introduction, Tehran 1355/1957; Dīwān, ed H. Ritter (Bibl. Islamica, XVI)—Translations: *The Song of the Lovers*.
A tribe called Iram is mentioned several times in ancient poems (over a dozen references are given by J. Horovitz, *Koranische Untersuchungen*, Berlin 1926, 89 f.). It is mostly coupled with ād, but sometimes also with Thamūd, Ḥimyar, etc., and is said to have been destroyed by a man called Ḫudar al-Ḥimmar (Uljaymir). In this meaning Iram is an ancient Arabian tribe. In his *Muṣallaha*, 68, al-Ḥārith b. Ḥillīzā uses the adjective *iraml* in the sense of 'a man of ancient race' (cf. al-Tibrīzī, *ad loc.*). When Muslim scholars came to link up traditional Arab genealogies with those of the Bible, they identified Iram with Aram the son of Shem (*Genesis*, x, 22 f.; 1 *Chronicles*, i, 17), and made various ancient peoples of Arabia descendants of Iram. Thus ād [q.v.] is the son of āws b. Iram (cf. Biblical Us) and Ṣanūd [q.v.] the son of Ṣābir b. Iram. The Ṣamālik [q.v.] or Amālikīs are the descendants of Ṣamālik (or Ṣalmālik) b. Lāwudh (cf. Lūd) b. Iram; and another son of Lāwudh, Uwaym, is said to have gone to Persia and is sometimes identified with Gāyomart (Ibn Ḥīṣām, 5; al-Masʿūdi, *Murūdī*, i, 77 f.; etc.).

(a) As a geographical term Iram is properly a pile of stones erected as a way-mark. Yākūt (al-Masʿūdi, *Murūdī*, i, 212-6) mentions a mountain and another place of this name in Arabia (cf. Th. Nöldeke, *Fünf Monllaaqai*, i, 78). When Muslim scholars regard Iram Dḥāt al-ʿimād as a town, they mostly identify it with Damascus, presumably because this part of Syria is called arām in Hebrew. Some, however, make it Alexandria or a place in the Yemen (Yākūt, *loc. cit.*).

(3) The word occurs once in the Kūr ṣān (LXXXIX, 6): a lam lara kaya faʿala rābu-ka biʿādī irama dḥāt l-ʿimād ... The passage has caused great difficulty to the commentators, both in respect of the meaning of the words and of their grammatical construction. Some read ʿādī, making ʿārama a dependent genitive, and then took Iram to be the capital of ād. The most likely view is that Iram designates a tribe and is in apposition with ʿādī, and that ʿimād means tent-pole or tallness. Iram may then be a subdivision of ād, as al-Ṭabarī suggests (*ad loc.*). Later Muslim scholars preferred to take Iram as a town, and Ḍhāt l-ʿimād could then mean 'with the pillars'; this was said to be the marble columns of Damascus. It is fascinating to observe the increasing elaboration of the accounts of this Iram Dḥāt al-ʿimād. One common story tells how it was built near Aden by Ṣhaddād b. ād as an imitation of Paradise, and how he was then, as a punishment for his pride, destroyed by a tornado and the city buried in sand (Yākūt, *loc. cit.*). In another story Alexander the Great finds at Alexandria the ruins of a great building with marble columns and an inscription telling how it was built as a replica of the first Iram Dḥāt al-ʿimād. Yet another story tells how in the reign of Muʿawiyah a bedouin found wonderful ruins in the sand.